



# Mid-Term Review of Building Drought Resilience Project, Kenya and Uganda

Dr. Ingrid Hartmann- International Consultant  
Charlottenburger Ufer 3  
10587 Berlin, Germany  
Phone: 0049-30-32502215  
Email: Ingridethio@yahoo.com

Dr. Washington Ochola - Regional Consultant  
Phone: +254-721-986-770  
Email: babatamara@yahoo.com  
<http://washingtonochola.blogspot.com>  
skype:washingtonochola

Dr. Jane Bemigisha  
Mr. Hen83 TcP026031-16(b)-23(c)P2031-3(s)-2s(J)-22(a)-216(b)-23(c)P2031-2





**Tables:**

Table 1: Result Areas and Resilience Pillars.....7

Table 2: Achievements of the Project versus Targets.....17

Table 3: Scores given on different interventions by Stakeholders in Stakeholder Meeting, Kenya .....19

Table 4: Suggested amendments on the Log-frame.....21

Table 5: Performance Matrix.....33

Table 6: Utilization of Funds.....41

Table 7: Community Actions in the Case of Absence of the Fund .....41

**Figures:**

Figure 1: Livelihood Framework .....5

Figure 2: Resilience Framework related to the IUCN Resilience Pillars .....6

Figure 3: Framework for mtr .....45





# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

---

## Introduction

This mid-term review was for a 3-year (2012-2014) Austrian Aid funded IUCN Eastern and Southern Africa Regional Office (ESARO) *Building Drought Resilience through Land and Water Management in Kenya (Lower Tana sub-catchment) and Uganda (the Upper Aswa-Agago sub-catchment)*. The aim of the project is to improve resilience of dryland communities within a river catchment to the impacts of increasingly severe and frequent drought, through strengthened ecosystem management and adaptive capacity. The project is applying a framework of strengthening societal and ecological resilience in the face of changing climate and increasing intensity of drought. The total funding of the project is 1 Million euros with a co-financing of 100,000 euros.

The scope of the mid-effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, sustainability and impacts; document lessons learned and make recommendations for consideration for the remaining project period as well as for future work.

## Project result areas and performance

The project is designed with five result areas matched to the resilience pillars as a mechanism for resilience enhancement. Result area 1 focuses on improving the integrity and functioning of catchments through ecosystems based actions that are gender sensitive and diversify livelihood assets. This is hoped to increase the diversity of options to invest into livelihoods and ecosystems and build sustainable infrastructures and technologies. Result area 2 focuses on improving the capacity of traditional and formal resource management institutions to sustainably manage natural resources within the catchment area. It is expected that this will enhance self-organisation at community level. Result area 3 focuses on mobilizing and improving the knowledge and skills of local communities to implement adaptation and innovation. Through this process, the resultant diversification of livelihoods and learning are hoped to strengthen the resilience of communities. Result area 4 focuses on greater coordination between multi-sectoral institutions improves harmonisation of plans and interventions. Through this strategy, self-organisation and learning processes are hoped to be strengthened. Finally, Result area 5 addresses raising awareness among policy makers on catchment management approaches to be increased through learning based on project experiences. This is essentially hoped to strengthen learning under the resilience building process.

## Effectiveness

- i. Most activities have been implemented according to the project plan, some of them ahead of scheduled time, except market chain development and GIS mapping, which will be done during the remaining phase.
- ii. The project has made excellent achievements in the area of wetland and riverbank protection, water development and management and sustainable land management in both countries. Particular merits of the project lie also in the integration of the poorest and most vulnerable segments of the rural population and prioritizing their needs. Specifically the following has been achieved:

The outputs achieved in the area of livelihood diversification are mainly related to tree planting and irrigation agriculture; for Kenya also gums, resins and aloe production. Further outputs on livelihood diversification are envisaged in the areas of small scale business and trade in the coming phase;

Sustainable technologies have mainly been installed for water development, including the provision of water harvesting structures, ponds, wells, pans and hand pumps in Uganda. Water supply and water resources management has been effectively integrated into rangeland management, so that an optimal balance between pastures and water resources has been achieved;

The project has harmonised successfully traditional laws with modern formal law, so that some of the by-laws can be legally enforced. However some of the by-laws still require harmonization with other sectors;

Outputs in p7&E\$xlxg&H+WbGS\$EwT5@bBDFR&18UYy&8U)R&e







There is the resilience approach divided into four pillars, which is kind of a shadow logframe. There are community prioritized actions, which substantially determine the shape and success of the project and could be addressed by a separate framework to be produced ad-hoc after community prioritized actions have been identified. While partly the community prioritized actions are captured through the impact indicators, their management is not. Furthermore, the log-frame and work-plan only foresaw community prioritized actions for Result Area 1, but what happened on the ground is that community prioritized actions took place in Result Area 1-3, which is the appropriate consequence of the self-regulation pillar of the resilience approach and was adequately taken up by the project management.

Furthermore, matrices of baselines and impact indicators are not identical. Respectively, baselines relate only to management and not to impacts. The division into sub-activities is partly not necessary, Result Area 3 should be mainstreamed and Result Area 4 should be reformulated in a more targeted and tangible way.

### **Relevance**

- i. The design and approach of the project was found to be very relevant in addressing the identified needs, issues and challenges, as far as building drought resilience is concerned in Arid and Semi-Arid Lands (ASALs)



iv)



(Highest score 6, lowest score 1, not assessable 0)

	Score
Output 1	6
Output 2	6
Output 3	4-5
Output 4	5-6
Output 5	5-6

Sustainability, Relevance and Impact 0.0.001 Tf18f1 0 0 1 101.66 27mBT1d001 206.66 0.0.001 ref\*EMC P A/CID 0Lang



1.



## **Uganda**

In Uganda, the project is aligned to key policies and strategies that underpin the decentralization of water governance, particularly, the National Constitution (1995), the decentralization policy (1995), the Local Government Act (1997), the National Environment Policy (1995), the Water Policy (1999) and Water Act (2000).

Plan (NDP) of 2010, including the key objective of promoting sustainable use of the environment and natural resources. This includes a focus on restoration of degraded ecosystems and improvement in the management

















**Box 2: Elements of the SCPs**

Major elements of the SCPs in Kenya are the mapping of water and land management units and the current status of resources and existing management practices. They contain an overview on population and settlements within the respective sub-catchment and a community ranking of major environmental problems. To establish in particular drought resilience building, the SCPs contain a participatory conservation approach to achieve drought resilience. The final parts of the SCMPs are related to resource availability and use, under the aspects of equitability of access, efficiency of use and conserv





Achievements of the project to revitalize by-laws or draft new ones, which match the requirements of sustainable dryland and wetland management under increasing drought conditions, have been substantial, but had a different shape in the two countries.

**In Uganda** customary law had to a great extent been forgotten due to the civil war, because it was not applicable in IDP camps, therefore, almost all by-laws developed within the project were new and were particularly devoted to three areas:

- Management of water sources, particularly, collection of water
- Land use and environment: issues like tree cutting, burning the bush, community participation, protection of riverbanks and wetlands
- Use and distribution of the CEFC fund.

Finally, the by-laws were transformed into parish laws, which were translated into the local language and approved by the Sub-county local councils. Some of those by-laws became district laws or ordinances and can be enforced through official legislation.

**In Kenya**, a study on customary institutions and regulations made the following recommendations:

- Develop a structure for by-laws* and facilitate the four communities to develop their own by-laws in a participatory process based on the common structure;
- Validate the by-laws* through an elaborate process at the level of each community that may include the production of the by-laws in the local language where appropriate;
- Develop and implement a strategy to support the county governments to develop regulations* for recognition and enforcement of community by-laws for planning and management of natural resources.
- Develop and implement a strategy to support communities to have their by-laws* recognized by the county governments as a basis for enforcement

Subsequently some of the recommendations especially 1 and partly 2 above have been implemented, while the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> recommendations will be implemented in phase 2.

**Result 3: Knowledge and skills of local communities to implement adaptation, innovation and change within institutions are mobilized and improved**

Activity	Sub-activity	Quarter
<b>Activity 3.1</b> Knowledge and skills of local communities to implement adaptation, innovation and change within institutions are mobilized and improved	<b>Sub-activity 3.1.1</b> Facilitate exchange visits between communities within a catchment area for learning and knowledge exchange	1-2/13
<b>Activity 3.2</b> Market and value chain analysis of economically and environmentally sustainable natural resource products that have been identified in management plans	<b>Sub-activity 3.2.1</b> Analysis of market and value chains of suitable natural resource products which identified synergies and limitations of operationalisation	2-4/12
<b>Activity 3.3</b> Communities facilitated to identify priority business opportunities and training of local business entrepreneurs in business enterprise that focus on environmentally and economically sustainable natural resource products	<b>Sub-activity 3.3.1</b> Facilitation of dialogue meetings with key stakeholders across sectors to disseminate	





### Conclusion

The interventions in this result area have high synergies with activities under Result Area 1.3 on water management and by-laws on sustainable rangeland management, which eases the pressures on grazing land and therefore conserving it. The positive impacts on land management created by the project may in the long run be effective in restoring former pasture productivity with additional positive impacts on water resources.

The Result area does not really have a focus, and the linking of market and business activities solely with knowledge management appears a little bit casual. Vice versa there is the impression that the various other activities related to knowledge management are miscellaneous. For instance, it is not clear why tree production in Uganda and irrigation agriculture is reported under this result. To solve this confusion, it seems rather to be recommendable to link knowledge management to all Result Areas as a cross-cutting issue, as further elaborated in the Sub-Section on Project Design. It is also not clear, why Activity 3.1 was conducted after Activity 3.2, and Sub-Activity 3.3.2 started later than 3.3.3.

### Result 4: Greater Coordination between Multi-Sector Institutions

Activity	Sub-activity	Quarter
Activity 4.1 Strengthen existing multi-stakeholder dialogues between different natural resource users to mitigate conflicts and prevent exacerbation of drought conditions	<b>Sub-activity 4.1.1</b> Train key stakeholders in multi-stakeholder processes to reduce conflict over natural resources within the catchment area	3 and 4/12
	<b>Sub-activity 4.1.2</b> Facilitate the strengthening of existing catchment dialogue platforms (f.eg. WRUAs) between different natural resources users to mitigate conflicts	4/12-4/14

Activity 4.2





Activity 4.2: **In Uganda** the project hosted a learning exchange visit of participants from Kigezi Diocese and the Albert Nile Water Management Zone an IWRM project team with funding from DANIDA. The agenda was lesson sharing and visit of BDR project sites in Lira and Otuke districts. The visitors appreciated the CECF approach, which they wish to replicate at their sites in South West Uganda. **In Kenya** the project organized an exchange visit to Garba Tula and Isiolo and visits



- Hosting a national stakeholder awareness creation workshop on Integrated Water Resources Management;
- Choosing BDR project site of Ating parish in Otuke District by the 4th Joint Technical Review Committee of the Ministry of Water and Environment as a learning site for IWRM;
- Participation in the October 2012 Joint sector review meetings between the Government of Uganda, the Donors and Ministry of Water and Environment;
- Orientation of project staff to a new DANIDA-funded IWRM project;
- Support to two UWASNET IWRM workshops to draft the Otuke district NRM ordinance;
- A team from the Austrian Development Cooperation (ADC) in Uganda and Journalists from Austria visited the Uganda project sites in May 2013 for learning and understanding project progress in resilience building of community government's new ecosystem-based approach to Water Resource Management; and
- Participation in World Water Day in Lira District.

The project conducts monthly community meetings to which policy makers are invited, where all current and





## 6. PROJECT PERFORMANCE

---

### 6.1. Effectiveness

In terms of effective delivery of the outputs and activities most of the activities have been implemented in accordance with the project plan, some of them ahead of schedule, except GIS mapping, which is still outstanding and is scheduled to be implemented during the remaining period of the project. Other activities scheduled to be accomplished before the project ends includes bio-enterprise development under Result Area 3.

The project has excellent outputs in the area of riverbank protection, water development and management and sustainable land management in both countries. Particular merits of the project lie in integrating the needs of the poorest and most vulnerable segments of the rural population in project activities and targets. The outputs achieved in the area of livelihood diversification are mainly related to rehabilitation of degraded areas, promotion of small-scale irrigation agriculture, gums, resins and aloe production.



Result Area	Output Targets	Achievements
Result 2: Improved capacity of traditional and formal resource management institutions to		





*. % change in extent to which resource management as a means to improve adaptation*







#### **6.1.4 Factors which enhanced the effectiveness of the project implementation**

##### *Implementation Approach*

While the implementation approach turned out to be highly successful, there are still options for improvement as outlined below:

The four pillars of the resilience approach are generically distributed to certain desired outcomes. This has to be revisited and instead all elements of ecosystems and livelihoods including the various components of value chains, should be linked to all four pillars of the resilience approach. The need for this is particularly true for market development, which is only linked to the adaptive learning pillar and submerged under knowledge management. This could



*Co-funding and Synergies:*

The project managed to ensure additional financial support from the government, as well as from the Howard G. Buffett Foundation through Global Water Initiative in Kenya and many others, and new proposals



## **6.2 Efficiency**

### **6.2.1 Project Staff**

The project staff in both countries have an appropriate and rich educational background to manage the project. The evaluation found that the project staff are highly dynamic, engaging, competent and well informed, as well as extremely active, committed and well coordinated.

### **6.2.2. Initial Unforeseen Problems**

Initially the project transaction costs in Uganda were higher than anticipated. This is because the project had no vehicle and the old IUCN office car which was allocated attracted high repair and maintenance



Through its inter-sectoral approach on water, the project has adequately recognized the ADC water policy by emphasising harmonization and integration of water, agriculture and health issues and creating inter-sectoral linkages for implementation of interventions.

The project is also successfully aligned to key policies and strategies in Uganda and Kenya that underpin the decentralization of water governance and the Nairobi principles, which state that urgent actions are needed to use land and water resources for development and livelihoods improvement in particular to address vulnerability to climate change through integrated approach by working within specific catchments and addressing natural resource management encompassing both land and water.

### 6.3.2 Relevance to Community Needs

Project interventions were found to be relevant to community needs in as far as they are coherent with IUCN Policies. For instance, at the district levels, the project has been relevant to relieve major environmental problems such as the protection of wetlands and riverbanks in both countries, the protection of the Shea tree in particular in Uganda, and the mitigation of environmental problems linked to higher sedentarism of pastoralists in Kenya.

The PM has shown a very high understanding of closing the gaps in the human-environmental systems, which disrupted resilience. For example, the loss of resilience addressed in **Uganda** was due to an unsustainable response to a reduction of the rainy season and general amounts of precipitation and increased temperatures, which stimulated the cultivation of riverbanks and wetlands, which are capable of holding soil moisture longer. Cultivation of wetlands and riverbanks led to loss of environmental resilience through deterioration of water sources in the catchment for house-holds use, which again affected negatively the well-being and economic resilience of households. On the other hand, the loss of economic resilience triggered destruction of the Shea tree for charcoal burning, which otherwise was protected for its high economic value of the Shea butter. Despite lower revenues from charcoal burning than from Shea butter, people were forced to sacrifice long-term incomes to meet short-term needs for cash to meet their daily subsistence, leading to a breakdown of resilience of the human-ecological system, which the project has successfully addressed through its livelihood interventions and catchment management plans.

In **Kenya**, the loss of resilience had been due to a reduction of land productivity and unsustainable coping mechanisms such as higher sedentarism, which had dismantled the validity and applicability of traditional institutions. The change in environmental and social conditions also increased the pressure on water systems, further exacerbating the imbalance between pasture and water resources



reached at higher temperatures and lower precipitation, then an approach which supports the human-ecological system to restore its original structure might not necessarily be appropriate because the original structure will no more be adapted<sup>1</sup> to the long-term change and instead, the underlying structure itself will need to be totally changed by implementing no-regret approaches towards long-term adaptation to drier conditions. This situation would require rather a long-term adaptation strategy. Therefore resilience approaches make more sense with respect to disasters and extreme events than climatic change.

## **6.4 Sustainability**

The project identified lack of political support as the only risk which did not happen. Due to the approach of the project to involve partners from different sectors and at different levels, support to the project has been very high. Indeed, sustainability within the project is high and is expected to continue even after end of project as highlighted below:

### **6.4.1 Sustainability building through the resilience approach**

Resilience has a lot in common with sustainability; therefore, through resilience building also sustainability of an intervention is established. The step from resilience to sustainability only requires a further transition from just being able to restore the original conditions from a shock towards maintaining these conditions in future. On management level this requires that the project processes be maintained and managed through the communities. This is achievable, since all components which stimulate self-regulation of communities also enhance capabilities and therefore sustainability at management level. By the MTR undertaking, communities had already acquired the necessary skills and knowledge to manage their own funds and resources and to replicate some of the interventions.

### **6.4.2 Ecological Sustainability**

Ecological sustainability



The motivation of stakeholders was created through their involvement in management plans and vision maps right from the beginning. Continuity of involvement was ensured through by-laws and incentives through access to the CECF. In Uganda, stakeholders initially had resisted to collaborate with

#### **6.4.6 Conclusions**





**In Kenya** improved water availability (with full support from the Government and partners) on rangeland led to improved conservation of pastures throughout the seasons and therefore improved land productivity so that the system did not collapse under drought conditions by forcing pastoralists too early to graze in dry reserves. The major impacts were recorded in the following areas:

*Mapping and Resource Planning*





## CECF

Most interesting are the lessons, which the Ugandan PM extracted about the social and ecological benefits accrued through the CECF and what would have happened without the fund. The results are very clear:

**Ecological resilience** would have been botched; first through continuation of charcoal production and cultivation of wetlands. Furthermore, many communities would not have collaborated within communal work for environmental protection, like the clearing of water sources and establishment of buffer zones. Secondly, **food security** would have broken down, since communities would have had lesser incomes. Thirdly, **education** would have been impacted, since many parents would not have been able to continue paying school fees. Fourthly, **poverty-related conflicts** would have increased within families and communities. Fifthly, and most interestingly, **poverty related psychological problems** would also have increased, such as depression and, hopelessness. Finally, **hygienic issues** and related health problems would have worsened. In summary, the fund led to:

Improved connectedness of the community members through the monthly village meetings;



drier and people would have started to cultivate the wetlands, to compensate for the losses of yields. Under this pressure, the erosion of riverbanks would have been further increased, leading to a loss of land, floods and further changes of the riverbed. The same would have happened in Kenya without the implementation of the SCPs. Therefore, the resilience of dryland ecosystems would have been undermined by continued unsustainable natural resource exploitation, widespread environmental degradation, emergence of non-compatible land use systems and inappropriate coping mechanisms for livelihood support e.g. clearing wetlands and riverine areas for cultivation and rampant deforestation for charcoal burning as alternative livelihood. Without the project interventions, all the above would result into extreme poverty levels and break down of social and ecological resilience thus rendering the communities more vulnerable to climate shocks.

It is moreover envisaged that there would be a significant increase in **land** degradation and **water stress** for example in the middle Aswa-Agago catchment, where the human populations are higher than in the upper catchment, ultimately impacting on the lower catchment areas through silting and flooding. Other



## 6.6. Lessons Learnt

Lessons learnt in the following are perceived as certain evidence and conclusions drawn by the evaluators based on certain outcomes of the project.

### 6.6.1 Implementation Approach

#### *Overall implementation and impact*

The project staff in both countries understood well and implemented the resilience approach of IUCN by carefully identifying and filling existing or emerging gaps within the human-environmental system. While the resilience approach in total seems to be a great success, it is in particular the strengthening of elements of self-regulation and connectivity and their integration with prioritized activities by communities on the ground, which have mainly been instrumental in generating the success and positive impacts observed in the MTR.

#### *Livelihood support to ensure environmental protection*





**Final Rating Effectiveness: (Highest score 6, lowest score 1, not assessable 0)**

Issue	Score
Output 1	6
Output 2	6





Under the existing MoU arrangements the CECF **in Uganda** could be managed on behalf of DWRM which could help to roll out and upscale CEFC in other districts in the catchment. This would also help to trigger policy be



### *Tree Development*

On tree development, certain changes were suggested for future phases. In Uganda, tree nurseries should be established under the supervision of few interested individuals instead of the entire community.

Fruit trees which yield in the first year, like banana, pawpaw should be given priority in the beginning, to motivate community members to participate in the activities.

In Kenya, in general better exploration of the economic potential of Non-timber forest products (NTFP) and valuable wood trees should be focused upon, but since NTFP also often turn out to be a poverty trap, development of NTFP value chains should be incorporated. The development of commercial trees such as *Marer – Cordia quercifolia*, *Ohio – Cadaba sp.* *Tira – Clerodendrum* were recommended by communities during the MTR, in addition to the common gum and resin trees *Acacia Senegal*, *Commiphora* and *Boswellia*.

### *Soil and water conservation on catchment level*

Stone lines and soil bunds in hilly areas are sustainable technologies which protect riverbanks on catchment level against siltation. Trenches, *zai* culture, half-moons, *fanjaa juu* systems can improve the soil water storage capacity within rangelands which will further enhance rangeland productivity. Where considered as feasible, these should be included into future sub-catchment plans in collaboration with communities and installed in future phases, particularly in Kenya.

### *Replacing water, where wetlands are protected*

Wetlands are used as safety nets for water during dry seasons where wetlands are protected, these water sources for human and livestock consumption and agricultural production are not available for people, which therefore have to be replaced to enhance livelihoods and well-being of project beneficiaries and the sustainability of the project.

Water harvesting and diverting water to the people in sustainable way would therefore, be a necessary intervention for the future. Obviously, traditional knowledge will not be sufficient to ensure that, therefore, in particular for Uganda, it is recommendable to hire a hydrological specialist as a consultant who will optimize the water supply system in the catchments under conditions of full wetland protection.

#### *- Groundwater prospecting*

Groundwater prospecting was highly recommended by communities to enhance the available water sources in the region.

#### *- Using water efficient crop varieties, where water scarcity remains*

Where water scarcity remains, more water efficient crops can be used, such as sorghum instead of rice, where culturally accepted.

#### *- Nutrient recycling for agricultural production*

If not yet provided through the existing agricultural extens





### ***Result 3: Knowledge Management***

-



## Wildlife

- Training on conservation of wildlife
- Training on data collection on signs and symptoms of outbreak of diseases for early reporting and action plan
- Life-saving skills from attacks of wildlife
- Sensitization of community and by-laws creation on land use and management (all sectors)
- Training on proposal writing and development

## Minerals

- Training on exploitation and use of minerals
- Training on marketing of ballast, building blocks and cement
- Entrepreneurial training
- Education tour to Matuu and Thika
- Sensitization on the impacts of the exploitation process

## Pasture and fodder production

- Sensitization on use of wet and dry season fodder during different periods
- Training on pasture and fodder production and storage e.g. hays farms
- Sensitization on dangers of causing wildfire
- Training on pasture and fodder seeding and re-seeding in rainy season
- Training on pasture/fodder marketing
- Training on control of *Prosopis juliflora* and other encroaching bush

### - *Involving Science*

To enhance the vibrancy of the learning part of the project, it is recommended to implement a CB-2 project for knowledge management. The project could support establishing the GIS data base for improving the available data base on water and natural resources, better access of these data to planners, policy makers and for project implementation, improved access to methods and results on the interpretation of these data through scientists. Main research should focus on the questions of trade-offs between mobility and sedentarism, trade-offs between agricultural land resources and rangeland, the balancing of land with water resources, integrated water development, control and handling of invasive species, and alternative livelihoods. A research component on the value of the resilience approach is also highly recommended.

## **Result 4: Multi-Sectoral Linkages on River Catchment Scale**

### *Taking a broader catchment approach*

In the view of communities, up to now only 30% of the river banks are well managed, the remaining 70% are poorly managed. This is due to challenges, which up to now have not yet been fully addressed by the project interventions, which are

- Upstream river pollution (Kenya), deforestation (Uganda)
- Hydropower (Kenya)
- Riverine agriculture (Kenya)

While these problems are partly addressed through the ongoing upstream-downstream user dialogues, they could be tackled by an overarching catchment approach in future.

- *Balancing of interests between upstream and downstream users*



*Generating of Payment for Ecosystem Services and Tapping of Climate Funds*

Both, the current rangeland management activities in Kenya and in particular the wetland protection in both countries create ecosystem services for local and global users through active work by communities and therefore qualify for payments for ecosystem services. Also opportunity costs between upstream and downstream users occur which require compensations. Since it is doubtful, if PES could really be generated on national or district level under the current economic pressures of stakeholders in both countries, international funds could be raised for water services from the international communities.

The project would need then to identify the mechanisms and partners, preferably international ones, like the



•

















It is suggested that the methodology should include, but not be limited to the following, but consultants must propose their own methodology and justify and explain that proposal:

- 1) A desktop review of all relevant documentation, including (but not limited to):
- 2) The project document, contracts and related agreements
- 3) Work-plans and budgets
- 4) Progress Technical and Financial Reports
- 5) Face-to-face interviews and discussions with all key stakeholders involved in the project to ensure that the review is carried out in a participatory manner. A list of key partners and stakeholders would be identified at an early stage and a consultation process developed. All stakeholders consulted should be in a position to present their views in confidence to the team and to identify issues, opportunities, constraints and options for the future
- 6) Electronic interviews through teleconference or written comments e.g. email; where partners cannot be reached for face to face interviews IUCN will assist with the organisation of meetings and discussions, and inform the relevant stakeholders of the review process and their role in it, well in advance.

## **5. Review Team Composition**

The team will consist of two people, an international evaluation expert and an expert from the region (Kenya/Uganda) with natural resources management background as well as experience in climate change adaptation or resilience more so in the ASAL context. The two experts will have complementary skills covering programme design and implementation, programme/project review, natural resources management especially community participation, policy and institutional processes more so in natural resources management in ASAL. The international expert will be the team leader, with considerable prior experience in evaluation methodologies and principles.

The team leader will have the overall responsibility for the design and implementation of the evaluation, writing of the report, and timely submission of the draft and final version of the report. Detailed responsibilities of each team member shall be determined at the beginning of the mission and outlined in the methodology.

## **6. Reporting outputs**

The Consultants will prepare and submit the following reports to IUCN:

- 1) An inception report outlining the proposed methodology and detailed responsibilities of each team member to be submitted prior to the onset of the assessment process.
- 2) A findings report, which should include the following:
- 3) An assessment of the performance of the project, based on the project
- 4) document, contracts and agreements
- 5) Identification of the main lessons learnt, and



# Annex IV: TOOLS

## QUESTIONNAIRE GUIDELINE FOR FIELD VISIT / DOCUMENT REVIEW

---

### **Project Design**

Were indicators appropriate to capture mapping and planning harmonization and gender issues

### **Performance indicators**

*Effectiveness:*

#### **Overall**

Has the project visibly enhanced livelihoods, ecosystems and drought resilience?

#### **Landscape / Ecosystem Approach**

Effectiveness of chosen technologies to address landscape/ecosystem approach

Effectiveness to address gender issues

Overall Community Satisfaction with the Project

Effectiveness of action plans for climate change and drought adaptation and byelaws

#### **Stakeholder Involvement**

Has the selection of stakeholders included the most relevant groups? Is equity and fairness in project participation among stakeholders catered for through the project?

Which difficulties had to be overcome within communities in respect to mapping processes themselves, which difficulties to relate these to resource management?

Is the mapping approach accepted as an appropriate management tool among communities?



Impact of awareness creation activities (participation in World Environment Day, awareness creation workshops) etc. on actual awareness and governance and project implementation

*Efficiency*

Time requirement to achieve respective results, taking into account all constraints to overcome, such as soil fertility constraints (Uganda), need for harmonization of maps and plans (Uganda)

Utilization of Community Environment Conservation Funds (CECF)

*Feasibility*

Appropriateness of tools and instruments to address the problem, such as mapping, integration of traditional institutions into formal systems, merging of planning approaches etc..

Feasibility of action plans for climate change and drought adaptation and byelaws

**Mapping and GIS**

Achievements in finalization of mapping processes and data bases and their use for ecosystem based action and



NRM and Institutions (f. Eg. Byelaws)

Which traditional skills, mechanisms, knowledge etc.. hav(i)-4(o)(o)-3(n)Bc04(ti)7(o)-3(n)JTJETBT1 0 0 1 112012(s)-6()/MCID 6/1)11(h)



Which awareness raising activities were conducted by the project?

Did they raise awareness of policy makers?

How would you score awareness raising activities of the project?

Score 1 5

1 = Excellent

2 = Very good

3 = good

4 = satisfactory

5 = non satisfactory

Stakeholder Involvement

Has the selection of stakeholders included the most relevant groups? Is equity and fairness in project participation among stakeholders catered for through the project?

Type and satisfaction of stakeholders involved into consensus-building on certain interventions (f. Eg. Group farming, river bank management etc..?)

Type

.Score Satisfaction with equity, fairness and consensus-building

Score 1 5

1 = Excellent

2 = Very good

3 = good

4 = satisfactory

5 = non satisfactory

How are Water Resource User Associations (WRUAs) linked to other stakeholders like Rangeland User Association, Community Forest Associations (CFAs) Community Conservancy Association

Impacts

Identify types of conflicts and the resolution mechanisms learnt within the project. .

.  
Score effectiveness

Score effectiveness what was reached?

Score 1 5

1 = Excellent

2 = Very good

3 = good

4 = satisfactory

5 = non satisfactory

Gender

From which project components did women benefit in particular?

In which way:

Income

Labour

Social connectivity

Empowerment

Score effectiveness what was reached?

Score 1 5

1 = Excellent

2 = Very good

3 = good

4 = satisfactory

5 = non satisfactory

Pls score overall satisfaction with the project









--	--	--	--

