

**Project Evaluation Series**

**Terminal 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”**

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

**Follow-up Report**

**FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS  
Rome, 2021**

Accepted evaluation recommendations	Action agreed in the Management Response	Description of actions actually taken, or reasons for actions not taken	MAR score	Impact of, or changes resulted from taken actions
<p><b>Recommendation 1.</b></p> <p><b>ACCEPTED</b></p> <p><b>To FAO HQ and country offices</b></p> <p><b>Future projects that are focused on improving the implementation of land and forest tenure reform should consider including stronger elements of sustainable livelihoods so that communities and indigenous peoples are able to benefit directly from tenure reform, through, for example, improved supply of ecosystem services, enhanced skills in production and marketing and greater access to finances.</b></p>		<p>FAO HQ: Sustainable livelihoods has been central to work of the Social Forestry Team in FAO Forestry (HQ). All normative and projects advocating for tenure reforms have had a dual purpose – i) to improve forest governance with meaningful local participation, and ii) to enhance local livelihoods for income generation and subsistence needs. The sustainable livelihood dimension is reflected in our recent normative work on strengthening tenure: i) Assessing the governance of tenure for improving forests and livelihoods (<a href="http://www.fao.org/3/ca5039en/ca5039en.pdf">http://www.fao.org/3/ca5039en/ca5039en.pdf</a>); ii) A framework to assess the extent and effectiveness of community-based forestry (<a href="http://www.fao.org/3/ca4987en/ca4987en.pdf">http://www.fao.org/3/ca4987en/ca4987en.pdf</a>). It is also reflected in the two most recently initiated projects: i) Technical Cooperation Project in India entitled “Support Implementation of National Agroforestry Policy by Enhancing Tree Cover &amp; Production of Wood” (2019-2021); ii) “Upscaling Community-Based Forest Management Approach in Sierra Leone” under the EU Boosting Agriculture and Food Security (BAFS) Project (2019-2021). The latter builds on earlier two year FAO TCP that piloted community forestry rights formalization process, and is aimed at developing forest based income</p>	<p>Advancing</p>	<p>FAO HQ: Initiatives are in too early a stage of implementation to determine. In the meantime, Social Forestry is collaborating with FAO HQ’s Forest and Farm Facility Program on strengthening of tenure and producer organizations that provides examples of achievements on the livelihood dimensions:  <a href="http://www.fao.org/3/b-i7231e.pdf">http://www.fao.org/3/b-i7231e.pdf</a> FAO Indonesia: Indonesia is one of potential countries to participate in the FAO’s Farm Facility Program in collaboration with AMAN (Aliansi Masyarakat Adat Nusantara or Customary Law Communities Alliance the Archipelago) aims to strengthen the forest farmers of customary law communities to produce foods and other commodities with more inclusive local value chains systems. FAO Peru: NA FAO Uganda: No response CIFOR: NA.</p>

Accepted evaluation recommendations	Action agreed in the Management Response	Description of actions actually taken, or reasons for actions not taken	MAR score	Impact of, or changes resulted from taken actions
		<p>generation opportunities and linkages with private sector implemented tree outgrower scheme/program. Under a parallel initiative "Leveraging global instruments and knowledge products," the project will support south-south learning exchange on responsible investments, better practices in tree outgrower schemes, and other producer as well as buyer driven forest product enterprises. The exchange will include community forest groups, local NGOs, private sector, district and central forest department representatives, etc. FAO Indonesia: The project in the country office was in collaboration with CIFOR to study three communal land tenure types that have different land tenure systems. Of the three types of land tenure systems have different communal land management systems to secure their communal rights as their main livelihood resources as well as address conflict resolutions to provide better access to the communal communities. The other projects have identified the process in obtaining their right to manage their customary land with support from the National Social Forestry Program and the food systems of four customary law communities to support their food security. FAO Peru: A set of Projects are being formulated in the Country, which includes an important work with</p>		

Accepted evaluation recommendations	Action agreed in the Management Response	Description of actions actually taken, or reasons for actions not taken	MAR score	Impact of, or changes resulted from taken actions
		<p>indigenous people (Amazon, north coast of the Country), which includes support for the development of their life plans, articulated with other planning instruments of the territory, as well as their participation in value chains of products that promote the maintenance of forests (Amazonian fruits, Amazonian art, etc.).</p> <p>FAO Uganda: No response                      CIFOR: We have several new projects that include a strong tenure component but are driven by other concerns regarding sustainability and livelihoods. These include: livelihoods impacts of forest restoration, which focused on how to understand and resolve tenure security as necessary but insufficient condition (BMZ), inclusive business models for value chains, which has a strong component on VGGT adoption (SDC), and strengthening women’s land rights in IFAD country programs (IFAD)..</p>		
<p><b>Recommendation 2.</b>  <b>ACCEPTED</b>  <b>To FAO COUNTRY OFFICES with FAO HQ support when needed</b>  <b>To improve the likelihood of the Project outcomes sustainability it is recommended to further support communities, indigenous peoples, NGOs and government agencies to implement the multi-</b></p>		<p>FAO HQ: FAO HQ does not currently have projects on-going in the three countries where the multi-stakeholder action plans were developed. Attempts were made to continue follow on activities in Peru and Uganda in particular through recent FAO GEF and GCF proposal initiatives, but this has not come into fruition. It is recommended that FAO country offices incorporate these plans into their on-going programs. FAO Indonesia: FAO</p>	<p>Advancing</p>	<p>FAO HQ: No project opportunities as yet for follow on work in the three project countries. FAO Indonesia: Please see response above                      FAO Peru: Please see response above                      FAO Uganda: No response                      CIFOR: Please see response above</p>

Accepted evaluation recommendations	Action agreed in the Management Response	Description of actions actually taken, or reasons for actions not taken	MAR score	Impact of, or changes resulted from taken actions
<p><b>stakeholder action plans developed during the implementation of the Project.</b></p>		<p>Indonesia had implemented the technical cooperation project in strengthening the Forest Management Unit in Conservation and in Production to strengthen the FMU management for their human resources as well as its farmer groups with several productive activities in producing honey for improving their production capacity as well as in marketing through the farmer field school. The project also provide technical support in developing their business plan to enable them in managing their natural resources in sustainable manners. FAO Peru: These three Projects contemplate an important work with the indigenous peoples of these areas, so that their life plans are articulated in the instruments of territorial planning, their participation in the management of protected areas, OMECS and in landscape restoration actions is strengthened, and that they have an active participation in sustainable businesses. Likewise, an emergency project has been formulated (in response to COVID-19) for food security and Amazonian indigenous peoples, which will be financed with funds from Canada. FAO Uganda: No response CIFOR: We have not obtained further funding to continue working directly with the PPA action plans developed in the various countries (see</p>		

Accepted evaluation recommendations	Action agreed in the Management Response	Description of actions actually taken, or reasons for actions not taken	MAR score	Impact of, or changes resulted from taken actions
		<p>FAO HQ response on joint GEF proposal for Peru). Nevertheless, the tenure activities in Peru ended up being of considerable interest to NORAD and assuming this portion of our grant is approved for 2021-2025, there is a component that would permit such follow up in both Peru and Indonesia.</p>		
<p><b>Recommendation 3.</b> <b>ACCEPTED</b> <b>To FAO HQ and COUNTRY OFFICES</b></p> <p><b>The use of theories of change as conceptual frameworks and as a basis for monitoring, evaluation and adaptation should be encouraged within projects. Ideally, ToCs should be developed as part of the ProDoc and regularly revisited during project implementation to promote lesson learning and adaptation.</b></p>		<p>FAO HQ: The ToC conceptual framework is being used consistently in the development of new initiatives. It was used in the development of the two project documents for: i) Technical Cooperation Project in India noted above: “Support Implementation of National Agroforestry Policy by Enhancing Tree Cover &amp; Production of Wood” (2019-2021); ii) “Upscaling Community-Based Forest Management Approach in Sierra Leone” under the EU funded Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry Boosting Agriculture and Food Security (BAFS) Project (2019-2021). FAO Indonesia: ToC has recently been adopted in formulating a new GEF Project document on the Food Systems, Land Use and Restoration by promoting the Integrated Landscape Management. Forestry would be important component in the integrated landscape management to preserve the forest resources in the upstream of landscape for addressing the water resources as well as endemic flora and fauna by establishing and</p>	<p>Advancing</p>	<p>FAO HQ: The two project documents noted above were guided by ToC. However, ToCs are not formally required in FAO TCP documents. Hence, ToC narratives are not consistently included in the final TCPs signed between FAO country offices and government partners. FAO Indonesia: ToC has been adopted in the new GEF project document and other new Global Cooperation Project (GCP) and not for the TCP project that design in simple form to speed up the endorsement by the government partners. In Indonesia, the new Country Programming Framework will adopt ToC that aligning with the newly developed UN Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework (UNSDCF) 2021-2025. FAO Peru: Please see response above FAO Uganda: No response CIFOR: Please see response above</p>

Accepted evaluation recommendations	Action agreed in the Management Response	Description of actions actually taken, or reasons for actions not taken	MAR score	Impact of, or changes resulted from taken actions
		<p>strengthening Essential Ecosystem Areas. FAO Peru: In the GEF Projects that are being formulated, the conceptual framework of the ToC has been applied, taking into account the ToC of the GEF impact programs, which are adjusted with the main stakeholders of the intervention areas. FAO Uganda: No response CIFOR: CIFOR is starting to adopt the use of in-depth ToCs for project development, including inviting key stakeholders to ToC exercises as early as possible in the project lifecycle, and revisiting, updating and adapting those regularly as part of reflective learning exercises. This is being developed further by our M&amp;E team through greater attention to using social theory to understand pathways and assumptions about how change occurs. ToCs are being developed and used for impact monitoring and evaluation.</p>		
<p><b>Recommendation 4.</b> <b>PARTIALLY ACCEPTED</b> <b>To FAO and COUNTRY OFFICES</b> <b>The use of the tools and methodologies developed by the Project, in particular historical institutional analysis and Participatory Prospective Analysis, and the approach of the Project to gender should be</b></p>	<p>The methodologies are useful, but resource and time intensive. They may be used in long-term projects (5 years or more) or usefully combined with FAO methodologies that are more cost and resource effective.</p>	<p>FAO HQ: No long-term tenure or community-based forestry project has been signed in the past year by FAO Social Forestry. Utilization of the tools and methodologies were promoted in the short-term projects in India and Sierra Leone, but there has not been a buy-in from country team in case of India, or the donors in Sierra Leone. The very limited project funds and short duration of the projects have been the major deterrents. Similar challenges</p>	<p>Advancing</p>	<p>FAO HQ: No long-term project has been signed in the past year. Two of the tools have been promoted in a short-term project in Timor Leste. Use of additional tools is anticipated in a longer term project anticipated in country. FAO Indonesia: Please see response above FAO Peru: Please see response above FAO Uganda: No response CIFOR: Please see response above</p>

Accepted evaluation recommendations	Action agreed in the Management Response	Description of actions actually taken, or reasons for actions not taken	MAR score	Impact of, or changes resulted from taken actions
<p><b>considered in other relevant projects.</b></p>		<p>were encountered on a community forestry TCP in Timor Leste to which FAO Social Forestry provides technical support. There, buy-in was obtained but no funds were allocated for the use of the tools. FAO HQ has provided separate funds for use of two of the tools. We anticipate a larger follow up project in country which should allow for the use of others. FAO Indonesia: FAO Indonesia is in the initial process to strengthen the collaboration with the Ministry of Agrarian Affairs and Spatial Planning focusing on the Customary Land by providing technical assistance and inputs from global lesson learned in reviewing a draft of land law. FAO Peru: The tools generated by the Project have been put into consideration by the GEF Project formulator team and will undoubtedly be used during the implementation phase of the Projects. FAO Uganda: No response CIFOR: PPA has been integrated into several new grant proposals, at least two of which have been approved (BMZ tenure and FLR project; Restoring African Degraded Landscapes in Kenya). The former has just been approved by donor. Conducting PPA in the latter has been delayed due to COVID – it is difficult to imagine something as interactive as PPA without being able to meet in person. The project’s approach to</p>		



Accepted evaluation recommendations	Action agreed in the Management Response	Description of actions actually taken, or reasons for actions not taken	MAR score	Impact of, or changes resulted from taken actions
		gender is being developed much further, as one of the lead project scientists has become the co-coordinator of CIFOR's gender team, and one of the project co-PIs has been elected to serve on the CG Gender Platform.		
<p><b>Recommendation 5.</b></p> <p><b>ACCEPTED</b></p> <p><b>FAO HQ and COUNTRY OFFICES</b></p> <p><b>FAO should continue to develop and apply effective processes for inducting FAO's Operational Partners, including ensuring that these partners fully understand: FAO's reporting requirements, standards and normative guidelines; opportunities for accessing FAO's skills and knowledge; the need for engaging FAO Country Offices; and mechanisms for managing conflicts and agreeing on changes to project activities, outputs or outcomes.</b></p>		<p>FAO HQ: The issue has not been relevant with regards to the projects initiated in the past year as they are being implemented by FAO country offices with technical support from HQ. FAO Indonesia: NA FAO Peru: During the implementation phase, interaction with the Operating Partners of FAO will be important, so that they understand fully FAO processes. FAO Uganda: No response CIFOR: NA</p>	Advancing	<p>FAO HQ: NA FAO Indonesia: NA FAO Peru: NA FAO Uganda: No response CIFOR: NA.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 6.</b></p> <p><b>ACCEPTED</b></p> <p><b>To FAO HQ</b></p> <p><b>In the case of global and regional OPIM projects (such as the Project which is the subject of</b></p>		<p>FAO HQ: FAO HQ Social Forestry Team has not initiated any global or regional OPIM projects in the past year. FAO Indonesia: In the recent project document formulation, FAO INS has no plan to use OPIM modality due to the government is less likely willing to</p>	Advancing	<p>FAO HQ: NA FAO Indonesia: NA FAO Peru: NA FAO Uganda: NA CIFOR: NA.</p>

Accepted evaluation recommendations	Action agreed in the Management Response	Description of actions actually taken, or reasons for actions not taken	MAR score	Impact of, or changes resulted from taken actions
<p><b>this evaluation), OPIM operational partners should be encouraged and supported to engage with FAO Country Offices. Links with Country Offices can help to a) communicate key messages from the project to policy makers at the national level; b) create with FAO a virtuous circle of lessons learnt across countries and; c) enhance quality of project delivery and sustainability of results from the capitalization of Country Offices' knowledge of the context and technical expertise.</b></p>		<p>manage the fund through OPIM scheme since they have to manage their own national budget. FAO Peru: FAO Peru has not initiated any global or regional OPIM projects in the past year. FAO Uganda: NA CIFOR: NA.</p>		

Office of Evaluation  
[evaluation@fao.org](mailto:evaluation@fao.org)  
[www.fao.org/evaluation](http://www.fao.org/evaluation)

**Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations**  
Rome, Italy