

EURECOCA

“Enhancing Resilience of Communities to Climate Change through Catchment Based Integrated Management of Water and Related Resources in Uganda (2017–2021)”

AQ/OSS/EURECOCA/190710]

MIDTERM EVALUATION REPORT

November 2019



SAHARA
AND SAHEL
OBSERVATORY



ADAPTATION FUND



Adroit
Consult Int

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This evaluation report was developed through wide consultation with OSS, MWE, mandated MDAs and relevant stakeholders of EURECCCA project at national, regional and catchment levels. The evaluation team is grateful to OSS for the opportunity they gave to Adroit Consult International, the information that they provided to Adroit and the regular communication that made the work to move faster.

In addition, we thank the PSC of EURECCCA project for creating an enabling environment for the consultants who undertook the MTE. Special thanks go to the PCT lead by the PM for introducing the MTE programme to all relevant stakeholders especially the EURECCCA project structures at National and Regional level.

We thank the TLs of the WMZs who welcomed the MTE team/programme in their respective regions. The TLs took an initiative to introduce the evaluation team to their staff in the zones. They also mobilized the stakeholders in the respective catchments. This made the work of the evaluation team smooth.

We also thank the CMC/SCMCs for supporting our evaluation teams during field visits. They were available to be interviewed, to mobilize their catchment members and to escort the evaluation teams for site visits at grass root level especially to the most degraded catchments and the surrounding/affected communities.

Finally, we thank all the respondents who gave us very useful information while in the zones and at catchment level.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	i
TABLE OF CONTENTS	ii
ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS	iii
1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
1.1 Project Information	1
1.2 Project Description (brief)	1
1.3 Project Progress Summary	1
1.4 Summary of MTE Ratings and Achievement	3
1.5 Summary of conclusions	5
2.1 Purpose of the MTE and objectives	7
2.2 Methodology:	7
2.3 Structure of the MTE report	8
3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND	8
3.1. Development Context	8
3.2. Problems that the project is addressing	9
3.3 Project Description and Strategy	10
3.4 Project Implementation Arrangements	11
3.5 Main stakeholders.	11
4.1 Project Strategy	12
4.2 Progress towards Results	17
4.3 Project Implementation and Adaptive Management	27
4.4 Sustainability	31
5.1 Conclusion	35
5.2 Recommendations	35
ANNEXES	38

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

<i>AF</i>	Adaptation Fund
<i>AWE</i>	Air Water Earth
<i>CBWRMP</i>	Community-Based Wetland Restoration Management Plan
<i>CC</i>	Climate Change.
<i>CCD</i>	Climate Change Department
<i>CMCs</i>	Catchment Management Committees
<i>CMO</i>	Catchment Management Organization
<i>CMPs</i>	Catchment Management Plans
<i>CSOs</i>	Civil Society Organizations
<i>DPs</i>	Development Partners
<i>DWRM</i>	Directorate of Water Resources Management
<i>EA</i>	Executing Agency
<i>EE</i>	Executing Entity
<i>EURECCA</i>	Enhancing Resilience of Communities to Climate Change through Catchment-Based Integrated Management of Water and Related Resources
<i>GA</i>	Grant Agreement
<i>GCF</i>	Green Climate Change
<i>GoU</i>	Government of Uganda
<i>GWPEA</i>	Global Water Partnership Eastern Africa
<i>HS</i>	High School.
<i>IA</i>	Implementing Agency
<i>IE</i>	Implementing Entity
<i>IEC</i>	Information Education Communication
<i>IGAs</i>	Income Generating Activities
<i>IPs</i>	Implementing Partners
<i>IRWM</i>	Integrated Regional Water Management
<i>IWRM</i>	Integrated Water Resource Management.
<i>LG</i>	Local Government
<i>LVEMP</i>	Lake Victoria Environment Management Project
<i>M&E</i>	Monitoring and Evaluation
<i>MAAIF</i>	Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries.
<i>MCM</i>	Million Cubic Meters
<i>MDAs</i>	Ministries, Departments and Agencies
<i>MoFPED</i>	Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development
<i>MoLG</i>	Ministry of Local Government
<i>MoU</i>	Memoranda of Understanding
<i>MTIC</i>	Ministry of Trade, Industry and Commerce

<i>MWE</i>	Ministry of Water and Environment
<i>NARO</i>	National Agricultural Research Organization
<i>NEMA</i>	National Environmental Management Authority
<i>NFA</i>	National Forestry Authority
<i>NGOs</i>	Non-Governmental Organizations
<i>OSS</i>	Sahara and Sahel Observatory
<i>PCT</i>	Project Coordination Team
<i>PD</i>	Project Document
<i>PDU</i>	Procurement and Disposal Unit.
<i>PET</i>	Project Execution Team
<i>PIM</i>	Project Implementation Manual
<i>PM</i>	Project Manager
<i>PMT</i>	Project Management Team
<i>PP</i>	Procurement Plan
<i>PPDA</i>	Public Procurement and Disposal of Assets
<i>PS</i>	Permanent Secretary
<i>PSC</i>	Project Steering Committee.
<i>SACCOs</i>	Savings and Credit Cooperatives
<i>SG</i>	Solicitor General
<i>TLs</i>	Team Leaders
<i>ToT</i>	Trainer of Trainees.
<i>UNMA</i>	Uganda National Metrological Authority.
<i>USD</i>	United States Dollars
<i>WMD</i>	Wetland Management Department
<i>WMZs</i>	Water Management Zones

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 Project Information

Country:	Republic of Uganda
Project Title:	Enhancing Resilience of Communities to Climate Change through Catchment Based Integrated Management of Water and Related Resources in Uganda - (EURECCCA)
Donor:	Adaptation Fund - AF
Implanting Entity	Sahara and Sahel Observatory (OSS)
Executing Entity:	Ministry of Water and Environment, Uganda
Budget:	USD 7,751,000
Duration:	2017-2021
MTE Period Considered:	May 2017-September 2019

1.2 Project Description (brief)

The “Enhancing Resilience of Communities to Climate Change through Catchment Based Integrated Management of Water and Related Resources in Uganda” (EURECCCA) Project was designed to support Uganda’s Government efforts to implement Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) through Catchment Management Planning and implementation to increase the resilience of communities to the risk of floods and landslides in Maziba, Aswa, and Awoja Catchments. The overall goal of the project is to increase the resilience of communities to floods and landslides in Awoja, Maziba, and Aswa Catchments through promoting catchment based integrated, equitable and sustainable management of water and related resources. The Specific objectives are to;

1. Increase the resilience of ecosystems by supporting the sustainable management of natural ecosystems including forests, wetlands, and riverbanks;
2. Increase the resilience of agricultural landscapes by supporting communities to develop and implement sustainable water harvesting, soil biophysical, and flood control structures;
3. Increase the resilience of other community livelihood systems by supporting income generating activities through facilitating credit and market access;
4. Build the capacity of extension services and institutions at local, catchment, water management zone and national level to better support local stakeholders.

These objectives are intended to be achieved through compliance with the following key components:

- Component 1: Establishing Frameworks for Climate Resilient Catchment Management in Awoja, Aswa, and Maziba catchments:
- Component 2: Implementing concrete adaptation actions for resilient and sustained ecosystems, agricultural landscapes and diversification of livelihood systems
- Component 3: Building capacities of extension services and institutions at sub-catchment, catchment and WMZ level to support local communities and knowledge management.

1.3 Project Progress Summary

The overall progress towards results is currently 33%. At midterm, most of the documentation especially the updated CMPs, CBWRMPs, restoration plans, and various terms of references and specifications were in place. There has also been significant stakeholder engagement and capacity

building in Awoja, Maziba and Aswa catchments. The findings reveal that stakeholders in all the three catchments are very enthusiastic about the EURECCCA interventions and are willing to participate in the project activities. Preparations for physical implementation are almost complete; as most of the service providers for the activities dedicated to restoration have been already procured and are active.

EURECCCA project team is very committed to fast track the execution of the physical restoration activities of natural resources in the riverbanks, forests, agricultural landscapes and wetlands for which there has been recorded a smooth delay of about 6 months. The low disbursement level (16%) is attributed to the delays in executing the project activities. The project is credited for establishing SCMCs to coordinate, supervise and implement activities at the grassroots level. Nine (9) fully functional SCMCs for the 3 target catchments are in place. The SCMCs have appointment letters and are already working in the catchments and willing to support the physical implementation of this project. The MTE recommends that they continue to produce minutes of their meetings and reports of their involvement in the project to take stock of their performance.

Regarding the resilience of livelihood systems to climate change impacts, this project has carried out significant capacity building and awareness raising in the Catchments and the community perceptions towards restoration activities have been significantly improved. To fast track the progress, there is a need for timely provision of the alternative IGAs to the target beneficiaries. This should be enhanced through the execution of the revolving fund.

To accelerate the adaptive capacity of communities and other stakeholders to climate change, the project has set up three (3) demonstration centers. It is envisioned that this will strengthen the capacities of extension services and institutions at catchment level to undertake climate change adaptation activities which have already begun with a TOT training in Maziba catchment. The ToT trainings of Awoja and Aswa catchments are scheduled to be held within November 2019.

Whereas the project development was ambitious, the demand for alternative livelihood options is high among affected households. The budget of USD 699,000 may cover fewer households in the degraded hotspots. This calls for the prioritization of the most vulnerable households. Furthermore, this should inform the design of similar projects in the near future to scale up the interventions. The consultancy-based methodology used by the project is a good approach for knowledge transfer to the communities and project staff, despite a few shortcomings identified during the MTE as elaborated later in the report. The team should also document this methodology for learning purposes.

Despite challenges related to disbursement delays expected to finance activities within the targeted catchment which is linked to procurement problems, it has to be highlighted that the project has recorded progress succeeding onto putting in place capacity building and preparatory activities prior to the realistic and heavy scheduled action plan of the project during the next period. This calls for continued dialogue between OSS, MWE, and MoFPED to agree on how best to address the challenges so far faced in order to facilitate timely disbursement of funds. In addition, MWE should discuss with MoFPED on how best to improve internal disbursement procedures.

1.4 Summary of MTE Ratings and Achievement

Evaluation Criteria	Midterm Value	End of Project Targets	Explanation of Midterm Value	Means of Verification
Objective: To increase the resilience against the risk of flood and landslides of Awoja, Maziba and Aswa Catchments through promoting catchment based integrated, equitable and sustainable management of land and water resources	16%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Integrity of targeted natural resources improved by at least 50% 	The overall progress towards results is at 33%. Preparations for physical implementation are under way and most of the service providers for the restoration activities have already been procured and are already working.	Training reports, Quarterly reports, Annual Technical Report, Supervision Reports, Capacity building reports, Field reports, MOUs, Attendance lists, Workshop Reports, Baseline reports and field interviews
	16%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 50% of targeted households develop climate resilience to climate change impacts by 2020 		
	1%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Natural resources restored by 10% in the project areas by 2020 		
Component 1: Establishing Frameworks for Climate Resilient Catchment Management in Awoja, Aswa and Maziba catchments				
Outcome 1.1 Comprehensive catchment planning system that integrates issues of climate change established and tested in Awoja, Aswa and Maziba	65%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Three (3) fully functional Catchment management structures for the 3 target catchments are in place. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SCMC minutes of their meetings are available 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Copies of the CMPs 500 copies verified Workshop reports
Outcome 1.2 Awoja, Aswa and Maziba catchments managed by appropriate water and climate governance structures	70%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fully functioning structures by end 2017 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SCMCs were formed in 2018, they have met twice so far 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minutes of meetings Lists of SCMC members Appointment letters of SCMCs
Component 2 Implementing concrete adaptation actions for resilient and sustained ecosystems, agriculture and other livelihood systems				
Outcome 2.1 Resilience of ecosystems services of forests, wetlands and riverbanks to climate change impacts enhanced	32%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least two ecological systems improved their resilience by 2020 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Hectares that are in for restoration are not specified in the results matrix These were supposed to be improved after undertaking physical restoration activities which have not taken place 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Capacity building reports Attendance lists for the trainings Field interviews with stakeholders Baseline reports for EURECCCA project CBWRMP

Evaluation Criteria	Midterm Value	End of Project Targets	Explanation of Midterm Value	Means of Verification
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quarterly reports Annual Technical report
Outcome 2.2 Resilience of agricultural landscapes to climate change impacts enhanced	18%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 400ha of land of agricultural land with biophysical and water harvesting structures in place. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some draft costed plans are in place Community engagement in the planning process is on-going until end of project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Training reports Quarterly reports Annual Technical Report Supervision Reports
Outcome 2.3 Resilience of livelihood systems to climate change impacts enhanced by providing alternative income generating opportunities	3%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The percentage of food insecure households is reduced to 10% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The CBWMP process has identified some livelihood options The identified livelihood options will be the basis for preparing the livelihood report 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Capacity building reports Field reports
	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2400 vulnerable households have improved livelihoods 		
	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least incomes of 70% of participating farmers have improved 		
Component 3: Building climate change adaptive capacities of institutions and communities and knowledge management				
Outcome 3.1 Adaptive capacity of communities and other stakeholders to climate change impacts strengthened	24%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adaptive capacities of at least 60% target communities to climate change impacts have been strengthened. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The livelihood options and all other physical interventions have not yet been implemented in the identified hotspots 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Training reports MOUs Quarterly reports Attendance lists for trainings
Outcome 3.2 Demonstrating and developing mechanisms to integrate climate change adaptation and implementation	16%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> By the end of the project lessons and best practices are documented, shared and influence local and central government planning and policy. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual Technical Reports Quarterly reports
	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 2 study tours per catchment organized 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Study tours are yet to be undertaken 	

1.5 Summary of conclusions

Overall, EURECCCA Project was well thought out and responds to the needs of the beneficiaries because flooding and landslides are common challenges in Maziba, Awoja and Aswa catchments. The project is credited for forming gender-inclusive SCMCs in all the three catchments. The EURECCCA project has undertaken a good level of stakeholder engagement, capacity building and sensitization aimed at building climate change adaptive capacities of institutions and communities and knowledge management. The project is credited for innovating a multi-disciplinary, multi-sectoral and multi-institutional approach in undertaking key interventions such as forestry, livelihood systems, wetlands restoration, agricultural landscapes and soil bio-physical structures. This is justified by the MOUs signed with various institutions such as NARO, GWPEA, MTIC and other PPPs with nursery operators.

1.6 Summary of Recommendation

To successfully realize the intended results of the project interventions, the following recommendations should be put into consideration;

No	RECOMMENDATIONS
	TECHNICAL
1.	Consider more involvement of the MDAs that have expertise in forestry, livelihood systems, wetlands restoration, agricultural landscapes and soil bio-physical structures to take advantage of their capacity and experience
2.	Explore the option of opening new SACCOs/cooperatives with full membership of the beneficiary communities in the degraded catchments
3.	Since the funds for the IGAs will be able to cover fewer number of households as compared to the total number of households that will be affected by the interventions, there is need to prioritize the most vulnerable households in the hotspots
4.	Develop a gender equality action plan
5.	Prepare a livelihood assessment report based on the available information from the consultants
6.	Ensure that affected communities in degraded hotspots are prioritized by women groups, tree nursery operators and the consultants while implementing various interventions
7.	Increase the involvement of the CMCs and the SCMCs in work planning, budgeting and accountability monitoring, to strengthen transparency in decision making on this project
8.	Capture and document input of the CMCs and SCMCs in the planning process of the EURECCCA project
9.	Fast track development of a communication plan for the project and recruit a communications officer to support its implementation
10.	Ensure faster execution of the activities in order to reduce the delay. OSS should consider more frequent supervision missions (for instance twice a year) accordingly
	ADMINISTRATION
1.	Fast track the legalization of SCMCs to create an enabling environment for them to be supported to undertake their roles
2.	Continuously utilize regional PDUs where possible that can be easily accessed for follow-up to minimize unnecessary procurement delays
3.	Introduce “NAVISION” accounting software in the regional offices
4.	According to the Grant Agreement between GoU and OSS, EURECCCA Project can withdraw any amount of money without exceeding the cap of USD 750,000 at any time during the project execution by providing all the required documents. This disbursement procedure should be utilized in accordance to the grant agreement
5.	Seek no objection for the recommendation made by the PSC to hold meetings after every 4 months but not every 3 months.
6.	Continue to use the approved Procurement Plan (PP) to avoid further delays. In addition, there is need to

No	RECOMMENDATIONS
	give one “no objection” that applies to the entire procurement process so that the EA does not seek more than one “no objection” on the same process
7.	Consider applying for a no cost extension in the event that there is indication that the project implementation will not be completed within the remaining period given that the project delayed for about 6 months
8.	OSS, MWE and MoFPED should continue to dialogue and agree on how best to address the disbursements challenges so far faced in order to facilitate timely disbursement of funds
MONITORING AND EVALUATION	
1.	Ensure regular work plan reviews (at least monthly) which make tracking of results easier
2.	Come up with a rigorous knowledge management and documentation system to capture all the achievements of the project to take stock of the cumulative effect of the interventions that will support evaluation of the project results. Knowledge management and documentation function should therefore be given priority through either assigning it to an existing staff where possible or engaging a new person.
3.	Revise the results matrix to include further break down of some of the project indicators in order to measure level of progress
4.	Develop more accountability tools that get feedback from the communities on project implementation. Pre-tested Each tool on the target stakeholders
5.	Build the capacities of the project staff to support in taking stock and documenting processes, progress, challenges, lessons and feedback from the stakeholders especially beneficiaries. Notwithstanding, the project should come up with a flexible routine of undertaking monitoring visits to each of the respective catchments
6.	Recruit at least one M&E officer per region or assign the function to existing staff where possible

2. INTRODUCTION

2.1 Purpose of the MTE and objectives

The objective of the Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) was to assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document. It assessed early signs of project success or challenges in order to identify adjustments to achieve its intended results. The Mid-term evaluation assessed:

- The initial outputs and results of the project;
- The quality of implementation, including financial management;
- The assumptions made during the preparation phase, in particular, objectives and agreed upon indicators, against current conditions;
- The factors affecting the achievement of objectives, and;
- The M&E systems and their implementation.

The MTE findings highlight issues requiring decisions and actions, present initial lessons learned about project design, implementation, and management and incorporates recommendations for the second half of the project's term.

2.2 Methodology:

Study Design: We employed a descriptive cross-sectional study design using highly participatory and credible methods/approaches of data collection. The approach was supported by qualitative methods of data collection (*i.e. document review, face-to-face interviews, key informant interviews and Observation checklist*).

Scope of the Evaluation: The project assignment is located in Uganda and the Midterm evaluation specifically covered four (4) geographic sites of; Kampala at the Directorate of Water Resources Management, Awoja catchment located in Kyoga Basin in the Eastern, Aswa catchment located in Aswa basin in the Northern and Maziba catchment located in Kagera Basin in the South western. The MTE considered the May 2017-September 2019 project implementation period.

The Targeted Respondents: The Midterm evaluation specifically sought to capture responses from the following stakeholders/respondents. This list of persons interviewed is presented in annex 2.

Level	Category
- Central Level	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Project Steering Committee Members- Coordination Team- Ministry of Finance Officials- Representative from GWPEA
- Maziba Catchment	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- LC V Chairperson Kabale and Ntungamo- The SCMC Chairpersons and secretaries- Women groups- KaZARDI- VWMZ/EURECCCA Staff- Wetlands- Tree Nursery

	- Consultants on ground
- Aswa Catchment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consultants on ground (IUCN, WAM Inc., Devine Waters, JEEP) - The SCMC /CMC Chairpersons and secretaries. - Directorate of Environmental Affairs staff (Wetlands, Forestry, Environmental officers) - UNWMZ/EURECCCA Staff - Women groups - District local Government technical staff (Natural Resources Officer, CDO) - Ngetta - Karenga Wetland - Selected Tree Nursery Operator
- Awoja Catchment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - KWMZ/EURECCCA Staff - LC5 for Soroti District/Chairperson of Awoja CMC and Secretary of CMC - The SCMC Chairpersons and secretaries - Women Groups - Serere Demonstrational Center - Selected Tree Nursery Operator - Consultants (Segamu 14 and AWE)

Data Collection: In order to address the objectives and indicators of this midterm evaluation, a highly participatory and consultative techniques were used, involving document review, key informant interviews and field observation. Both primary and secondary data were collected using qualitative techniques so that all the task questions can be answered.

Limitations: The study had no major limitations only that some sites in the project area was inaccessible during the MTE period due to bad road network.

2.3 Structure of the MTE report

This report has four sections namely:

1. Executive Summary
2. Introduction
3. Project Description and Background Context
4. Findings
5. Conclusions and Recommendations

3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND

3.1. Development Context

About 50% of Uganda's¹ working population is engaged in subsistence agriculture as the main occupation. Currently, agriculture employs approximately 66% of the working population and contributes about 22% to total GDP. Between 2009 and 2010, Uganda's human population grew by 3.7% to (32 million people) and is projected to 103.2 million in 2050. Furthermore, in spite of rapid urbanization, 85% of the population remains predominantly rural. Although Uganda's Vision 2040

¹ The 2016/17 household survey

targets 60% urban population by 2040, it is more likely that, 79% of Uganda's population will still live in rural areas by 2030. The total demand for water is expected to increase from 408 MCM/y in 2010 to 3963 MCM/y in 2050. Under different climate change scenarios, the total unmet water demand in 2050 could rise from 3 to 10 MCM/y. Therefore, Uganda's economy and local communities, especially in rural areas, are vulnerable to climate change and variability due to:

- Heavy reliance on natural resources in the agricultural sector and dependence on rain-fed agriculture
- Agricultural performance is linked to climatic changes and rainfall variability e.g. seasonal rainfall patterns
- High human population growth rates of ~3.2% per year coupled with high poverty levels
- Reducing the capacity of communities to cope with climate hazards
- Low per capita income of ~ US\$506;
- Limited financial capacity to fund adaptation measures
- Weak and inadequate infrastructure
- Inadequate supply of clean water and sanitation facilities; and
- Inadequate availability of health and medical services.

3.2. Problems that the project is addressing

Although Uganda's climate is naturally variable, the major symptoms of climate change include: an increase in temperatures; an increase in variability and unpredictability of rainfall patterns leading to increased frequency and intensity of disasters e.g. floods and landslides. The poor and vulnerable feel these impacts the hardest. Exacerbating poverty, triggers migration and heightens competition for water resources, and leads to regional insecurity. Many ecosystems, including forests, wetlands, streams, rivers and riverbanks as well as farmlands are under increasing threat of degradation or modification in the face of population increase and climate change. Regulatory services of these ecosystems for instance flood control through water infiltration, landslide regulation and soil erosion control or water purification are decreasing due to unsustainable cropping practices in Uganda's farming systems. These have led to declining land productivity with reduction in food supply; expansion of agricultural frontiers to fragile parts of ecosystems e.g. riverbanks, swamps and steep slopes. Inevitably, interference with slope stability has led to increased magnitude of various hazards e.g. soil erosion, landslides, siltation and flooding.

As a means of promoting integrated planning, development and management of water and related resources to address the various impacts including climate change, Uganda has embarked on the preparation of Catchment Management Plans (CMPs).

However, the current CMPs neither sufficiently consider the inter-linkages between water and land management nor take climate change fully into consideration. The involvement of sub-regional and local management structures as well as extension service workers in management of water and related resources have been limited. Farmers in the catchment areas have limited capacity to sustainably manage water and land resources to decrease the risk of floods, landslides and siltation.

They are limited in the form of technical know-how on implementation of various adaptation technologies and lack the tools in form of guidance documents and equipment to enable them effectively plan and implement measures to reduce these risks. There is high prevalence of wetland, forest and riverbanks degradation due to insufficient incentives for conservation. Lack of access to credit facilities further impedes efforts of the local populations to engage in alternative sources of livelihoods. Therefore, the EURECCA project, which is a 4 years project (2017-2021) focuses on strengthening the capacity of sub-regional and local management structures and extension services to promote integrated management approaches; promoting the organization of communities in interest groups to facilitate

stakeholders' driven catchment-based planning, development and management of water and related resources; establishing cooperation with partners and stakeholders in planning, development and management of water and related resources as well as undertaking actions to **ensure sustainable management of water resources and agricultural landscapes** to increase their resilience to floods and landslides.

3.3 Project Description and Strategy

3.3.1 Goal

The overall goal of the project is to increase the resilience of communities to the risk of floods and landslides in Awoja, Maziba and Aswa Catchments through promoting catchment based integrated, equitable and sustainable management of water and related resources.

3.3.2 Specific objectives

The specific objectives are to:

1. **Increase the resilience of ecosystems** by supporting the sustainable management of forests, wetlands and riverbanks
2. **Increase the resilience of agricultural landscapes** by supporting communities to develop and implement sustainable water harvesting, soil bio-physical and flood control structures.
3. **Increase the resilience of other community livelihood systems** by supporting income-generating activities with credit and market access
4. **Build the capacity of extension services and institutions** at local, catchment, water management zone and national level to better support local stakeholders.

3.3.3 Description of field sites

This project is being implemented in three (3) catchments namely: Awoja found in Kyoga Basin in Kyoga WMZ; Aswa found in Aswa Basin in Upper Nile WMZ and Maziba found in Kagera Basin in Victoria WMZ. The three catchments have been selected out of four water management zones of Uganda based on:

1. **Relative degree of vulnerability to climate change** risks of landslides and floods due to challenges of land degradation, water scarcity, population pressure and poverty.
2. **Broader representation of climatic zones of Uganda in order to** adapt to changing climate in different climatic zones and local contexts.
3. **Representation of diverse livelihood and social systems** ranging from high population density around high slope and degraded areas dominated by crop farming to semi-arid mixed agriculture.
4. **Opportunity for building synergies with on-going programs/interventions** to demonstrate management of water resources and climate change adaptation measures that are responding to the local specific contexts and situations. The three catchment areas were also prioritized by the Government when it started implementing catchment management approach.
5. **Sensitivity of ecological systems** such as degraded highlands and wetlands.

The three catchments are exposed to the climate change-related risk of flood and landslides. Occurrence of landslides in these areas is concentrated in the highland ecosystems, while flooding occurs in lowland ecosystems.

3.4 Project Implementation Arrangements

The project is implemented by the Sahara and Sahel Observatory (OSS) and executed by the Ministry of Water and Environment (MWE) through the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) (Uganda). OSS is:

- Supervising the Monitoring & Evaluation activities
- Participating in joint supervision missions with MWE/DWRM
- Auditing the completion of the evaluation and preparing the annual reports to the AF
- Auditing Quarterly Reporting and Validation
- Auditing and Approving Certified Periodic Financial Statements
- Reviewing the work plan and half-yearly and annual budgets of the project
- Approving the annual technical and financial reports
- Supervising Environment and Social Management Plan

The overall management of the project is ensured by the Permanent Secretary /Ministry of Water and Environment (PS/MWE). The PS has the overall responsibility for the execution of the project. The day to day management of the project is ensured by the Project Manager and Team Leaders of the Water Management Zones (WMZs). Existing structures such as the Water Management Zone Advisory Committees, the Catchment Management Organization (CMO) in collaboration with key stakeholders such as the Global Water Partnership Eastern Africa (GWPEA), National Environment Management Authority (NEMA), Climate Change Department (CCD) and the participating local governments in the three catchments of Awoja, Aswa and Maziba are also used to support project implementation.

DWRM through the various WMZs has already established governance structures (Stakeholders Forums and Catchment Management structures in the 3 catchments that are being strengthened and used for coordination of project implementation. At the local level, project execution offices are based at the MWE eastern regional offices based in Mbale (for Awoja catchment), the MWE northern regional offices based in Lira (for Aswa catchment) and the MWE south-western regional offices located in Kabale (for Maziba catchment). The project execution offices are closely collaborating with local government structures in the execution of the project in line with the Catchment Planning Guidelines. A project manager was appointed and stationed at the Directorate of Water Resources and ensures liaison on project activities among and between the MWE, the WMZs, the field offices, local governance structures and other stakeholders.

The project is guided by various committees including the Project Steering Committee, Project Coordination Team, Project Execution Team, Focal Points at WMZs, and Support Team at the MWE. In addition, existing structures such as the Water Management Zone Advisory Committees, the Catchment Management Organization (CMO) structure and GWPEA provides the necessary guidance to the project and ensure that the needs of the local communities are met. GWPEA performs the advisory role and is responsible for providing technical guidance and support to the project.

3.5 Main stakeholders.

- Sahara and Sahel Observatory.
- Ministry of Water and Environment.
- Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development
- Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries
- Ministry of Trade Industry and Cooperatives
- National Environment Management Authority
- National Forestry Authority

- Climate Change Department
- Directorate of Water Resources Management
- Directorate of Environmental Affairs
- Global Water Partnership
- Catchment Management Committees
- Sub-Catchment Management Committees
- Local Governments

4. FINDINGS

4.1 Project Strategy

4.1.1 Project Design

Issues addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions

The EURECCCA project set out to increase the resilience of communities to the risk of floods and landslides in Awoja, Maziba and Aswa Catchments through promoting catchment-based integrated, equitable and sustainable management of water and related resources through its three components. Overall the issues addressed by the project were relevant to the needs of the communities affected by flooding and landslides. The project design was guided by several assumptions as reviewed below:

Under outcome 1.1 *Comprehensive catchment planning system that integrates issues of climate change established and tested in Awoja, Aswa and Maziba*, the project assumed that decision-makers at all levels are willing to mainstream climate change considerations into planning and programming in a timely manner. This assumption is still valid and indeed the MTE observed various efforts by the key decision-makers and stakeholders to mainstream issues of climate change at all levels of decision making. The LGs in the project areas acknowledge the importance of mitigating the challenges addressed by this project. Furthermore, the assumption that no major disputes and conflicts occur within communities is still valid.

Outcome 2.1: *Resilience of ecosystems services of forests, wetlands and riverbanks to climate change impacts enhanced*. The assumption that local and regional planners, landowners, farmers, and local communities understand the value of combining conventional and traditional flood control systems to reduce risk is not entirely valid. Statistics show that up to 70% of the land degradation in the project areas occurs on private land and is perpetuated by landowners, farmers, and local communities. This explains the project's high investment on stakeholder engagement and sensitization.

The second assumption on Outcome 2.1 was that Environmental authorities and local communities work together to incorporate ecosystem conservation measures into risk reduction. This assumption is valid, although additional efforts are needed to facilitate local government authorities to spearhead this initiative. This would create the cohesion and synergy required to sustain the project interventions. In addition, it should be noted that communities do not easily adopt some of the proposed conservation measures especially those whose livelihoods will be affected by the project interventions.

Output 3.1.2: *Three (3) demonstration centers to facilitate experience sharing activities regarding ecosystems conservation control of floods and landslides and Alternative Income Generating Activities established*. The underlying assumption that Government is willing to provide land and other facilities

necessary for a demonstration center is valid. Indeed, the project has partnered and signed MoUs with National Agricultural Research Institute (NARO) through its Zonal Agricultural Research centers, to provide demonstration centers and plots in a bid to enhance learning and adoption of climate change adaptation activities within the communities in the catchment.

Output 3.2.2: *Government officials integrate IWRM and CC in national and sectoral development plans.* Under this output, the assumption was that key sector heads and ministries are willing to integrate IWRM and CC issues in development plans. This MTE observed that key sector heads have demonstrated their willingness by committing to incorporate IWRM and CC issues in the national and sectoral development plans. During an interaction with the LCV Chairman in one of the catchments, he alluded to the fact that climate change issues are key in their planning. *“Climate Change and environmental issues are some of the things I am trying to adapt within the district budget, set up and planning,”* said the LCV Chairman, adding that he wants to streamline it in their management and development framework.

Overall approach in relation to the Project's objectives

The stakeholder-driven and owned approach adopted in implementation of the project is linked to the project's objectives. For enhanced resilience of communities to Climate Change through Catchment Based Integrated Management of Water and Related Resources, the project has ensured stakeholder participation and engagement from the onset. The baseline surveys carried out in Aswa, Maziba and Awoja catchments involved the communities in identifying their needs and developing action plans. In addition, the formation of the SCMCs with a composition of stakeholders from different sectors and platforms of government at lower levels enabled collective planning, engagement and active participation of local communities. This is key in ensuring ownership and sustainability of project interventions.

The objectives of this project are diverse and require immense expertise, skills, and knowledge in its execution. The adoption of the consultancy-based methodology guided by in-house development of concept notes has helped in meeting this required technical expertise. This also facilitated the engagement of a number of stakeholders from various fields to address the broad nature of the activities in the project design. The MTE calls on the execution team to note the following while engaging the consultants;

- The effectiveness of the consultancy-based method is usually hindered by delays in the procurement process. This should be fast-tracked for successful delivery of project outputs.
- Consultancy services are provided in a multi-phased approach and this should be taken care of during planning for timeliness in delivery.
- Consultancy services are tagged to agree payment schedules for the execution of deliverables i.e. in the event of delayed financial releases, the execution is equally delayed.
- The consultancy periods for implementation should match the scope of work to ensure quality of deliverables.
- With this approach, there is need for effective mechanisms on knowledge transfer to the project staff as well.
- The quality of some staff fronted by some of the consultancy firms are at times below the technical specifications of some of the deliverables.

The EURECCCA team is encouraged to document this methodology for learning and to inform the design of similar projects in the near future.

Design of the Project and the coherence of its strategies and activities

Climate change is a cross-cutting issue. To respond to this, the EURECCCA project is implemented in a multi-disciplinary, multi-sectoral and multi-institutional design and incorporates issues pertaining to restoration of forests, wetlands and riverbanks; sustainable water harvesting, soil bio-physical and flood control structures; community livelihood systems through supporting income generating activities with credit and market access and capacity building.

EURECCCA project was designed to work closely with key sector stakeholders especially WMD, NFA, MTIC, CC Department, LG, NEMA, MAAIF, MoFPED and NARO as illustrated in the organogram presented in the Project Document. The MTE recognizes the significant role the project has played in coordinating these MDAs to work together in fulfilling the project objectives for example the ongoing collaboration with MTIC for the implementation of the revolving fund, the Public Private Partnership with the Nursery Operators and the signing of MOUs with institutions such as NARO. For EURECCCA project to adequately benefit from this unique arrangement, there is need for continuous active involvement of these MDAs in project activities. In addition, the project is also credited with establishing SCMCs to coordinate supervise and implement activities at the grassroots level. These structures have facilitated the creation of awareness and ownership of project interventions by stakeholders from different fields. (Political leaders, media, LGs, religious leaders, cultural leaders, among others). Strengthening of these structures is key in ensuring sustainability of the project at grassroots level.

Incorporation of lessons from other relevant projects into EURECCCA

The lessons learnt from existing projects were adequately used in the design and implementation of EURECCCA Project. For example, there has been very significant sharing of lessons by the EURECCCA, and the project entitled “Building Resilient Communities, Wetlands Ecosystems and Associated Catchments in Uganda” funded by Green Climate Fund (GCF), which activities are partly being implemented in the same area. This has ensured sharing between project management teams and building of other synergies.

The EURECCCA project philosophy is unique as it follows a catchment-based approach and is driven by stakeholders at national level through to the community involvement. It is therefore changing the way existing projects in the ministry have been implemented. EURECCCA has tried to address the shortfalls in existing projects that used a similar multi-sectoral approach such as Lake Victoria Environment Management Project (LVEMP); Community Conservation Initiatives (COBWEB) project but continues to learn from the mistakes as well and the success of these projects that did not follow a catchment based implementation arrangement.

Coherence of EURECCCA project with the needs and expectations of the beneficiaries

EURECCCA Project is in line with the needs and expectations of the beneficiaries. The project set out to increase the resilience of ecosystems by supporting sustainable management of forests, wetlands and riverbanks; increase the resilience of agricultural landscapes by supporting communities to develop and implement sustainable water harvesting, soil bio-physical and flood control structures; increase resilience of other community livelihood systems by supporting income generating activities with credit and market access and build the capacity of extension services and institutions at local, catchment, water management zone and national level to better support local stakeholders.

Awoja, Aswa and Maziba CMPs, had highlighted challenges of the beneficiaries to include flooding, deforestation, wetland degradation, poor agricultural productivity in the landscapes, degradation of riverbanks, landslides, lack of alternative IGAs, poor market access, lack of credit and weak institutional

framework. To effectively address these needs, the project implementation requires continuous alignment of interventions with the management objectives of the CMPs.

Coherence of EURECCCA project with country priorities and country ownership

Uganda has the following country priorities that EURECCCA project is currently addressing: Uganda National Climate Change Policy; Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) framework, Uganda Catchment Management Planning guidelines, CMPs for Awoja, Aswa, Maziba; Vision 2040, Wetland management policy, forestry sector guidelines, Poverty eradication programmes and the National Adaptation Plan for the Agricultural Sector among others. The project is contributing to the country planning to ensure country ownership through integration of climate change issues in Awoja, Aswa and Maziba CMPs. These guidelines are very useful in decision making at national, regional and local levels.

Overall, the concept is in line with the National sector development priorities and plans. The project is in line with the commitments of the executive arm of the Government².

Extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design

The EURECCCA project was designed to incorporate gender-related issues in stakeholder consultations and other participatory forums through the development of a gender equality action plan. The participatory forums and structures were to be constituted through representatives of different groups, including women, poor, youth, elderly and persons with disability as these are the most vulnerable groups.

As set out during the design, the project is credited for forming nine (9) gender inclusive SCMCs in Awoja, Aswa and Maziba Catchments. It is aimed to allow active engagement and participation of both women and men in the project activities. During this MTE, it was noted that the representation of women in these committees was good as it is above the National Standard of $\frac{1}{3}$ representation of females. The 50:50 ratio proposed by the PSC was not achieved due to the limited representation of women especially in the political and sectoral leadership positions. The project team has however put in place deliberate efforts to increase women representation in the committees.

Additionally, the turn up of women during community sensitizations and meetings is approximately 37% due to among others, socio-cultural challenges women face in these catchment areas. The project is however credited for exceeding the national standard of 33%.

Notwithstanding, efforts have been made to ensure that gender sensitivity is followed through mobilization and community awareness meetings conducted by both consultants and project staff. The project also practices gender disaggregation in reporting. For continuous representation of gender issues, and to meet the gender requirements in the project design, EURECCCA should develop and implement a gender equality action plan. Furthermore, the project is encouraged to increase the representation of women among project staff.

² <https://opm.go.ug/2019/02/04/uganda-celebrates-world-wetlands-day-2019/>

Incorporation of various stakeholders' perspectives and opinions in Decision-making processes

According to the project document, decision making is to be guided by various committees including the Project Steering Committee, and Project Coordination Team, Project Execution Team, Focal Points at WMZ and Support Team at the Ministry among others. In addition, several lead agencies were foreseen to actively participate in decision making on the project such as; NEMA, MAAIF, Ministry of Finance, GWPEA, staff of the participating agencies, Catchment Management Committees, relevant technical staff of the participating local governments, NGOs and private sector among others.

The project is credited for creating good decision-making support platforms through PSC, PTC, CMCs, SCMCs, resource user groups and women groups in the project area. These have provided input into informed decision making through sharing their perspectives and opinions about the project outputs. There is also a validation system that involves all stakeholders at National, regional and catchment/project area level.

To strengthen the decision making processes, the PSC needs to meet regularly as stipulated in the PIM to enable timely approval of project document such as; the quarterly reports, review of work plans and budgets among others and to discuss emerging issues raised during meetings held by the lower structures (the PCT, PET, WMZs and CMCs and SCMCs).

Major areas of concern

1. Although the project has involved other agencies at national and district levels through the Project Steering Committee, Contract Management Teams and during specific project activities the technical lead agencies (MDAs) have various roles and obligations in their respective agencies, which sometimes limits their contribution and involvement in the project.
2. **The project Scope**; given the context and needs of target groups, the funds and time allocated for the project are limited.
3. **The consultancy-based methodology**; this demonstrated a few shortcomings in timeliness and effectiveness among others as elaborated earlier in the report.
4. **Approach for implementation of the revolving fund**; for effectiveness, the affected communities should form SACCOS/ Cooperatives that will be linked to this fund. Whereas the concept of channeling the money through already established SACCOS is good, the MTE draws attention to the following shortcomings:
 - SACCOS lend to their members and have strict membership requirements that the low-income communities in the degraded hotspots might not be able to fulfill
 - Distance between the targeted households and the SACCOS is far
 - The interest rates of some SACCOS are very high with some charging as much as 10%

EURECCA Project is working with MTIC to offer technical guidance about implementation of the revolving fund.

5. **Involvement of targeted communities**; formation of the women groups for promotion of improved cook stoves and selection of the nursery operators should prioritize the affected communities in the degraded catchments.
6. **Functionality of SCMCs**; the committees are not legally mandated by any policy document to enforce the conservation measures. However, the SCMCs have been provided for in the ongoing review of the National Water Policy and Water Act and will soon become legal structures. The

project is utilizing the recently launched CMO manual to provide guidance on the roles and responsibilities of the SCMCs.

7. **Procurement Delays;** There is need to closely and consistently follow up with the Contracts Committee for timely approval of procurements.
8. **Documentation;** the absence of a project communication plan has affected learning, knowledge management and sharing.
9. **M&E;** Limited project monitoring and evaluation affects results tracking and dissemination of project outputs.

4.1.2 Results Framework/Log-frame

Clarity, practicality and feasibility of EURECCCA project's objectives and outcomes within its time frame

Some of the project targets and funds are limited compared to the needs on the ground. The target area/hectares of restoration is small and this calls for scaling up of the project interventions.

For example, on:

1. Outcome 2.3; Resilience of livelihood systems to climate change impacts enhanced. The demand for Alternative livelihood options is high among affected households. The budget of USD 699,000 may cover fewer households in the degraded hotspots. This calls for prioritization of the most vulnerable households.
2. Outcome 2.1: Concrete output 2.1.4; Communities in 3 catchments supported to rehabilitate degraded wetlands was expected to cost USD 1,071,000 but the Costed CBWRMPs have revealed a higher cost of restoring the hotspots.
3. Outcome 2.2: Concrete output 2.2.1; Communities in 3 catchments supported to harvest water and control floods. Emerging cost projections of establishing biophysical structures and flood control structures may exceed the budget of USD 1,044,000.

The budget constraints call for prioritizing the most degraded areas in the identified hotspots.

4.2 Progress towards Results

4.2.1 Progress towards outcomes analysis

The overall progress towards results is at 33%. At midterm, most of the documentation especially the updated CMPs; CBWRMPs, restoration plans, and various Terms of References and specifications were in place. There has also been significant stakeholder engagement and capacity building in Awoja, Maziba and Aswa catchments. The findings reveal that stakeholders in all three catchments are very enthusiastic about the EURECCCA interventions and are willing to participate in the project activities. Preparations for physical implementation are almost complete, most of the service providers for the restoration activities have already been procured and are already working. Table 1 presents detailed progress towards results.

Table 1: Detailed presentation of progress towards EURECCCA Project results

Evaluation Criteria	Midterm Value	End of Project Targets	Explanation of Midterm Value	Means of Verification
Objective: To increase the resilience against the risk of flood and landslides of Awoja, Maziba and Aswa Catchments through promoting catchment based integrated, equitable and sustainable management of land and water resources	16%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Integrity of targeted natural resources improved by at least 50% 	<p>The overall progress towards results is at 33%. Preparations for physical implementation are under way and most of the service providers for the restoration activities have already been procured and are already working.</p>	<p>Training reports, Quarterly reports, Annual Technical Report, Supervision Reports, Capacity building reports, Field reports, MOUs, Attendance lists, Workshop Reports, Baseline reports and field interviews</p>
	16%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 50% of targeted households develop climate resilience to climate change impacts by 2020 		
	1%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Natural resources restored by 10% in the project areas by 2020 		
Component 1: Establishing Frameworks for Climate Resilient Catchment Management in Awoja, Aswa and Maziba catchments				
Outcome 1.1 Comprehensive catchment planning system that integrates issues of climate change established and tested in Awoja, Aswa and Maziba	65%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Three (3) fully functional Catchment management structures for the 3 target catchments are in place. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SCMC minutes of their meetings are available 	
Output 1.1.1 The existing catchment management planning guidelines revised to include aspects of climate change	100%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revised CMP guidelines in place 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The revised CMP guidelines are in place and they have been printed and ready for dissemination 4 workshops have been held Copies not yet disseminated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Copies of the CMPs
	100%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 500 copies of revised guidelines 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 500 copies verified
	50%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 8 workshops 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Workshop reports
Output 1.1.2 The Catchment Management Plans (CMPs) of Awoja, Maziba and Aswa revised to address climate change issues	75%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3 CMPs for Awoja, Aswa, Maziba revised 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The CMPs are being revised to incorporate climate change issues but not yet finished For Maziba the consultant is on deliverable 4 (water 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft CMPs
	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 700 copies of revised CMPs 		
	67%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6 workshops held 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Workshop reports

Evaluation Criteria	Midterm Value	End of Project Targets	Explanation of Midterm Value	Means of Verification
			<p>resources assessment under climate change report) out of 7 deliverables whereas for Awoja and Aswa, the consultant is on deliverable 6- Draft CMPs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There was a challenge with Maziba, the water resources assessment is being redone ▪ Two workshops held in Maziba, 1 Awoja 1 Aswa 	
Outcome 1.2 Awoja, Aswa and Maziba catchments managed by appropriate water and climate governance structures	70%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Fully functioning structures by end 2017 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The SCMCs were formed in 2018, they have met twice so far 	
Output 1.2.1 Nine (9) sub-catchment level community management structures, established and supported, in the 3 catchments (3 for Awoja, 3 for Maziba & 3 for Aswa).	70%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ All the Catchment committees, Fora and Secretariats established/strengthened in the three catchments and the 9 target sub-catchments and Micro-catchments within the sub-catchments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The SCMCs are supposed to hold regular meetings and implement up to the end of the project ▪ The SCMCs should be meeting at least twice a year. ▪ 54 meetings are planned for the SCMCs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes of the meetings
Component 2 Implementing concrete adaptation actions for resilient and sustained ecosystems, agriculture and other livelihood systems.				
Outcome 2.1 Resilience of ecosystems services of forests, wetlands and riverbanks to climate change impacts enhanced	32%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ At least two ecological systems improved their resilience by 2020 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Hectares that are in for restoration are not specified in the results matrix 	

Evaluation Criteria	Midterm Value	End of Project Targets	Explanation of Midterm Value	Means of Verification
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> These were supposed to be improved after undertaking physical restoration activities which have not taken place 	
Output 2.1.1 The most degraded areas vulnerable to intensive rainfall confirmed	100%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In each catchment an area of forest, wetland and riverbank defined as most vulnerable to intensive rainfall, risk of flooding and landslides. 	This output was completed.	Assessment Reports
	100%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A detailed baseline report 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Baseline reports
Output 2.1.2 Communities in 3 catchments supported to restore deforested and degraded land through afforestation	30%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 9 tree nurseries supported to produce 1450,000 seedlings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The nurseries have been procured; the contracts are being finalized. The trainings have started in Maziba and are continuing in other catchments The training for the households will target household representatives There was training for some of the beneficiaries where pilot tree planting activities were conducted The tree planting that was carried out was after identification of most deforested land by the EURECCCA staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Copies of contracts Field interviews with Nursery operators
	30%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 180 (72 Women and 98 Men) people trained 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attendance lists for the training
	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 10,000 households trained 		
	5%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1000 ha restored 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Capacity building reports
Output 2.1.3 Improved	25%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18 groups are supported to produce 8000 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The 18 groups are in 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Groups lists

Evaluation Criteria	Midterm Value	End of Project Targets	Explanation of Midterm Value	Means of Verification
cooking stoves promoted in the 3 catchments to reduce levels of forest degradation		stoves	place	
	7%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 3600 households trained in the installation and use of improved cooking stoves. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The consultants (3) have been procured and have started the training of women groups 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Training reports Attendance lists
	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 3600 households have acquired and are using improved cook stoves 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TOT trainings were conducted in Maziba The trainings are scheduled in other locations. 	
Output 2.1.4 Communities in 3 catchments supported to rehabilitate degraded wetlands	15%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 300 ha restored 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Physical rehabilitation is scheduled. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Capacity Building reports
	83%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1800 households trained of which 50% are women 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6 CBWRMP submitted The turn up of women is 37%. This is largely attributed to cultural issues where land is mostly owned by men 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Training reports Attendance lists
	40%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 12 individual wetland restoration action plans (4 per catchment) developed and implemented for 12 wetlands in the 3 catchments. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CBWRMP
Output 2.1.5 Communities in 3 catchments supported to restore degraded river banks and protect buffer zones	15%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 320ha stabilized and restored 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6 river bank restoration plans have been submitted 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Activity reports Quarterly reports Annual Technical report
	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 200 Km boundary put in place 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 162 community members trained so far 	
	30%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 540 community members 50% of which are women trained 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The number of community members engaged along the river banks is low (in some communities the population is sparse) In some communities' discussions are still ongoing on the size of the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Training reports

Evaluation Criteria	Midterm Value	End of Project Targets	Explanation of Midterm Value	Means of Verification
			buffer	
Outcome 2.2 Resilience of agricultural landscapes to climate change impacts enhanced	18%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 400 ha of land of agricultural land with biophysical and water harvesting structures in place. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some of the draft costed plans are in place Community engagement in the planning process is ongoing until end of project 	
Output 2.2.4 Communities in 3 catchments supported to harvest water and control floods	43%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 2,000 households trained 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximately 850 households have been sensitized/engaged Approximately 0.7km of biophysical structures covered Physical implementation is yet to begin There is significant training and awareness in the respective catchments A communication officer is required to support media communication Communication and knowledge management need to be given more priority 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Training reports Quarterly reports
	0.07%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1000 Km of biophysical structures in place 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quarterly reports Annual Technical Report Supervision Reports
	30%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 18 Community workshops and 36 training meetings 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Training reports
	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 6 radio talk shows to sensitize communities on biophysical structures held 		
Outcome 2.3 Resilience of livelihood systems to climate change impacts enhanced by providing alternative income	3%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The percentage of food insecure households is reduced to 10% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The CBWMP process has identified some livelihood options The identified 	
	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2400 vulnerable households have improved livelihoods 		

Evaluation Criteria	Midterm Value	End of Project Targets	Explanation of Midterm Value	Means of Verification
generating opportunities	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least incomes of 70% of participating farmers have improved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> livelihood options will be the basis for preparing the livelihood report 	
Output 2.3.1	20%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Each catchment identifies HH to be targeted through livelihoods improvement activities of the project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The consultants are capturing the livelihood options. This could support the production of the livelihood analysis report One training for TOTs in Maziba involving 7 modules has been conducted 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Capacity building reports
	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> About 90% of the HHs affected by project interventions supported for IGAs 		
Output 2.3.2 Revolving fund schemes introduced to diversify sources of income in 3 catchments	5%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 9 community groups (3 per catchment) trained 27community trainings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EURECCCA is working with MTIC to devise the means of managing the revolving fund The existing SACCOs were also assessed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Field reports
	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 3,000 HH are accessing the revolving fund 		
	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> About 80% rates of return on investment 		
Output 2.3.3 Alternative income generating activities-IGAs (bee keeping, tourism, Hand crafts etc.) supported	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 2,400 HH trained (20 trainings each of 30 participants per year with at least 2 trainings per sub catchment) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No trainings undertaken yet 	
Component 3: Building climate change adaptive capacities of institutions and communities and knowledge management				
Outcome 3.1 Adaptive capacity of communities and other stakeholders to climate change impacts strengthened	24%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adaptive capacity of at least 60% target communities to climate change impacts have been strengthened. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The livelihood options and all other physical interventions have not yet been implemented in the identified hotspots 	
Output 3.1.1 Capacities of extension services and	20%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least- 14 TOT workshops conducted 90 micro catchment level dissemination 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7 training modules have been developed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Training reports

Evaluation Criteria	Midterm Value	End of Project Targets	Explanation of Midterm Value	Means of Verification
institutions at catchment level are strengthened to support communities in Awoja, Aswa and Maziba to undertake climate change adaptation activities		workshops in 3 years (10 community meetings per sub catchment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 7 TOT workshops carried out in Maziba catchment only ▪ The beneficiaries of the TOT on tree planting are already conducting training in some schools ▪ There have been more trainings undertaken during the planning process by the consultants ▪ At the time of the MTE trainings had been planned for TOTs in Awoja and Aswa 	
Output 3.1.2 Three (3) Demonstration centers to facilitate experience sharing activities regarding ecosystems conservation, control of floods and landslides and alternative income generating activities established	40%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ One Demonstration center set up in each of the 3 catchments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Locations for the demonstration centers have been identified and an MOU signed with NARO to set and operate the centers ▪ 1 training was conducted ▪ The requirements for rehabilitation and furnishing the centers identified and agreed with NARO ▪ Procurement for rehabilitation and furnishing has just started ▪ The TOR for the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ MOUs
	20%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ At least 5 trainings in key interventions conducted at each center 		
	15%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ At least 4 plots established at each demonstration center 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Quarterly reports

Evaluation Criteria	Midterm Value	End of Project Targets	Explanation of Midterm Value	Means of Verification
			demonstration plots are being discussed with the three centers (Kacwekano, Ngetta and Serere ZARDIs)	
Outcome 3.2 Demonstrating and developing mechanisms to integrate climate change adaptation and implementation	16%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> By the end of the project lessons and best practices are documented, shared and influence local and central government planning and policy. 		
Output 3.2.1 Good practices and lessons that influence policies and practices documented	30%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 3 documents with lessons learned and best practices from the project documented (i.e. policy briefs, brochures, media articles etc) (This Output captures the best practices as well) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EURECCCA project has developed brochures, conducted school awareness campaigns, distributed T-Shirts, participated in water week, media articles among others Consolidation of lessons learnt on the project is ongoing but no consolidated documentation has been produced yet 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual Technical Reports Quarterly reports
	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 2 study tours per catchment organized 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Study tours are yet to be undertaken 	
Output 3.2.2 Key Government officials integrate IWRM and CC in national and sectoral development plans	33%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 150 Officials from Districts and Sub county levels trained on IWRM and CC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There have been trainings on IWRM and climate change this targeted a number of officials from the catchment Approximately 50 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Training reports Attendance
	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 90% of Development plans at district, Sub county and National levels integrate climate change resilience and adaptation issues 		

Evaluation Criteria	Midterm Value	End of Project Targets	Explanation of Midterm Value	Means of Verification
	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A scaling up strategy developed and is being used to scale up project 	officials have been trained	
Project Management and M&E				
Number of Project launching workshops held in the catchments.	100%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4 Project launching workshops (1 national and 3 catchment levels) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The 4 workshops have been implemented 	Workshop Reports
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Baseline undertaken Mid-term evaluation Final evaluation 	66%		Final evaluation is scheduled at the end of the project	Baseline reports MTE report

4.3 Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

4.3.1 Management Arrangements

The EURECCCA Project is financed by the Adaptation Fund (AF); implemented by the OSS and executed by the Ministry of Water and Environment (MWE) in Uganda. There were no major changes in the Project management as outlined in the Project Document. The notable changes include;

- The inclusion of Ministry of Local Government (MoLG) and Ministry of Trade and Cooperatives on the Project Steering Committee
- The transfer of Team Leaders (TLs) of the Water Management Zones (WMZs), for example, Upper Nile and Victoria and introduction of a new TL for Kyoga.
- The signing of framework contracts with service providers.
- Establishment of Stakeholder Coordination Committees from the community levels to the Catchment levels and setting up of Contract Management Committees.
- Recruitment of additional staff for technical, administrative and financial support.
- The PSC revised the frequency of their meetings from quarterly to every four (4) months due to challenges in the availability of its members

According to the PCT and PET, these changes were necessary in improving budget performance at implementation; ensuring active involvement of all key stakeholders; and timely delivery of good quality services.

The responsibilities and reporting lines are clear based on the organogram in the PD. Whereas the decision-making is transparent, there are some challenges in timeliness for example the procurement of consultants to prepare Wetland Management and Restoration Plans (WMRPs); Riverbank restoration and protection of buffer zones; water harvesting and flood control structures and biophysical conservation structures which had 6 months delay.

4.3.2 Work planning

The actual implementation vis-à-vis the planned activities indicates that overall, most of the project deliverables have delayed. The following points stand out:

- At the time of the MTE, the project activities are approximately 6 months behind schedule.
- With regards to the preparatory studies under Outputs 2.1.4, 2.1.5, 2.2.1, the call for tenders launched by the PCT following the OSS No-objection on May 18, 2018, was unsuccessful due to market price inflation. As a result, and in order to reduce the delays, an integrated approach of entrusting to consulting firms (3 in each catchment = one per sub-catchment): the development of the action plans, the consultation of the stakeholders and the supervision of the execution of the work was agreed and adopted to ensure the achievement of these outputs.
- In regards to the development of a revolving fund and to the support of alternative Income Generating Activities (IGAs) under Output 2.3.1 and 2.3.2, the actions to be taken in order to achieve this output were not clear in the project document and required extensive discussions and experience sharing with key players such as MTIC and District Commercial Officers. Pursuant to this direction, MTIC was engaged and contributed to development of a concept note that is guiding the ongoing assessment of SACCOs at the time of the MTE.

Generally, the causes of the delays included;

- The rigorous clearance processes of the project activities, especially on the procurement of Consultants to help in carrying out of the concrete adaption actions.
- Delays in the release of funds.
- The challenge of under staffing in the initial processes.

- Strict guidelines and regulations in place which delay decision making.
- Delay in recruitment, induction and assimilation of project staff.
- Lack of clear candidate sites for restoration resulting in cancellation of some already identified sites
- Delays in finalization of some deliverables by consultants due to their inadequate quality that led to extensive discussions and engagements with DWRM.
- The internal audit of the project, which delayed disbursement
- Overwhelming roles of the MWE staff (DWRM staff have wide scope of work covering other Catchments).
- Irregular meetings of the PSC and SCMCs.

It has to be noted that actions have been undertaken to mitigate the above-identified causes, namely through:

- Recruitment of the support staff (11 people)
- Utilization of other staff in MWE to handle the tasks of the project accountant who resigned.
- Bi-weekly staff meetings being held by Project Teams to track on progress and to internalize the project document and expected deliverables.
- Close follow-ups with OSS on no-objections
- Follow up on consultants' deliverables
- Up scaling procurement of service providers and signing framework contracts with them
- Establishment of Contract Management Teams involving representatives' various MDAs

The work planning process is coordinated at the central level. The process starts at the center where the PCT develops the template for the work plan. The template is sent to the WMZs for input. After receiving various inputs from the WMZs, the PM invites a planning meeting that is attended by all project staff at the center. The Project Document is the basis for work planning processes and the tracking of the results is based on progress reports. The directives and recommendations of PSC also inform the planning process.

This evaluation further noted that the Results Framework of the project sufficiently defines success indicators for project implementation and the respective means of verification, with no major changes to it. The PCT was able to undertake baseline surveys and prepared a detailed M&E plan that streamlines project objectives, indicators and methodologies of data collection. Two joint review missions to the project sites have been conducted by OSS in a span of two years which was inconsistent with the Project Document which calls for twice in a year review missions.

In addition, Quarterly Progress Reports were prepared by the Project team. Annual Project Reports were equally prepared and reported on progress made towards project objectives and project outcomes – each with indicators, baseline data and end-of-project targets (cumulative); and annual Project outputs delivered per project outcome, among others.

The PCT recruited the M&E officer based at Head Office to ensure that field monitoring visits are conducted; quarterly M&E reports are prepared with the involvement of all relevant stakeholders. This evaluation also confirms that the Project launch workshops were conducted at national and regional levels to build ownership for project results amongst stakeholders. The Project Team also deploys what it calls “critical path approach” in using the results framework by having a focal point person on different activities since most of them are running concurrently.

Despite the fact that no major changes have been made to the log frame, this evaluation proposes the further breakdown of some of the project indicators in order to level of progress. For example, level of

awareness of communities on the importance of conserving the ecosystems, frequency of flooding/landslides, number of self-driven initiatives by the CMCs or SCMCs.

4.3.3 Finance

The EURECCCA project has made considerable steps in using innovative financial mechanisms to establish PPPs with tree nursery operators and Research Institutions in a bid to increase the resilience of community livelihood systems by supporting IGAs. Considering that approximately only 16% of the project budget was disbursed by the project mid-term, at the present stage, progress toward the project objective is limited.

On the other hand, the PET noted that the project budget didn't cater for project administration at the Catchment level, for example the biweekly meetings, vehicle repairs and maintenance, stationery, etc. There is an aspect of Government co-funding, but may not be sufficient.

Furthermore, in accordance with the Grant Agreement and the contractual documents (PIM), the PCT is responsible for quarterly technical and financial reporting. In addition, an overall annual report template provided was by OSS. The financial monitoring of the project is ensured using the "NAVISION" accounting software with a public accounting approach. Agreeable accounting interventions were adopted into the system. However, there is a need to decentralize this accounting system to the Project Execution Units at the WMZs. Additionally, the timely submission of documents like internal and external audit reports, quarterly reports, and technical reports is not yet well observed. The quarterly reporting including technical and financial aspects should be submitted according to the agreed deadlines to help in fast tracking the financial implications of Project interventions. This evaluation notes that the delays in both financial and technical reporting may have affected timely flow of funds. This is because, the disbursement percentage remains way below what was expected two years after the start of the project.

This evaluation recommends further the need for MWE, OSS and the MoFPED to have a discussion on how to facilitate timely disbursement of funds.

4.4.4 Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems

This evaluation observed that the M&E tool is informed by the results matrix, and its structure follows the key components in the results matrix. The M&E system of the project involves stakeholders through monitoring visits, although they don't usually use M&E tools during field visits. In addition, the project targets to improve the integrity of natural resources, and household resilience to climate change are in line with the integrated water resource management system. The tools also leverage on the water sector information such as the CMPs, IRWM framework, CC Policy, Uganda Catchment Management Planning Guidelines, Wetland Management Policy, Forestry Sector Guidelines, and the National Adaptation Plan for Agriculture Sector.

However, the monitoring tools are insufficient and there is need to have; quality benchmark tools for activities, distribution lists, feedback gathering tools, pre and post evaluation tools, and beneficiary and stakeholder tools among others. Currently, the M&E reporting tool used by the project does not involve a lot of costs as reporting relies on information from officers from the WMZs. The project should develop more accountability tools that get feedback from the communities on implementation. Each tool should be pre-tested on the target stakeholders.

Whereas the budget allocated for M&E is sufficient for the PCT monitoring activities, this evaluation revealed the need for increased monitoring, supervision of activities and quality assurance especially at catchment and sub catchment levels through;

- Recruitment of additional M&E staff especially at WMZs
- Periodic mission trips at least every month to each of the catchments to take stock of the processes, progress, challenges, lessons, and feedback from the stakeholders especially beneficiaries.

4.3.5 Stakeholder Engagement

The EURECCCA project is designed to be implemented based on stakeholder driven and issue-based approach. There is no doubt that the project has leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships. This evaluation observed that joint reviews were conducted with representation from executing stakeholders, LGs and communities. There was also an effort to coordinate and harmonize the support that is to be provided by Research Institutions. In addition, there was an attempt to streamline the activities of the different stakeholders especially the SCMCs by defining their roles and responsibilities. For effectiveness, this is required for all project stakeholders.

Nevertheless, the MTE observed that the SCMCs have not been functioning as expected. This has led to inadequate coordination and limited information sharing among the key project stakeholders. Therefore, there is need to streamline and adequately facilitate the activities of all project stakeholders to allow for synergy and effective project implementation.

This evaluation also observed that EURECCCA project enjoys the support of both the local and national stakeholders as provided for in the PD. At national level, the key stakeholders continue to have an active role in decision making especially at the PSC and PCT. At LG level, the involvement of stakeholders is envisioned in the CMCs, SCMCs and community level structures. These structures are assumed to be a true representation of both the political and technical involvement of LGs in the project implementation. As noted earlier, the functionality of these structures needs to be strengthened. This therefore means that the sustainability of the project interventions will be at stake if CMCs, SCMCs and community level structures are not made fully functional to coordinate stakeholder engagements and participation in the EURECCCA project activities especially at community levels.

Notwithstanding, this evaluation found it difficult to measure the extent to which stakeholder involvement and public awareness has contributed to the progress towards the achievement of project objectives considering the fact that the actual implementation of the project activities is yet to start.

4.3.6 Reporting

In accordance with the Grant Agreement and the contractual documents such as the Project Implementation Manual (PIM), this evaluation noted that the Project coordination Team partly complied with the OSS reporting requirements for quarterly technical and financial reporting. For example, at the beginning of the project and given the delays in project start, PCT submitted to OSS one progress report covering the entire period from May 2017 to April 2018. Actually, the report covered the effective executing period which is about 4 months in the first year. At the beginning of this year the PCT was finalizing some documents that conditioned the entry into force of the agreement and was stabilizing the Project team, this has delayed the activities execution. During the second year, the required reports were submitted by the PCT to OSS in due time and according to the agreed frequency, although the resubmission of the reviewed documents according to comments and inputs took some time.

This evaluation also noted that although the documentation of lessons learnt and best practices in climate change adaptation is being done, it is not consolidated in a single report. However, at the time of this evaluation, the consultant had been procured and expected to document good practices of IWRM and climate change adaptation innovations implemented under the project.

4.3.7 Communications

The EURECCCA project has adopted a number of channels for internal communication and feedback mechanisms, including but not limited to emails, social media (WhatsApp), telecommunications, and internal meetings, and letters, physical visits, among others. It was agreeable to most of the stakeholders interviewed that these channels are effective in informing on the various interventions undertaken by the project. However, these internal communications are undertaken in ad hoc manner. The absence of a communication plan and a dedicated communications officer at both Central and WMZs is a major contributing factor.

This evaluation noted that there was a communication gap among the PET, CMCs, and SCMCs. As a matter of fact, some members of the CMCs and SCMCs interviewed revealed that some of the project activities had implemented in their jurisdictions without their knowledge and participation.

This evaluation noted that a number of awareness raising programs like stakeholder workshops, newspaper articles, IEC materials and Radio talk shows, community sensitization meetings, transect walks with community members, joint planning workshops with targeted beneficiaries, among others, had been used to express the project progress and intended impact to the public. In addition, the project launching workshops, stakeholder forum meetings and PSC meetings have been deployed to allow for participation by key stakeholders in project implementation.

Most of the external communications on the project are embedded on the MWE website. There is, therefore, urgent need to develop the communication plan for the project as it moves into full scale implementation. This will reduce chances of poor coordination, misunderstandings, and lack of information sharing among the key project stakeholders.

Summary of the project's progress towards results in terms of contribution to sustainable development benefits, as well as global environmental benefits.

The EURECCCA project is contributing to the SDGs, and in particular to Goal 6 (target 5 on implementing integrated water resources management at all levels and target 6 on protection and restoration of water-related ecosystems including forests and wetlands). The SDGs 7 and 13 which front universal access to affordable, reliable, and modern energy services; and taking of urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts, respectively are also being contributed to. Therefore, the strengthening of national institutions and structures related to water and environment management under the EURECCCA project in Uganda is a step in the right direction. This will go a long way in promoting sustainable ecosystem management, including forest management, and conservation and sustainable use of wetland resources, and protection of riverbanks and lakeshores. Furthermore, alternative IGAs for livelihoods and the revolving fund will reduce pressure on natural resources.

4.4 Sustainability

Appropriateness of risks identified in the Project Document

To some extent, the risks identified in the project document are up to date and valid. The risk of sectoral bias is however not up to date. The project endeavored to form SCMC and CMC as a strategy for sustainability. This has greatly minimized this risk, since these committees encompass leaders from all crosscutting sectors; water, natural resource, environment, media, politics, L.G, among others. Furthermore, there is high community participation, when mobilized for activities.

For instance, much as the vision of conservation and restoration sits with all stakeholders, there is a need for more harmony across the instructions of especially leaders, technical agencies and politicians concerning resource use. Furthermore, the community also shares different interests and within the

identified catchment zones. This risk is low but may have high impact on project objectives. Local Government and the people still have high expectations and fairly understand that the project benefits will be long term.

Communities have a tendency to prefer short term investments which would not go well with some interventions like tree planting. In fact, tangible benefits are not directly realized in environment interventions, which slow response from communities.

Low technology adoption rate by communities still remains a valid risk. These activities have been part of these communities for years, and adoption of new practices may take time. Majority of the households are more interested in working with interventions that have proven to be successful in other areas.

Delay in project implementation due to bureaucracy and long procurement processes still remains a valid risk, and has been a contributing factor to some of the project implementation delays. The valid risks as identified during this MTE are discussed below.

4.4.1 Financial risks to sustainability

The evaluation revealed that the SCMC structures were formed to ensure the continuity of the project. These structures require additional support that holds them together, outside the project, and guarantees that they will continue to execute their roles as outlined in their Terms of Reference. This has been evidenced by the limited enforcement they have so far displayed within their obligation to ensure that project components are achieved; example the wetland restoration.

There is a possibility that the proposed livelihoods Income Generating Activities (IGAs) will generate additional financial and economic resources within the communities. Despite the fact that the project has not yet set up IGAs within the community, a comprehensive livelihoods analysis was conducted to inform the acceptability of livelihood options as feasible within the areas of implementation. Furthermore, there is also local market available for proposed IGAs. The IGAs may not take people completely away from the wetlands but it will certainly reduce the rate of degradation of natural resources.

There are opportunities available for Private, Public Partnerships (PPP), that the project is valorizing and this could contribute to the sustainability. In fact, the project is aimed at enhancing the capacity of local nursery bed operators, through partnerships. The Project has prepared a number of studies and CBWRMPs which provide opportunities for PPP. It is also building capacities of relevant stakeholders across the board which can be taken advantage of through PPP.

4.4.2 Socio-economic risks to sustainability

The political will for the Project has been evidenced by the involvement of Local Government (LG) structures from the District to the LCIs (The Heads of Catchment Management Committees (CMCs) and the Sub Catchment Management Committees (SCMCs) are politicians). This Project complements the aspirations of the various Development Plans of the Districts and Sub Counties in ensuring resilience of communities to Climate Change. The analysis of political involvement within the project revealed the following findings:

1. Politicians played and continue to play a key role in the dissemination of conservation messages targeting the wider population. The community entrusts their leaders, and their views are valid to the decision-making process. Furthermore, these leaders have been a key arm in advocacy, awareness raising and regularly communicate the project objectives and achievement through radio talk shows, meetings, newspaper articles, among others.

2. The capacity building initiatives by the project have placed these leaders in a good position to act as Trainers of their subsidiaries, and communities. The knowledge on project aspects will be shared across the structures, for a wider coverage.
3. The concept of Catchment operations of the Project needs rethinking because the scale of implementation is too big vis-a-vis the available resources. There is need to focus on micro-catchment implementation of Project interventions.

For sustainability of the project, the aspect of community awareness and engagement as emphasized by the project design requires a lot of time and resources. Currently, the possibility of social collaboration is still low, given the remaining years of project execution. It is advised that additional time and resources are allocated to this intervention, especially due to the nature of project methodology of “voluntary stakeholder action.” The levels of women emancipation and youth involvement also put the social participation at risk for particularly two reasons:

- 1) Women, who are at the forefront of livelihood, agriculture and ecosystem interventions, are not culturally recognized as valuable representatives during meetings, decision making, as well as strategic planning processes. Analysis revealed that the project target to ensure a 50:50 representation during mobilization is currently about 37%. Thus, additional efforts should be deployed to ensure continuous awareness and involvement of women groups even at CMC level.
- 2) Sustainability aspect is geared towards the future generation that will be spearheaded by the current youth. Additionally, the aspects of this project will be sustained if the community has a concrete understanding of the relevance of the objectives and activities. The project is ensuring a rigorous involvement of youths, through activities such as constant awareness of youth through schools, youth led campaigns among others. The mission recommends to strengthen this approach.

There is need to purposefully cater for documentation of lessons learnt as well as the best practices of this Project. Much as the lessons of the Project are being documented on a continual basis in project progress reports, it is recommended that this must be done in a systematic manner and template, with a final point within the project structure that receives and accumulates these lessons in a database for dissemination. Additionally, a discussion with the PCT revealed a consultancy, has been tasked to document lessons learnt in an ongoing partnership. The risk this has on sustainability is the dispatchment of the lessons captured with actual experiences on ground, due to limited understanding of project aspects as compared to actual executing staff, as well as a strain on knowledge transfer within the project components.

The project has embraced sharing of lessons learnt with stakeholders during engagement to inform subsequent planning and execution processes. The lessons learnt are majorly disseminated to relevant stakeholders through internal weekly meetings and weekly reporting, CMCs meetings, Annual Stakeholders Catchment Forum, validation workshops, as well as site visits. There is however a need to reinforce learning/ communications workshops organized by the project purposely for sharing of best practices, lessons and success stories. There is also need for recognition of the high relevance of advocacy, awareness raising and communication, especially with regards to the areas of focus of the EURECCCA project.

4.4.3 Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability

The project methodology of bringing together leaders and governance structures from different sectors has greatly aided the harmonization of policies, frameworks and plans. At catchment and sub catchment levels, leaders across different sectors have been brought together on a platform to share ideas beyond EURECCCA project. This has greatly minimized the risks pertaining to institutions and framework.

However, the assumption that the structures and personnel will ensure sustainability of the project results beyond project lifecycle because institutions are permanent and will continue to execute their mandates after the project and their capacities would have been built by the project, is questionable, since these structures are challenged with resources. The Project is also engaged in knowledge transfer through capacity development. The LG staffs are the major Trainer of Trainees, and it is a guarantee that this knowledge will be passed on within their structures.

There project has mechanisms for accountability, transparency and technical knowledge transfer, especially with high level stakeholders within these catchments. This is carried out through reporting, meetings and validation workshops. The project has Social development Officers, whose roles are to bridge any gaps with the community and stakeholders. It is advised that the level of direct community feedback and accountability is scaled up.

4.4.5 Environmental risks to sustainability

There is a likelihood of community demobilization due to the perceived environmental risks of some of the project activities, through an increased effect on public health. Whereas this risk remains low, there are possibilities of increased cases of malaria outbreak in communities surrounding locations of implementation. As identified in the project document, water harvesting, storage and irrigation facilities may aggravate some diseases such as malaria. This MTE also identified fears by communities neighboring wetland hotspots mapped for restoration, of increment in number of mosquitoes due to the bushes that may spring up, given the wetlands are near community settlements.

The afforestation of degraded land has started with a high involvement of communities. Field visits were conducted in each of the catchments and the stakeholders owning the land on which the tree planting will be conducted were asked what tree species they wanted and whether they were willing to restore their degraded areas through afforestation. Based on the list of tree species requested for by the stakeholders and those proposed by the National Forestry Authority (NFA), a list of the agreed tree species to be planted in each of the catchments has been set up. The selection of tree species was also based on seedlings that are likely to be raised in the nursery bed for distribution to community members. The project is advised to work with nursery tree operators to raise up tree species that not only provide environmental benefits, but also support the livelihoods of the households.

To mitigate the identified risks, the project has carried out a number of activities which among others include: i) Awareness creation through sensitization meeting, radio talk shows, and posters; ii) Involvement of leaders and iii) Involvement of technical experts like the forestry, wetlands, and environmentalists in the selection of tree species as well as conducting EIAs.

5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Conclusion

Overall, EURECCCA Project was well thought and responds to the needs of the beneficiaries because flooding and landslides are common challenges in Maziba, Awoja and Aswa catchments. The project is credited for forming gender inclusive SCMCs in all the three catchments. The EURECCCA project has undertaken a good level of stakeholder engagement, capacity building and sensitization aimed at building climate change adaptive capacities of institutions and communities and knowledge management. The project is credited for innovating a multi-disciplinary, multi-sectoral and multi-institutional approach in undertaking key interventions such as forestry, livelihood systems, wetlands restoration, agricultural landscapes and soil bio-physical structures.

5.2 Recommendations

5.2.1 Corrective actions for designing, implementing, monitoring and evaluating the project

To successfully realize the intended results of the project interventions, the following recommendations should be put into consideration:

NO	RECOMMENDATIONS	RESPONSIBLE PARTY	TIMELINES
TECHNICAL			
1	Consider more involvement of the MDAs that have expertise in forestry, livelihood systems, wetlands restoration, agricultural landscapes and soil bio-physical structures to take advantage of their capacity and experience	MWE/DWRM	Throughout the project
2	Explore the option of opening new SACCOs/cooperatives with full membership of the beneficiary communities in the degraded catchments	MWE/DWRM	By 15 th December 2019
3	Prioritize the most vulnerable households in the hotspots in attributing the revolving fund since the available funds will not be able to cover all the affected households upon its implementation	MWE/DWRM	By close of project
4	Develop a gender equality action plan	MWE/DWRM	By 28 th February 2020
5	Prepare a livelihood assessment report based on the available information from the consultants in charge of the restoration action plans	MWE/DWRM	By 31 st December 2019
6	Ensure that the affected communities in degraded hotspots are prioritized by women groups, tree nursery operators and the consultants while implementing various interventions	MWE/DWRM	Throughout the project
7	Increase the involvement of the CMCs and the SCMCs in work planning, budgeting and accountability monitoring, to strengthen transparency in decision making on this project	MWE/DWRM	Throughout the project
8	Capture and document input of the CMCs and SCMCs in the planning process of the EURECCCA project	MWE/DWRM	Throughout the project

9	Develop more accountability tools that get feedback from the communities on project implementation. Pre-tested Each tool on the target stakeholders	MWE/DWRM	By 15 th December 2019
10	Fast track development of a communication plan for the project and recruit a communications officer to support its implementation	MWE/DWRM	By 31 st March 2020
11	Ensure faster execution of the activities in order to reduce the delay. OSS should consider more frequent supervision missions (for instance twice a year) accordingly	OSS/ MWE/DWRM	At least twice every year
ADMINISTRATION			
1.	Fast track the legalization of SCMCs to create an enabling environment for them to be supported to undertake their roles	MWE/DWRM	By 30 th March 2020
2.	Continuously utilize regional PDUs where possible that can be easily accessed for follow-up to minimize unnecessary procurement delays	MWE/DWRM	Throughout the project period
3.	Introduce "NAVISION" accounting software in the regional offices	MWE/DWRM	30 th November 2019
4.	According to the Grant Agreement between GoU and OSS, EURECCA Project can withdraw any amount of money without exceeding the cap of USD 750,000 at any time during the project execution by providing all the required documents. This disbursement procedure should be utilized in accordance to the grant agreement	MWE/DWRM	Immediately
5.	Seek no objection for the recommendation made by the PSC to hold meetings after every 4 months but not every 3 months.	MWE/DWRM	Throughout the project
6.	Continue to use the approved Procurement Plan (PP) to avoid further delays.	OSS/ MWE/DWRM	Immediately
7.	Consider applying for a no cost extension in the event that there is indication that the project implementation will not be completed within the remaining period given that the project delayed for about 6 months	MWE/ DWRM/ OSS/ MoFPED	6 months to end of project
8.	OSS, MWE and MoFPED should continue to dialogue and agree on how best to address the disbursements challenges so far faced in order to facilitate timely disbursement of funds	MWE/ DWRM/ OSS/ MoFPED	Immediately
MONITORING AND EVALUATION			
9.	Come up with a rigorous knowledge management and documentation system to capture all the achievements of the project to take stock of the cumulative effect of the interventions that will support evaluation of the project results Knowledge management and documentation function should therefore be given priority through either assigning it to an existing staff where possible or engaging a new person.	MWE/ DWRM	15 th November 2019
10.	Ensure regular work plan reviews (at least monthly) which make tracking of results easier	MWE/DWRM	Throughout the project
11.	Revise the results matrix to include further break down of some of the project indicators in order to measure level of progress	MWE/ DWRM	30 th November 2019

12.	Build the capacities of the project staff to support in taking stock of the processes, progress, challenges, lessons and feedback and document from the stakeholders especially beneficiaries. Notwithstanding, the project should come up with a flexible routine of undertaking monitoring visits to each of the respective catchments	MWE/ DWRM	15 th November 2019
13.	Recruit or assign at least one M&E officer per region or assign the function to existing staff where possible	MWE/ DWRM	31 st December 2019

5.2.2. Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project

The project has created the following initial benefits:

No	Initial benefits	Enhancement measures	Responsibility	Time lines
1	Formation of CMCs and SCMCs	Facilitate (Where possible) the SCMs to perform their duties as specified in their TOR	MWE/ DWRM	Throughout the project
2	Knowledge transfer to the community through capacity building	Continuous capacity building especially through SCMC structures	MWE/ DWRM	Throughout the project
3	Direct benefits the nursery operators	Provide them with inputs to meet the 1,200,000-seedling target of the project	MWE/ DWRM	By 30 th November 2019
4	Formation of wetland and river bank user committees	Capacity building on their roles and responsibilities as well as facilitation to do their work	MWE/ DWRM	By 15 th January 2019
5	Establishment of pilot biophysical structures in Maziba	Scale up the structures to all hotspots	MWE/ DWRM	By 30 th January 2019
6	Pilot tree planting in Maziba, Awoja and Aswa catchment	Scale up the tree planting to all identified deforested areas, increase post tree planting care	MWE/ DWRM	By 31 st May 2019
7	Consultancies have enhanced knowledge transfer to local, political and technical persons in the WMZs and the catchments	Continuously refresh the local, political and technical persons to mainstream the issues trained about into district development plans	MWE/ DWRM	Throughout the project

Annexes

Annex 1: MTE assessment guide

Category	Sub-category	Issues/questions to be discussed	Target respondents ³
1. Overall	Project Steering	<p>1. We have noted low level of disbursement of funds for the project as the disbursement percentage remains way below what was expected two years after the start of the project and this has resulted in significant delay in carrying out activities</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Why is this so? Have you put any measure in place to mitigate this significant delay? If so, what measures are these? In your opinion will the measures work? <p>2. OSS has noted in their previous missions an encounter of failures in both quality and frequency of the reporting, have you taken any actions to mitigate this gap?</p> <p>3. If yes, what actions have you taken?</p> <p>4. From the review of the PSC meetings, we have noted that the PSC has met 4 times since the project begun, for example we have noted that from 27th November 2018 (3rd PSC meeting) you met again on 7th August 2019, doesn't this affect approval of critical actions and outputs necessary for the project coordination team to move faster?</p> <p>5. From the terms of reference, the Steering Committee is supposed to meet quarterly through face to face, video or Skype, why isn't this so?</p> <p>6. From the review of minutes of the meetings, several recommendations for action are often made, but how do you ensure that the Project Coordination team implements these recommendations?</p> <p><u>Budgets and Finance</u></p> <p>In your TOR, the Steering Committee is required to discuss and approve (where appropriate) recommendations made for Budget and budget constraints:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> What challenges are you facing in your collaboration between MWE and ministry of finance concerning budget financing? Have you requested for extensions in disbursement and or expenditure? If yes how much and what was the extension for? Are there some amounts that you have re-allocated based on the approved budget? If so how much is it? Are there expenses that you have incurred outside the approved budget? If so what is the amount and why? Do you have any cancelled amounts so far? If yes, how much? 	PSC Chairperson or delegated member

³ PSC=Project Steering Committee; MoFPED=Ministry of Finance Planning and Economic Development; TL= Team Leader; WMZ=Water Management Zone; PM=Project Manager; RWM=Regional Wetland Manager; PTO=Project Technical Officer; CDO=Capacity Development Officer; CO=Communication officer; SDO=Social Development Officer; M&E=Monitoring and Evaluation officer

Category	Sub-category	Issues/questions to be discussed	Target respondents ³
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. What were the original disbursement deadlines? 7. Have you asked for any supplementary financing yet? If yes, how much? 	
	Project Financing	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We have noted low level of disbursement of funds for the project as the disbursement percentage remains way below what was expected two years after the start of the project and this has resulted in significant delay in carrying out activities <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Why is this so? b. Have you put any measure in place to mitigate this significant delay? c. If so, what measures are these? d. In your opinion will the measures work? 2. What challenges/gaps are you facing in your collaboration between MWE and ministry of finance concerning budget financing 3. What are you doing to ensure respect to the deadlines of the Grant agreement especially the disbursement aspects and all the other related documents signed by the Government in this regard? 4. Have you received requests for extensions in disbursement and or expenditure? If yes how much and what was the extension for? 5. Are there some amounts that MWE has requested you to re-allocate based on the approved budget? If so how much is it? 6. Are there expenses that MWE has incurred outside the approved budget? If so what is the amount and why? 7. Do you have any cancelled amounts sofa? If yes, how much? 8. What were the original disbursement deadlines? 9. Has MWE asked for any supplementary financing yet? If yes, how much? 	MoFPED officials
2. Project Strategy	a. Project Design and Relevance	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What key issues did the project set out to address? 2. How do you link these issues to your results matrix? 3. What implementation approach are you applying to achieve the project objectives? 4. According to you, what are the merits of the implementation approach? 5. What are the shortcomings of the approach? 6. Do you think that the implementation approach was best suited for the objectives? 7. What are the project components being implemented? 8. How are these components linked to the activities that the project is undertaking? 9. Overall, do you see this project to be strategically aligned to achieve its objectives and context? 10. Were the beneficiary needs assessed at the beginning of the project? 11. How were the needs of the beneficiaries identified? 12. According to you, what were the key beneficiary needs that the project set out to mitigate? 13. What country priorities are you currently addressing through this project? 14. Do you think that these are in line with the national sector development priorities and plans? 15. What is the gender composition of the Sub-Catchment Management Committee (SCMC) and Catchment Management Committee (CMC)? 16. Did the project incorporate the gender in the interventions at community level? 17. If so, how do you mainstream gender at project area level as you implement various components? 18. What is the representation of relevant stakeholders on the coordination committee? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TL WMZs • PM • RWM • PTO

Category	Sub-category	Issues/questions to be discussed	Target respondents ³
		19. Are interventions validated by the beneficiaries before being implemented? 20. During implementation in the specific project areas, are relevant stakeholders involved in role of activities? 21. Do you have any specific areas in the project design that you feel should be improved?	
3. Progress towards Results	b. Results Framework/Log frame	1. Are there any barriers to achieving the project objectives? 2. If so, what are they? 3. How do you intend to overcome them? 4. Are there any aspects of the project which have already been successful? 5. How can the project further expand these benefits?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • M&E • CDO
4. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management	a. Management Arrangements	1. Were there any changes made in the project document? If so, which ones were they? 2. Do you have any challenges implementing the structures proposed on the organogram? 3. If so, what are the challenges? 4. Does every staff take part in the budget development process? 5. The last time a major decision was being made involving major spending on the project or policy issues on the project were you consulted or did you consult? 6. Where can the project improve in terms of management as outlined in the project document?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PM • TL WMZs • M&E • PTO
	b. Work planning	1. We have noted several delays in executing most of the planned activities, what could have caused this? (Note: Probe on each outcome area as the delays could vary) 2. What steps have you taken to address the challenges and to prevent recurrence? 3. What informs your work planning process? 4. How do you take care of overlapping activities and those activities that do not get completed within a given planning period?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TL WMZs • PM • M&E • PTO

Category	Sub-category	Issues/questions to be discussed	Target respondents ³
	c. Finance	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is a Low level of disbursement, the disbursement percentage remains way below what was expected two years after the start of the project leading to the significant delay in carrying out activities, why is this so? 2. What challenges are you facing in your collaboration between MWE and ministry of finance? 3. What are you doing to ensure respect to the Grant agreement especially the financial reporting aspects and all the other financial documents signed by the Government? 4. What measures are you taking to ensure prompt execution of the project in the given deadlines? 5. Have you requested for extensions in disbursement and or expenditure? If yes, how much and what was the extension for? 6. Are there some amounts that you have re-allocated based on the approved budget? If so, how much was it and which budget line? 7. Are there expenses that you have incurred outside the approved budget? If so, what is the amount and why? 8. Do you have any cancelled amounts so far? If yes, how much? 9. What were the original disbursement deadlines? 10. Have you asked for any supplementary financing yet? If yes, how much and what was it for? 11. What approval process do you follow before getting disbursements from Ministry of finance? 12. When funds reach the MWE account, how are they disbursed for activities? 13. How do you ensure that the requests match the planned activities? 14. Are the recipients required to account for the funds received? 15. Is the accountability adequate and effective? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finance • TL WMZ • PM
	d. Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems	<p>The monitoring tools currently being used</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What monitoring tools are being used on the project? 2. Do the tools provide the necessary information? 3. Are the key technical partners involved in preparation of tools 4. If yes, which ones are they? 5. Is the tool informed by existing information? 6. How efficient are the tools in gathering required information? 7. Is the M&E budget adequate? If not which areas need additional budget? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • M&E • PTO
	e. Stakeholder engagement	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Who are the major stakeholders/partners on your project from grass root level? 2. Do you have a written stakeholder engagement strategy? 3. How do you engage the stakeholders? 4. How do you get and or give feedback from the stakeholders? 5. What is the level of participation and enthusiasm on the project? 6. How do you engage local government structures? 7. Do you receive recommendations for improvement from stakeholders? 8. If so how do you integrate them into project implementation 9. Do you undertake validation workshops at project area level? If yes, how often? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CDO • SDO

Category	Sub-category	Issues/questions to be discussed	Target respondents ³
	f. Reporting	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How are adaptive management changes handled and reported by the project management and shared with the PSC? 2. What reporting requirements and formats do you follow? 3. Please rate the quality of reporting on this project? Rate it on a scale of 0-10 and give reasons why? 4. Are there any lessons learnt so far? 5. How do you keep record of these lessons learnt? 6. How do you ensure that these inform the subsequent planning and execution processes? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PM • M&E • PTO • TL WMZs
	g. Communication	<p>Internal project communication with stakeholders</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How often do you communicate? 2. It is effective? 3. Who are the key stakeholders? 4. How do you receive and give feedback to stakeholders? 5. Does the communication with stakeholders contribute to their awareness of project outcomes and activities and investment in the sustainability of project results? 6. What communication tools and channels are you currently using to reach out to all stakeholders on the project 7. What documentation tools are you currently using on the project? 8. What exactly do you document? 9. Do you have a communication strategy for this project? Is it followed/implemented? 10. What challenges are you facing in undertaking your roles on the project? 11. Have you documented any success stories on this project? 12. Kindly inform us about any success stories that you have documented 13. Have you identified any lessons from implementation activities? 14. If yes, which ones are they? Did you document them? 15. Have you communicated the lessons to the relevant stakeholders? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CO • SDO • CDO
5. Sustainability	a. Financial risks to sustainability	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What opportunities are available for Private, Public Partnership (PPP) after the project closure? 2. According to you, do you think that the proposed IGAs will continue after the project? 3. Will these IGAs prevent communities from retuning into degradation of their resources? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • M&E • PTO • SDO • RWM • TL WMZs
	b. Socio-economic risk to sustainability	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Do you have political will for the project? What is the level of involvement by the local authorities at the project area level? 2. Do you involve politicians in project activities? 3. Do local government staff see this restoration as their own initiative? What is their level of self-drive when invited or undertaking any activities in the project area? 4. Are there any lessons learnt so far? 5. How do you keep record of these lessons learnt? 6. How do you ensure that these inform the subsequent planning and execution processes? 7. How are lessons learnt disseminated to the relevant stakeholders? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • M&E • SDO • RWM • PTO • TL WMZs

Category	Sub-category	Issues/questions to be discussed	Target respondents ³
		8. How do you ensure that the lessons are adopted in the subsequent programming of various stakeholders on the project?	
	c. Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What underlying negative forces/demobilization efforts are you faced with? How do you intend to manage this by close of project to attain sustainability? 2. Do you think that the risk of demobilization in the project area is high and could threaten project outcomes after closure? 3. Are you engaged in any knowledge transfer to local government technical and political leaders? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SDO • RWM • TL WMZs • CO • PTO
	d. Environmental risks to sustainability	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What are the environmental risks that could jeopardize the sustenance of project outcomes? 2. What are the social risks that could jeopardize the sustenance of project outcomes? 3. What mitigation actions are undertaken by your project? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SDO • RWM
Catchment Level	Catchment, Sub-catchment and micro-catchment level Stakeholder engagement	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How have you been involved on EURECCCA project activities? 2. What activities have you been involved in EURECCCA project? 3. At the start of this project, what were your expectations? 4. Have you been involved with any consultants on the project? 5. Did the consultants involve you in the planning process/activities and execution (where applicable) for rehabilitation of degraded wetlands, restoration of degraded riverbanks and protection of buffer zones, construction of water harvest and flood control structures, and capacity building and knowledge management? If yes, what were the firms involved and how were you involved? 6. Are you updated on the overview of EURECCCA project and progress of implementation of EURECCCA activities? If yes, how often? 7. During the inception of this project, were you told about your roles and responsibilities on the project as well as generally the conservation of the sub catchments? 8. What is the representation of females and males on the SCMC? 9. What medium of communication does MWE use to reach out to project area stakeholders? According to you are they effective? 10. What kind of support do you need from WMZ to perform your duties? 11. What kind of support were you promised by the WMZ? 12. What support has WMZ given to you so far to perform your roles? 13. In the project activities undertaken by consultants, did you receive any training from any consultancy firm that was/is involved in project activities? 14. What steps have you taken as a committee or as a stakeholder against encroachment in the selected areas for restoration of forest cover, river banks, and wetlands? 15. Since the EURECCCA project started, what restoration activities have been implemented in your catchment? 16. Do you see any improvement/increase in forest cover, wetland cover and regeneration vegetation along the riverbanks? Or is the situation getting worse? 17. Are you aware of any dissemination methods for conservation messages targeting the wider population depending on these natural resources? If yes, according to you, are they effective? 18. Have you ever heard about the plans for the revolving fund meant to implement alternative income 	All catchment, Sub-catchment and micro-catchment level identified stakeholders in Maziba, Aswa and Awoja such as Local Councils, District technical persons, MDAs, nursery operators, women groups, CMCs, SCMCs, Resource User groups and committees, Households in degraded hotspots among others

Category	Sub-category	Issues/questions to be discussed	Target respondents ³
		generating activities (IGAs) for the communities whose livelihoods will be affected by the restoration activities? If yes, going by the current level of stakeholder engagement, do you think that the fund will reach the right beneficiaries?	
Consultants	Technical support/ Consultancy services	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What assignments have you undertaken on the project? 2. What is the completion status of your deliverables? 3. What stakeholders did you engage during execution of the assignment? 4. Did you conduct capacity building especially for the CMC and SCMC? 5. What challenges did you face in undertaking your assignment? 6. How did you overcome the challenges? 7. What recommendations do you have for future improvement? 	WSS, AWE, SEGAMU14 IUCN,WAM Inc., Devine Waters, JEEP
Advisory	Technical adviser	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In the project documents, you were mentioned as a technical adviser on the project and therefore you are included in the project organogram at the national level. 2. What kind of technical advice are you currently giving to EURECCA project? 3. According to the project documents, you are supposed to support capacity building and knowledge management component. 4. What kind of capacity building are you offering to the project? 5. What tools are you currently using on capacity building? 6. What communication methods are you using to mobilize the trainees and other stakeholders? 7. What training methods are using in implementing capacity building on the project? 8. During your capacity building activities, which kind of stakeholders do you engage? 9. How is the response by the stakeholders? 10. We have recently noted that you have been undertaking ToT trainings in Maziba catchments but this was not possible in Awoja and you cancelled the training that had been scheduled this week. Why is it so? 11. We have noted in the annual technical report that the executing agency was complaining about your delay in preparing capacity building tools and execution of trainings of women concerning the component of cook stoves. What do you have to say about this complaint by the project executing agency? 12. We have noted that the GWP is on the P.S.C. What has been your note on the P.S.C and why doesn't the P.S.C meet regularly as specified on the ToR which requires them to meet quarterly (after 3months) 13. Do you have any other observation/recommendations to capture to inform this MTE? 	GWPEA

Annex 2: List of persons interviewed

	Name	Position	Location	Contact
1.	Maximo Twionomuhangi	Team Leader	MWE/KWMZ	+256772659001
2.	Akia Martha	Communications officer	MWE/KWMZ	+256787459023
3.	Enwaku E Smith	Social development officer	MWE/KWMZ	+256781863030
4.	Opolot Augustine	Capacity development officer	MWE/KWMZ	+256773183073
5.	Dr Callist Tindimugaya	Project Manager	MWE/DWRM	+256772521413
6.	Eneyr Johnson	Project technical officer	MWE/KWMZ	+256772890221
7.	Anguria Albert	District water officer	Kween District	+256772646460
8.	Tony Henry	L CIII C/P kwanyiy S/C /C/p Kelim-Tabkoki SCMC	Kween District	+256773336680
9.	Nakabi Ceaser Kisc	Civil Engineer	AWE	+256700570090
10.	Atukunda Anita	Engineer	AWE	+256700415548
11.	Nankya Eseri	Soil scientist/SLM expert	AWE	+256774423458
12.	Muddukaki Solomon	Sociologist	AWE	+256701761531
13.	Egunyu Gorge Michael	LCIV	Soroti District	+256772408341
14.	Ocen Bonnie	LC III C/P	Kapir-Ngora	+256782805042
15.	Aisu Stephen	Director of studies	Ogino SS	+256783225566
16.	Iredwat Patrick	Neighbor to the wetland	Ogino-Osera	
17.	Daphine Ainebyona	M&E officer	MWE/DWRM	+256779423791
18.	Omonuk Stella Rose	Neighbor to the wetland	Ogino-Osera	+256783896313
19.	Obonipe Peter	Neighbor to the wetland	Ogino-Osera	+256786540731
20.	Opio Moses	District Environment/ forest officer	Kumi District	+256784362055
21.	Omondong John	LCIII C/p	Ogino	+256782015260
22.	Apolot Christine	LC IV	Kumi District	+256787814760
23.	Kabalu Deo	Regional Wetlands Coordinator	KWMZ	+256782729140
24.	Acipa Lucy	C/p Tididiek Asianut Women's Group	Ngora s/c,Tididiek Villiage	
25.	Akello Grace	Secretatery Tididiek Asianut Women's Group	Ngora s/c,Tididiek Villiage	+256781515464

26.	Auma Betty	Member Tididiek Asianut Women's Group	Ngora s/c,Tididiek Villiage	+256777723483
27.	Akello Immaculate	Member Tididiek Asianut Women's Group	Ngora s/c,Tididiek Villiage	+256789125411
28.	Annette Turyamureeba	Project Coordinator	MWE/DWRM	+256414323531
29.	Aayu Grace	Member Tididiek Asianut Women's Group	Ngora s/c,Tididiek Villiage	+256771526150
30.	Aguti Regina	Member Tididiek Asianut Women's Group	Ngora s/c,Tididiek village	
31.	Ikiring Immaculate	Member Tididiek Asianut Women's Group	Ngora S/c, Tididiek village	+256781532861
32.	Adongo Selina	Member Tididiek Asianut Women's Group	Ngora S/c,Tididiek village	
33.	Akiror Berna	Member Tididiek Asianut women's Group	Ngora S/c,Tididiek village	+256779736131
34.	Acheko Margret	Member Tididiek Asianut Women's Group	Ngora S/c,Tididiek village	
35.	Apio Margret	Member Tididiek Asianut Women's Group	Ngora S/c,Tididiek village	
36.	Anyumel Grace	Member Tididiek Asianut Women's Group	Ngora S/c,Tididiek village	
37.	Ogwok Gertrude	Programe Assistant	IUCN	
38.	Achan Anna	Social Development Officer.	UNWMZ	
39.	Dr. Laban F. Turyagyenda	Director of Research	Ngetta Zardi	+256 772473123
40.	Dr. Ahmed K. Eldaw	Regional Coordinator	GWPEA	+256 757680896
41.	Olal David Churchill	District Natural Resource Officer	UNWMZ (Agago)	
42.	Lokiria Ben Anjello	SCMC Chairperson	UNWMZ (Pageri-Matidi)	
43.	Okullo Robert	SCMC Chairperson	UNWMZ (Aswa 1)	
44.	Okolli Richard	SCMC Chairperson	UNWMZ (Agago)	
45.	Sylvano Afai	Regional Wetlands Coordinator	UNWMZ	+256780808448
46.	Richard Musota	Team Leader	UNWMZ	+256772520966

47.	Denis Ownai	Director	Gum Blessings Technical Consult and Supplies	+256782439559
48.	Ogena Henry	Project Technical Officer EURECCCA	UNWMZ	+256772687622
49.		Chairperson CMC	UNWMZ	
50.		Secretary CMC	UNWMZ	
51.	Mwebesa Beda	District Production Officer	VWMZ	+256772358052/ +256759358052
52.	Bernard Byagageire	CDO	VWMZ	+256772620719
53.	Annet	SDO	VWMZ	+256782656393
54.	Patrick Besigye Keihwa	Chairman LCV, Kabaale	VWMZ	
55.	Rogers Akatwijuka	District Natural Resources Officer/ Secretary Maziba CMC	VWMZ	+256772670508
56.	Jennifer Tuwezi	District Fisheries Officer	VWMZ	+256772593312
57.	Mutayamba Amos Justus Matunguru	Focal Person, EURECCCA KAZARDI (Research officer at NARO KAZARDI)	VWMZ	+256774964007/ +256754964007
58.	Women group	Mukirwa Women's Group	VWMZ	
59.	Rukundo Hadad	Upper Maziba fruitful seedlings co-owner.	VWMZ	
60.	Musasizi allan	Engineering assistant	VWMZ	+256776993820
61.	Ramuel Ahabwe	Consultant. NACOPAT-Fitz	VWMZ	
62.	Sarah Kasande	Consultant, NACOPAT-Fitz	VWMZ	
63.	Singa Singa Hache Denis	Chairman Maziba CMC	VWMZ	+256772569831/ +256701569831
64.	Evan Karingu	Chairman SCMC/ LV3	VWMZ	+256772545808/ +256756415949
65.	Vivian Safari	Consultant, Kigezi Diocese	VWMZ	+256788833889
66.	Mugisha Louis	Team Leader	VWMZ	+256772421608

Annex 3: List of documents reviewed

No.	Reference Name	Project Document
1	Project Document	Project Proposal to the Adaptation Fund - PUBLISHED
2	Grant Agreement GoU-OSS	Grant Agreement Between OSS& The Republic Of Uganda
3	Project TOR	Job Description for Capacity Development Officer- EURECCCA-Final
		Job Description for Project Technical Officer- EURECCCA
		Job Description for Social Development Officer- EURECCCA-Final
		Job description of M&E OFFICER- EURECCCA
		Job Description Project Financial Accountant- EURECCCA
		Job Description Project Financial Accountant- EURECCCA
		Terms Of Reference For The Project Coordination Team
		Terms Of Reference For The Project Steering Committee- AF Project
4	Conditions precedent to entry into force	EURECCA Project Implementation Manual (PIM) - Final-Oct2017
		EURECCCA Financial Performance Planning - Final-Oct2017
		EURECCCA Procurement Plan - Final-Oct2017
		EURECCCA Project Work plan - Final-Oct2017
		Members Of The Project Coordination Team - EURECCCA
		Members Of The Project Steering Committee- EURECCCA
		Opening of Bank Account
		Project Audit Team - EURECCCA
		Statement of Account 1
		Statement of Account 2
5	Project Progress	First EURECCCA Annual Technical-Report-MAY17-MAY18- 29-6-2018-commentaires-03072018
		First EURECCCA Financial Statement 30th April 2018
		2nd EURECCCA 2nd Annual Technical Report April 18-April-04-07-2019
		2nd EURECCCA Annual Financial Report pdf
		2nd EURECCCA Financial Statement 30th April 2019
		2 nd Quarter Technical Report – October 2019
6	PSC	Minutes of the 1st Project Steering Committee of the EURECCCA Project – 12th March 2018_Final
		Minutes of the Second Project Steering Committee of the EURECCCA Project – 31 July 2018 (1)
		Minutes of the Third Project Steering Committee of the EURECCCA Project – 27 Nov 2018-Final
		EURECCCA SCM Action Points Fourth Meeting Kabale
7	Project Supervision OSS	EURECCCA-Project Aide Memoire –June 2018
		EURECCCA-Project Aide Memoire-Second Year 2019
8	Baseline Studies	EURCCCA Aswa Baseline Report Final Draft

		Maziba baseline report
		Revised Baseline Study Report_Awoja
9	MTE/MTR	<p>Taking Adaptation to the Ground: A Small Grants Facility for Enabling Local Level Responses to Climate Change – Small Grants Facility</p> <p>Addressing Climate Change Impacts on Marginalized Agricultural Communities Living in the Mahaweli River Basin of Sri Lanka – MTR UNFCCC Adaptation Fund</p> <p>Increasing Climate Resilience Through an Integrated Water Resource Management Programme – MTE - United Nations Development Programme</p> <p>Executing Agency: Ministry of Environment and Energy</p>

