

Project Evaluation Series

**Terminal evaluation of the project
“Participatory assessment of land
degradation and sustainable land
management in grassland and pastoral
systems”**

**Project code: GCP/GLO/530/GFF
GEF ID: 5724**

Annex 2. Implementation of the mid-term review recommendations

MTR recommendation (shortened)	Management response (shortened)	Action taken	TE assessment
<p>1.1 Use DPSIR (Drivers-Pressures-State-Impact-Response) not only for data analysis but also for framing a system of “criteria and indicators” for the assessment</p>	<p>Partially accepted DPSIR was not only used for data analysis, but also to facilitate organised discussions with stakeholders, in the baseline, and to analyze data systematically</p>	N/A	<p>Appropriate response</p>
<p>1.2 Develop an overall project TOC and country level TOCs that better explain the causality chain to achieve the results</p>	<p>Partially accepted The TOC proposed by the MTR does not fit the project scope. The TOC should have been captured in the project design phase. A TOC will be developed for the overall project, but this might be late.</p>	Draft TOC prepared by IUCN but not finalised	<p>Appropriate response</p>
<p>2.1 Provide a framework with globally comparable indicators and criteria in the social, economic and governance dimensions</p>	<p>Accepted</p>	PRAGA methodology fully developed with a global indicator framework	<p>Adequately implemented</p>
<p>2.2 Establish a clear and systematic approach to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhance engagement with partner governments, the private sector, partners of other FAO interventions, pastoralists organizations – to enhance the linking of assessment results to national decision-making processes • Report on progress towards outcomes, disseminate assessment methods, and aggregate and disseminate best practices and lessons 	<p>Accepted</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy action plans and recommendations developed in Burkina Faso, Kenya (county level), Kyrgyzstan (ongoing), Niger, Uruguay (ongoing) • Outcomes captured in PIRs • Two publications capturing lessons and best practice developed 	<p>Adequately implemented</p>
<p>2.3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve the targeting strategy for engaging women and youth. • Capture gender sensitive indicators in logframe • Contextualise PRAGA methodology to the need of men and women • Capture climate change indicators in the PRAGA monitoring • Capture knowledge from women in pastoralist communities and use derived indicators to inform policy and decision-making processes • Use a gender expert for the above 	<p>Partially accepted</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Women and youth included in local consultations. Indicators used for local level assessment provided by men, youth and women tapping into community knowledge. • Climate-related indicators were important ecological pointers for baseline and field assessment, but without specific reference to climate change • Project in advanced stage and all indicators decided, tested, analysed 	Women included in workshops discussing and interpreting assessment results	<p>Partly adequate response Women and youth were included in community consultations, but rarely given the opportunity to speak in separate groups</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revised methodology will be explicit on women and youth engagement 		
<p>3.1 Increase dialogue and interaction are between project partners to coordinate implementation, facilitate relationship building, and clarify project progress and the roles and inputs of each stakeholder</p>	<p>Accepted</p>	<p>Pursued, especially in the policy discussion frameworks and collaboration on knowledge products.</p> <p>Co-financing by FAO to pursue regional dialogue and knowledge sharing in West Africa (Niger, Burkina Faso, Togo and Benin) and a regional symposium in Latin America.</p>	<p>Adequately implemented</p>
<p>3.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Duly follow the institutional and management arrangements described in the ProDoc. Clarify the role of FAO Country Offices and strengthen their responsibility (as in Uruguay) 	<p>Partially accepted</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Institutional arrangement altered to address demands from countries re. implementation difficulty in countries where the IUCN did not have offices. Some of the changes were not supported by IUCN, which felt sidelined by the decisions Unclarity on FAO Country Office functions and lack of allocated budget lines where IUCN was implementing, this hindered the ability to tap into FAO Country Offices 	<p>FAO noted a lesson for future projects: Clarity on roles of FAO country offices necessary during project design with budget allocations</p>	<p>Largely appropriate response – but an opportunity missed</p> <p>The decision -process on the changes could have been more inclusive.</p>
<p>3.3 Obtain a one-year no cost extension</p>	<p>Accepted</p>	<p>Extension obtained, incl. a period due to delays resulting from COVID-19 pandemic</p>	<p>Appropriate response</p>
<p>4.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Kenya and Kyrgyzstan: Implement appropriate modalities for involving subnational governments in implementation Prepare an exit strategy for sustaining results, with a coordinated approach and clear responsibilities for each project partner Enhance collaboration with government agencies and FAO country offices/programme Explore strategic linkages with other SLM interventions, sector fora and multi-stakeholder/knowledge platforms, regional pastoral 	<p>Accepted</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Kenya: county governments further involved: training of county officials on PRAGA; elaboration of county policy action plans; participation in all project events and workshops Kyrgyzstan: the project worked closely with pasture committees, which are designated by government to manage pastures Policy action plans and recommendations developed (see 2.2) 	<p>Appropriate response</p> <p>However, limited government involvement in Kyrgyzstan due to contextual constraints</p>

Office of Evaluation
evaluation@fao.org
www.fao.org/evaluation

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
Rome, Italy



Some rights reserved. This work is available
under a CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO licence.