



Mid-term evaluation of the project “Sustainable forest management under the authority of Cameroonian councils”

Executive summary

**Project Evaluation Series
03/2020**

**Mid-term evaluation of the project
“Sustainable forest management under
the authority of Cameroonian councils”**

**Project code: GCP/CMR/033/GFF
GEF ID: 4800**

Executive summary

Required citation:

FAO. 2020. *Mid-term evaluation of the project "Sustainable forest management under the authority of Cameroonian councils"*. Executive summary. Project Evaluation Series, 03/2020. Rome.

The designations employed and the presentation of material in this information product do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) concerning the legal or development status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. The mention of specific companies or products of manufacturers, whether or not these have been patented, does not imply that these have been endorsed or recommended by FAO in preference to others of a similar nature that are not mentioned.

The views expressed in this information product are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of FAO.

© FAO 2020



Some rights reserved. This work is made available under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 IGO licence (CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO; <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/igo/legalcode>).

Under the terms of this licence, this work may be copied, redistributed and adapted for non-commercial purposes, provided that the work is appropriately cited. In any use of this work, there should be no suggestion that FAO endorses any specific organization, products or services. The use of the FAO logo is not permitted. If the work is adapted, then it must be licensed under the same or equivalent Creative Commons licence. If a translation of this work is created, it must include the following disclaimer along with the required citation: "This translation was not created by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). FAO is not responsible for the content or accuracy of this translation. The original [Language] edition shall be the authoritative edition."

Disputes arising under the licence that cannot be settled amicably will be resolved by mediation and arbitration as described in Article 8 of the licence except as otherwise provided herein. The applicable mediation rules will be the mediation rules of the World Intellectual Property Organization <http://www.wipo.int/amc/en/mediation/rules> and any arbitration will be conducted in accordance with the Arbitration Rules of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL).

Third-party materials. Users wishing to reuse material from this work that is attributed to a third party, such as tables, figures or images, are responsible for determining whether permission is needed for that reuse and for obtaining permission from the copyright holder. The risk of claims resulting from infringement of any third-party-owned component in the work rests solely with the user.

Sales, rights and licensing. FAO information products are available on the FAO website (www.fao.org/publications) and can be purchased through publications-sales@fao.org. Requests for commercial use should be submitted via: www.fao.org/contact-us/licence-request. Queries regarding rights and licensing should be submitted to: copyright@fao.org.

Cover photo credits: 1. © FAO/Zinyange Auntony, 2. ©FAO/Luis Tato, 3.©Benedicte Kurzen/NOOR for FAO, 4. ©FAO/Lou Dematteis.

Acronyms and abbreviations

ACFCAM	Association of Forest Councils
CF	Council forest
CFU	Communal Forestry Unit
DP	Development plan
ET	Evaluation team
GEF	Global Environment Facility
LoA	Letter of Agreement
LTO	Lead Technical Officer
MA&D	Market analysis and development
MINATD	Ministry of Territorial Administration and Decentralisation
MINEPDED	Ministry of Environment, Nature Protection and Sustainable Development
MINFOF	Ministry of Forestry and Wildlife
MTE	Mid-term evaluation
NPC	National Project Coordination
PMU	Project Management Unit

Executive summary

Introduction

1. The global environmental objective of the project is to reduce deforestation and forest degradation in council forests (CFs) in order to improve biodiversity conservation, reduce emissions and enhance carbon stocks. Its development objective is to improve the livelihoods of local communities by promoting sustainable income-generating activities in Cameroon.
2. The objective of the mid-term evaluation (MTE) planned by the GEF is three-fold: carry out an in-depth analysis of project implementation in order to determine the progress made towards achieving the expected results; identify the factors affecting or likely to affect, positively or negatively, the performance of the project; and make appropriate recommendations.
3. The project "Sustainable Management of Forests under the Authority of Cameroonian councils" is financed by the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF), operated by the Global Environment Facility (GEF), for a period of four years. The cost of the project is USD 21 423 333, including a GEF allocation of USD 3 573 333 and co-financing of USD 17 850 000 from partners. The project is implemented by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) in close collaboration with the Ministry of Forestry and Wildlife (MINFOF), the Ministry of Environment, Nature Protection and Sustainable Development (MINEPDED), and the Association of Forest Councils of Cameroon (ACFCAM).
4. The project targets 561 825 hectares (ha) of forests – 17 CFs totalling 416 901 ha and covering 21 councils, 33 forest reserves transferred to councils totalling 137 738 ha, and nine reforestation areas in the CFs totalling 7 186 ha.

Main findings

To what extent is the project appropriate to meet the needs of Cameroon and to achieve the expected results under FAO and GEF objectives?

5. In terms of strategic relevance, the project is well aligned with Cameroon's development priorities and its commitments to sustainable forest management, biodiversity conservation and the fight against climate change. The project is in line with the GEF and FAO strategic frameworks for sustainable forest management, biodiversity conservation and the fight against climate change. The issues identified in terms of sustainable CF management, development of alternative income-generating activities, carbon storage and biodiversity conservation are also considered relevant by all project stakeholders, mainly by the councils and representatives of the local communities involved in the project.

To what extent is the project implementation progressing towards the achievement of results?

6. The review of development plans (DPs), which is the prerequisite for any change in land use and resource management in the CF, has not yet been carried out due to lack of sufficient budget. A budget review is therefore proposed: substantial resources, under the general budget line 'contract', could be made available and, subject to this budget

availability and the application of best implementing arrangements, the DPs could be implemented within a maximum period of 12 months according to those involved.

7. In addition, the project had experienced a considerable delay in the implementation of its 2016 work plan. Despite these delays, the project implementing partners have achieved all the expected outputs. As of June 2019, all the submitted outputs were validated or in the process of being validated, with the exception of one which was deemed non-compliant by FAO and was the subject of intense discussion between FAO and the partner concerned. The meeting held on 4 June 2019 concluded that this non-compliance could not be attributed to the partner and made recommendations to finalise the activity and close the Letter of Agreement (LoA). National Coordination was not very proactive.
8. The project would generate expected effects and impacts if the DPs are revised and implemented and if capacity building is improved by complementing training with equipment support for the Peasants Forest Committees, Communal Forestry Units (CFU) and beneficiaries of training on market analysis and development (MA&D).

To what extent are the project implementation and management mechanisms (management systems, activity planning, financing and co-financing, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder participation, data reporting and communication) likely to increase or decrease the efficiency and effectiveness of the project?

9. The direct involvement of the beneficiaries in the implementation of the project and in the ownership of the achievements through capacity building is a strength of the project. However, the process is interrupted or weakened by two factors. On the one hand, as the project has not yet implemented the development plans of the targeted forests, the populations are not yet involved in the implementation of these DPs as initially planned. Moreover, the interruption of MA&D training also limits the direct involvement of the beneficiaries and the enthusiasm observed in the local communities for sustainable forest management and the development of alternative income-generating forestry activities. On the other hand, the decision to involve each implementing partner in the co-financing of the activities entrusted to it, has proved to be counterproductive because the activities were in fact only carried out thanks to the GEF grant.
10. Although the results framework and the theory of change are in general realistic and particular attention has been paid to the quality of the outputs produced, the evaluation team (ET) considers the overall efficiency of the project to be moderately unsatisfactory.

To what extent are the sustainability conditions and risks (financial, socio-economic, environmental, institutional and governance) identified (in the project document and PIR, Project Implementation Report) taken into account, updated and managed?

11. The ET considers that the initial duration of the project was realistic enough to allow for a good appropriation of the achievements and results. The project envisaged and proposed measures to mitigate socio-economic and environmental risks, essentially based on stakeholder consultation with a focus on awareness-raising and technical training of council agents. However, the financial and technical support (equipment) necessary for their sustainable operation was not well taken into account.
12. The dissemination of technical guidelines and guides for sustainable forest management and biodiversity conservation and their use for awareness-raising among all stakeholders

will contribute to strengthening the capacities of CFU members in planning and monitoring the implementation of management plans and exploitation activities, as well as to limit the damage related to poorly designed exploitation contracts, executed both by the councils and companies. The effective distribution of these materials, which has yet to be finalised, is, however, essential to achieve the expected results.

To what extent do the design of the project and the mechanisms for its implementation and management affect its performance?

13. The responsibilities and tasks of the Lead Technical Officer (LTO) and the Technical Project Coordinator (TPC) on the one hand, and those of the Project Management Unit (PMU) and the National Project Coordination (NPC) on the other, are neither clear nor properly defined in terms of project execution and implementation.¹ Likewise, the role of National Coordination deserves to be integrated and clarified in the process of technical review and validation of the outputs. For its part, the Steering Committee held regular meetings; an extraordinary Steering Committee was organised to resolve some of the constraints encountered by the project. The implementing partners present at these steering committees participated in the discussions but some of them mainly defended their interests.
14. The project budget is insufficient for the activity related to the review of forest development plans. In order to assess the extent to which the budget is insufficient, the PMU has estimated the activities already carried out by other development partners, apart from the socio-economic studies directly financed by the project, at about USD 190 000. The ET did not receive evidence of resources mobilised by other co-financing partners such as the National Participatory Development Programme (PNDP) and the German Agency for International Cooperation (GIZ) for project-related activities. Actually, these two entities do not yet have a LoA with the project. In addition, the project has established contacts without yet being able to work closely with other projects and organisations in order to generate visible synergies, both in the intervention and in the results, or to learn lessons. Difficulties in communicating with stakeholders and beneficiaries are thus one of the project's weaknesses.
15. The design of the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) plan is sound and takes into account different levels (strategic, executive and operational) while involving beneficiaries, thus ensuring its sustainability. However, as the project monitoring and evaluation system has no dedicated staff and the territory to be covered is very large, the project team, as presently constituted, cannot ensure it.

To what extent are the issues related to gender, indigenous people, vulnerable or marginalised groups and environmental protection, effectively taken into account during project implementation?

16. Despite the number of activities targeting women, indigenous people and vulnerable or marginalised groups, the project does not have a plan or specific indicators to better target and improve gender and indigenous people related issues. Despite this, the inclusion of environmental protection in the project is very innovative and satisfactory.

¹ Although the roles are made explicit in the Project Document, the perception each partner has of its own role differs from that of its partners (see Annex 15 for the roles and responsibilities of each within FAO).

17. Stakeholder commitment is real and serves the project, although the ET notes a lack of active involvement on part of some key government institutions in the project, such as the Ministry of Territorial Administration and Decentralisation (MINATD) and the Special Fund for Equipment and Intercommunal Intervention (FEICOM) (see Conclusion 3 – Sustainability conditions are taken into account and managed in a moderately satisfactory manner).
18. Finally, with regard to knowledge management, the project focuses on outputs and training that have a strong potential impact on the beneficiaries and all stakeholders through the dissemination of technical guidelines and guides for sustainable forest management and biodiversity conservation. However, at the time of this mid-term evaluation, neither the training courses nor the dissemination of these guides had been finalised.

Conclusions

Conclusion 1. The strategic relevance of the project is very satisfactory.

19. The project is well aligned with the needs and priorities of the Government of Cameroon with regard to sustainable forest and environmental management as well as socio-economic development. It complies with the legal framework of Cameroon and is consistent with the GEF and FAO strategic frameworks for sustainable development and sustainable forest and environmental management.
20. Environmentally, the project targeted three outcomes of the GEF results framework and two outcomes of the FAO Country Programming Framework by providing relevant indicators and mechanisms to obtain the necessary information.
21. The consultative and participatory approach adopted in the design phase of the project made it possible to widely involve stakeholders in the management and use of council forests. It also helped to take into account the expectations and especially the needs of the communities bordering the CF. The studies planned at the very beginning of the project also helped to specify the needs of stakeholders (the councils as well as the local communities and their organisations), the constraints and the project interventions. The project objectives are relevant and respond to a dual environmental and development need; the strong interest shown by the stakeholders is a major asset for the project.

Conclusion 2. Progress towards the achievement of the project's expected effects is moderately unsatisfactory.

22. Out of the 36 activities planned to generate ten outputs and five expected outcomes, 28 have been at least partially completed while eight have not started at all. The mid-term results have not been achieved and only the outputs expected in the first year of the project (LoA 2016 and consultancy contracts) have so far been effectively implemented. Most of them have been validated.
23. The lack of review of CF development plans, due to an insufficient budget, has been a major constraint for the continuation of the activities that were supposed to generate the expected effects. Insufficient collaboration and confrontational relations between the project coordination and supervision bodies did not make it possible to resolve this problem early and definitively.

24. However, the possibility of achieving the expected effects and impacts of the project remains if, on the one hand, the recommended budget review is carried out and allows the necessary resources to be allocated to the review of development plans and if, on the other hand, the effective review and implementation of these development plans are carried out by partners with the best capacities. In this light, the identification of potential partners with the best implementation capacities as well as the consultation and preparation work of the next LoA deserve to be pursued and formalised.

Conclusion 3. The conditions for sustainability are taken into account and managed in a moderately satisfactory manner.

25. The project has provided for a strong involvement of local stakeholders and beneficiaries in its implementation in order to guarantee the appropriation of the results and the sustainability of the intervention. However, it did not take into account some major risks that could affect this sustainability.
26. The capacity building of beneficiaries focuses on awareness raising and training (Peasants Forest Committees, CFU, leaders of the local communities on MA&D). This training is incomplete and for this reason, it is less likely that the actors take ownership of what they have learned and that they operate during and after the project. Although an amount of USD 21 000 is earmarked for the implementation of business development plans, the mechanisms for financial (working capital requirement) and technical (advisory requirement) support to pre-enterprises, from their creation through training to their subsequent development, are not yet clearly defined. The budget allocated to provide the technology/equipment needed to start up small forest products-based enterprises is insufficient, given the needs of the beneficiary groups of the first phase of MA&D training. Several of these groups are requesting equipment (*Njanssang* crusher) at much higher costs than initially planned (about USD 3 000 per unit, whereas the current budget per council is USD 1 000).
27. The lack of active involvement on part of some key government institutions in the project, such as the Ministry of Territorial Administration and Decentralisation (MINATD) and the Special Fund for Equipment and Intercommunal Intervention (FEICOM), is a weakness. With a view to sustain the achievements of the project, it might have been more judicious to include in the project capacity-building activities for the Technical Centre for Communal Forestry (CTFC) on the basis of the audit's recommendations and to give it more responsibilities given its presence and its proven experience in the multifaceted support to council forests.

Conclusion 4. Project implementation is moderately unsatisfactory.

28. Despite a satisfactory project design and preparation, the mechanisms put in place to supervise, manage and implement the activities were inefficient.
29. The drafting of the final version of the project document was preceded by a stakeholder consultation to take into account their comments and suggestions. However, the validation of the final project document by FAO was not preceded by a technical validation at national level (due to the absence of a validation workshop for the final project document). As a result, the project document had various shortcomings (insufficient budget for DPs, non-compliance of Country Programming Framework and Technical Operation Unit (UTO)

terminology and of some activities targeting these entities, etc.). These shortcomings subsequently slowed down or even blocked the implementation of activities.

30. From the outset, the PMU did not benefit from the level of capacities required by the project management and subsequently, it experienced periods of vacancy, which weakened project implementation. The human resource capacity of the PMU still needs to be strengthened. Difficult relations between the LTO and other project stakeholders (PMU members, NPC, Steering Committee [SC], implementing partners) affected the project implementation performance.
31. There is little communication between the PMU, NPC and the different partners. Apart from the Steering Committee and stakeholder committee meetings, stakeholders are not informed about the project because information does not circulate efficiently. Some of the project's achievements remain relatively unknown to stakeholders.
32. The arrival of the current FAO Representative has made it possible to resume monitoring missions in the field that were once interrupted. This made it possible to recreate links with local stakeholders and beneficiaries and to re-mobilise them around the project objectives. The FAO Representation in Cameroon is finalising the recruitment of a communication officer who will be able to improve external communication of the project; however, the internal communication mechanism with the project implementing partners also needs to be strengthened. Technical guidelines and guides for sustainable forest management and biodiversity conservation are ready but not yet disseminated. The communication officer currently being recruited should be able to ensure this dissemination.

Conclusion 5. The issues related to gender, indigenous people or vulnerable groups and environmental protection have been satisfactorily taken into account.

33. Environmental protection is at the heart of the project. However, the fears of these groups and the risks that they are not sufficiently involved in the project remain significant. The support provided by the project to the development of alternative income-generating activities through the MA&D approach is a significant contribution to the mitigation of socio-economic risks related to sustainable forest management (SFM) integrating biodiversity conservation and carbon storage. However, the project has neither a plan nor specific indicators and targets to guide and encourage better integration of gender and indigenous people.

Recommendations

Recommendation 1. To FAO, the FAO Representation and the Government of Cameroon.

FAO, through the Country Representation and in collaboration with the Government, needs to re-establish a climate of trust and collaboration between the different project partners, especially between the PMU, CNP, ACFCAM, implementing partners and co-financing partners.

34. FAO, through the Country Representation and in collaboration with the Government, needs to re-establish a climate of trust and collaboration between the different project partners, especially the PMU, CNP, ACFCAM, implementing partners and co-financing partners. A better dialogue with National Coordination would raise the issue of the participation of implementing partners in the steering committee. It should explore ways to simplify certain

implementation mechanisms and modalities that have proved to be inadequate and adjust the project's theory of change in order to prioritise activities with a high impact potential (development plans and MA&D training) that can be carried out within a reasonable timeframe.

35. Collaboration with all potential co-financing partners (including the National Participatory Development Programme [PNDP] and the Special Fund for Equipment and Intercommunal Intervention [FEICOM]) deserves to be materialised in the very short term by establishing a framework for collaboration and concerted implementation of activities in the field. In view of the weaknesses observed, it seems necessary for the PMU, in consultation with CNP and the GEF focal point, to organise, in the very short term, a meeting with all the potential co-financing partners to present/reaffirm the objectives of the project, its achievements and its expectations/needs/avenues for collaboration.

Recommendation 2. To FAO and the FAO-GEF focal point

FAO, in consultation with GEF, should undertake a budget review in order to implement the development plans. If this review cannot be decided and effective one year before the end of the project, the latter should be extended in order to achieve the results.

36. FAO should in the very short term carry out a budget review and allocate sufficient resources for the implementation of the CF development plans (DPs). These DPs are a priority expectation of the councils and a prerequisite to establish innovative systems for sustainable forest management integrating biodiversity conservation and improved carbon storage. Annex 11 presents avenues that can supplement the budget needed to carry out the development plans. The materialisation and accentuation of collaboration with partners such as the German Agency for International Cooperation (GIZ) and the C2D-PSMINEFE project (Debt Reduction-Development Contract - Forest Sector Programme) – which are heavily involved in the development activities of certain targeted CFs – is a priority.

Recommendation 3. To FAO and the SC

The Steering Committee, in consultation with FAO, needs to take certain decisions, including the proposed budget review (Recommendation 2), to ensure the project outcomes.

37. The Steering Committee, in consultation with the FAO and under the auspices of the government (MINFOF and MINEPDED are respectively chair and co-chair of the project steering committee) should in the very short term decide on the possible budget review proposed in Recommendation 2. The latter is a prerequisite for activities with greater impact (development plans). The mid-term evaluation also recommends clarifying the role of the SC members, to avoid these meetings being used as an opportunity to defend particular interests rather than the interest of the project (see Finding 11).

Recommendation 4. To FAO, the FAO Representative and the FAO-GEF Management Unit

FAO needs to improve its internal management arrangements and processes for this project, with particular emphasis on creating a healthy, collaborative and non-confrontational working environment.

38. The Representative as Budget Manager and Chairperson of the Project Task Force (PTF) could propose an adjustment or a change of the human resources involved in the supervision and implementation of the project, in order to best revive the project. They

could explore the possibility of recruiting either a local staff member to support the TPC in the review of development plans or an international-level human resource (P2 or P3) based in Yaoundé and responsible for the review and validation of technical and methodological aspects in collaboration with the national counterpart and supervision. Another option would be to set up a Project Technical Advisory Committee (PTAC) in order to provide technical and scientific advice to the project on an ad hoc basis. This PTAC could be used to ensure the technical review/revision of methodologies and reports at the national level prior to their submission for validation to the FAO focal point concerned.

39. FAO needs to effectively clarify/specify the responsibilities of the LTO and the TPC with regard to the following critical points: the identification and selection of consultants and implementing partners, the review and validation of the terms of reference (ToR) and methodology, and the technical review and validation of project report. It also needs to find the best way to involve the NPC at relevant levels in these processes. As the technical validation of reports is one of the main causes of the delays encountered by the project, FAO could explore the possibility of classifying the reports into two distinct categories providing for either a local or headquarters validation.
40. The Country Representation should in the future adopt more adequate options/arrangements for the recruitment of casual field staff such as MA&D facilitators. Priority should be given to contractors with the best presence in the targeted councils and with adequate technical capacities as well as human, material and financial resources that can be easily mobilised.

Recommendation 5. To FAO

FAO must, through the PMU, exploit all the achievements of the project, put them in synergy with the interventions of the other partners in the CF and disseminate them in order to sensitize and support policy makers, council officials, forest operators, development actors and beneficiaries with a view to sustain the achievements.

41. FAO, through the Country Representation, must continue dialogue with the government to involve more central services of the concerned ministries (MINFOF, MINEPDED, MINATD) as well as state and non-state institutions in charge of supporting councils, in order to set up conditions for the sustainability of interventions.
42. Support should include research and the establishment of conditions for sustainability, starting with a better management of the risks that could affect sustainability as identified by the MTE. Awareness-raising may focus firstly on the need to build the capacity of Peasants Forest Committees, CFUs and beneficiaries of MA&D training to facilitate their work; and secondly, on the rationale for SFM, biodiversity conservation and carbon storage within the CF.
43. The FAO Representation in Cameroon is currently finalising the recruitment of a communication officer who will help in the exploitation and dissemination of the achievements to the various stakeholders and to actual or potential project partners.

Lessons learned

44. Better involvement from the national counterpart (government and national experts) in the review process of the project document and project activities (including terms of reference

[ToR] and methodologies) and outcomes can contribute to improving the quality of FAO's review and validation of these outputs. This would also help in the following: ensure an initial appropriation of the project by the stakeholders; verify and ensure the effectiveness and conformity of the activities and costs in relation to the realities/benchmarks of the context of intervention of the project; and eventually examine and ensure the quality of the processes and outputs in the shortest possible time.

45. The proper functioning of the mechanisms and processes for supervising, executing and implementing the project requires a clear and precise definition of the roles and functions of each person in charge and, if necessary, an explicit delimitation of their fields of intervention. A confrontational and non-collaborative environment causes delays in the implementation processes and affects the efficiency of the project. These mechanisms can (and should, if the project encounters difficulties) be redefined – even if implementation is already well under way – to ensure the success of the project; the FAO Representative plays a key role in this allocation of roles.

GEF Rating Table

GEF criteria/sub-criteria	Rating ²	Summary comments ³
A. STRATEGIC RELEVANCE		
A1. Alignment with GEF and FAO Strategic Priorities	HS	Section 4.1.2
A2. Relevance to national, regional and global priorities	HS	Section 4.1.1
A3. Complementarity with existing interventions	HS	Section 4.1.1
A4. Overall strategic relevance	HS	Section 4.1
B. EFFECTIVENESS		
B1. Overall evaluation of project outcomes	MU	Section 4.2
B1.1 Achievement of results	MS	Section 4.2.1 Annex 4, Annex 6
B1.2 Progress towards project outcomes ⁴ and objectives	MU	Section 4.2
- Effect 1.1.	MU	Paragraphs 107 to 114
- Effect 2.1.	MS	Paragraphs 115 to 133
- Effect 3.1.	MS	Paragraphs 134 to 139
- Effect 4.1.	U	Paragraphs 140 to 143
- Overall evaluation of progress towards objectives/outcomes	MU	Paragraphs 107 to 143
B1.3 Probability of impact	Not assessed by the MTE	
C. EFFICIENCY		
C1. Efficiency ⁵	MU	Sections 4.3.; 4.2.2.; 4.5.3, 4.5.4., 4.5.5., 4.5.8.
D. SUSTAINABILITY OF PROJECT OUTCOMES		
D1. Overall probability of sustainability risks	LU	Section 4.4
D2. Financial risks	ML	Section 4.4.1
D3. Socio-political risks	L	Section 4.4.2
D4. Institutional and governance risks	ML	Section 4.4.3
D5. Environmental risks	ML	Section 4.4.2
D6. Catalysis and replication	S	Section 4.4
E. FACTORS AFFECTING PERFORMANCE		
E1. Project design and preparation ⁶	S	Sections 4.5.1., 4.5.2.
E2. Quality of project implementation	MU	Section 4.5.3

² See rating scheme at the end of Annex 5. Highly Satisfactory (HS); Satisfactory (S); Moderately Satisfactory (MS); Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU); Unsatisfactory (U); Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). Sustainability and probability of impact are ranked from Likely (L) to Highly unlikely (HU).

³ References to relevant sections of the report.

⁴ Evaluation and ratings can be carried out for a particular achievement if there is added value.

⁵ Includes cost efficiency and meeting deadlines.

⁶ Refers to factors that affect the ability of the project to start at the planned time, such as the presence of sufficient capacity among the implementing partners at the start of the project.

E2.1 Project supervision (FAO, SC, Project Task Force, etc.)	MU	Section 4.5.2
E3. Quality of project execution	MU	Section 4.5.2.
E3.1 Project management and execution arrangements (PMU, Financial Management, etc.)	MS	Sections 4.5.5, 4.5.3.
E4. Co-financing	MU	Section 4.5.4
E5. Project partnerships and stakeholder involvement	MS	Section 4.5.5
E6. Communication and knowledge management	MU	Section 4.5.6
E7. Overall quality of monitoring and evaluation	MS	Sections 4.5.7, 4.5.8
E7.1 Monitoring and evaluation arrangements	S	Section 4.5.7
E7.2 Implementation of the monitoring and evaluation plan (including financial and human resources)	MU	Section 4.5.8
E8. Overall evaluation of factors affecting performance	MU	Sections 4.2.2, 4.5.
F. CROSSCUTTING DIMENSIONS		
F1. Gender and other equity dimensions	S	Paragraphs 205 to 206
F2. Human rights issues	S	Section 4.6
F2. Environmental and Social Safeguards	HS	Paragraphs 205 to 206
Overall rating of the project	MU	

Office of Evaluation
E-mail: evaluation@fao.org
Web address: www.fao.org/evaluation

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
00153 Rome, Italy