Mid-term Evaluation of the Project Titled "Improving Land Governance in the IGAD Region"

Prepared by:

Dr. Frank F K Byamugisha
Consultant
ECA
ALPC/ECA

May 20, 2018

United Nations
Economic Commission for Africa

Contents

United Nations
Economic Commission for Africa

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

AfDB	African Development Bank
ALPC	African Land Policy Center (previously called Land Policy Initiative)
AUC	Africa Union Commission
BMZ	German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development
CAADP	Comprehensive African Agricultural Development Programme
IFPRI	International Food Policy Research Institute
IGAD	Inter-governmental Authority on Development
IGAD A&E	IGAD Agriculture & Environment Division
F&G	Framework and Guidelines
ECA	UN Economic Commission for Africa
EU	European Union
GIZ	German International Cooperation
IGADInfo	IGAD Monitoring and Evaluation Framework and System
LAT	FAO's Land Assessment Tool
LPI	Land Policy Initiative (renamed African Land Policy Center)
MELA	Monitoring and Evaluating Land in Africa
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
NELGA	Network of Excellence on Land Governance in Africa
NEPAD	New Partnership for African Development
NPCA	NEPAD Planning and Coordinating Agency
OECD-DAC	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development – Development Assistance Committee
RCMRD	Regional Center for Mapping of Resources for Development
RECs	Regional Economic Communities
SDC	Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
SLGA	Strengthening Capacities for Land Governance in Africa
TORs	Terms of Reference
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
VGGT	Voluntary Guidelines on the Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests

Executive Summary

This Report presents the findings and recommendations of an independent mid-term evaluation of the project titled "Improving Land Governance in the IGAD Region" whose goal is to facilitate the implementation of the African Union Declaration on land policy in Africa. The Declaration, which was adopted by the African Union heads of state in 2009, calls upon the Land Policy Initiative (LPI; recently transformed into the African Land Policy Center -- ALPC) to assist member states in its implementation through regional economic communities (RECs). LPI/ALPC and the Intergovernmental Authority for Development (IGAD) are the executing agencies for the project while the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation is the development partner. The project supports enhancement of capacity of LPI/ALPC and of IGAD to mainstream land governance in their development strategies and programmes in order to facilitate land access and tenure security for all land users in the IGAD region.

With half of the implementation period already passed, a mid-term evaluation has been undertaken to inform implementation of the remaining part of this first phase of the project and the design of the second phase. In addition, the evaluation serves two other purposes:
- learning and accountability as required by the ECA Evaluation Policy; and
- drawing lessons and using them to identify key future project intervention areas that can be incorporated in the second phase.

The evaluation covers the period from October 1, 2014, to December 31, 2017, approximately 12 months before project completion. While assessing project results, the evaluation did not assess impacts because the implementation period was not long enough to allow impacts to materialize. Instead, the focus was on assessing project outcomes. In terms of geographic coverage, the evaluation assesses project results at LPI/ALPC and IGAD level which is the focus of the first phase; member states will be targeted directly by the second phase.

Project performance was assessed according to the criteria of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, progress towards outcome and sustainability. Key methods and tools used to collect data were desk review and fieldwork. Several primary data collection tools including interviews and direct observation were used. The data were collated, triangulated and analyzed guided by the evaluation criteria.

The project is strategically relevant to the land governance issues it seeks to address. It is also consistent with the priorities of LPI/ALPC and IGAD and has a good fit with the LPI Strategic Plan and Road Map 2012-2016 and the IGAD Strategy 2016-2020. Also, it is aligned to the African Union Declaration on land policy and the associated Framework and Guidelines on Land Policy as well as the *Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security.*

Implementation start-up delayed by about one year and a half primarily due to delays in: (i) transferring funds from LPI to IGAD, partly caused by difficulties associated with ECA's migration to a new UN computerized administrative system called UMOJA; and this affected the hiring of the project team at IGAD level.

Despite delays in implementation start-up, the project's effectiveness has been generally satisfactory. Overall the project has made good progress towards achieving its objectives and outcomes, helped largely by an adequate governance structure underpinned by a competent project management team at IGAD. The project staff at IGAD has performed well, with good technical support from LPI/ALPC, effective supervision from IGAD senior management and good policy guidance from the Project Steering Committee. One particular outcome area that has benefited from the strong project management and governance structure at IGAD Secretariat is the mainstreaming of land governance into IGAD programmes as required by the African Union Declaration on Land Policy in Africa. The mainstreaming has been done in 3 out of 5 targeted programmes, with the work on the remaining 2 (migration and gender) advancing well and due for completion in 2018. The mainstreaming has involved also the training of Secretariat staff in land governance. Both the mainstreaming and staff training were strongly supported by the senior management of the Secretariat.

A good start has also been made in developing a multi-stakeholder regional platform to share experiences and best practices; the first regional dialogue was held in November 2017 during which project progress and results of recently completed land governance studies were discussed with various stakeholders including IGAD member states and development partners. There has been less progress in knowledge generation and dissemination and in the development of regional monitoring and evaluation systems.

Regarding efficiency in project performance, there has been concerted effort to enhance cost-effectiveness and to produce quality outputs. For example, to minimize costs, Project Steering Committee meetings have been held back-to-back with other meetings such as regional land dialogues and development partners meetings; similar consultancy studies have been bundled into fewer contracts; and partnerships have been developed to leverage resources outside the project. Consequently, based on budget and expenditure analysis by the evaluator, there are no project cost overruns. In addition, a review of selected project outputs especially consultancy reports indicate that they are of high quality, suggesting that value for money has been realized.

As for sustainability, there are good indications that project results will stay even after the end of the project. **First**, IGAD's capacity has been considerably enhanced in terms of institutional management but also with the internalization of land governance within senior management and staff and the mainstreaming of land governance into IGAD programmes. **Second**, IGAD member states have also bought into the land governance agenda as demonstrated by their strong participation in the project steering committee, the regional land dialogue, the development partners meetings and the 2017 Conference on Land Policy in Africa. These positive indications of project sustainability notwithstanding, they are frail and need to be consolidated in the second phase. There are also signs of uncertainty regarding future funding of LPI/ALPC if the financing gap left by the cut off of EU funding in December 2017 is not filled.

A number of lessons have been drawn by the evaluation. **First**, capacity development has been a cross-cutting and important activity in the project benefiting the key regional institutions including the executing agencies (LPI/ALPC and IGAD), the collaborating partners (academic and research institutions, farmers and civil society organizations) and IGAD member states. It has also benefited

a critical activity of the project, namely, mainstreaming land governance in IGAD programmes which has been one of the better performing outcome areas in the project.

The **second** lesson is that partnerships have been productive. The first partnership is with the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation which, as a development partner, has funded about 82 percent of the project costs and has committed to financing the second phase. The second partnership is with IGAD member states, Academic and Research Institutions and farmers and civil society organizations as cooperating partners in enhancing project implementation. The third partnership is with some donors including EU and GIZ who have been funding IGAD programmes in which land governance has been mainstreamed. And the fourth partnership is in developing and implementing a regional monitoring and evaluation system which is being done in collaboration with other regional and global monitoring and evaluation initiatives including LPI's Monitoring and Evaluation of Land in Africa which is being piloted in 12 countries including 3 IGAD member states with the support of the International Food Policy Research Institute. These partnerships have been beneficial not only in leveraging capacities and resources of partners but also in enhancing project implementation.

The **third** lesson is the need for early planning and undertaking of procurement processes (short of contract signing) for first year project activities before project commencement and signing of financing agreements, notwithstanding the resources needed to do it. In the case of procurement of consultants, their terms of reference should be prepared during preparation of the project proposal document. If this had been done and project funds transferred to IGAD on time, project implementation delays experienced in the early period of the project would have been minimized if not eliminated completely.

The **fourth** lesson is the need for buy-in and strong commitment to the project by senior management to enhance project success as demonstrated by the positive role played and strong contributions made to the project by IGAD's senior management who mobilized key IGAD staff from thematic programmes and programmatic pillars to support the project; oversaw and guided the work of project staff; and chaired the project steering committee and the various land-related land dialogue platforms.

The **fifth** lesson is that the arrangements for the project steering committee meetings have been so effective that they should be maintained during the remaining part of the project, adopted in the second phase and considered by other RECs in their future land governance projects. The arrangements are as follows: the project steering committee is made up of key project stakeholders, chaired by the Director of IGAD's Agriculture and Environment Division; and the meeting venue rotates among member states to enhance their buy-in and ownership.

In light of the experience gained from engaging in this current phase of the project and the success of the project in mainstreaming land governance, LPI/ALPC should explore opportunities to introduce similar land governance projects in other RECs to support their implementation of the African Union Declaration on land policy. It should use the success in mainstreaming land governance in IGAD to dialogue with and seek funding for these projects from development partners.

Given the experience and lessons drawn by the evaluation, there are at least 5 priorities for successful completion of the current project and preparing for the second phase:

- completing the unfinished activities;
- keeping the current project staff, infrastructure and systems in place for the second phase while using them in the transition to support pre-second phase activities;
- expedited preparation of the project proposal document for the second phase, and negotiating and signing the associated financing agreement before the end of the project to ensure a seamless transition to the second phase;
- in parallel with preparation of the project proposal document, undertaking a capacity assessment of IGAD Secretariat focusing on procurement and financial management with a view to recommending actions necessary to strengthen IGAD's readiness to take over from LPI/ALPC the management and implementation of the second phase; and
- preparing and including terms of reference in the project proposal document to ensure a timely and strong start-up of the second phase.

It should be noted that the ALPC was launched as a successor to LPI on October 20, 2017 in the presence of African Ministers and experts at the margins of the second meeting of the African Union Specialized Technical Committee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Water and Environment under the theme: "Enhancing environmental and agricultural transformation to achieve food and nutrition security in advancing Agenda 2063. During the launch, the African Union Commissioner for Rural Economy and Agriculture affirmed the decision by the Ministers attending the Specialized Technical Committee of "the need for the African Land Policy Centre to be stronger in capacity and reach than the LPI, in order to support Member States to domesticate African Union Decisions in their efforts to develop land policies, reform institutions and build land information systems to improve the governance of land" (as reported in the proceedings of the Specialized Technical Committee).

It should also be noted that, while the project being evaluated was formulated before the adoption of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in 2015, its implementation supports the SDGs. LPI/ALPC, the project's executing agency (with IGAD), participated with other members of the Global Donor Group on Land in successful negotiations to include land tenure indicators in the SDGs (SDGs 1, 2, 5, 11, 14, 15 and 16) and to report on progress towards their achievement. In the course of implementation, the project management team has collaborated with LPI/ALPC and the Global Land Indicators Initiative (GLII; responsible for reporting on the land indicators for the SDGs) in developing their respective monitoring and evaluation systems to avoid duplication and maximize synergies at country level; Ethiopia, Kenya and Uganda have been used as pilot countries for this collaboration.

Chapter 1: Background

1.1 Introduction

This evaluation report has been prepared by Dr. Frank F K Byamugisha, a consultant of the UN Economic Commission for Africa (ECA). After covering the context and project description, the evaluation report: (i) discusses the evaluation framework and methodology and the collected data and its analysis; (ii) presents the evaluation findings; and (iii) wraps up with general recommendations.

1.2 The context and project description

The Land Policy Initiative (LPI) was established in 2006 as a joint initiative of the African Union Commission (AUC), the Economic Commission for Africa (ECA) and the African Development Bank (AfDB). In its first phase (2006-2009) the LPI was successful in developing a Framework and Guidelines on Land Policy in Africa (F&G), with a view to facilitating national land policy development and implementation processes. The F&G, which was developed through a rigorous roadmap of activities, including regional assessments and consultations on land policy, was adopted by the African Ministers responsible for land in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, in April 2009. They were further endorsed by the highest level of African governance—the AU Heads of State and Government, through the adoption of a Declaration on Land Issues and challenges in Africa, during the 13th Assembly of the African Union in Sirte, Libya, in July 2009. The launch of the implementation of the Declaration marked the beginning of the second phase of the LPI, at the Conference of Ministers of Agriculture in Lilongwe Malawi in October, 2010.

For its second phase, the goal of LPI is to assist member states in the implementation of the Declaration on land issues and challenges in Africa, in accordance with the F&G in order to achieve socio-economic development, peace and security, and environmental sustainability. In order to guide the implementation process of the AU Declaration on land issues and challenges, the LPI prepared a Draft strategic plan and roadmap.

The accomplishment of strategic plan and roadmap objectives is being achieved through a number of interventions including developing of joint projects with regional economic communities (RECs) and Member States with financial support from development partners. The AU declaration on land invites also RECs to convene periodic regional platforms to facilitate experience sharing, lessons learnt and dissemination of best practices in land policy formulation, implementation and monitoring based on member states experiences; and appropriately capture and address issues of land policies within their respective common agricultural policy framework. It is in this context that the LPI and the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD), with support from the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC), developed a project "Improving land governance in the IGAD region" to be implemented in two phases.

The first phase, to be implemented in three years (October 2014-September 2017), was to focus on strengthening IGAD to mainstream land governance in its programmes and to develop multi-stakeholder platforms to engage member states and partners; the second phase would focus on helping IGAD member states to implement the AU Declaration on land. The total cost of phase one was budgeted at US$ 2.7 million (amended to US$ 2.5 million in August 2016), of which 82

percent was funded by SDC and the rest by LPI and IGAD (see Table 1.1). Due to initial delays in implementing the first phase, a no cost extension of up to December 2018 was agreed.

Table 1.1: Budget & mid-term expenditures by source (US$)

	Original (A)	Amended (B)	Midterm (C)	C/B (%)
SDC	2210000	2062986	1159007	56
LPI	423240	375240	245358	65
IGAD	53000	48000	32000	67
Total	2686240	2486226	1436365	58
Source: Financing Agreements between SDC and ECA				

The goal of the project is to facilitate the implementation of the AU Declaration on land issues and challenges in accordance with the F&G, in order to facilitate access to land and security of land rights for all land users in the IGAD region, especially vulnerable groups such as pastoralists, women and youth. Its main objectives are to:

- enhance the capacity of the LPI and the IGAD Secretariat to facilitate and monitor implementation of the AU Declaration on land issues in the region;
- mainstream land governance issues in programs and activities of the IGAD Secretariat;
- build capacity of academic institutions in the region to promote and undertake land policy related research;
- establish a regional platform for knowledge sharing and advocacy aimed at promoting good land governance and land policy convergence among member states;
- improve partnerships, coordination and alignment of land governance related programs in the IGAD region; and
- facilitate monitoring and evaluation of land policy reform processes and implementation.

The expected outcomes, which are a result interventions (activities) and their outputs, include:
1. Strengthened capacity of IGAD and the LPI to facilitate and monitor implementation of the AU Declaration on Land in the IGAD Region;
2. Land mainstreamed in the development programmes of IGAD to strengthen programmes at the IGAD Secretariat that incorporate land governance issues in the context of agriculture and natural resource management, regional economic integration, and peace and security;
3. Strengthened capacity of IGAD member states to improve land governance and achieve Land policy convergence;
4. Strengthened capacity to generate and disseminate knowledge in land policy formulation and implementation in the region;
5. Partnerships and coordination mechanisms strengthened and resources mobilized; and
6. Enhanced monitoring and evaluation of land policy processes in the IGAD region.

According to the project document, the first phase was to focus on outcomes related to strengthening the capacity of the IGAD Secretariat to mainstream land governance in its programmes (outcomes 1 and 2) and to establish and strengthen a multi-stakeholder platform to

engage member states and partners (outcome 5) while the second phase was to focus on outcomes related to helping member states implement the AU Declaration on land policy (outcome 3).

United Nations
Economic Commission for Africa

Chapter 2: Evaluation Analytical Framework and Methods

2.1 Objectives of the evaluation

As the project has passed its mid-point[1], a mid-term evaluation was planned as stipulated in the project document especially to inform implementation of the remaining part of the first phase and the design of the second phase. The mid-term evaluation also serves two other purposes:

- learning and accountability as required by the ECA Evaluation Policy; and
- based on lessons learned, identifying key future project components and intervention areas that can be incorporated in the second phase.

The evaluation is required to pay special attention to gender issues and to explore ways on how to make the project more responsive to women needs. The main objective of the evaluation therefore is to provide an impartial assessment of the project's progress made so far towards achieving its objectives. It is expected to determine the project's relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, progress towards outcomes and sustainability. Specifically, the review is required to:

- Assess the extent to which the project is achieving its objectives and the results it has attained so far;
- Determine the project's relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and potential for sustainability; based on the findings;
- draw and document lessons learned; and
- make recommendations on the implementation of the remaining part of the current phase and on the design of the next phase.

2.2 The scope

The evaluation covers the period from October 1, 2014, to December 31, 2017, approximately 12 months before project completion[2]. While assessing project results, the evaluation did not assess impacts because the implementation period was not long enough to allow impacts to materialize. Instead, the focus was on assessing project outcomes. In terms of geographic coverage, the evaluation assesses project results at LPI/ALPC and IGAD levels which are the focus of the first phase; member states will be targeted directly by the planned second phase.

2.3 Analytical framework and evaluation criteria

The evaluation uses the logical framework to track the nature of change brought about by the project interventions (activities). It traces the results of interventions in terms of reviewing and analyzing the context prior to an intervention using baseline data, followed by analyzing the resources and activities of the project and then tracing the outputs and outcomes of the project in the changed situation following a results-based performance measurement framework. The project was designed using a logical framework which is presented in the Annex of the project document

---

[1] While the mid-point of the project as originally designed was March 2016, project implementation delays of about one year and a half led to a "no cost" extension of the project to December 2018 and to a revised implementation time frame which pushed the new mid-point to the second half of 2017.
[2] This includes a period before April 2016 when little implementation was done because project management staff were not yet in place.

presented as a log frame matrix. It is elaborate, only missing baseline and targets data which were plugged in during project implementation. It has been used as a basis for monitoring and reporting project progress in terms of inputs, outputs and outcomes.

Given the short duration of the project – only 3 years – and taking into account the reality that land policy development and implementation, based on global and pan-African experiences, take a long time to complete and produce impacts, this evaluation has not assessed the impacts of the project. Instead, the focus has been on assessing project outcomes, largely based on project self-reporting using the results framework. This was followed up by in-depth interviews with key stakeholders involved in the project as implementers, beneficiaries or financiers. Considerable data was also collected from observations in the field especially during the IGAD regional land dialogue and development partners' meetings in November 8-9, 2017 and the second Conference on Land Policy in Africa in November 14-17, 2017.

The second important tool used in this evaluation is the five-point evaluation criteria widely used in OECD-DAC and UNEG evaluations of programmes and projects and in accordance with the ECA Evaluation Policy. The five criteria used are relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, progress towards outcomes, and sustainability.

Relevance refers to consistency of the intended project objectives and outcomes with the continental, regional and national priorities while effectiveness refers to the extent to which the expected objectives and outcomes have been achieved as planned in the results framework.

Efficiency refers to the extent to which human, financial resources and time were used in the best possible way to deliver activities and outputs, and facilitate the achievement of results in coordination with other stakeholders.

Outcome refers to the likely or achieved short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention's outputs. On the other hand, impact refers to fundamental and significant changes and effects, positive and negative, planned and unforeseen that have resulted from the sub-programme or project with respect to the target groups and other affected stakeholders.

And sustainability refers to the likelihood that the positive effects of the project will be continued or mainstreamed beyond the project lifetime.

Selected questions were asked under each of the 5 focal areas of the evaluation criteria. The evaluation questions, data collection methods, and data sources are presented in the Evaluation Planning Matrix in Annex 3.

The evaluation was done based mainly on qualitative analysis.

2.4 Sources and types of data

Data for the evaluation was obtained from the following sources:
- Documents from a broad literature review;
- E-room reservoir of documents and data supplemented by additional data from LPI and IGAD including monthly and quarterly progress reports, consultancy reports, concept

notes, output reports, and minutes of meetings of the IGAD project team, IGAD Agriculture and Environment Unit, Project Steering Committee and LPI Steering Committee;
- Inception report meetings and discussions
- Reports and papers presented at the November 8-9 2017 IGAD regional land dialogue and development partners meeting;
- Results framework for outcomes and for outputs;
- Personal observations from meetings and the conference attended in Addis Ababa;
- Individual interviews of 15 key project stakeholders; and
- Feedback received from the evaluation reference group.

Two types of data were collected and used in the evaluation: secondary and primary data. Secondary data included documents and M&E data compiled by LPI and IGAD and found in the knowledge repository of ECA... On the other hand, primary data included data collected:
- during Inception Report meetings and discussions;
- from in-depth interviews with individuals from LPI, ECA's Strategic Planning and Operational Quality Division, AUC's Department of Rural Economy and Agriculture, SDC, IGAD and RCMRD and focal points from some IGAD member states;
- from written responses to questions provided ahead of the in-depth interviews indicated in the preceding bullet point; and
- from follow-up interviews to verify responses received from individual interviews and data obtained from other sources.

2.5 Data analysis and triangulation

The first analysis was a review of secondary data including literature from a wide range of sources and project documentation and data contained in the knowledge repository of ECA. This was largely qualitative analysis, including checking for consistency in output and outcome data in the results frameworks. It also included preparation for the collection of primary data including the framing of questions for interviews and the selection of interviewees. This review, manipulation and interpretation of secondary data provided inputs into the preparation of the Inception Report and protocols for field interviews as presented in the Inception Report.

The second analysis dealt with the processing and interpretation of primary data collected from the review and discussions of the Inception Report, in-depth interviews and observations made from meetings attended by project stakeholders. Again, the analysis was largely qualitative, and the findings were used in writing the evaluation report.

The final analysis was the verification, validation and clarification of the findings obtained from the analysis of primary and secondary data as typically done in a triangulation approach. Using audio and email communication, additional interrogation was made with the reference group for the evaluation; a follow-up was also made with selected interviewees especially from LPI, IGAD and a few member states.

2.6 Limitations of the evaluation

There were three limitations to the evaluation:

1. drawing conclusions on first phase results when their full realization is expected only in the second phase;
2. attributing results to the project when implementation involves considerable partnerships; and
3. the period of intervention evaluated was short..

Project design anticipated implementation to be in two 3-year phases. As a consequence, project outcomes in the first phase are mostly intermediate results whose full realization is expected in the second phase. And the measurement indicators for the first phase are framed accordingly. Unless interpreted carefully, conclusions drawn from the first phase could easily overstate or understate the project outcomes. The evaluation leaned towards a conservative approach to avoid overestimating the project outcomes.

Most of the project's 6 outcome areas or components have been implemented in partnership with other programmes. While partnerships are potentially beneficial to the project as they bring synergy and cost savings, they pose a challenge in assessing the benefits contributed by the project. There is a risk that the assessment of the project benefits could include those of partners. The evaluation minimized the risk again by taking a conservative interpretation of the results contributed by the project in cases where there were implementation partnerships.

The implementation period of the first phase, being evaluated, is short. Three years is too short a time to effectively determine the impacts of the interventions particularly when the focus is on capacity building which is a process that takes time. As the project is now in the first phase of implementation, the second phase of the project could be planned in a way that allows more time for implementation and evaluation of impacts.

Chapter 3: Evaluation Findings and Analysis

3.1 Relevance

The evaluation for relevance of the project focused on answering two questions:

- Are the objectives, design & implementation arrangements consistent with priorities of IGAD and its member states on land and F&G, and with global strategies and VGGT?
- Have they been responsive to any significant changes in the priorities and strategies during the project?

A desk review and responses from interviewees indicate that the project's objectives, design and implementation arrangements are consistent with priorities of IGAD and have a good fit with the IGAD Strategy 2016-2020. This should not be surprising given that the first phase of the project focuses on IGAD Secretariat and specialized regional institutions while the second phase will roll out to member states. Also, they are aligned to AU Declaration on land and the associated F&G, NEPAD and CAADP as well as the *Voluntary Guidelines on the Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests* (VGGT) and to the *Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)*. Interviewees pointed out that the project design is flexible enough to allow the inclusion of emerging issues at regional and global level and the alignment to global strategies although it has not been necessary to undertake significant changes to project design to respond to any regional or global changes in priorities and strategies. While it might not have been necessary to change project design to accommodate changes in priorities and strategies, often budgeting and financing agreements for projects can create difficulties to accommodate project changes. Below is an elaboration of evaluation findings on the relevance of each of the six outcome areas:

Enhanced capacity of IGAD and LPI. The enhancement of capacity of IGAD and LPI to facilitate and monitor implementation of the AU Declaration on land in the IGAD Region is relevant to the continental and regional agenda as provided for in the AU Declaration which: (i) calls on the AUC-ECA-AfDB consortium on land policy to "work toward the establishment of an appropriate institutional framework", namely LPI (ALPC), "to provide coordination and support of implementation activities of the Declaration;" and (ii) invites "RECs to convene periodic platforms to facilitate experience sharing, lesson learning and dissemination of best practices in land policy formulation and implementation."

Land mainstreamed in the development programmes of IGAD. The mainstreaming of land in the development programmes of IGAD is relevant to the continental and regional agenda as it helps strengthen IGAD's regional programmes of agriculture and natural resource management, regional economic integration, and peace and security by enhancing efforts to address the associated land governance issues. This is consistent with the AU Declaration which calls upon RECs to "appropriately capture and address land policy issues within their respective common agricultural policy framework."

Strengthened capacity of IGAD member states. The strengthening of capacity of IGAD member states to improve land governance and achieve land policy convergence is relevant to the continental and regional agenda. It is consistent with the AU Declaration which calls upon RECs to "convene periodic regional platforms to facilitate experience sharing, lesson learning and dissemination of best practices in land policy formulation and implementation" and to

"appropriately capture and address land policy issues within their respective common agricultural policy framework." It is also consistent with the mandate of IGAD to support member states strengthen the management of land and natural resources.

Strengthened capacity to generate and disseminate knowledge. The strengthening of capacity to generate and disseminate knowledge in land policy formulation and implementation in the region is relevant to the continental and regional agenda. It is consistent with and helps promote the objectives of IGAD which include to "facilitate, promote and strengthen cooperation in research development and application in science and technology"; it is also consistent with and promotes the AU Declaration which calls upon RECs to "convene periodic regional platforms to facilitate experience sharing, lesson learning and dissemination of best practices in land policy formulation and implementation."

Partnerships and coordination mechanisms established. The establishing of partnerships and coordination mechanisms is relevant to the continental and regional agenda. It is consistent with and promotes a key objective of LPI/ALPC, namely to "coordinate and galvanize the efforts of partners towards effective synergies and partnerships for the implementation of the African agenda on land policy as stated in the AU Declaration."

Enhanced monitoring and evaluation. The enhancing of monitoring and evaluation of land policy processes in the IGAD region is relevant to the continental and regional agenda. It is consistent with and promotes the AU Declaration which calls upon the AUC-ECA-AfDB consortium on land policy to "take appropriate actions for establishment of a progress tracking mechanism and periodic reporting by member states." It also supports global strategies for monitoring land governance as expressed in the SDGs.

3.2. Effectiveness

The evaluation for effectiveness focused on addressing the following questions:
- How much progress has the project made to realize its objectives?
- Have the project's governance structure and M&E system been adequate for implementation?
- Was the original project design realistic?

Analysis of self-reported performance through the results framework, annual reports and progress reports as well as interview responses indicate that, after delayed implementation start-up, the project has made good progress towards achieving its objectives and targeted outputs, helped largely by an adequate governance structure underpinned by a competent project management team at IGAD, implementation support and guidance from LPI/ALPC and a high performing project steering committee (PSC). However, as indicated in the following paragraphs, the progress has been uneven among the six outcome areas: very good in capacity development of IGAD and LPI/ALPC and in the mainstreaming of land governance into IGAD programmes; promising in strengthening regional activities to enhance the capacity of IGAD member states, and in developing platforms for land dialogue and donor partnerships; and work-in-progress in knowledge generation and dissemination and in the development of regional M&E systems. The original project design was realistic although a "no cost" extension of project closing was made to make up for initial delays in project implementation. Findings for each outcome area are outlined below:

Enhanced capacity of IGAD and LPI. The staffing plans of IGAD and LPI have been achieved as indicated in the results framework (Table 3.1). However, for IGAD, there was a long delay in procuring the 2 project staff (land expert and programme assistant) which could have been partially avoided by: (i) preparing their TORs during the preparation of the project proposal document; and (ii) undertaking the procurement (short of contract signing) ahead of project commencement. Another source of delay in recruitment was lack of funds which LPI could not transfer to IGAD due to issues associated with ECA's new UMOJA administrative system. However, after being recruited, project staff performance has been satisfactory according to independent interviewees, working under an effective governance structure with support from LPI/ALPC, close supervision from IGAD senior management and good policy guidance from an active PSC. According to interview responses, the capacity to deliver has also been enhanced by partnerships especially in mainstreaming land governance into IGAD programmes and in developing a regional M&E system. In regard to the staffing of LPI, there was a turnover of staff in the course of the project for the positions of Senior Land Expert, M&E Expert and Communications expert but the turnover was effectively managed.

Table 3.1: Results framework for outcomes

Key Indicators	Accomplishments			
Outcome Indicator	Baseline (actual)	Midterm[3] (realized)	Midterm (% of end project target)	End of project (target)
Outcome 1: Enhanced capacity of IGAD and the LPI to facilitate and monitor implementation of the AU Declaration on Land in the IGAD Region				
Outcome Indicators				
1. Professional profile at IGAD (and LPI) with respect to land governance 2. Timely delivery of outputs (as per the plan)	LPI: 5 IGAD: 0 0	6 2 15	100 100 75	6 2 20
Outcome 2: Land mainstreamed in the development programmes of IGAD				
Number of IGAD programs adopting guidelines to mainstream land issues in strategies and programs	0	3	60	5
Outcome 3: Strengthened capacity of IGAD member states to improve land governance and achieve land policy convergence				

---

[3] Targets were not set for midterm.

Number of common/joint (policy) instruments developed	0	1	50	2
Outcome 4: Strengthened capacity to generate and disseminate knowledge in land policy formulation and implementation in the region				
1. No. of academic/research institutions (partners of the project) undertaking land related research	0	0	0	2
2. No. and type of land related research (peer reviewed journal article, monograph, review articles, etc) published by academic/research institutions	NA	0	0	2
Outcome 5: Partnership and coordination mechanisms established/strengthened and resources mobilized				
Number of functional stakeholder platforms	0	1	100	1
Outcome 6: Enhanced monitoring and evaluation of land policy processes in the IGAD region				
Number of countries submitting M&E reports	0	0	0	3

Land mainstreamed in the development programmes of IGAD. The mainstreaming of land in the development programmes of IGAD and its member states as planned in the results framework has been achieved in 3 out of 5 programmes (Strategic Plan 2016-20; CAADP Regional Investment Plan 2016-20; and Natural Resources Strategy Paper) while the mainstreaming work for the remaining 2 programmes (migration; and gender) is on-going and due for completion in 2018 (Tables 3.1). The mainstreaming has involved studies on key land areas and issues to be mainstreamed and the identification of entry points in regional policies, strategies and programmes; the studies have been completed and at least 11 land areas/issues have been agreed upon to be mainstreamed including land tenure, land administration, land conflict resolution, land use planning, gender equity and land markets. A business plan and implementation strategy to guide the mainstreaming have been under development while implementation has been going on as well. Notwithstanding the rather ambitious agenda to mainstream land governance in IGAD's 5 existing programmes, it is being done quite successfully, according to independent interviewee responses, driven by the training of all staff in land governance and by a supportive senior management which has internalized land governance and become a good advocate for its enhancement.

Table 3.2: Results framework for outputs

Outputs		Key Indicators	Accomplishments			
Outputs		**Output Indicators**	**Baseline (Target)**	**Midterm (Realized)[4]**	**Midterm (% end of project target)**	**End of project**
For outcome1: Enhanced capacity of IGAD and the LPI: to facilitate and monitor implementation of the AU Declaration on Land in the IGAD Region						
Output 1.1	Staff of the IGAD Secretariat Recruited	Number and profile of staff recruited	NA	2 Land expert; Program assistant	100	2
Output 1.2	IGAD staff's capacity on key land policy and governance enhanced	Number and profile of staff trained	NA	30	100	30
Output 1.3	Staff at the LPI Secretariat Recruited	Number and profile of staff recruited Days of technical assistances (TAs) provided	NA	2 4 experts part-time	100 100	2 4 experts part-time
Output 1.4	IGAD Secretariat annual work plan developed and reviewed	Work plans developed and approved	NA	Yes (for 2015, 2016 and 2017)	75	For each year (4)
Output 1.5	Project steering committee and joint working group on land organized	- Strategic guidance provided - Meetings held	NA NA	Yes 4	100 80	Yes 5
For outcome 2: **Land mainstreamed in the development programmes of IGAD**						
Output 2.1	Study on mainstreaming of land governance issues in programmes and activities of IGAD Secretariat and member states	Timely finalization of the study (as per the plan)	NA	Done: 1	100	1

---

[4] There are no mid-term targets.

	conducted and published					
Output 2.2	IGAD Secretariat Strategy for mainstreaming land governance developed and reviewed	Timely completion and approval of Action// Work plan	NA	Done: 1	100	1

For Outcome 3: Strengthened capacity of IGAD member states to improve land governance and achieve land policy convergence

Output 3.1	Existing land related policy frameworks, strategies and programmes reviewed	Number of policy frameworks reviewed (study)	NA	Yes: 7	100	7 (8th country not active)
Output 3.2	Land policy convergence framework developed	Framework document published	NA	No but consultant identified: 0	0	1
Output 3.3	Regional dialogue platform established and functioning	Number of events organized	NA	1	50	2

For outcome4: Strengthened capacity to generate and disseminate knowledge in land policy formulation and implementation in the region

Output 4.1	Mapping of and establishing partnerships with academic/research institutions	Institutional mapping report	NA	Done: 1	100	1
Output 4.2	Research grants disbursed	Number of LoAs signed with academic/research institutions	NA	None: 0	0	2
Output 4.3	Current status of the land governance related issues in the 8 IGAD countries documented	Number of countries assessed	NA	7	100	7 (8th country not active)
Output 4.4	Knowledge management,	Functional KM platform	NA	Web-based data base	50	1

	dissemination and sharing strengthened			being developed at IGAD		
For Outcome 5: Partnership and coordination mechanisms established/strengthened and resources mobilized						
Output 5.1	Development Partners platform on land policy established	Number of development partner platform meetings held	NA	1	50	2
Output 5.2	Resources mobilized	Amount of additional resource mobilized; Number of project proposals prepared	NA	Only commitments for phase 2; EU aid discontinued	50	Commitments for phase 2 & more
For Outcome 6: Enhanced monitoring and evaluation						
Output 6.1	IGAD M&E framework adapted	Timely development of the framework	NA	Developed; not adapted	50	Developed & adapted
		Number of experts trained	NA	4	100	4
Output 6.2	M&E Piloted	Countries piloted	NA	On-going: 3	50	3
Output 6.3	Regular Monitoring reports prepared	Number of reports produced in timely manner by country	NA	0	0	2 per year by pilot countries
Output 6.4	Mid-term evaluation of the project completed	Mid-term evaluation report and management response	NA	Report prepared; management response awaited	100	1

Strengthened capacity of IGAD member states. The strengthening of capacity of IGAD member states to improve land governance and achieve land policy convergence is at a formative stage, with an IGAD regional land policy dialogue platform only recently launched in November 2017. The dialogue which the evaluator also attended, was quite limited as it involved mainly regional entities, development partners and IGAD member states. Interview responses indicate that a second regional land policy dialogue, planned for 2018, is intended to involve a wider range of stakeholders including CSOs and the private sector. A commendable aspect of the inaugural November 2017 land dialogue, as reported in the interviews, is that it was preceded by an

informative review of existing land policy frameworks, strategies and programmes in 7 active member states (out of 8) of IGAD. The land dialogue platform and the land policy harmonization framework, to be undertaken in the first half of 2018, will help develop the necessary foundation on which the second phase of the project can build to enhance land governance in member states.

Strengthened capacity to generate and disseminate knowledge. According to responses from 4 out of 6 people who were interviewed on this subject, the strengthening of capacity to generate and disseminate knowledge in land policy formulation and implementation in the region has only been in preparatory stages, underpinned by a study that mapped research and academic institutions in 2016, and the identification in 2017 of 3 priority areas for research to be undertaken by 2 institutions in 2018. To ensure quality and synergy, the research will be undertaken in partnership with the Network of Excellence on Land Governance in Africa (NELGA), supported under the Strengthening Capacities for Land Governance in Africa (SLGA) programme, also coordinated by ALPC and funded by BMZ/GIZ and the World Bank. As the research has not yet started, it is unlikely that it will be completed and disseminated before end of the project. There is therefore a need to focus on its implementation in the remaining part of this project and to include it in the second phase of the project.

Partnerships and coordination mechanisms established. The first development partners meeting in November 2017, also attended by the evaluator, was, according to interviewees, successful in that it launched the initiative, but it also symbolized weakness as it came quite late in the process of project implementation. Since it is not only meant to be a mechanism for resource mobilization but also for enhancing synergies, coordination and alignment, this development partners platform should have been initiated early in project implementation to maximize benefits for the project arising out of synergy and alignment with other donor engagements in land governance. On the resource mobilization side, while similar amounts of resources during the November 2017 were committed for the second phase as in the current phase, responses from interviewees indicate that it is necessary to have more development partners meetings and resource commitments to ensure adequate funding for the second phase which will likely require more resources to fund activities at both country and regional levels.

Enhanced monitoring and evaluation. According to annual progress reports and interview responses, enhanced monitoring and evaluation of land policy processes in the IGAD region has not been accomplished but progress has been made through collaboration with other M&E initiatives to generate systems and processes of land monitoring at country and regional levels. The biggest of these initiatives is MELA which is being piloted in 12 countries (including 3 IGAD member states) and is due to end at the same time as this project that is being evaluated. According to a presentation made by IFPRI during the IGAD regional land dialogue in November 2017, MELA is making very good progress, and it is expected that the 3 participating IGAD member states will start producing and submitting M&E reports in 2018. However, it will not be possible to roll over the M&E system to cover the whole IGAD region in this phase of the project.

3.3 Efficiency

The evaluation for efficiency focused on addressing the following questions:

- Were the interventions implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternative ways?
- Were activities cost-efficiently done and outputs delivered on time?
- What implementation, programme management, monitoring and reporting difficulties did the project face?
- Are the gender equality and human rights considered in the project budget?

While implementation of the project was programmed to start in October 2014, project progress reports, minutes of internal meetings and interview responses indicate that it delayed until about April 2016 primarily due to delays in: (i) transferring funds to IGAD, partly caused by ECA's migration to a new UN computerized administrative system called UMOJA;[5] (ii) executing a letter of agreement (LOA) between LPI and IGAD; and (iii) hiring the project team at IGAD partly due to lack of initiating procurement processes ahead of or at the beginning of the project. The delays in implementation start-up which led to extension of the project's completion date by 15 months could potentially cost the project in terms of delayed project benefits; the certainty and extent of the adverse impacts will be known only after completion of the project when a post-evaluation is done.

Delayed start-up notwithstanding, there has been concerted effort to enhance cost-effectiveness and produce quality outputs, according to interview reports and a desk review of the project's consultancy reports. For example, to minimize costs, PSC meetings have been held back-to-back with other meetings such as regional land dialogues and development partners meetings; similar consultancy studies have been bundled into fewer contracts; partnerships have been developed to leverage resources outside the project; and there have been judicious use of staff at LPI/ALPC, ECA and IGAD to support project implementation. Consequently, based on the review of the project's expenditures and budgets including the 2018 Work Plan and Budget, there are no cost overruns although a review of progress reports and minutes of internal meetings indicate tendencies of under-budgeting project activities especially training (see Table 3.3). But this has not adversely affected the quality of the project outputs. Interviewees and independent observers at the November 2017 regional land dialogue and the November 2017 Land Policy in Africa Conference pointed out the high quality and usefulness of consultancy reports and, given the concerted efforts to minimize consultancy costs, this suggests that value for money has been realized. Gender equality and human rights have been considered in project budgeting and implementation especially in the mainstreaming of land governance into IGAD programmes as documented in the "Strategy of Mainstreaming Land Governance in IGAD policies, strategies and programs" developed under the project being evaluated and as indicated in interview responses. Evaluation findings and analysis on efficiency for each of the six outcome areas are outlined in the following paragraphs:

Enhanced capacity of IGAD and LPI. Notwithstanding the extension of project implementation period by more than one year, project costs are within the project budget as discussed above, partly due to the judicious use of staff at LPI/ALPC and IGAD and the oversight and supervision by

---

[5] The design of UMOJA computerized system was initiated in 2008 as an integrated administrative system for all the UN and rolled out to all the UN work units in November 2015. A literature review reveals considerable frustration with the system among many staff and management especially in regard to disruptions and increased time taken to hire staff and consultants, and to make financial transfers and payments (Foreign Policy 2016).

management in both institutions and the PSC, according to interview responses. In addition, communication and reporting between LPI/ALPC and IGAD have been improved and streamlined with introduction of monthly meetings of key technical staff and quarterly meetings of senior managers from both institutions. Similarly, communication with the development partner (SDC) has been streamlined, with LPI/ALPC taking on the responsibility of communicating with and reporting to SDC on its own behalf and on behalf of IGAD.

Table 3.3: Budget and midterm expenditures by outcomes (US$)

Outcome	Original (A)	Amended (B)	Midterm (C)	C/B (%)
1: Enhanced capacity of IGAD and the LPI to facilitate and monitor implementation of the AU Declaration on Land in the IGAD Region	1267512	1158911	1075172	93
2: Land mainstreamed in the development programmes of IGAD	122260	122260	94745	77
3: Strengthened capacity of IGAD member states to improve land governance and achieve land policy convergence	339280	339280	1429	0
4: Strengthened capacity to generate and disseminate knowledge in land policy formulation and implementation in the region	326300	251800	81814	32
5: Partnership and coordination mechanisms established/strengthened and resources mobilized	100900	100900	36968	37
6: Enhanced monitoring and evaluation of land policy processes in the IGAD region	275740	275740	12900	5
Total Outcomes	2431992	2248891	1303028	58
Indirect Costs	254248	237335	133337	56
Grand Total	2686240	2486226	1436365	58
Source: Financing Agreements between SDC and ECA				

Land mainstreamed in the development programmes of IGAD. According to verified interview responses, cost and time savings were realized by initiating the mainstreaming of land governance into IGAD programmes before the mainstreaming strategy was completed. Interview responses indicated also that cost savings were realized in the land mainstreaming activities by

developing partnerships with donors such as BMZ/GIZ who were already supporting existing IGAD programmes such as migration.

Strengthened capacity of IGAD member states. Cost savings were realized in the review of the status of land governance in IGAD as the study was contracted in combination with 2 other studies -- mapping of research and training institutions in IGAD and drafting a strategy of land governance in the region. Further cost savings were made especially in travel costs by holding back-to-back in November 2017 the regional land dialogue, the partners meeting, training in land administration and the second Land Policy in Africa conference, which involved participation by IGAD member states.

Strengthened capacity to generate and disseminate knowledge. Progress reports and interviews indicate that some cost savings were made in the mapping of research and training institutions study by combining it into one contract with the study on the status of land governance in 7 active IGAD member states and the drafting of a strategy to enhance land governance in the region as indicated above. Further cost savings are expected to be realized from the partnership between the project's research activities and the larger NELGA research programme; and expectations are that this would also help to improve research quality and possibly value for money.

Partnerships and coordination mechanisms established. The delay in launching the first development partners platform was not an efficient use of time resources and risked the loss of benefits arising from alignment and coordination associated with development partnerships. This notwithstanding, the development partners meeting in November 2017 generated cost savings as it was held back-to-back with the multi-stakeholder regional land dialogue, according to interview responses.

Enhanced monitoring and evaluation. To the extent that the project can build on M&E initiatives of other partners especially those coordinated jointly with it by LPI/ALPC such as MELA, expectations from interviewees are that this would generate value for money as it would save financial and human resources while also improving quality of the product.

3.4 Outcomes

The evaluation on outcomes focused on addressing the following questions:
- What progress has been made toward achieving the project results and to what extent are the results related to the project?
- How has the project affected the land and human rights, skills and access to services in terms of gender equality and access by the youth and other vulnerable groups?
- What influence has the project had on member states, IGAD and research/academic institutions?
- What are the lessons learnt and corrective actions to maximize the results of the project and inform the design of future projects?

After delayed implementation start-up, overall the project has made good progress towards achieving its objectives in terms of achieving targeted outputs with potential to generate outcomes, helped largely by an adequate governance structure underpinned by a competent project

management team at IGAD, implementation support and oversight by LPI/ALPC and a high performing PSC. However, the progress has been uneven among the six outcome areas: very good in capacity development of IGAD and LPI/ALPC and in the mainstreaming of land governance into IGAD programmes; promising in capacity development of IGAD member states, and in developing platforms for land dialogue and donor partnerships; and work-in-progress in knowledge generation and dissemination and in the development of regional M&E systems. But potential outcomes including improved land and human rights, skills and access to services in terms of gender equality and access by the youth and other vulnerable groups, which are achievable at the level of member states, will materialize in the next phase of the project which will be focused on member states. Similarly, the project's influence on member states is minimal during this phase. Regarding the influence on IGAD and academic and research institutions, interview responses indicate that it is expected to be positive but too early to materialize at this time since some associated project activities have not yet been implemented (Table 3.2). Lessons learnt and corrective actions to maximize the results of the project and to inform the design of future projects are presented and analysed in the next chapter while evaluation findings and analysis on outcomes for each of the six outcome areas are outlined in the following paragraphs:

Enhanced capacity of IGAD and LPI. According to self-reporting through the results framework, two output-oriented indicators to measure progress towards enhanced capacity of IGAD and LPI to facilitate and monitor implementation of the AU Declaration on land in the IGAD Region have been achieved, namely, (i) staffing for land governance at IGAD and LPI, and (ii) timely delivery of planned outputs; the former has been fully achieved while the latter will most likely be achieved by the end of the project (see Tables 3.1 and 3.2). While this represents very good progress toward achieving the necessary outputs to generate outcomes, interview responses indicate that actual outcomes will take more time to materialize and certainly beyond the life of this phase, and will need extra support from the second phase of the project to fully materialize and sustain.

Land mainstreamed in the development programmes of IGAD. The progress reports, interviews and the results framework indicate that 3 out of the 5 necessary outputs to generate the outcome of mainstreaming land in the development programmes of IGAD have been achieved so far, namely agriculture and natural resource management, regional economic integration, and peace and security. Mainstreaming land governance is reported to be underway in the remaining 2 programmes, namely, the Transhumance Protocol and the Protocol on Free Movement of Persons on one hand and the gender programme on the other, and is expected to be completed by the end of 2018. A business plan and implementation strategy for the mainstreamed land governance agenda is planned for development in 2018 and for implementation in the second phase of the project. While all the output targets are on course to be achieved by the end of this phase, implementation of the mainstreamed land governance agenda will await to be implemented under the second phase. That is when the outputs from this phase will generate outcomes and be sustained with support from the second phase.

Strengthened capacity of IGAD member states. The progress reports, interviews and the results framework indicate that one out of 2 necessary outputs to generate the outcome of strengthened capacity of IGAD member states to improve land governance and achieve land policy

convergence, namely an IGAD regional land policy dialogue platform to create an enabling environment for member states, regional institutions, development partners CSOs, private sector and other stakeholders to learn from each other and identify possible areas of collaboration and convergence in taking forward the land policy reform agenda at country and regional levels. The second output is the IGAD region land policy convergence framework to enhance cohesion within the region and to support national land policy development. This has not yet been produced but interview responses indicate that a consultant has been identified and will start work in early 2018 to develop the framework and a strategy to implement it. While both outputs are on course to be completed by the end of this phase, translating them into outcomes and sustaining them will only be possible under the second phase.

Strengthened capacity to generate and disseminate knowledge. The progress reports, interviews and the results framework indicate that the 2 necessary outputs to generate the outcome of strengthened capacity to generate and disseminate knowledge in land policy formulation and implementation in the IGAD region have not yet been produced. These are: academic/research institutions undertaking land related research; and land related research published by research institutions. The necessary ground work has been done to commence research work. For example, a study mapping research and academic institutions was conducted in 2016. From within the identified institutions, progress reports and interviews indicate that research grants will be given for policy research to 2 institution in 2018. The research topics will be drawn from 3 areas that were identified in 2017: Youth access to land and agriculture in the IGAD region; Land and investment in the IGAD region; and Urban and peri-urban land use and conflict in the IGAD region. Interview responses indicate that it is unlikely that this research work will be completed and published by the end of this phase. The expected outcomes are therefore beyond this phase and will require support from the next phase in order to materialize.

Partnerships and coordination mechanisms established. The interviews and the results framework indicate that the necessary outputs to generate the outcome of partnerships and coordination mechanisms established or strengthened and resources mobilized have been partially achieved, namely establishing or strengthening functional stakeholder platforms and their activities. The first donor partnership dialogue was held on November 9, 2017, back-to-back with a regional land administration dialogue platform. The development partners meeting which the evaluator attended shared experiences in financing and implementing land governance in the IGAD region and discussed entry points for further funding. According to interview responses, another development partners meeting is planned in 2018. In addition to these meetings, interviews indicated that there have also been partnership engagements with one or more donors in the course of mainstreaming land governance in various on-going IGAD programmes including land governance and research on migration with GIZ, and monitoring land governance with EU under the EU-IGAD Trust Fund (EUTF-IGAD). The development partners meeting planned for 2018 is crucial to mobilize adequate funding for the second phase. Achieving the full outcomes and sustaining them will require strong support from the current phase and additional support from the second phase.

Enhanced monitoring and evaluation. Progress reports, interviews and the results framework all indicate that the necessary outputs to generate the outcome of enhanced monitoring and evaluation of land policy processes in the IGAD region have not yet been produced, namely developing an M&E system for land policy monitoring at regional and country levels for IGAD member states to report on progress made in implementing the AU Declaration on land issues. The required M&E system has not been developed yet. However, according to self-reporting and interview responses, the project has developed an M&E framework and has been collaborating with other M&E initiatives on its implementation. The main collaboration is with ALPC/LPI's Monitoring and Evaluating Land in Africa (MELA) implemented in partnership with IFPRI and funded by EU/GIZ, to pilot a continental land governance M&E system in 12 selected African countries including 3 IGAD member states (Ethiopia, Kenya and Uganda) from January 2017 to December 2018. For each of the 3 IGAD states, the project has funded a national consultant to support implementation of the M&E with a view to customize the MELA M&E system to the IGAD region. The other initiatives the project has been collaborating with are the FAO's Land Assessment Tool (LAT), UN Habitat's Global Land Indicators Initiative and the World Bank's own administrative data. The 3 IGAD member states involved in MELA are expected to start producing M&E reports before the end of 2018. Interview responses indicate that enabling all the IGAD member states to adopt the regional M&E system and to use it to produce M&E reports cannot be accomplished under the current phase; it will need to be supported by the next phase.

It should however be noted that, while there have been delays to implement an IGAD regional M&E system for use by member states, desk review and interview responses indicate that the project has an M&E system that has been used to report on the results framework indicators. The project is reported to have mainstreamed land governance into a newly developed IGAD M&E Framework and System called IGADInfo for its use.

Cross-Cutting Issues – Gender, Youth and Human Rights. In the first phase, gender is addressed in two interventions. The first intervention is the mainstreaming of land governance in IGAD's gender programme being done in the first half of 2018; this mainstreaming will ensure that IGAD's thematic programme of promoting gender equality will include the enhancement of women's land rights. The second intervention related to gender is the development of a regional monitoring and evaluation system which is being undertaken in collaboration with LPI's Monitoring and Evaluation of Land in Africa and is providing for use of gender-disaggregated data in monitoring and reporting progress in improving land governance. The piloting of the M&E system in Ethiopia, Kenya and Uganda will be completed by December 2018. Regarding youth access to land, it has been identified as one of the 3 research studies to be undertaken in 2018 with a view to have the recommendations implemented in the second phase. Regarding human rights, it is being addressed only indirectly through the mainstreaming of land governance in the peace and security pillar of IGAD, especially through preventing and reducing land-related conflicts. It should be noted that, under this phase, cross-cutting issues are not being addressed front and center; they should be given more prominence under the second phase of the project.

3.5 Sustainability

The evaluation for sustainability focused on addressing the following questions:
- To what extent have capacities of IGAD and member states been enhanced?
- To what extent have the created partnerships enhanced achievement of project objectives?

- To what degree are stakeholders embracing practices and policies to improve gender equality?
- What should be done currently to ensure sustainability of the current project?
- What aspects and direction should the next phase of the project consider?

Based on interviews, desk reviews and the analysis by the evaluator, there are good indications that the achieved project results will stay even after the end of the project although this greatly depends on going forward with the second phase:

- IGAD's capacity has been considerably enhanced in terms of institutional management but also intellectually with the internalization of land governance within senior management and staff and the mainstreaming of land governance into IGAD programmes including gender, and conflict prevention and management;
- IGAD member states have also bought into the land governance agenda as demonstrated by their strong participation in the PSC, the regional land dialogue, the development partners meetings and the Land Policy in Africa Conferences; and
- The key stakeholders including LPI/ALPC, IGAD and development partners seem committed to making the mainstreaming of land governance agenda into IGAD's programmes and its implementation a success so that other regional economic communities (RECs) can learn from it to implement the AU Declaration on land.

These positive indications of project sustainability notwithstanding, they are frail and need to be consolidated in the second phase. There are also signs of uncertainty regarding future funding[6] of LPI/ALPC whose leadership role and convening power at continental level is critical to enhancing land governance in Africa. Speeding up the transition of LPI into ALPC would help not only in abetting the uncertainty of the future funding of ALPC by strengthening its role in building partnerships and resource mobilization; it would also help in enhancing its effectiveness by re-orienting it away from managing projects to becoming a prominent continental land governance leader, coordinator, quality assurer and promoter of policy advocacy. Evaluation findings and analysis on sustainability for each of the six outcome areas are outlined in the following paragraphs:

Enhanced capacity of IGAD and LPI. Interviews with key stakeholders indicate that it is likely that the project's outcome of enhanced capacity of IGAD and LPI will last beyond the project lifetime, but that the likelihood is stronger for IGAD than LPI. For IGAD, interviews indicate that the staff hired to run the project are performing at a high level and IGAD's senior management who oversees the project and chairs the PSC, has fully owned the project. This augurs well for the management and implementation of the second phase of the project and for sustainability of the project results. In addition to effective staffing and staff performance, the mainstreaming of land governance into programmes of IGAD (discussed below) will also help to enhance the sustainability of project results. As for LPI, interview responses indicate a question mark on sustainability because of the discontinuation of funding by EU. There is a concern that the resulting gap in funding will have adverse effects especially on LPI/ALPC staffing and its capacity to guide and coordinate continental and regional activities as mandated in the AU Declaration on land. To mitigate against the risk of reduced sustainability, there is a need to persuade EU to reverse its

---

[6] EU, the major financier of LPI, contributing more than 75% to its 2009-2015 budget, discontinued its support as of December 31, 2017.

funding decision and/or to aggressively seek increased and new sources of financing from the tripartite sponsors of ALPC (AfDB, AUC and ECA) and from BMZ, GIZ, SDC and USAID.

Land mainstreamed in the development programmes of IGAD. Virtually all interviewees believe that it is highly likely that the outcome of mainstreamed land governance in the development programmes of IGAD will endure beyond the project lifetime and be consolidated within member states in the second phase of the project. In addition, evidence from the minutes of a meeting of all IGAD's staff from the Agriculture and Environment Division held on May 10, 2016 to introduce the project to the staff indicates strong enthusiasm and ownership of land governance among staff and senior management right from the beginning; the enthusiasm and ownership has continued and was apparent during the November 8-9 2017 IGAD Regional Land Dialogue which the evaluator attended. It will help sustain the mainstreamed results beyond the project and catapult them into the second phase. Another source of sustainability, according to interview responses, are partnerships which have been made during the mainstreaming with other programmes including migration and gender, involving BMZ/GIZ and the EU.

Strengthened capacity of IGAD member states. Based on the interviews and progress reports, sustainability of the results of improved land governance and land policy convergence at member state level can only be a work-in-progress because while the instruments are being developed, much of the implementation will be in the second phase. A head start was made with the review of the status of land governance in each of the IGAD member states in 2017 partly to lay the ground for the regional land dialogue platform. While the launch of the regional land dialogue is reported to have been successful, it did not include all stake holders especially CSOs and the private sector which normally play an important advocacy role for good land governance. As currently planned, the second dialogue in 2018 will include all key stakeholders. Once done, it will be a positive step toward sustainability but needs to be consolidated in the second phase with more multi-stakeholder dialogues. Further progress toward strengthening capacity of IGAD member states to improve land governance and achieve land policy convergence is expected when a framework and an implementation strategy for land policy convergence is developed later in 2018 for implementation in the second phase.

Strengthened capacity to generate and disseminate knowledge. All interviewees believe that the strengthening of capacity to generate and disseminate knowledge in land policy formulation and implementation in the region is at a preparatory stage and unlikely to be completed during this phase of the project; hence its completion and sustainability depend on expedited implementation in the remaining part of this project and its inclusion in the second phase.

Partnerships and coordination mechanisms established. There is also general agreement among interviewees that the strengthening of partnerships and coordination mechanisms and the mobilization of resources which have only been recently initiated with the first development partners meeting taking place in November 2017 have some ways to go; they indicated that their accomplishment and sustainability much depend on stepped up implementation efforts in 2018 with more development partners meetings organized to ensure adequate funding for the second phase of the project and a more systematic dialogue introduced during the second phase of the project.

Enhanced monitoring and evaluation. According to progress reports and interview responses, enhanced monitoring and evaluation of land policy processes in the IGAD region has not been accomplished so far; indications are that an M&E system currently under development as a pilot in countries including 3 IGAD member states will start producing M&E reports in 2018 before end of this phase. To enable effective completion and roll out of the system to cover the whole IGAD region and to sustain the results, it is important to step up implementation of the activity in the current phase and to include funding for the activity in the second phase of the project.

3.6 Sustainability implications for design and donor support for the second phase

Given the way the project was framed with the first phase focused on developing initiatives and the second phase on consolidating them, sustainability of project results attained so far depends on effective implementation of the remaining part of this first phase and adequate design, financing and implementation of the second phase. A critical driver of effective implementation of the remaining part of this current phase and of the second phase is the strengthened capacity of IGAD and LPI/ALPC which has been substantial especially for the former. Looking ahead into the second phase, continued capacity of IGAD will depend on retention of current project staff and senior management while, for LPI/ALPC, it will depend on increased funding to support its transition from LPI to ALPC to play its enhanced role as a prominent continental land governance leader and promoter of policy advocacy.

In the second phase of the project, LPI/ALPC is expected to fully divest itself of project management and implementation responsibilities so that it can focus on coordination and oversight, quality assurance, sharing best practices among RECs, mobilizing resources and nurturing partnerships. To play its coordination and oversight role most effectively, it will need to continue making improvements in communication and reporting systems established from scratch between itself and IGAD during the first phase; similar improvements will be required for its reporting and communication with development partners to enhance resource mobilization and consolidate partnerships.

Another driver of successful implementation and sustainability of results is the growing ownership of land governance by IGAD member states which should see further growth with increased involvement of multi-stakeholders including CSOs and the private sector in IGAD regional land dialogue platforms. This will be even more essential in the second phase which is expected to have activities implemented at country level. The regional M&E system should be fully developed during the second phase to enable adequate reporting and monitoring especially between IGAD and its member states in regard to implementation not only of the project but also of the AU Declaration on land issues and challenges.

As indicated above, sustainability of the results from the first phase depends on the adequacy of the design, financing and implementation of the second phase. Regarding implementation, a seamless transition from the first to the second phase, a carry-over of the project infrastructure, systems and staff to the second phase and advance preparation of some first year activities (including TORs) ahead of project commencement are essential to successful implementation of

the project. Achieving a seamless transition from the first to the second phase will require either a timely start-up of the second phase or a "no cost" extension of the first phase.

As for design of the second phase, it will be similar to the first phase which will be consolidating initiatives and results from phase one especially capacity development, mainstreaming land governance, harmonizing land policies, generating and sharing knowledge, and developing M&E systems tied to the implementation of the AU Declaration on land issues and challenges. However, at least five new elements are expected in the design of the second phase:

- project management and implementation should be fully divested from LPI/ALPC;
- there should be more activities implemented at country level especially strengthening capacity of member states, harmonizing their land policies and mainstreaming land governance into country strategies and programmes;
- resources should be provided to member states to prepare business plans (project proposals) of bankable projects or programmes for presentation to their Ministries of Finance and development partners to mobilize resources for the development and/or implementation of national land policies;
- the financing requirements for the second phase will be greater than for the first phase by at least US$1 million due to the new elements especially the financing of business plans, and may therefore require financing from at least 2 development partners; and
- due to the challenge of implementing the next phase at country level for all the IGAD member states and handling some new activities, more time should be allowed for implementation; hence the second phase should be at least 4 years instead of 3. A detailed outline of the second phase is presented in Annex 8.

Chapter 4: Conclusions, Lessons Learnt, and Recommendations

4.1 Conclusions

The project is strategically relevant to the land governance issues it seeks to address. It is also consistent with the priorities of LPI/ALPC and IGAD and has a good fit with the LPI Strategic Plan and Road Map 2012-2016 and the IGAD Strategy 2016-2020. Also, it is aligned to the African Union Declaration on land policy and the associated Framework and Guidelines on Land Policy as well as the *Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security.*

The project was formally launched in February 2015 with the first meeting of the PSC, which was facilitated by IGAD and LPI staff with the support of a short term consultant. The delay in the start-up of project implementation was due to delays in: (i) transferring funds to IGAD, partly caused by difficulties associated with ECA's migration to a new UN computerized administrative system; and (ii) executing a letter of agreement (LOA) between LPI and IGAD. The delays in project implementation inevitably led to delays in the flow of project benefits to beneficiaries. After the delayed start-up, overall the project has made good progress towards achieving its objectives and outcomes, helped largely by an adequate governance structure underpinned by a competent project management team at IGAD. Overall, its performance in terms of effectiveness has been satisfactory. One particular outcome area that has benefited from the strong project management and governance structure at IGAD Secretariat is the mainstreaming of land governance into IGAD programmes as required by the African Union Declaration on Land Policy in Africa. The mainstreaming has been done in 3 out of 5 targeted programmes, with the work on the remaining 2 (migration and gender) advancing well and due for completion in 2018.

A good start has also been made in developing a multi-stakeholder regional platform to share experiences and best practices; the first regional dialogue was held in November 2017 during which project progress and results of recently completed land governance studies were discussed with various stakeholders including IGAD member states and development partners. There has been less progress in knowledge generation and dissemination and in the development of regional monitoring and evaluation systems.

As for sustainability, there are good indications that project results will stay even after the end of the project although this depends on implementation of the second phase. **First**, IGAD's capacity has been considerably enhanced in terms of institutional management but also intellectually with the internalization of land governance within senior management and staff and the mainstreaming of land governance into IGAD programmes including gender, and conflict prevention and management. **Second**, IGAD member states have also bought into the land governance agenda as demonstrated by their strong participation in the PSC, the regional land dialogue, the development partners meetings and the Conference on Land Policy in Africa. These positive indications of project sustainability notwithstanding, they are frail and need to be consolidated in the second

phase. There are also signs of uncertainty regarding future funding[7] of LPI/ALPC. Speeding up the transition of LPI into ALPC would help not only in abetting the uncertainty of the future funding of ALPC by strengthening its role in building partnerships and resource mobilization; it would also help in enhancing its effectiveness by re-orienting it away from managing projects to becoming a prominent land governance leader in Africa, a coordinator and a promoter of policy advocacy.

4.2 Lessons learnt

There are at least five lessons that emerge out of the evaluation. The **first** is that capacity development has been a cross-cutting and important activity in the project benefiting the key regional institutions including the executing agencies (LPI/ALPC and IGAD), the collaborating partners (academic and research institutions, farmers and civil society organizations) and IGAD member states. It has also benefited a critical activity of the project, namely, mainstreaming land governance in IGAD programmes which has been one of the better performing outcome areas in the project.

The **second** lesson is that partnerships have been productive. The first partnership is with the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation which, as a development partner, has funded about 82 percent of the project costs and has committed to financing the second phase. The second partnership is with IGAD member states, Academic and Research Institutions and farmers and civil society organizations as cooperating partners in enhancing project implementation. The third partnership is with some donors including EU and GIZ who have been funding IGAD programmes in which land governance has been mainstreamed. And the fourth partnership is in developing and implementing a regional monitoring and evaluation system which is being done in collaboration with other regional and global monitoring and evaluation initiatives including LPI's Monitoring and Evaluation of Land in Africa which is being piloted in 12 countries including 3 IGAD member states with the support of the International Food Policy Research Institute. These partnerships have been beneficial not only in leveraging capacities and resources of partners but also in enhancing project implementation.

The **third** lesson is the need for early planning and undertaking of procurement processes (short of contract signing) for first year project activities before project commencement and signing of financing agreements, notwithstanding the resources needed to do it. In the case of procurement of consultants, their TORs should be prepared during preparation of the project proposal document. If this had been done and project funds transferred to IGAD on time, project implementation delays experienced in the early period of the project would have been minimized if not eliminated completely.

The **fourth** lesson is the need for buy-in and strong commitment to the project by senior management to enhance project success as demonstrated by the positive role played and strong contributions made to the project by IGAD's senior management who mobilized key IGAD staff from thematic programmes and programmatic pillars to support the project; oversaw and guided

---

[7] EU, the major financier of LPI, contributing more than 75% to its 2009-2015 budget, discontinued its support as of December 31, 2017.

the work of project staff; and chaired the project steering committee (PSC) and the various land-related land dialogue platforms.

The **fifth** lesson is that the arrangements for PSC meetings, which have been effective, should be maintained during the rest of the project period and adopted in the second phase; also they should be emulated by other RECs considering to implement land governance projects in future. The arrangements are as follows: the PSC is made up of key project stakeholders, chaired by the Director of IGAD A&E Division; PSC meeting venues rotate among countries to enhance buy-in and ownership by member states; and with the exception of 2016 when it met twice, the PSC meets once a year to approve the work plan and budget while project technical meetings are organized twice a year to review project progress, work plan and budget, and with the outcomes presented at the next PSC meeting. The arrangement aims to achieve a healthy balance between effectiveness, cost-efficiency and project ownership by member states.

4.3 Recommendations

There are at least three recommendations:

First, based on early results that show the success of the project in mainstreaming land governance into IGAD's programmes and initiating a multi-stakeholder regional platform for the sharing of lessons and best practices, LPI/ALPC should explore opportunities to introduce similar land governance projects in other RECs to assist them implement the AU Declaration on land policy. The positive role that LPI/ALPC has played in providing technical back-up and support in the implementation of this project has given it adequate experience to play a similar role in introducing and coordinating similar projects for other RECs.

Second, LPI/ALPC should use the early positive results from phase 1, especially the mainstreaming of land governance into IGAD programmes, to dialogue more actively with and seek funding from development partners to finance the mainstreaming of land governance in programmes of other RECs and the strengthening of the capacity of ALPC to provide them with technical back-up. In its transformation from LPI to ALPC, the ALPC will be playing a greater role in fund-raising for and providing a technical back-up to the RECs while the latter take up the bulk of the responsibilities for project management and implementation.

Third, there are at least 5 actions required to support successful completion of the current phase and to prepare for the second phase:

- completing the unfinished activities;
- keeping the current project staff, infrastructure and systems in place for the second phase while using them in the transition to support pre-second phase activities;
- expediting preparation of the project proposal document for the second phase, and negotiating and signing the associated financing agreement before the end of the current phase to ensure a seamless transition to the second phase;
- in parallel with preparation of the project proposal document, undertaking a capacity assessment of IGAD Secretariat focusing on procurement and financial management with a view to recommending actions necessary to strengthen IGAD's readiness to take over from LPI/ALPC the management and implementation of the second phase; and

- preparing and including TORs in the project proposal document and initiating procurement of some first year activities (short of signing contracts) ahead of the second phase to ensure a timely and strong start-up of the second phase.

Project resources are available to finance the above activities until the second phase (see Table 3.3). In case there is a delay in the start-up of the second phase, a "no cost" extension of the first phase should be explored to ensure a seamless transition from the first to the second phase.

The following are the unfinished activities that need to be undertaken for successful completion of the current phase:

- holding the annual PSC for 2018 preferably back-to-back with the second regional land dialogue and the second development partners meeting;
- implementing the consultancy to develop a framework and an implementation strategy for IGAD regional land policy convergence; a consultant is already identified;
- completing the remaining work in mainstreaming land governance in 2 IGAD programmes, namely migration and gender, and finishing the consultancy to develop a business plan and the associated implementation strategy for the mainstreamed land governance issues for implementation in the second phase;
- selecting research institutions and signing LOAs with them to implement 2 research grants; and
- implementing an M&E system in 3 pilot IGAD member states (Ethiopia, Kenya and Uganda) in collaboration with MELA.

ANNEXES

Annex 1: Terms of Reference

1. Introduction

1.1 Background and context

Project title	Improving land governance in the Intergovernmental Authority on development (IGAD) Region
Duration	2014-2018
Funding partners	Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation SDC
Executing Agencies	Land Policy Initiative (LPI) and IGAD
Cooperating Partners	Member States, Academic and Research Institutions, and Civil Society Organizations
Budget	USD 2,663,988.00
Types of evaluation	Mid-Term
Time period covered by the evaluation	October 2014-December 2016
Geographical coverage of the evaluation	IGAD-Africa

The Land Policy Initiative (LPI) was established in 2006 as a joint initiative of the African Union Commission (AUC), the Economic Commission for Africa (ECA) and the African Development Bank (AfDB). In its first phase (2006-2009) the LPI was successful in developing a Framework and Guidelines on Land Policy in Africa (F&G), with a view to facilitating national land policy development and implementation processes. The Framework & Guideline, which was developed through a rigorous roadmap of activities, including regional assessments and consultations on land policy, was adopted by the African Ministers responsible for land in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, in April 2009. They were further endorsed by the highest level of African governance—the AU Heads of State and Government, through the adoption of a Declaration on Land Issues and challenges in Africa, during the 13th Assembly of the African Union in Sirte, Libya, in July 2009. The launch of the implementation of the Declaration marked the beginning of the second phase of the LPI, at the Conference of Ministers of Agriculture in Lilongwe Malawi in October, 2010.

For its second phase, the goal of LPI is to assist member states in the implementation of the Declaration on land issues and challenges in Africa, in accordance with the Framework and Guidelines on Land Policy in Africa in order to achieve socio-economic development, peace and security, and environmental sustainability. In order to guide the implementation process of the AU Declaration on land, the LPI prepared a Draft strategic plan and roadmap.

The accomplishment of strategic plan and roadmap objectives is being achieved through a number of interventions including developing of joint projects with RECs and Member States with financial support from development partners. The AU declaration on land invites also RECs to convene periodic regional platforms to facilitate experience sharing, lessons learnt and dissemination of best practices in land policy formulation, implementation and monitoring based on member states experiences; and appropriately capture and address issues of land policies within their respective common agricultural policy framework. It is in this context that the LPI and the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD), with support from the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC), developed a three-year (October 2014- September 2017) project "Improving land governance in the IGAD region." A no cost extension of up to December 2018 was signed with SDC.

1.2 Project Goal, Objectives and Outcomes

The project was designed to facilitate access to land and security of lands rights for all land users in the IGAD region, especially vulnerable groups such as pastoralists, women and youth.

The main objectives of the project are to:

- enhance the capacity of the LPI and the IGAD Secretariat to facilitate and monitor the implementation of the AU Declaration on land in the region;
- mainstream land governance issues in programs and activities of the IGAD Secretariat;
- build capacity of academic institutions in the region to promote and undertake land policy related research;
- establish a regional platform for knowledge sharing and advocacy aimed at promoting good land governance and land policy convergence among member states;
- improve partnerships, coordination and alignment of land governance related programs in the IGAD region; and
- facilitate monitoring and evaluation of land policy reform processes and implementations

The expected outcomes of the project include:

1. Strengthened capacity of IGAD and the LPI to facilitate and monitor implementation of the AU Declaration on Land in the IGAD Region
2. Land mainstreamed in the development programmes of IGAD to strengthen programs at the IGAD Secretariat that incorporate land governance issues in the context of agriculture and natural resource management, regional economic integration, and peace and security
3. Strengthened capacity of IGAD member states to improve land governance and achieve Land policy convergence
4. Strengthened capacity to generate and disseminate knowledge in land policy formulation and implementation in the region
5. Partnerships and coordination mechanisms strengthened and resources mobilized
6. Enhanced monitoring and evaluation of land policy processes in the IGAD region

2. Purpose, Scope and Objectives of the Mid-term Evaluation

The IGAD-LPI-SDC has reached its mid-point and the project document stipulates that a mid-term evaluation will be conducted to among other things inform the design of the next phase of the project. The ECA Evaluation Policy also requires that projects be evaluated for learning and accountability purposes. Furthermore, the review will draw lessons learned and based on that identify key future project components and intervention areas that can be incorporated into a potential second phase of the project. The evaluation will also pay special attention to gender issues and explore ways on how to make the project more responsive to women needs.

The main objective of the evaluation therefore is to provide an impartial assessment of the project's progress made so far towards achieving its objectives. The evaluation will determine the project's relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, progress towards outcomes and sustainability. Specifically, the review will:

- Assess the extent to which IGAD-LPI-SDC is achieving its objectives and the results it has attained so far;
- Determine the project's relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and potential for sustainability;
- Based on findings, draw and document lessons learned; and
- Make recommendations for implementation of the remaining part of the current phase and for the design of the next phase.

4. **Evaluation Criteria and Key Questions**
   The Mid-term evaluation will use the following criteria:
a) **Relevance**: The extent to which the objectives of the project were consistent with the continental, regional and national needs and requirements and in line with the implementation of the AU declaration on land and F&G; *Sample questions:*

- Objective/ logical framework/theory of change: are they relevant to the achievement of expected outcomes, given the AU declaration on land and F&G?

- Is the project aligned to priorities of Members states/ IGAD on land and F&G?

- Are the logical framework indicators appropriate and of sufficient quality to assess performance?

- Was the project designed in line with international, regional or national strategies of advancing gender equality and human rights?

b) **Effectiveness:** Assessment and analysis of the extent to which the project objectives are being achieved.

Sample questions

- To what extent has progress been made to realize the objectives of the IGAD-LPI-SDC?
- Extent to which the governance structure (steering committee) was effective?
- Is "gender mainstreaming" being adequately addressed in the project design and implementation?
- Are monitoring data disaggregated by gender, age, etc?

c) **Efficiency:** The extent to which the resource/inputs such as funds, expertise and time were converted to results in a timely manner as per timelines and scope of the joint project. Implementation difficulties; adequacy of monitoring and reporting; the quality and quantity of administrative and technical support by IGAD and LPI; and efficacy of the project management structure will also be assessed

Sample questions:

- Were the interventions implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternative ways? Were activities cost-efficient? Were outputs delivered in a timely manner?
- What implementation, programme management, monitoring and reporting difficulties did the project face?
- To what extent has the governance structure of the project advanced the project objectives?
- Are gender equality and human rights considered in the project budget?

d) **Progress towards outcomes**: To the extent possible, assess the degree to which intended and unintended outcomes were achieved and can reasonably be associated to the work of IGAD-LPI-SDC.

Sample questions

- What progress has been made towards achieving results and to what extent these can be attributed to the work of the project?
- Are there results achieved beyond what was planned? Are there effects on gender equality and human rights?
- Did the project promote more equal access by men and women, boys and girls to the benefits of the project, and more broadly to resources, services and skills?
- What influence has the project had on member States, IGAD and research/academic institutions?
- What are the lessons learnt and corrective actions that should be taken to maximize the impact of the project?

e) **Sustainability:** The extent to which the benefits and results accrued over the project implementation period are being or will be continued or mainstreamed beyond the project lifetime. Within this context, definition of perspectives and future directions for the next phase of the project including identification of the different outputs of the second phase of the project and donor support (resource). Guidance on priorities, actions and resources for the successful completion of the present project.

Sample questions

- To what extent have capacities been enhanced for IGAD and its member States?
- To what extent has partnerships entered enhanced the achievement of the project objectives?

- To what degree are stakeholders embracing practices and policies to improve gender equality?
- What should be done currently to ensure sustainability of the current project?
- What aspects and direction should the next phase of the project consider?

4. Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the UN Evaluation Group (UNEG) "Norms and Standards" and the "ECA Evaluation Policy". The evaluation as indicated above will focus on relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and progress towards outcomes.

The evaluator will fine-tune the methodology but on the least will make use of a mixed method approach where both quantitative and qualitative methods will be rigorously utilized. Data will be triangulated to ensure the validity and reliability of the evidence used to reach conclusions.

Data collection methods may include but not limited to: Secondary
data Collection

- Desk review of documents
- Use of administrative data Primary data collection
- Inception meetings
- Key Informant Interviews
- Observations
- Surveys

5. Management of Evaluation Process

The evaluation will be carried out by an independent consultant who will report directly to ECA's Evaluation Section of the Strategic Planning and Quality Assurance Division thus the Evaluation Section will be responsible for managing and supervising the evaluation process to ensure impartiality. This will be done in consultation and collaboration with LPI.

The Evaluation Section will support the evaluator by:

- Providing all documents related to IGAD-LPI-SDC which will be identified by LPI;
- Providing substantive and technical oversight and backstopping;
- Liaising with the inter-office and intra-office data gathering;
- In collaboration with LPI, facilitating the logistical arrangements;
- Ensuring oversight and tracking progress during fieldwork;
- Facilitating exchanges with members of reference group;
- Collating and transmitting feedback from reference group to the evaluators
- Collating and preparing management response to the evaluation
- Sharing final report with ECA management and partners
- Tracking recommendations implementation The LPI will support the evaluation process by:
- Coordinating with evaluation section throughout the evaluation process
- Providing all necessary documentation
- Supporting administrative and logistical actions- recruitment, travel etc

- Supporting Evaluation Section to arrange in-house appointments and appointments with key stakeholders to be interviewed
- Providing technical input to the evaluation

A reference group that will include ECA and IGAD and other partners and donors will be set up to act as an interface between the ECA Evaluation Section and the evaluation team and their role will be to:

- Review and approve inception report;
- Review and provide input to the evaluation methodology and data collection instruments
- Review and provide input to draft and final reports The consultant will perform the following assignments:

The consultant will undertake the evaluation design, data collection and analysis, report-writing, presentation of findings. Detailed list of deliverables is indicated below.

6. Skills Requirements and Qualifications
The consultant should have the following attributes: -

- A minimum of a Master's Degree in Evaluation, Social Sciences, Social Development, Development Economics, Agricultural economics, Rural Development, Land or a related field.
- Experience in conducting projects evaluation using participatory methodologies;
- A minimum of 7 years' experience in the land policy, development, agriculture, and programme management and monitoring and evaluation.
- Demonstrated analytical skills;
- Sound track record in the development of socio-economic strategic documents;
- Language: Fluent in English and Working Knowledge of French is an advantage.

7. Key Deliverables and Timeframe
The key deliverables/outputs are:

1. Draft Inception report which details the methodology for the midterm evaluation including data collection protocols and detailed work plan
2. Final inception report incorporating comments from the inception meeting
3. Monthly brief progress update reports on the assignment
4. Draft evaluation report of the findings of the project evaluation
5. EGM report on validation of the draft report
6. Final evaluation report
7. Short report (5-6 pages) on future components of the second phase of the project

The consultancy is for the duration of three months in total. Tentative timeframe is as follows:

Sr #	Activity[8]	Time Frame

---

[8] Templates for the inception and final evaluation report will be submitted on ECA prescribed format

1	Signing of contract	
2	Desk review & inception meeting	2 weeks
3	Inception report (draft and final)	2 weeks
4	Field work- Data Collection	2 weeks
5	Draft report	3 weeks
6	Feedback from ECA and partners	2 weeks
5	EGM/Validation	1 week
6	Second draft report	2 weeks
7	Feedback from ECA and SDC	1 month
8	Final Report	2 weeks
9	Short report on project phase 2	2 weeks

United Nations
Economic Commission for Africa

Annex 2: Evaluation Work Plan

	Milestones[9]	Responsibility	Time frame/Deadlines
1	Inception meeting	ECA/LPI	Oct 18
2	Document review	Consultant	Oct 23
3	Draft Inception report	Consultant	Oct 26
4	Feedback on draft inception report	ECA/LPI	Nov 3
5	Final Inception report	Consultant	Nov 7
6	Desk review	Consultant	Concurrent
7	Field work to collect data	Consultant	Nov 8 to 22
8	Follow-up Discussions if necessary to validate collected data	Consultant	Nov 22 to 28
9	Draft report	Consultant	Dec 8
10	Feedback on draft evaluation report	ECA/SDC	Jan 15, 2018
11	Final report	Consultant	Jan 23
12	Debrief and presentation	ECA/Consultant	Jan 31

---

[9] Indicative

United Nations
Economic Commission for Africa

Annex 3: Evaluation Planning Matrix

Evaluation question	Indicators Data	Collection Methods	Data Sources
(a) Relevance:			
1. Are the objectives, design & implementation arrangements consistent with priorities of IGAD and its member states on land and F&G, and with global strategies?	Land policy development and implementation processes in IGAD member states	M&E reports;	LPI/IGAD
2. Have they been responsive to any significant changes in the priorities and strategies during the project period?	Political and policy developments	M&E reports; interviews	LPI/IGAD
(b) Effectiveness:			
1.How much progress has the project made to realize its objectives	Outcome indicators	Progress reports; interviews log frame analysis	LPI/IGAD/Member states/Academic & research institutions
2. Have the project's governance structure and M&E system been adequate for implementation?	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above
3. Was the original project design realistic?	Same as above	Same as above	Member states/LPI/IGAD
(c) Efficiency:			
1. Were the interventions implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternative ways?	Comparison of unit costs with "unit norm rates"	Progress reports; interviews	LPI/IGAD/Consultant
2. Were activities cost-efficiently done and outputs delivered on time?	Unit norm rates and service standards	Same as above	Same
3. What implementation, programme management, monitoring and reporting difficulties did the project face?	Comparing actual with project design expectations	Interviews	Member states/LPI/IGAD
4. Are the gender equality and human rights considered in the project budget?	Project budget	Review of project budgets in progress reports; and individual interviews	Same
(d) Progress towards outcomes:			
1. What progress has been made toward achieving the project results and to what extent are the results related to the project?	Outcome indicators	Progress reports; interviews; log frame analysis	LPI/IGAD/Member states/Academic & research institutions

2. How has the project affected the land and human rights, skills and access to services in terms of gender equality and access by the youth and other vulnerable groups?	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above
3. What influence has the project had on member states, IGAD and research/academic institutions?	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above
4. What are the lessons learnt and corrective actions to maximize the results of the project and inform the design of future projects?	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above
(e)Sustainability:			
1. To what extent have capacities of IGAD and member states been enhanced?	Indicators for Outcome 1 and 3	Progress reports; interviews	LPI/IGAD/Member states/Academic & research institutions
2. To what extent have the created partnerships enhanced achievement of project objectives?	Indicator for Outcome 5	Progress reports; interview guide	Same as above
3. To what degree are stakeholders embracing practices and policies to improve gender equality?	Cutting across all outcome indicators	Progress reports; interviews;	Same as above
4. What should be done currently to ensure sustainability of the current project?	All indicators of the 6 outcomes	interviews;	Same as above
5. What aspects and direction should the next phase of the project consider?	Same as above	Interviews; Feedback from key stakeholder; review of the outcome matrix	Same as above

United Nations
Economic Commission for Africa

Annex 4: Protocol 2 - In-depth discussion guide

Part 1: In-depth guide with LPI

List of respondents and responsibilities

1. Are the objectives, design & implementation arrangements consistent with priorities of IGAD and its member states on land and F&G, and with global strategies?_____

2. Have they been responsive to any significant changes in the priorities and strategies during the project period? _____

3. Were the interventions implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternative ways? _____

4. What implementation, management, monitoring and reporting difficulties did the project face? _____

5 Are the gender equality and human rights considered in the project budget? _____

6. What progress has been made toward achieving the project results and to what extent are the results related to the project? _____

7. How has the project affected the land and human rights, skills and access to services in terms of gender equality and access by the youth and other vulnerable groups?_____

8. What influence has the project had on member states, IGAD and research/academic institutions? _____

9. What are the lessons learnt and corrective actions to maximize the results of the project and inform the design of future projects? _____

10. To what extent have capacities of IGAD and member states been enhanced? _____

11. To what extent have the created partnerships enhanced achievement of project objectives? _____

12. What should be done to make it a better arrangement of partnership as necessary? _____

13. Do you have any other comments related to the inputs, processes, outputs and results of the project? _____

14. To what degree are stakeholders embracing practices and policies to improve gender equality? _____

15. What should be done currently to ensure sustainability of the current project? _____

16. What aspects and direction should the next phase of the project consider? _____

Part 2: In-depth guide with IGAD Secretariat

List of respondents and responsibilities
1. Are the objectives, design & implementation arrangements consistent with priorities of IGAD and its member states on land and F&G, and with global strategies? _____
2. Have they been responsive to any significant changes in the priorities and strategies during the project period? _____
3. How much progress has the project made to realize its objectives _____

4. Have the project's governance structure and M&E system been adequate for implementation? _____

5 Was the original project design realistic? _____

6. Were the interventions implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternative ways? _____

7. Were activities cost-efficiently done and outputs delivered on time? _____

8. What implementation, project management, monitoring and reporting difficulties did the project face? _____

9. Are the gender equality and human rights considered in the project budget? _____

10. What progress has been made toward achieving the project results and to what extent are the results related to the project? _____

11. How has the project affected the land and human rights, skills and access to services in terms of gender equality and access by the youth and other vulnerable groups? _____

12. What influence has the project had on member states, IGAD and research/academic institutions? _____

13. What are the lessons learnt and corrective actions to maximize the results of the project and inform the design of future projects? _____

14. To what extent have capacities of IGAD and member states been enhanced? _____

15. To what extent have the created partnerships enhanced achievement of project objectives? _____

16. To what degree are stakeholders embracing practices and policies to improve gender equality? _____

17. What should be done currently to ensure sustainability of the current project? _____

18. What aspects and direction should the next phase of the project consider? _____

Part 3: In-depth guide with Academic, Research and Training Institutions

Name of Academic or Research Institution
List of respondents and responsibilities
1. How much progress has the project made to realize its objectives _____

2. Have the project's governance structure and M&E system been adequate for implementation? _____

3. Was the original project design realistic? _____

4. Were the interventions implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternative ways? _____

5 Were activities cost-efficiently done and outputs delivered on time? _____

6. What implementation, project management, monitoring and reporting difficulties did the project face? _____

7. What progress has been made toward achieving the project results and to what extent are the results related to the project? _____

8. How has the project affected the land and human rights, skills and access to services in terms of gender equality and access by the youth and other vulnerable groups?_____

9. What influence has the project had on member states, IGAD and research/academic institutions? _____

10. What are the lessons learnt and corrective actions to maximize the results of the project and inform the design of future projects? _____

11. To what extent have capacities of IGAD and member states been enhanced? _____

12. To what degree are stakeholders embracing practices and policies to improve gender equality? _____

13. What should be done currently to ensure sustainability of the current project? _____

14. What aspects and direction should the next phase of the project consider? _____

United Nations
Economic Commission for Africa

Part 4: In-depth Guide with Member states

Name of country

List of respondents and responsibilities

1. How much progress has the project made to realize its objectives? _____

2. Have the project's governance structure and M&E system been adequate for implementation? _____

3. Was the original project design realistic? _____

4. Were activities and outputs delivered on time? _____
5 What implementation, project management, monitoring and reporting difficulties did the project face? _____

6. What progress has been made toward achieving the project results and to what extent are the results related to the project? _____

7. How has the project affected the land and human rights, skills and access to services in terms of gender equality and access by the youth and other vulnerable groups?_____

8. What influence has the project had on member states, IGAD and research/academic institutions? _____

9. What are the lessons learnt and corrective actions to maximize the results of the project and inform the design of future projects? _____

10. To what extent have capacities of IGAD and member states been enhanced? _____

11. To what degree are stakeholders embracing practices and policies to improve gender equality? _____

12. What should be done currently to ensure sustainability of the current project? _____

13. What aspects and direction should the next phase of the project consider? _____

Part 5: In-depth Guide with Africa Union Commission

List of respondents and responsibilities

1. What progress has been made toward achieving the project results? _____
2. To what extent have the capacities of LPI and IGAD been enhanced? _____

3. To what extent have partnerships been strengthened especially with development partners especially SDC and EU? _____

4. How will discontinuation of the EU support for LPI (beyond 2017) affect funding of the second phase of the project and of the implementation of the AU Declaration on land as a whole? _____

5. What is planned to cope with discontinuation of the EU funding? _____

6. What resource mobilization and partnership strategies are being considered to address the expected funding gap? _____

Part 6: In-depth Guide with the Partnership & Resource Mobilisation Section of ECA

List of respondents and responsibilities

1. Has the project faced monitoring and reporting difficulties, and which ones, if any? _____

2. How adequate have the partnerships been with AUC, RCMRD and the academic and research institutions under the project? _____

3. How adequate has the relationship been with development partners especially SDC? _____

4. What is being planned to cope with the discontinuation of EU support for LPI? _____

5. What resource mobilization and partnership strategies are being considered to address the expected funding gap? _____

6. What would be the appropriate size of donor funding for the next phase of the project to enhance development impact especially in member states of IGAD? _____

7. Given that SDC is unlikely to increase its contribution beyond the levels of the current phase ($2.2m), what additional financing can be mobilized and from which donors? _____

8. Are there any lessons learned from this project or others that should be used in designing, planning and budgeting for the next phase? _____

Part 7: In-depth Guide with the Planning and Budgeting Section of ECA

List of respondents and responsibilities

1. Are the objectives and design of the project consistent with priorities of IGAD and its member states on land and the AU Declaration on land policy?_____

2. What implementation, monitoring and reporting difficulties has the project faced? _____

3. What progress has been made toward achieving the project results? _____

4. Is the budget for the project -- $2.7m -- consistent with the expected project results? _____

5. To what extent have the capacities of LPI and IGAD been enhanced? _____

6. Given the extent the capacities of LPI and IGAD Secretariat have been enhanced, what roles should the two entities play in the oversight, management, monitoring and reporting in the next phase of the project? _____

7. What budget size and direction should the next phase of the project have to increase impact especially in member states of IGAD? _____

8. What will be the likely impact of the discontinuation of EU support for LPI to the LPI-IGAD-SDC project? _____

9. What is being planned to cope with the discontinuation of EU support for LPI? _____

10. Are there any lessons learned from this project or others that should be used in designing, planning and budgeting for the next phase? _____

Annex 5: Protocol 3 - Secondary data results framework

Log frame 1 for Outcomes

Impact: Improved access to land and security of land rights for all land users in the IGAD region, especially for vulnerable groups such as pastoralists, women and youth [with a view to enhance food security as well as sustainable use of natural resources, peace and security] through the implementation for the AU Declaration on Land				
Key Indicators	**Accomplishments**			**Data Sources Means of Verification**
Outcome Indicator	Baseline	Mid-term	End of project	
Outcome 1: Enhanced capacity of IGAD and the LPI to facilitate and monitor implementation of the AU Declaration on Land in the IGAD Region				
Outcome Indicators				
1. Professional profile at IGAD (and LPI) with respect to land governance 2. Timely delivery of outputs (as per the plan)				Progress Reports, Institutional Assessment/Mid-term evaluation report
Outcome 2: Land mainstreamed in the development programmes of IGAD				
Number of IGAD programs adopting guidelines to mainstream land issues in strategies and programs				Progress Reports
Outcome 3: Strengthened capacity of IGAD member states to improve land governance and achieve land policy convergence				
Number of common/joint (policy) instruments developed				Progress Reports; project documentations
Outcome 4: Strengthened capacity to generate and disseminate knowledge in land policy formulation and implementation in the region				
1. No. of academic/research institutions (partners of				Assessment report, Progress Reports

the project) undertaking land related research 2. No. and type of land related research (peer reviewed journal article, monograph, review articles, etc) published by academic/research institutions				

Outcome 5: Partnership and coordination mechanisms established/strengthened and resources mobilized

Number of functional stakeholder platforms				Progress Reports; Assessment report

Outcome 6: Enhanced monitoring and evaluation of land policy processes in the IGAD region

Number of countries submitting M&E reports				Progress Reports, pre and post training assessments, M&E reports

Log frame 2 for Outputs

Outputs		Key Indicators	Accomplishments			Data Sources
Outputs		**Output Indicators**	**Baseline**	**Mid-term**	**End of project**	
For outcome1: Enhanced capacity of IGAD and the LPI: to facilitate and monitor implementation of the AU Declaration on Land in the IGAD Region						
Output 1.1	Staff of the IGAD Secretariat Recruited	Number and profile of staff recruited				Progress Reports
Output 1.2	IGAD staff's capacity on key land policy and governance enhanced	Number and profile of staff trained				Progress Reports

Output 1.3	Staff at the LPI Secretariat Recruited	Number and profile of staff recruited Days of technical assistances(TAs) provided				Progress Reports
Output 1.4	IGAD Secretariat annual work plan developed and reviewed	Work plans developed and approved				
Output 1.5	Project steering committee and joint working group on land organized	- Strategic guidance provided - Meetings held				Minutes of the SCM Progress Reports
For outcome 2: **Land mainstreamed in the development programmes of IGAD**						
Output 2.1	Study on mainstreaming of land governance issues in programmes and activities of IGAD Secretariat and member states conducted and published	Timely finalization of the study (as per the plan)				Progress Reports, Study report
Output 2.2	IGAD Secretariat Strategy for mainstreaming land governance developed and reviewed	Timely completion and approval of Action// Work plan				Progress Reports
For Outcome 3: Strengthened capacity of IGAD member states to improve land governance and achieve land policy convergence						
Output 3.1	Existing land related policy frameworks, strategies and	Number of policy frameworks reviewed (study)				Progress Reports

	programmes reviewed					
Output 3.2	Land policy convergence framework developed	Framework document published				Progress Reports, evaluation report of advocacy events
Output 3.3	Regional dialogue platform established and functioning	Number of events organized				Progress Reports
For outcome4: Strengthened capacity to generate and disseminate knowledge in land policy formulation and implementation in the region						
Output 4.1	Mapping of and establishing partnerships with academic/research institutions	Institutional mapping report				Study report, progress report
Output 4.2	Research grants disbursed	Number of LoAs signed with academic/research institutions				MoUs/LoAs signed
Output 4.3	Current status of the land governance related issues in the eight IGAD countries documented	Number of countries assessed				Assessment report
Output 4.4	Knowledge management, dissemination and sharing strengthened	Functional KM platform				Progress Reports Mid-term evaluation report
For Outcome 5: **Partnership and coordination mechanisms established/strengthened and resources mobilized**						
Output 5.1	Development Partners platform	Number of development partner				Reports;

	on land policy established	platform meetings held				Minutes of platform meetings
Output 5.2	Resource mobilized	Amount of additional resource mobilized; Number of project proposals prepared				Progress Reports
For Outcome 6: **Enhanced monitoring and evaluation**						
Output 6.1	IGAD M&E framework adapted	Timely developed of the framework Number of experts trained				Progress Reports
Output 6.2	M&E Piloted	Countries piloted				Progress Reports
Output 6.3	Regular Monitoring reports prepared	Number of reports produced in timely manner by country				Progress Reports
Output 6.4	Mid-term evaluation of the project completed	Mid-term evaluation report and management response				Review report, progress reports

Annex 6: Protocol 4 – A guide to follow up discussions for validation

Type of Group of Respondents:
Responsibility (ies):
Types of Activity
List of Key topics for Discussions

1. Enhanced Capacity of IGAD and the LPI - To what extent have capacities of IGAD and member states been enhanced to facilitate and monitor implementation of the AU Declaration on land in the IGAD region? Give examples.

2. Land Mainstreamed in the Development Programmes of IGAD – Give examples of IGAD programs that have adopted guidelines to mainstream land issues in strategies and programs.

3. Strengthened Capacity of IGAD Member States to Improve Land Governance and Achieve Land Policy Convergence – Strengthening capacity of IGAD member states is a key result area of the project – While it might be too early to see the full results of the project, what are the early indications that progress is being made by the project in this area? What needs to be done to achieve full results in the remaining part of the project and in the next phase of the project?

4. Enhanced capacity to generate and disseminate knowledge – How many academic and research institutions have been supported to undertake increased or new land-related research and how many incremental research products have been produced? How has knowledge been shared? How have these institutions contributed to land policy development and implementation in their respective member states?

5. Partnerships and Coordination Mechanisms Established/Strengthened and Resources Mobilized – What mechanisms or stakeholder platforms have been established or strengthened? And have they reduced duplication and created coordination and collaboration? And is there evidence that they have increased resource availability and efficient resource use?

6. Enhanced Monitoring and Evaluation of Land Policy Processes in the IGAD Region – To what extent has the IGAD M&E framework been piloted and used for reporting by member states?

7. Lessons Learnt – what lessons were established or learnt, and were they shared? What should be done in the remaining period to ensure sustainability of the results of this project?

8. Next Phase of the Project - What aspects of this project should be continued into the next phase of the project? And what direction or change of direction should the next phase take?

United Nations
Economic Commission for Africa

Annex 7: Protocol 5 - For development partners (SDC)

Responsibility of the Respondent_____
Name of the Development Partner/Agency _____
Number of years of involvement with Partnership Programme_____

1. What in your opinion are the most significant achievements of this project in terms of progress towards achieving the project outcomes?

a. Enhanced Capacity of IGAD and the LPI _____

b. Land Mainstreamed in the Development Programmes of IGAD _____

c. Strengthened Capacity of IGAD Member States to Improve Land Governance and Achieve Land Policy Convergence _____

d. Enhanced capacity to generate and disseminate knowledge _____

e. Partnerships and Coordination Mechanisms Established/Strengthened and Resources Mobilized _____

f. Enhanced Monitoring and Evaluation of Land Policy Processes in the IGAD Region _____

2. What in your opinion are the key lessons learnt from the project? And what are the prospects that the project results will be sustained? _____

3. What aspects of the current project would you like to see continued or strengthened in the next project, which ones would you like dropped? And what new direction, if any, would you like the next phase to take? _____

Annex 8: Improving Land Governance in IGAD Region: Outline of the Second Phase

Objective 1: Enhance further the capacities of ALPC and IGAD to oversee and manage implementation of the second phase respectively

1. Review and develop ALPC systems and capacity to supervise the second phase and to report to development partners
2. Review and develop IGAD systems and capacity to manage the second phase and to facilitate its implementation by member states
3. Implement IGAD's business plan for the mainstreamed land governance issues
4. Implement IGAD's regional framework and strategy for land policy convergence.

Objective 2: Facilitate IGAD member states to implement the AU Declaration on land issues and challenges in Africa

1. Support member countries in identifying priority land issues requiring redress
2. Support National level platforms/dialogues for the development and/or implementation of national land policy reforms
3. Facilitate inter-sectoral collaboration to ensure comprehensive and coherent National land policy development and implementation
4. Work with ministries responsible for Agriculture to ensure that land issues are captured in country agricultural policy frameworks
5. Enhance resource mobilization capacity of member states by funding preparation of business plans (project proposals) of bankable projects or programmes to develop and/or implement national land policies

Objective 3: Increase research and knowledge generation on key land governance questions for the IGAD region for learning, policy and practice change among member states

1. Map research and training institutions with research and training capacity in land governance.
2. Pilot initiatives across member states aimed at improving land governance in the region.
3. Commission research on key land governance challenges in the IGAD region with a view to enrich land policy implementation and regional convergence.
4. Undertake policy advocacy in IGAD and its member states

Objective 4: Facilitate a functional regional platform for experience sharing, lesson learning and dissemination of best practices in land policy formulation and implementation among Member states in the IGAD region.

1. Facilitate the functionality of a regional CSO forum that can ably raise strategic people-centred issues at the regional dialogues.

2. Engage with the private sector to ensure their effective participation at the regional dialogues
3. Work with the Research and Training Institutions to ensure that knew knowledge generated is disseminated and informs the regional dialogues
4. Work with the steering committee to identify themes and organize the Annual East and the Horn of Africa Regional Dialogues.
5. Prepare the regional outcome documents for endorsement by the IGAD Council of Ministers
6. Engage Development partners to collaborate on the emerging land governance initiatives in IGAD and its Member States

Objective 5: Facilitate monitoring & evaluation, and reporting of land policy reform processes and implementation among Member States
1. Adapt the ALPC M&E Framework to the IGAD M&E Framework taking into consideration the SDG indicators on land in selecting appropriate indicators for the IGAD region.
2. Build Capacity in Member states on Monitoring and reporting on land indicators for the AU Declaration on Land Issues and Challenges in Africa and the Sustainable Development goals.
3. Support member states in collecting and reporting land data in line with the AU Declaration on land issues and challenges in Africa as well as the Sustainable Development Goals.
4. Prepare Annual Regional Reports on the status of land governance in the IGAD regions in line with the selected indicators.

Project Duration and Financing Arrangements: The second phase would be implemented over 4 years (January 2019 to December 2022) and would cost about US$4 million, of which 82% (about US$3.3 million) would be funded by development partners and 18% (US$ 0.7 million) by ALPC and IGAD. Since SDC has indicated it will not contribute more than it has done for the first phase, additional donors are needed to finance the second phase.

United Nations
Economic Commission for Africa

Annex 9: Institutions and Persons Interviewed

African Union Commission
Department of Rural Economy and Agriculture
Dr. Janet Edeme, Head, Rural Economy Division

UN Economic Commission for Africa (ECA)
Strategic Planning and Operational Quality Division of ECA
Evaluation Section:
Eskedar Nega, chief
Grace Chisamya, Evaluation Officer
Inam Ullah, Evaluation Officer

Programme Planning and Budgeting Section
Josephine Ulimwengu, Chief

Partnership and Resource Mobilisation Section
Marlon Lezama, Chief
Hemant Sunth, Programme Management Officer
Wouter Coussement, Programme Management Officer

African Land Policy Center (former LPI)
Belay Demissie, Economic Affairs Officer - Regional Land Expert

IGAD Secretariat
Mohamed Moussa, Director, Agriculture and Environment Division
Esther Obikol, Land Tenure Expert

South Sudan
Robert Ladu Luki, Chairman, South Sudan Land Commission

Uganda
Grace Kagoro, Principal Land Officer, Ministry of Lands

Regional Center for Mapping of Resources for Development
Byron Anangwe

Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation Peter Sidler, Development Programme Officer
Swiss Embassy, Addis Ababa

Annex 10: Documents Reviewed

African Union, 2009. Declaration on Land Issues and Challenges in Africa. Assembly/AU/Decl.1 (XIII) Rev. 1, African Union, Addis Ababa, July.

Agreement between the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation and the UN Economic Commission for Africa concerning LPI/SDC Assistance to the IGAD in Support of "Improving Land Governance in the IGAD Region for the period October 2014-30 September 2017 (no. of agreement: 81028740).

Amendment 1 to the Agreement between the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation and the UN Economic Commission for Africa concerning LPI/SDC Assistance to the IGAD in Support of "Improving Land Governance in the IGAD Region for the period October 2014-30 September 2017 (no. of agreement: 81028740).

AU-AfDB-ECA, n.d. Draft Elements of a Five-Year LPI Strategic Plan and Road-map (2012-2016). African Union, Addis Ababa.

AU-AfDB-ECA, 2010. Framework and Guidelines on Land Policy in Africa. African Union. Addis Ababa.

Foreign Policy, 2016. "At the United Nations, Umoja Translates as Bureaucratic Chaos." May. http://foreignpolicy.com/2016/05/06/at-the-united-nations-umoja-translates-as-bureaucratic-chaos/

IGAD, 2018. Project Work Plan and Budget for 2018

IGAD/Project Team, Minutes of selected meetings

IGAD/LPI, Minutes of selected meetings

LPI, 2014. Support to Mainstreaming land governance in IGAD Programs, Project Proposal. May

LPI-IGAD-SDC 2016. IGAD Land Governance Strategy, Final Report, October

LPI-IGAD-SDC 2016. Land Governance in IGAD Member Countries, Final Synthesis Report, November.

LPI-IGAD-SDC, 2016. Country Profiles on the Status of Land Governance in IGAD Member States, Final Report, October.

LPI-IGAD-SDC, 2016. Mapping of Research and Training on Land Governance Institutions in IGAD Member States, November.

LPI-IGAD-SDC 2017. Mainstreaming Land Governance in IGAD Policies, Strategies and Programs: The Strategy, March 28.

Project Team, Minutes of selected Weekly Meetings

Project Steering Committee, Minutes of selected Meetings

Project Annual Reports 2015 and 2016

UN ECA, 2014. Evaluation Policy, December.

UN Evaluation Group, 2017. Norms and Standards for Evaluation.

MANAGEMENT RESPONSE

Evaluation/Inspection/Audit title &Year	Mid-term Evaluation of the Project Titled "Improving Land Governance in the IGAD Region"
Prepared on:	6/30/2018
Approved by:	Joan Kagwanja, Coordinator, African Land Policy Center

Evaluation recommendation 1: Based on early results that show the success of the project in mainstreaming land governance into IGAD's programmes and initiating a multi-stakeholder regional platform for the sharing of lessons and best practices, LPI/ALPC should explore opportunities to introduce similar land governance projects in other RECs to assist them implement the AU Declaration on land policy. The positive role that LPI/ALPC has played in providing technical back-up and support in the implementation of this project has given it adequate experience to play a similar role in introducing and coordinating similar projects for other RECs.

☒Accepted   ☐Not Accepted

Management Response: *(if not accepted please provide reasons)*

In case accepted also fill section below

Key actions *(identify key actions for compliance with the recommendation)*	Time Frame	Responsibility (staff/section)	Expected Outcome	Periodically tracked on
1.1. ALPC will prepare Guidelines on Mainstreaming Land Governance in RECs (part of current Work Plan) drawing on best lessons/best practices to inform other REC programmes.	December 2019 October 2019	ALPC	- Guidelines published - Political will and commitment garnered for their implementation (e.g. Decision of AU STC-Oct 2019; REC Ministerial Meetings)	Annual basis
1.2. ALPC to provide Technical Assistance to RECs in developing	December 2018	ALPC/RECs	- Concept notes/proposals to inform	Annual basis

			projects/programmes for at least two (2) RECs submitted to donors - Resources pledged/ mobilized for REC programmes	
projects/programmes to mainstream land in their programmes (ensuring ALPC backstopping role is indicated in the project document).				
1.3. ALPC to providing technical back-up and support in the implementation of REC projects as defined in project documents	December 2020 (based on ALPC MTE)	ALPC	- Successful mainstreaming of land in REC programmes as per defined results in project documents	Annual basis

Evaluation recommendation 2: LPI/ALPC should use the early positive results from phase 1, especially the mainstreaming of land governance into IGAD programmes, to dialogue more actively with and seek funding from development partners to finance the mainstreaming of land governance in programmes of other RECs and the strengthening of the capacity of ALPC to provide them with technical back-up. In its transformation from LPI to ALPC, the ALPC will be playing a greater role in fund-raising for and providing a technical back-up to the RECs while the latter take up the bulk of the responsibilities for project management and implementation.

☒Accepted ☐Not Accepted	

Management Response: *(if not accepted please provide reasons)*

In case accepted also fill section below				
Key actions *(identify key actions for compliance with the recommendation)*	**Time Frame**	**Responsibility** (staff/section)	**Expected Outcome**	**Periodically tracked on**
2.1. Prepare an ALPC Business Plan (with cooperation/resource mobilization strategy) as a basis for partner engagement and resource mobilization for ALPC (including its Regional	December 2018	ALPC/PRMS	- Enhanced donor support (pledged resources) to support (ALPC and REC) programs for regional policy	Annual basis

Policy Convergence/ Harmonization Programme)			convergence/ harmonization	
2.2. Development partner platform events (2) organized/co-organized for advocacy/dialogue to enhance donor interest and support for ALPC/REC regional programmes	December 2018	ALPC/IGAD; PRMS	- Donor commitment/ pledged support for ALPC and REC regional programmes	Annual basis
2.3. Prepare ALPC proposal to enhance its capacity, support for the ALPC regional policy convergence/ harmonization programme	December 2019	ALPC	- Financial and technical resources pledged/ mobilized (e.g. proposals submitted to development partners)	Annual basis

Evaluation recommendation 3: There are at least 5 actions required to support successful completion of the current phase and to prepare for the second phase:
  i) completing the unfinished activities;
  ii) keeping the current project staff, infrastructure and systems in place for the second phase while using them in the transition to support pre-second phase activities;
  iii) expediting preparation of the project proposal document for the second phase, and negotiating and signing the associated financing agreement before the end of the current phase to ensure a seamless transition to the second phase;
  iv) in parallel with preparation of the project proposal document, undertaking a capacity assessment of IGAD Secretariat focusing on procurement and financial management with a view to recommending actions necessary to strengthen IGAD's readiness to take over from LPI/ALPC the management and implementation of the second phase; and
  v) preparing and including TORs in the project proposal document and initiating procurement of some first year activities (short of signing contracts) ahead of the second phase to ensure a timely and strong start-up of the second phase.

Project resources are available to finance the above activities until the second phase (see Table 3.3). In case there is a delay in the start-up of the second phase, a "no cost" extension of the first phase should be explored to ensure a seamless transition from the first to the second phase.

☒**Accepted**   ☐**Not Accepted**

Management Response: *(if not accepted please provide reasons)*

In case accepted also fill section below					
Sub-Recommendation #3	**Key actions** *(identify key actions for compliance with the recommendation)*	**Time Frame**	**Responsibility** (staff/section)	**Expected Outcome**	**Periodically tracked on**
i) Completing the unfinished activities	3.1.1 Regular monitoring of implementation of joint ALPC/IGAD 2018 Work Plan	Dec 2018	ALPC and IGAD	- Timely implementation of milestones/outputs (as per quarterly progress reports)	Quarterly
ii) Keeping the current project staff, infrastructure and systems in place for the second phase while using them in the transition to support pre-second phase activities	3.2.1. Prepare proposal for amendment of funding agreement (e.g. extension duration and fund reallocation) to maintain staff during transition	Dec 2018	ALPC and IGAD with PRMS	- ALPC and IGAD Staff contracts renewed until receipt of phase II resources	biannual (every 6 months)
iii) Expediting preparation of the project proposal document for the second phase, and negotiating and signing the associated financing agreement before the end of the current phase to ensure a seamless transition to the second phase	3.3.1 Prepare project proposal for phase II and 3.3.2. Negotiate with SDC and get signed financing agreement	November 2018	ALPC and IGAD Secretariat PRMS	- Seamless transition from Phase I to Phase II with adequate staff capacity	biannual (every 6 months)
iv) In parallel with preparation of the project proposal document, undertaking a capacity assessment of IGAD Secretariat focusing on procurement and financial management with	3.4.1. Conduct an assessment/due-diligence to determine IGAD capacity with regard to programme management and	September 2018	ALPC & ECA/PRMS	- Appropriate institutional arrangements for successful implementation of phase II (recommendations	Quarterly

	a view to recommending actions necessary to strengthen IGAD's readiness to take over from LPI/ALPC the management and implementation of the second phase; and	capacity for implementation 3.4.2. Prepare proposal/request for fund reallocation for additional funds to conduct due-diligence on financial management (see 3.4.1)				from assessment report)
v)	preparing and including TORs in the project proposal document and initiating procurement of some first year activities (short of signing contracts) ahead of the second phase to ensure a timely and strong start-up of the second phase.	3.5. Prepare TORs to guide procurement of consultants, firms, equipment and include as annexes to proposal	November 2018	IGAD and ALPC	- timely implementation of project (reduced delays associated with preparation of TORs)	
vi)	In case there is a delay in the start-up of the second phase, a "no cost" extension of the first phase should be explored to ensure a seamless transition from the first to the second phase.	3.6 Determine need/duration of no-cost extension based on monitoring of progress in implementation	August 2018	ALPC and SDC	- timely startup of Phase II	