

**Project evaluation series**

**Final evaluation of the project  
“Securing tenure rights for forest  
landscape-dependent communities:  
linking science with policy to  
advance tenure security, sustainable  
forest management and people’s  
livelihoods”**

**GCP/GLO/806/GFF  
GEF ID: 5797**

**ANNEX 1. Terms of Reference**

# Contents

<i>Acronyms and abbreviations</i> .....	<i>ii</i>
<b>1 Background and context of the project</b> .....	<b>1</b>
1.1. Results achieved.....	3
<b>2 Evaluation purpose</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>3 Evaluation scope</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>4 Evaluation objective and key questions</b> .....	<b>6</b>
4.1. Evaluation questions .....	6
<b>5 Methodology</b> .....	<b>8</b>
<b>6 Roles and responsibilities</b> .....	<b>10</b>
<b>7 Evaluation team composition and profile</b> .....	<b>11</b>
<b>8 Evaluation products (deliverables)</b> .....	<b>12</b>
<b>9 Evaluation time frame</b> .....	<b>13</b>
<b>Appendix 1. Project Results Framework</b> .....	<b>14</b>

## Acronyms and abbreviations

AUPWAE	Association of Uganda Professional Women in Agriculture and Environment
BH	Budget Holder
CEO	Chief Executing Officer (GEF)
CGIAR	Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research
CIFOR	Center for International Forestry Research
CRP FTA	CGIAR Research Programme on Forests, Trees and Agroforestry
EC	European Commission
EP	Executing Partner
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FORDA	Forestry Research Agency in Indonesia,
FPMIS	Field Project Management Information System
GEBs	Global Environmental Benefits
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GSC	Global Comparative Study
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
ILC	International Land Coalition
LTO	Lead Technical Officer
LTU	Lead Technical Unit
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MSP	Medium-Sized Projects (GEF grant)
NBSAP	National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan
NDP	National Development Plan
OED	Office of Evaluation
PIF	Project Identification Form (GEF)
PIR	Project Implementation Review
PIU	Project Implementation Unit
PPG	Project Preparation Grant (GEF)
PSC	Project Steering Committee
PTF	Project Task Force
PY	Project Year
REDD+	Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation
RRI	Rights and Resources Initiative
SO	Strategic Objective
STAP	Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel (GEF)
TOR	Terms of Reference
UNILA	University of Lampung
UNPATTI	University of Pattimura
USD	United States Dollar

# 1 Background and context of the project

1. The “Securing Tenure Rights for Forest Landscape-Dependent Communities: Linking science with policy to advance tenure security, sustainable forest Management and people’s livelihoods” project (FAO/GEF) is part of a two-project initiative called the Global Comparative Study on forest tenure reforms (GCS-Tenure)<sup>1</sup> being implemented by the Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR). The project started on 8 October 2015 and was due to close 7 October 2018 but was granted a no cost extension until 7 January 2019. The project has a total budget of about USD \$3,115,852 of which USD 2 million is funded by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and the GEF Project ID is 5797. The remaining amount was to be co-financed by project partners as follows: USD 815,852 from CIFOR, USD 300,000 from FAO.
2. The GCS-Tenure initiative is premised on the recognition that benefits and improvements for communities and resource management that should be associated with land and forest tenure reforms have not yet been achieved in the majority of cases. This is despite the fact that land and forest tenure reforms are of interest to many countries and are now part of the international agenda, including recognition of customary rights of indigenous and other local communities.
3. The FAO/GEF project (hereafter “the Project”), which is the focus of this final evaluation aims to improve the way knowledge about forest and land tenure reforms is understood, communicated and used so that decision makers, practitioners and forest-dependent people in developing countries are well-equipped to develop and implement policies and projects that support tenure security, livelihoods and sustainable forest management.
4. The project is being implemented in Indonesia, Peru and Uganda and is designed to draw from experiences from these countries, with a few activities in Nepal and Kenya. Unclear tenure and conflict are cited as major factors in deforestation in forest areas being targeted by the project. These countries also have a reputation for their biodiversity. Peru is among the world’s 10 mega diverse countries, while Indonesia’s rainforests shelter 10-17% of the world’s known plant, mammal and bird species. Although Uganda covers a relatively small terrestrial space, its forests are home to about 7.5% of mammal and 10.2% of the bird species that are globally recognized, and for its size supports the world’s highest number of primate species.
5. The project is premised on the realization that credible evidence is necessary for establishing research-policy linkages, and new knowledge and policy options must be communicated and shared with relevant target groups in innovative and accessible ways in order to influence attitudes, expand knowledge and skill sets, and strengthen capabilities to implement reforms.

---

<sup>1</sup> The other project “Securing tenure rights for forest dependent communities: A global comparative study of design and implementation of tenure reform” is funded by the European Commission (EC) and the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) to the tune of USD 3.43 million. This project was implemented between 2014 and 2018.

6. Also, the dynamic and complex roles of implementing agents, communities and practitioners requires that they have the capacity to identify what works on the ground and to update techniques or information, weeding out ineffective practices in order to improve outcomes. Knowledge sharing and capacity development among researchers, forest resource users, implementers and policy makers is often characterized by various shortcomings that constrain the effectiveness of policy interventions. These constraints include:
  - i. Inadequate communication channels, which often result in exclusion of resource users' perspectives, preferences and experiences from decision making processes;
  - ii. Inadequate feedback systems resulting in policy makers often being unaware of the different effects and outcomes of policies and researchers being similarly unaware of constraints faced by implementers and how they try to mitigate them;
  - iii. Incomplete/inadequate complementarity of skills, competencies and abilities to adapt, adopt, update or otherwise act on new knowledge in ways that transform practice.
7. The project objective is designed to be achieved through the attainment of five outcomes which are:
  - Outcome 1.** Increased awareness by policy makers of impact of and barriers to reform implementation across different socio-political and historical settings.
  - Outcome 2.** Increased awareness of ways to improve multi-actor collaboration, coordination
  - Outcome 3.** Increased awareness of reform impact on livelihoods and sustainability in target countries
  - Outcome 4.** Enhanced awareness and increased application of good practice in reform implementation by policy makers, officials, customary authority.
  - Outcome 5.** Enhanced skills in reform implementation.
8. The FAO/GEF project is meant to contribute to FAO's two strategic objectives, Strategic Objective (SO) 1 - the eradication of hunger and food insecurity and SO 3 – the reduction of rural poverty.
9. The project is also designed to contribute to GEF Land Degradation Strategic Objective 2 "Generate sustainable flows of forest ecosystem services in arid, semi-arid and sub-humid zones, including sustaining livelihoods of forest-dependent people", specifically contributing to the attainment of two outcomes which are: a) enhanced enabling environment within the forest sector and across sectors; and b) improved management of forest landscapes. An important approach to achieving these outcomes is the focus on capacity development to improve decision making in landscape management.
10. FAO is the GEF implementing agency and CIFOR is the executing partner for the project. As the GEF Agency, FAO is responsible for overseeing the project to ensure that GEF policies and criteria are adhered to and that the project efficiently and effectively meets its objectives and achieves expected outputs and outcomes as established in the project document. CIFOR as the executing partner is hosting the Project Implementation Unit (PIU) which is responsible for day-to-day project

operations. Project implementation is guided by a Project Steering Committee (PSC) comprising of senior level government officials from Indonesia, Peru and Uganda as well as representatives from FAO, Rights and Resources Initiative (RRI) and International Land Coalition (ILC).

11. The project implementing partners include FORDA-Forestry Research Agency, University of Lampung (UNILA) (Indonesia), University of Pattimura (UNPATTI) in Indonesia. Universidad Agraria La Molina (Peru), Makerere University (Uganda), Association of Uganda Professional Women in Agriculture and Environment (AUPWAE) in Uganda, Land Development and Governance Institute (NGO), Forest Action Nepal, Pusat Kajian Wanita dan Gender Universitas in Indonesia, Rights and Resources Initiative (RRI) and International Land Coalition (ILC).

## **1.1. Results achieved**

12. According to the Project Implementation Review Report of 30 June 2018 (Appendix 1), the project has to date achieved the following results:
  - i. Outcome 1: Increased awareness by policy makers of impact of and barriers to reform implementation across different socio-political and historical settings.
    - i. 188 policy makers attended national level policy round tables.
  - ii. Outcome 2.1: Increased awareness of ways to improve multi-actor collaboration, coordination
    - i. 624 government, NGO and community representatives attended multi-stakeholder processes
  - iii. Outcome 3.1: Increased awareness of reform impact on livelihoods and sustainability in target countries
    - i. 90% of the work on sharing methodologies and results from tenure reform outcome completed
  - iv. Outcome 4.1: Enhanced awareness and increased application of good practice in reform implementation by policy makers, officials, customary authority.
    - i. 80% of the work done.
  - v. Outcome 5.1: Enhanced skills in reform implementation.
    - i. 813 (42% women) community members trained.
    - ii. 358 government and NGO representatives trained.

## **2 Evaluation purpose**

13. This Final Evaluation serves a dual purpose of accountability and learning. It is a requirement of the GEF funding. The evaluation is expected to document lessons, identify good practices and challenges that can inform the design and implementation of ongoing and future similar projects. The evaluation will also contribute to GEF IEO databases for aggregation and analysis.
14. Primary users of the evaluation report will be GEF, national counterparts in Indonesia, Peru and Uganda, Communities and Indigenous Federations. Project Steering Committee (PSC), Project Task Force (PTF), project partners and FAO. Secondary users are various line ministries in the Governments of the above-mentioned countries and any another concerned local and international organizations both public and private.

### **3 Evaluation scope**

15. The scope of this evaluation will be confined to the FAO/GEF project, this includes co-financing from CIFOR and FAO. The evaluation will focus on activities implemented in Uganda, Indonesia and Peru between October 2015 and January 2019. The evaluation process will include consulting decision makers, practitioners and forest-dependent people who participated in any of the project activities or were expected to be affected by the project.

## 4 Evaluation objective and key questions

16. The main objective of the evaluation is to assess the extent to which stakeholders were empowered to develop and implement policies and projects that support tenure security, livelihoods and sustainable forest management. The evaluation will seek to establish the extent to which the empowerment can be attributed to the FAO/GEF project.
17. The evaluation will also provide lessons learnt and suggestions that will inform future similar GEF and FAO projects.

### 4.1. Evaluation questions

18. The evaluation will seek to answer the following key questions:

**Was the intervention relevant to the needs of stakeholders, government, NGOs and communities and in line with FAO and GEF strategic objectives?**

- i. To what extent was, the project design informed by the context of the target countries?
- ii. What are the major factors that influence land and forestry tenure policy development and implementation?
- iii. How realistic were the assumptions, which underpinned the TOC?
- iv. To what extent were environmental, social and gender concerns taken into consideration as outlined in the GEF guidelines<sup>23</sup>?
- v. Were the results relevant to the needs of stakeholders, government, NGOs and communities and in line with FAO and GEF strategic objectives?
- vi. To what extent were CIFOR methodologies and practices consistent and aligned with FAO normative work (e.g. Voluntary Guidelines on Land and Resource Tenure of FAO).

**What results, intended and unintended, did the project achieve?**

- i. To what extent are stakeholders now aware of the factors that constrain tenure reform, how to align reforms with customary practices and the impacts of tenure reform on livelihoods forest-dependent people?
- ii. Is the project likely to influence policy/project formulation in the mid and long-term, or is this already happening?

---

<sup>2</sup> Refer to GEF/C.41/10/Rev.1 available at: <http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meetingdocuments/>

[C.41.10.Rev.1.Policy\\_on\\_Environmental\\_and\\_Social\\_Safeguards.Final%20of%20Nov%2018.pdf](http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meetingdocuments/C.41.10.Rev.1.Policy_on_Environmental_and_Social_Safeguards.Final%20of%20Nov%2018.pdf)

<sup>3</sup> POLICY: SD/PL/02 Policy on Gender Mainstreaming available at:

[http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/Gender\\_Mainstreaming\\_Policy-2012\\_0.pdf](http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/Gender_Mainstreaming_Policy-2012_0.pdf), and GEF/C.47/09.Rev.01, Gender Equality

Action Plan (GEAP) available at: [http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meetingdocuments/25\\_EN\\_GEF.C.47.09.Rev\\_01\\_Gender\\_Equality\\_Action\\_Plan\\_1.pdf](http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meetingdocuments/25_EN_GEF.C.47.09.Rev_01_Gender_Equality_Action_Plan_1.pdf)

## Evaluation objective and key questions

- iii. To what extent are the tenure reform debates and policy developments in targeted countries benefitting from the products of the projects.
- i. To what extent has, the project contributed to the empowerment of women, youth and Indigenous federations.
- ii. To what extent did the project involve the right partners, leverage on ongoing initiatives, institutional arrangements and synergies?

### **What were the strengths and weaknesses of the project M&E plan and its implementation**

- i. Are the project's objectives, outcomes, outputs and indicators clear, practical, and feasible within the project period?
- ii. Where the data collection methodologies clearly defined?
- iii. To what extent was information from the M&E system used during project implementation

### **How effective was the project implementation/execution**

- i. Did all the partners undertake their roles as outlined in the project document and agreements?
- ii. Did the Operational Partnership Implementation Modality (OPIM) serve the delivery of project outcomes and outputs effectively? What were the advantages and disadvantages of implementing the project through OPIM.
- iii. Did the envisaged co-financing materialize?
- iv. Did the project implementation modalities take into consideration gender issues?

### **What is the likelihood that the project results will continue to be useful after the end of the project? Identify key risks, which may affect the sustainability of the project benefits.**

- i. To what extent do national stakeholders own the project's processes and results?
- ii. Have national and local institutions been prepared to carry out the activities after the project?
- iii. What factors may promote or hinder the application of the knowledge and skill gained in formulating and implementing reforms.

### **What are the key lessons learnt?**

19. The questions will be fine-tuned and further developed by the Evaluation Team after the review of the project Theory of Change. The Evaluation Team will also be responsible for developing the evaluation matrix. The evaluation matrix will identify, the GEF evaluation criteria to be addressed for each question.

## 5 Methodology

20. The evaluation will adhere to the UNEG Norms & Standards<sup>4</sup> and be in line with OED Manual and methodological guidelines and practices. It will adopt a consultative and transparent approach with internal and external stakeholders throughout the evaluation process. Triangulation of evidence and information gathered will underpin its validation and analysis and will support the conclusions and recommendations.
21. The evaluation will use the theory of change approach to assess the extent to which the implementation of activities led to the achievement or not of the results. The focus will be on understanding what was achieved, why and why not. Considering that the project explored innovative ways for sharing findings and developing capacity, the approach will also be used to assess how well the approach was implemented.
22. The evaluation team in consultation with the Evaluation Manager, will develop an evaluation matrix, undertake stakeholder analysis and submit an inception report articulating how the overall assessment will be undertaken. The matrix will list evaluation main and sub-questions, related methods and tools selected to collect data/evidence as well as GEF evaluation criteria addressed by each question. The inception report will also include a list of stakeholders to be consulted during the evaluation, these include officers from FAO, Development Partners, CIFOR and Implementing Partners. Government at national and subnational level, NGOs, Academic Institutions, Communities and Indigenous federations
23. To answer the question **“Was the intervention relevant to the needs of stakeholders, government, NGOs and communities and also in line with FAO and GEF strategic objectives”**, the evaluation will review project proposal, government policy documents and strategies, consult stakeholders (policy makers, NGOs, communities and indigenous federations) to assess the extent to which land and forest tenure issues are a priority to them and also establish the relevance of the outcomes achieved. The evaluation will also collect information from FAO headquarters and country staff and GEF Focal Points in each country.
24. To answer the question **“What results, intended and unintended, did the project achieve”** The evaluation will use qualitative methods to get a deeper understanding of the extent to which the project influenced attitudes, expanded knowledge and skill sets, and developed capacities. These results are all soft skills and difficult assess using quantitative methods, therefore capturing examples, undertaking case studies will enrich the evaluation. The evaluation method will also include a review of project documents, progress reports, research material and training/workshop reports. In addition the project will also synthesize findings of the outcome studies undertaken by CIFOR in Indonesia, Peru and Uganda.
25. The question **“What were the strengths and weaknesses of the project M&E plan and its implementation?”** Will be answered through reviewing the project

---

<sup>4</sup> <http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/21>

M&E plan, progress reports, minutes of (Project Steering Committee, National Advisory Committees and FAO Project Task Force) and other M&E products.

26. The question “**How effective was the project implementation?**” This will be answered through an analysis progress reports, financial reports, assessment of the extent to which the project achieved the expected results, key informant interviews with the project team and other stakeholders.
27. The question “**What are the key lessons learnt?**” Will be answered from analysis of information gathered in answering the preceding questions, key informant interviews with the project team and review of documents.
28. The evaluation team will review the tracking tool submitted with the final PIR to the GEF Secretariat.
29. The evaluation will mainstream the GEF evaluation criteria during the investigation phase and through evaluation questions: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, country ownership, stakeholder’s involvement, partnership/co-financing, sustainability, socio/environmental risks management, catalytic role and contribution to long term impacts, management and monitoring design/implementation.
30. In order to facilitate comparison with other GEF implementing Agencies and contribute to the GEF programme learning process, the final evaluation will rate the project in accordance to existing GEF rating scheme, policies and guidance and OED guidelines. This evaluation will also present financial data, including co-financing break up, as per annex 3 of the new *Guidelines for GEF Agencies in Conducting Terminal Evaluations for Full-sized Project* issued on April 2017<sup>5</sup>.
31. The evaluation team will in consultation with the Evaluation Manager, prepare an evaluation matrix, undertake stakeholder analysis and submit an inception report which will articulate how the overall assessment will be undertaken. The evaluation matrix will list evaluation main and sub-questions, related methods and tools selected to collect data/evidence as well as GEF evaluation criteria addressed by each question. The inception report will also include a list of stakeholders to be consulted to be consulted during the evaluation, these include officers from FAO, Development Partners, CIFOR and Implementing Partners. Government at national and subnational level, NGOs, Academic Institutions, communities and Indigenous federations

---

<sup>5</sup> The guidelines are available at the link below  
<https://www.gefio.org/sites/default/files/ieo/evaluations/files/gef-guidelines-te-fsp-2017.pdf>

## 6 Roles and responsibilities

32. The FAO Office of Evaluation (OED), in particular the Evaluation Manager is responsible for developing draft Evaluation TOR with inputs from the Project Task Force (PTF). The TOR should include the latest data about the project, specifically its key accomplishments and delivery.
33. The Budget Holder (BH) and Lead Technical Officer (LTO) are responsible for assisting the Evaluation Manager in drafting the TOR, identification of the Evaluation Team and the organization of the evaluation mission. The Evaluation Manager is responsible for the finalization of the TOR and the recruitment of the Evaluation Team. The Evaluation Manager shall brief the Evaluation Team on the evaluation methodology and process, and review the inception and evaluation reports for quality assurance purposes.
34. The PTF, which includes the BH, LTO are responsible for initiating the evaluation process. They will provide inputs to the draft Evaluation TOR, particularly the section on the project background and results achieved. They are required to participate in meetings with OED and the Evaluation Team. They shall make available information and documentation, and comment on Evaluation Report.
35. The BH is responsible for leading and coordinating the preparation of the FAO Management Response to the evaluation report, supported in this task by the LTO and others members of the PTF. OED guidelines on the Management Response and the Follow-up Report provide necessary details on this process. OED also has a responsibility in following up with the BH for the timely preparation of the Management Response to the evaluation report.
36. The Evaluation Team will be responsible for further elaborating the evaluation methodology which shall be described in an inception report and shall be responsible for the actual collection of data and information. The team leader will participate in briefing and debriefing meetings with the FAO GEF Coordination Unit (including the FLO), Project Task Force, Budget Holder, Lead Technical Advisor, CIFOR and other stakeholders. The evaluation team leader will also participate in discussions, and field visits, and will be responsible for the inception report and the drafting of the evaluation report. The team leader shall guide and coordinate the team in their specific assignments, discuss their findings, conclusions and recommendations, and prepare the inception and evaluation reports, while consolidating the inputs from the team members.

## **7 Evaluation team composition and profile**

37. The Evaluation Team will be comprised of two experts, with an appropriate balance of relevant technical expertise and experience in evaluation. The team will have expertise in:
- i. Evaluation experience of large and complex projects;
  - ii. Land and Forest Tenure Rights
  - iii. Awareness raising, capacity development, knowledge capitalization, management and sharing;
  - iv. Gender and social inclusion issues and approaches
  - v. Previous working experience with FAO/UN, GEF
  - vi. Previous working experience in Africa, Asia and Latin America

## 8 Evaluation products (deliverables)

38. The Evaluation Team will prepare and submit to OED: (a) an Inception Report including evaluation matrix and stakeholder analysis; (b) a First Draft and c) Final Draft Evaluation Report, and; (d) the Supporting Evidence to the evaluation report.
39. Inception Report – To be written in English, the inception report (15-25 pages excluding appendices and annexes) should describe the specific data collection methods and techniques that will be applied for the evaluation, with reference to the overall methodology indicated in this TOR. It should also include the elaborated Theory of Change underlying the project, the evaluation sub-questions and the interview/research questions, and the Evaluation Matrix.
40. First Draft Evaluation Report- A clear, concise (30-40 pages excluding appendices and annexes), professionally-written and high-quality draft evaluation report is expected. It should be written in English, and composed in accordance with the FAO Style of Writing. For reference, samples of FAO evaluation reports can also be accessed at <http://www.fao.org/evaluation/library/>. The report will be quality checked by OED, the project team and key stakeholders in the evaluation will also provide comments.
41. Final Draft Evaluation Report – should include an executive summary and illustrate the evidence found that responds to the evaluation questions listed in the ToR. The report should incorporate comments from OED and other stakeholders. The report will be prepared in English, with numbered paragraphs, following the OED template for report writing. Supporting data and analysis should be annexed to the report when considered important to complement the main report. Translations in other languages of the Organization, if required, will be FAO's responsibility.
42. The evaluation reports should be prepared in MS Word Format and submitted electronically by the ET to OED. As the main author of the report, OED will have the final decision as to how the report should be composed.
43. Supporting Evidence – Electronic copies of the survey data and report, minutes or notes of interviews and discussions, and other sources of the primary data/information collected by the Evaluation Team and used in the report should be sent to OED<sup>6</sup> Sources of secondary data/information used in the report should be cited in the footnotes and included in the list of documents reviewed which is appended in the evaluation report.
44. In addition to the hard deliverables mentioned above, the Evaluation Team (in collaboration with the Evaluation Manager) shall also facilitate a Theory of Change discussion with key project informants to elaborate the project's theory of change.

---

<sup>6</sup> Sources of secondary data/information used in the evaluation report should be cited in the footnotes. A list of documents reviewed should also be appended to the evaluation report

## 9 Evaluation time frame

45. The evaluation is expected to take place between end of October and December 2018. The timetable in the box below shows a tentative programme of travel and work for the Evaluation Team. It will be finalized upon the recruitment of the Evaluation Team.

Task	Dates	Responsibility
ToR finalization	Mid October 2018	OED/LTO/CIFOR
Team identification and recruitment	Late October 2018	OED/LTO
Mission organization	Early November 2018	OED/LTO
Reading background documentation provided by PTF	Late October 2018	Evaluation Team
Briefing of ET	Mid November	OED/LTO/CIFOR
Organization of the Evaluation Mission (travel arrangements, meetings arrangements with project stakeholders and partners, field visits, etc.)	Mid November	OED/LTO/FAO Cos/CIFOR
Evaluation mission	Late November to early December 2018	Evaluation Team
Drafting of first draft of FE Report	Late December – Early January	Evaluation Team
Review of first draft of FE Report	Late January	OED for comments and quality control
Review of final draft for circulation	Early February	PTF, CIFOR and OED for comments and quality control
Validation of the recommendations	Late February	OED,ET to the PTF
Final Report, including publishing and graphic design	Early March	OED
Management Response	1 month after the Final report is issued	OED
Follow-up report	1 year after the MR is issued	OED

## Appendix 1. Project Results Framework

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	End-of-project target
<b>Objective<sup>8</sup></b>			
<b>Outcome 1:</b> Increased awareness by policy makers of impacts of and barriers to reform implementation across different socio-political and historical settings	Assessment of structures (institutions), processes and outcomes of tenure reforms, both globally from the literature and for study countries, including: -an analysis of the catalysts of reform and factors maintaining the reform implementation process over time -comparative assessment of approaches to customary rights recognition for differentiated community stakeholders -analysis of differentiated outcomes of reforms	Limited understanding of the catalysts of tenure reform and barriers for implementation	At least 150 policy makers at national and sub-national levels in at least 3 countries aware of barriers to forest tenure reforms
<b>Outcome 2:</b> Increased awareness of ways to improve multi-actor collaboration, coordination and inclusiveness during reform implementation in target countries	Strategies designed to address constraints to and capitalize on opportunities for implementation of tenure reforms. These include strategies to improve: -the practices of implementing agencies -rights enforcement and conflict resolution -community representation and participation, including the role of customary authorities -addressing within and inter-community conflict and differentiation, especially the rights of tenure for women and marginalized groups -multi-stakeholder consultation and collaboration -reform implementation in	Limited understanding of how constraints of tenure reform implementation can be addressed and how opportunities can be capitalized	Understanding among stakeholders of the existing constraints and how these can be addressed  -At least 150 officials, NGO practitioners and community representatives attend multi-stakeholder processes/  -At least 150 policy makers and 60 NGO practitioners in target countries are aware of alternative scenarios of tenure security/ insecurity and of factors that drive the scenarios;  -At least 30 relevant government officials and 15 NGO practitioners aware of and integrating options

<sup>7</sup> This is taken from the approved results framework of the project. Please add cells when required in order to use one cell for each indicator and one rating for each indicator.

<sup>8</sup>Applicable only for projects with objective level indicators.

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	End-of-project target
	target countries		for supporting and strengthening multi-actor collaboration;
<b>Outcome 3:</b> Increased awareness of reform impacts on livelihoods and sustainability in target countries	Improved methods and frameworks for assessing tenure reform outcomes, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• clarification of definitions and meanings of tenure security</li> <li>• the relation of security to livelihood options for differentiated community actors</li> <li>• the relation of tenure security to sustainable use and management</li> </ul>	Understanding of how tenure reform impacts on community livelihoods in short and long term is limited	Understanding of the impact of tenure reform on livelihoods is increased  Methodologies and results from tenure reform outcome assessment is actively shared in the target countries and at the global level
<b>Outcome 4:</b> Enhanced awareness and increased application of good practice in reform implementation by policy makers, officials, customary authority etc.	Better targeted and effective outreach and knowledge sharing deploying a careful mix of multiple media and materials to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• global review of impacts of tenure (security) on forest sustainability and livelihoods</li> <li>• synthesis of findings and lessons of global comparative research</li> <li>• national, regional and global forums/roundtables on tenure security</li> <li>• policy roundtables, stakeholder dialogues</li> <li>• policy briefs, info-briefs, pamphlets/newsletters in local, national and international languages</li> <li>• best practice manuals and handbooks for policy makers, officials etc.</li> <li>• e-learning tool on tenure</li> </ul>	Tenure reform implementation is not based on lessons from past experiences or on good practices from elsewhere	Tenure reform implementation is based on a set of good practices derived from evidence:  Information on tenure reform barriers & opportunities, lessons learned and good practices are available to policy makers, practitioners, community members and other stakeholders and are used by them  Number of countries participating in FAOs voluntary guidelines on land tenure processes adopting good practice recommendations on tenure reform implementation

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	End-of-project target
	<p>and conflict resolution</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• e-network linking implementers</li> <li>• radio programs in local languages</li> <li>• website and project videos</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Outcome 5:</b> Enhanced skills in reform implementation e.g. capabilities to evaluate, learn, adapt</p>	<p>Tools and approaches for equitable and effective reform implementation developed</p> <p>Forest dependent communities, policy makers and practitioners are trained in effective reform implementation</p>	<p>Capacities of tenure reform stakeholders is often low</p>	<p>Capacities of stakeholders is at a level that they can evaluate past experience, learn from that and adapt the implementation accordingly</p> <p>Various tools in addition to publications and briefs etc above are available to support tenure reform, (see Table 4 for detail):</p> <p>Stakeholders are able to use the tools (5.1.1) available to support them in tenure reform implementation</p> <p>Community members, especially women have undergone skills training on legal literacy, collective organizing, conflict resolution and negotiation and leadership skills</p> <p>150 Policy makers and practitioners have received training (see Table 4 for detail)</p>