

**Final
Review cum Pre-appraisal Report**

Of the programme:

**Integrating Livelihoods and Conservation –
People Partnership with Nature for Sustainable Living**

April 2017

List of contents

1. Introduction	3
1.1. Objective and Scope	3
1.2 Background	3
1.3 Approach	3
2. Review of the Programme	4
2.1 Overall progress and performance of the programme	4
2.2 Progress towards meeting programme phase 1 results	4
2.3 Previous assessments and follow up	6
2.4 Contextual developments and the programme	6
2.5 Capacities of organisations and capacity building	7
2.6 Programme strategy, relevance, coherence and synergy	8
2.7 Partnership approach and local ownership	10
2.8 Sustainability	11
2.9 Management, financial management, budgets and cost effectiveness	11
2.10 Results framework, M&E, reporting and knowledge management	12
2.11 Review conclusions and recommendations	14
3. Pre-appraisal of Next Programme Phase	16
3.1 Key features of next phase programme	16
3.2 The next phase programme preparation process	16
3.3 Assessment of the programme's coherence, relevance and expected results	16
3.4 Assessment of the Partnerships	18
3.5 Assessment of target group and stakeholder participation	18
3.6 Assessment of the programme's sustainability	18
3.7 Assessment of the programme size, budget, coverage and cost-effectiveness	19
3.8 Pre appraisal conclusion and recommendations	19
Annex 1 Overview of previous assessments and the status of follow-up	22
Annex 2 TOR for the review cum pre-appraisal	24

List of Acronyms

BCN	Bird Conservation Nepal
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CISU	Civil Samfund i Udvikling (Civil Society in Development)
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
DKK	Danish Kroner
DOF	Dansk Ornitologisk Forening (BirdLife Denmark)
IBA	Important Bird Area
IGA	Income Generating Activities"
LBM	Local Based Monitoring
LFA	Logical Framework Approach
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MSC	Most Significant Change
NGO	Non Governmental Organisation
NRM	Natural Resource Management
PMC	Programme Management Committee
TOC	Theory of Change
TOR	Terms of Reference

1. Introduction

1.1. Objective and Scope

DOF is together with partners implementing the programme “Integrating Livelihoods and Conservation – People Partnership with Nature for Sustainable Living”. The programme is funded as part of the CISU programme funding modality. It is a three year programme (2015-2017), where DOF in Denmark is working with partners in Uganda, Kenya and Nepal and with a total budget of DKK 15,7 million. As part of CISU standard procedures, the programme has to undergo a review of the current phase and a pre-appraisal for a possible next phase of the programme.

Hence, the purpose of the review cum pre-appraisal is twofold. One is to assess the current programme phase performance and the other is to pre-appraise the proposed new programme phase outline/elements and provide recommendations on changes required in order to improve or change future strategies and activities. The scope of work in accordance with the ToR (see annex 2) for the review cum pre-appraisal includes the following overall areas, of which some will be addressed in relation to the review, namely:

- Overall performance and strategic approach, Partnership approach and local ownership, Quality assurance plus monitoring and evaluation approach, Sustainability, Budget and cost-effectiveness

And others, will be addressed in relation to the pre-appraisal, namely:

- Assessment of the partnership, Assessment of target groups/participants and their relation to the intervention, Assessment of the programme’s coherence, relevance and expected results, Assessment of the programme’s sustainability, Assessment of the programme’s cost-effectiveness

1.2 Background

The programme is a three-year programme in Kenya, Uganda and Nepal that started in its current form in January 2015. DOF has worked with some of the partners (Uganda and Kenya) with projects on conservation and sustainable development before the implementation of the programme. All partners are Birdlife Partners from their respective countries. The long-term development objective of the programme is “Reduce the destruction of forested IBAs and contribute to the realisation of best participatory forest management practises for the benefit of all”. The programme has activities at six different field sites as well as regional, national and international activities related to capacity development and advocacy.

DOF and partners have started development of the key points and features of a new phase of the programme. So far the development of the new phase of the programme is at an initial and general outline level with more detailed development following later in 2017. An important consideration for a new phase is the sharply reduced budget available for a next phase (from DKK 15,7 million to DKK 10,5 million), something that has to be assessed in terms of its impact on coverage, prioritisation and cost-effectiveness.

1.3 Approach

The review cum pre-appraisal was undertaken in the period March/April 2017 and included work in Denmark as well as work in Uganda and Kenya and Skype meetings with the partner in Nepal. The work has included meetings with stakeholders in Denmark, document analysis, meetings and field visits in Uganda and Kenya. Debriefing meetings have been undertaken, a debriefing note and review cum pre-appraisal report has been produced. The review cum pre-appraisal report has two major chapters one concerning the review (chapter 2) and one concerning the pre-appraisal (chapter 3). Each of the major chapters has a conclusion and recommendation section at the end. An external consultant has undertaken the review cum pre-appraisal, and the views and recommendations contained in this report are those of the consultant only. The consultant would like to thank all the people met for their support and assistance, which greatly facilitated the process.

2. Review of the Programme

2.1 Overall progress and performance of the programme

There is satisfactory performance and good progress of the programme. The overall performance of the programme is assessed to be satisfactory and in accordance with the agreed programme document. Progress in the programme is satisfactory with milestones in the respective countries largely being met. Especially, the last one and a half year of the programme has seen activities being implemented at a satisfactory level. Phase 1 objectives and outputs achievements are assessed to be relatively well on track and the objectives and outputs are likely to be achieved at a reasonable level. Achievements are most pronounced in Uganda and Kenya with Nepal being further behind in implementation. However, with Nepal being a new partner in the programme, slower initial progress is somehow to be expected. The programme works with issues, such as changing attitudes, practises and policies, which usually take time to change, hence, impacts from the programme are typically seen over time. This is also why the programme is conceived as a multi-year initiative with a number of phases.

The strategic approach of the programme is sound and supports civil society strengthening. The strategic approach of the programme builds on supporting sustainable use of natural resources, which includes actions to improve livelihoods and actions to promote conservation. The strategic approach is assessed to be relevant and implementation is assessed to be largely in accordance with the formulated strategic approach. The strategic approach and the programme as such are well in line with the Policy for Danish Support to Civil Society Policy including the aspects of promoting rights, strengthening of open debate, strengthening of locally based civil society, and advancing of capacity development, advocacy work and networking opportunities. The programme is creating impacts in its area of implementation and the activities are highly appreciated by the involved target groups including rights holders and duty bearers.

2.2 Progress towards meeting programme phase 1 results

Phase 1 results are to a large extent on track as assessed from the review of the programme activities and their impacts. Planning and inception have taken rather long time. The satisfactory progress in terms of results in the programme is assessed more from direct observations and discussions than from the reports being produced. The previous activities in Uganda and Kenya have helped in facilitating more progress in these countries as compared to Nepal. The inception and planning phase of the programme has been rather time consuming and demanding and probably more than need be. Although the planning has been worthwhile, it is assessed that further activities could have been initiated earlier and that a more parallel approach, with implementation and planning being done along side each other, would have resulted in progress in implementation at an earlier state.

Results framework of the programme has been developed and progress is demonstrated although poorly reported in reports. Results appear to be under-reported. An overall programme LFA has been developed with indicators at objective and output levels. Results reported are of mixed quality and assessment of progress in achieving objectives and outputs is partly based on reports and partly based on observations and discussions. The programme LFA has been translated into country LFAs. Yearly workplan and budgets are developed for the programme and for each partner in their respective countries. Milestones for delivery are developed yearly and per country. The review has assessed progress in delivery in relation to the agreed workplan and budget and the milestones and finds good progress largely in accordance with plans in the three countries. Generally, it appears that results at objective and output levels are being under-reported.

The programme development objective is “**Reduce the depletion of forested IBAs and contribute to the realisation of best participatory forest management practices for the benefit of all**”. It has three different indicators. There has been limited direct reporting in-line with these indicators, but some of the sites are demonstrating improvements in the state of forest and eco-system services as well as in the livelihood opportunities for poor people. Also, participatory forest management practises are showing improvements in several of the sites.

There are three immediate objectives of the programme and progress is assessed as follows:

- The immediate objective for component 1 “**Program partners have increased capacity to strategically work with the integration of poverty reduction and nature protection**” has three different indicators, namely (1) Programme partners recognised as contribution to best practises in integration of poverty

reduction and nature conservation. Status: Good progress, but only some of the results are reported at objective and output level, other results related to the key role of programme partners are not reported on. (2) Program partners formulate and review relevant strategies and approaches based on lessons learned for the development of phase II of the Program. Status: Good progress demonstrated, but not reported on. (3) Program partners invited /seconded to participating in relevant poverty and nature protection planning and ‘think tank’ groups. Status: Good progress demonstrated, some of the results also reported. Overall, the progress in component 1 is assessed to be satisfactory with suitable national level/partner capacity building and good national advocacy activities being implemented.

- The immediate objective for component 2 “**Participatory forest management contributes to improved livelihoods of poor communities, and reduce pressure on ecosystems and biodiversity**” has three indicators, namely (1) The population in forest adjacent communities experience better living conditions, and reduced poverty as a result of improved forest management. Status: Progress appears to be satisfactory, but limited reporting on results at objective level although some reporting on direct impact on inclusion done at the associated output level. In the respective sites it appears clear that programme activities have had an impacts in terms of improving inclusion and reducing poverty and that this is linked to better forest and land management activities. (2) Monitoring data and scientific studies show reduced pressure on forest sites. Status: Reduced pressure found in three of the sites (with longer-term project involvement) and reported in specific studies/monitoring reports. In two of the new sites, developments are not yet clear. In one site there is reported increased pressure. The monitoring/studies are not fully captured in overall programme progress reporting. (3) Forest management plans reflect increase in forest productivity and greater benefits from participatory management. Status: Progress not really known, there is only very limited output level reporting on this. It is difficult to assess other than there is a major interest in improving the participatory forest management operations among stakeholders and that forest management plans are being revised. Overall the progress in component 2 is assessed to be satisfactory.
- The immediate objective for component 3 “**Local civil society groups are empowered to engage in rights-based advocacy and political processes**”. Again the objective has three indicators, namely (1) Livelihood and biodiversity concerns, and local civil society are reflected in management plans. Status: Limited reporting on this, but it appears that the process with management planning is considering livelihood and biodiversity concerns, and as such there is progress in relation to this indicator (2) Local civil society involvement in decentralised political processes documented and consistent. Status: Few results reported, but lots of activities and results being indicated in relation to local civil society involvement in the political processes at local level. It is assessed that there is good progress in relation to this indicator. (3) Improved services and community driven priorities referenced as a result of participation in political processes. Status: Limited reporting on this, but it appears that there is a process in the various sites where local civil society increasingly are able to promote their priorities and demand their rights. Overall, it is assessed that there is good progress in Component 3 on CSO strengthening at local level and on local CSO involvement in advocacy.

Poverty reduction is being directly addressed under the programme. As part of the assessment of the results of phase 1, the review has looked specifically at how the programme is contributing to poverty reduction. Although, as seen from above, it does not feature strongly in the reports, it is the view of the review team that the programme is making important contributions to poverty reduction in the respective sites with good progress being made. Many activities of the programme are designed to address poverty reduction and it appears that good progress is made in improving livelihoods also for the poorer segments of the forest adjacent communities. The way that poverty reducing activities has been handled is to a certain extent based on a direct targeting on those identified as the most needy. Related to this, it also appears that the programme has good experience with savings and loans initiatives supported in the programme. These initiatives include some of the poorest, and it appears that they are generally able to sustain and increase their capital. Managing the natural resources more sustainably including given priority access to those most in need, as seen in some areas, has a positive impact on the poorest for whom a sustained natural resource base is of relatively higher importance than for those with wider income generating opportunities.

Local civil society is being strengthened. A key feature of the programme and, hence, also an aspect given emphasis in the review is the progress in strengthening of local civil society. It is assessed that local civil society is being strengthened, especially in relation to forest user groups. Forest user groups are demonstrating increased empowerment, and capacity building and organisational support from the programme have helped them to be able to manage their own activities and demand for their rights. The prospects of achieving fully sustainable

forest user groups or other local CSOs are increasingly good and are probably realistic in majority of the sites during the coming project phase.

The programme has a sound focus on advocacy and many advocacy activities are undertaken. Advocacy is done at many levels in the programme and it appears to be effective. It is, however, not really being monitored. Advocacy and communications plans have been developed and translated into site-specific plans, although some still needs to be finalised.

2.3 Previous assessments and follow up

DOF and partners have followed up and addressed most of the recommendations from the 2014 Cap/App. A Capacity Assessment/Appraisal was done in 2014 as part of the preparation for the programme and had a total of fourteen different recommendations. Generally, the recommendations have been met and/or addressed. The status of the follow-up on these recommendations can be seen in annex 1.

There is good progress in follow-up on the recommendations and requirements from the 2016 CISU supervision visit and report. In January 2016, CISU carried out a supervision visit to DOF and produced a supervision report with a number of observations, recommendations and requirements to be fulfilled. Generally, the recommendations and requirements have been or are in the process of being addressed and responded to. It should be noted that due to email server problems, the CISU report was only received by DOF in November 2016 and hence timing for accommodating the various recommendations and requirements has been relatively short. The status of the follow-up on these recommendations and requirements can be seen in annex 1.

2.4 Contextual developments and the programme

Contextual developments in terms of policies and legislation have largely been supportive of programme. Overall, the political and socio-economic context for implementation of the programme has not seen significant developments, which were not expected at programme outset. During its around two years of implementation, the context for the programme has remained relatively stable, and to the extent necessary, the programme partners have managed to regularly accommodate to whatever changes there have been in the context. Participatory forest management remains a highly relevant approach in all three countries to promote sustainable management of natural resources and improved livelihoods (for poverty reduction and conservation). In all three countries, the key government forest authorities continue to be supportive of participatory forest management. There are positive steps in terms of policies and regulations in the programme countries that are further supportive of participatory forest management and especially to the approach of integrating livelihoods improvement with better forest management and conservation practises. Establishing effective decentralised management on a nationwide scale that is benefitting livelihoods and conservation is, however, also recognised as a major undertaking, which will take time and resources.

Policies are supportive of participatory forest management, but implementation is needed. Generally, policies in support of participatory forest management are relative good, but policy implementation is lacking. Participatory forest management is an accepted policy, but it is only implemented in practise in relatively few places in Uganda and Kenya. In Nepal it is different, here participatory forest management is widespread, but implementation is generally not addressing sustainability and conservation issues. Review of legislation during the programme period has, in some of the partner countries, further emphasised participatory forest management as the preferred strategy for management of the forests. Hence, the programme is to be seen as a support to implementing a national forest programme in the respective countries. In this respect lesson learning and using this in advocacy to support the best implementation of participatory forest management is a key aspect of the programme.

Changing forest status in Nepal. In Nepal, the programme site (Reshunga) is in the process of being changed into a protected forest. This is reportedly supportive of the work that the programme is doing in the area, and it is also understood to be in line with the interest of the respective forest user groups. The change into a protected forest will be a new situation for BCN to operate in and will generate new lessons learned about participatory forest management in such a context. Reportedly, the higher protection status will promote better management and better generation of sustainable livelihoods from the forest. Rights of access for forest adjacent communities are however something that needs to be monitored.

Risks have had some negative impact on the programme. Risk reporting is somewhat ad hoc in the programme. Risk and assumptions associated with the programme has been developed at the general level at the respective country levels. Risks appear to have been followed and assessed along the way, but not reported on in a systematic way. Risks associated with natural disasters have materialised in Nepal with the earthquake and in Kenya with the drought, both risks have of course had serious negative impacts on people and they have also influenced the implementation of the programme negatively.

2.5 Capacities of organisations and capacity building

Partner capacity is generally found to be adequate. The partners in Uganda, Kenya and Nepal are relatively strong organisations with long history of working with conservation and people and with an expressed commitment to support local communities in sustainable livelihoods in order for poverty reduction and sustainable management of natural resources to be achieved together (people-nature partnership). They are all centrally placed in their respective countries in the CBD processes. Generally, it is assessed that the partners are well respected and have a central position in the respective countries when it comes to conservation and its integration with poverty reduction, rights of people and sustainable development. All partners participate and are invited to a range of different national forums related to conservation and local development. The partners appear to have skills and resources adequate for the programme implementation. In some countries, the capacity to implement the programme at field level has seen challenges. Although, the respective partners have adequate capacities to implement the programme, the technical and monitoring support from DOF is assessed to be very valuable for the programme implementation. DOF provides important and added value to the programme implementation, without which the programme would not be possible. The South-South collaboration in the programme is work in progress, but it is encouraged in the programme modality.

Capacity of Bird Conservation Nepal (BCN) considered to relatively strong. The programme is building on previous collaboration with Nature Kenya and Nature Uganda and their involvement over years with the subject matter and with site support in some specific areas. BCN is a new partner for DOF. BCN capacity appears to be relatively strong and it is valuable to have them in the programme as a partners. BCN is recognised as an organisation that works with integration of conservation and sustainable development and is relatively well positioned in the national processes related to participatory forest management. They are implementing a number of other projects and programmes where this integrated approach is being promoted and the programme is also drawing on experience from that range of other projects. BCN capacity to select stakeholders and approaches in working with participatory forest management is work in progress, which have also been challenged by the very uneven presence in the field (Reshunga), something, which now seems to be solved. Specifically for Nepal, it is worth discussing if alternative organisations with more focus for conservation should be developed and chosen by BCN as partners in addition to working with the existing forest user groups and building their capacity for sustainable natural resource management. The review would suggest focusing on working with forest user groups.

DOF is well placed as an organisation to implement the programme. DOF is a strong civil society actor in Denmark when it comes to nature conservation and seeking solution to management problems associated with the sustainable use of nature in Denmark. It has strong capacity in running a member organisation and undertaking advocacy. DOF has also a relative strong capacity related to being involved in international projects and when it comes to addressing the integration of nature conservation with development and poverty reduction. DOF has a solid affiliation to Birdlife and this is useful in the programme implementation. DOF has qualified staff dedicated to running the programme including involvement of additional experienced staff within the organisation in support of the programme. It brings several of its capacities into the collaboration with partners in the programme, and this brings important added value to the programme.

Capacity building in the programme is progressing well and all partners are learning valuable new skills. The programme has contributed within a range of subjects and approaches to building partner capacity. This applies to such areas as programme planning and management, advocacy strategies, biodiversity monitoring, poverty reduction and conservation, gender, rights and inclusion, where good training opportunities and capacity building efforts have been provided. The programme has undertaken some training needs assessment processes. It is not really clear how useful these assessments have been, and it appears that they might not have captured the very dynamic training needs in such a programme.

2.6 Programme strategy, relevance, coherence and synergy

The programme strategy is relevant and so is its translation into practise. A Theory of Change would be useful in supporting programme monitoring and management. The programme strategy is well described and relates to addressing development and conservation activities in an integrated manner. This is done through working with civil society and government in promoting participatory forest management and livelihoods in forest adjacent communities. Capacity building, advocacy and strategic service delivery are being undertaken and linked in the programme. The programme strategy shows a significant degree of relevance. The programme strategy is being translated into practise in the implementation of the programme. It directly addresses the problems associated with poor forest and land management and poverty in forest adjacent communities. The programme strategy has not been translated into a Theory of Change (TOC) giving guidance to programme implementers on the causal links between the various interventions and being explicit in how the programme is going to contribute to change at the various levels. It is assessed, that the programme relatively easily could develop a TOC based on the already existing elements in the programme strategy and this would ease the monitoring of how the programme is contributing to change. There is agreement in the programme on the need and usefulness to develop a TOC.

The support to income generating activities in forest adjacent communities is generally well implemented, although it could be made more strategic. Supporting livelihoods improvements in forest adjacent communities in order to address sustainable natural resource management and poverty reduction is an important aspect of the programme. The way this support is being implemented is relevant and relatively strategic, but aspects of delivery, agreements with communities, selection and focus in the support to communities could be further developed and made more strategic. In the work with communities, there are groups that have been supported for a long time, and although there are good examples of these groups acting as trainers of others, there could be better agreements on entry and exit in the support provided to community groups. The programme strategy is to support livelihoods that are linked to better management of the forest resources or “nature based solutions”, this strategy is sound as there is a need to create sustainable use linkages to the forest resources in order for local people to value such forest resources. However, in some cases it is not being properly implemented and instead there has been a focus on so-called alternative livelihoods. In this sense, there is need to be more strategic throughout the programme in the support to this kind service delivery. Also related to the income generating activities, the programme is seeking to apply a business approach to such activities, this appears to work in many cases, but improving on business aspects in the service delivery is another aspect that could continue to be developed.

Supporting savings and loans group in forest adjacent communities is a valuable approach to community empowerment and poverty reduction. Another way of providing support has been to facilitate various forms of savings and loans groups. It is assessed as being rather successful in terms of supporting poverty reduction, and it is relatively well implemented. It could, however, also be further developed in terms of creating additional linkages to micro credit institutions and experts to ensure that it is done in the most sustainable ways.

Use of service providers should be the way that services to communities is being handled. The modalities for supporting communities varies within the programme, in many cases the support is provided through existing service providers, in other cases the programme is directly doing the service delivery. The most strategic and sustainable way of providing such support is through existing service providers and the strategy of the programme should be to only provide services through existing and capable service providers, if such service providers are not present, the programme should simply not provide support within the given subject area.

Supporting forest management planning is important. The programme works with sustainable use of the forests and should continue to have this focus. The support provided to participatory forest management includes support for forest management planning. This is a value tool in order to get participatory forest management to work effectively. The programme has in clever ways focused on sustainable use and community led decisions on zoning for improved management. It is, however, also noted that some of the government forest authorities have strategies that include rather technical zoning for strict protection zones in some of the forest reserves. The programme should continue to promote sustainable use and continue to refrain from getting into very technical zoning as well as avoid zoning off areas for sustainable use. Strict nature conservation zones do not help in promoting local involvement and empowerment in managing the forest sustainably.

Inclusiveness and equity is being satisfactorily addressed by the programme. A rights based approach is being applied. Specific activities are undertaken in the implementation of the programme to address gender equity, inclusion of poorest segments of target group in the forest adjacent communities and in promoting rights of indigenous peoples in the areas where they are represented. The review finds that the issues of inclusiveness and equity are addressed directly and at a satisfactory level by the programme. It also appears that this is translating into specific benefits accruing to these specific segments of the target groups including specific benefits to women and to indigenous peoples. The work with the Batwa people in Uganda, promoting their rights to use forest products, is a good example of how the programme is having an important focus on working with vulnerable groups and ensuring that specific approaches and indigenous peoples rights are promoted in order to facilitate better inclusiveness and equity. Gender strategies have been developed and gender work is included directly in support to women groups and also through the various works on forest governance. The programme is promoting a rights-based approach. This is still work in progress, but it is coming from a situation where the partners and others involved in participatory forest management did not at all talk about rights. Hence, it takes time, but addressing rights in participatory forest management has clearly improved and involves such things as putting pressure on duty bearers in relation to promoting access and benefit sharing rights.

Forest user groups play a key role in local civil society and in advocacy where they are demanding their rights from duty bearers. The programme is working effectively to strengthen the forest user groups. A key aspect of the programme implementation is the emphasis on working together with and building capacity of local civil society groups involved in promotion of participatory forest management and sustainable livelihoods development. Working with forest user groups as a key aspect of the programme is a strong added value. In all three countries, forest user groups are within the national legislation of participatory forest management and it provides a valuable local anchoring of the programme. Forest user groups are generally appreciated as the most effective organisational set up in terms of addressing participatory forest management. Overall, it is found that the programme has progressed well in relation to strengthening of local civil society, especially when it comes to the different forest user groups that are recognised as partners in the official legal set up related to participatory forest management. Forest user group strengthening at organisational level continues to be needed. The advocacy roles played by local civil society are significant and the programme plays an important role in facilitating such advocacy. Good examples of local civil society acting to stop illegal destruction of forest resources and demand rights from duty bearers can be found in a number of cases in the programme.

Advocacy is working well and is linked also to collaboration with government at various levels. The programme has implemented a range of advocacy and communication activities at local and national levels. Advocacy activities in the programme are well linked to the general advocacy work of the programme partners. Progress within advocacy has been relatively good and there are good cases of impacts in terms of changed decisions and regulations in order to promote participatory forest management in a sustainable way that respects local communities and conservation values. All partners have strategies on advocacy and communication being developed. Plans are also developed, but there is also a constant need to be opportunistic in relation to the advocacy opportunities and needs arising. Partners appear to have been effective in using the various opportunities given. It is also found that advocacy activities can be difficult to plan and budget and that they require a significant staff time to be allocated by the partners at national and local level. The advocacy activities are also linked directly with the partner's involvement with government at various levels in relation to working groups and planning processes. Through such involvement, some of the advocacy opportunities have been materialising and are being identified.

Synergy is promoted and there is a good reinforcement between components and countries. The programme strategy addresses the three aspects of the development triangle (capacity, advocacy, strategic services) and the programme is to a large extent divided into components accordingly. It is assessed that there is a good synergy between the various components of the programme. Advocacy is utilising evidence from the field, the support to the field is relatively strategic, so that it can be utilised for advocacy and the capacity building are linked well with and supports activities in the other components. The components in the programme are reinforcing each other, and the work in the different countries is ensuring exchange and lessons learning across countries.

Programme baselines and surveys have been thorough, but have also been time consuming and demanding. The programme has been prepared rather thoroughly with strategies and various forms of baselines and surveys. This has contributed to a strategic programme approach, good cooperation and guided implementation based on updated knowledge. The surveys/baselines has given good input to what and where to focus activities, however, some of this knowledge was to some extent already available in some of the countries,

where the programme is based on previous years of engagement in the selected areas. Strategies for specific interventions (such as gender, inclusion, advocacy and communication) have helped in guiding the programme. An important area, where the preparation has not fully provided input to progress, is the application of a strategic approach to M&E that provides regularly input to management of the programme and gives input to how the programme is contributing to results and changes. This is also reflected in a relative lack of strategic reporting (and learning). Although the M&E manual for the programme seeks to address some of these aspects of monitoring, this has not been sufficiently put in to practise in the programme implementation. There are, however, plans for the remainder of the current phase to introduce more strategic M&E.

2.7 Partnership approach and local ownership

Partner collaboration in the programme is supportive of programme implementation and functions well, some aspects of planning could possibly be further streamlined for speedier decision making. All partners in the programme appreciate the programme approach and partners have a joint approach and common involvement in steering of the programme. The PMC set up is overall found to work well with quarterly Skype meetings and annual face-to-face meetings. The steering of the programme is in good hands with the partners. Each partner takes up responsibilities and there appears to be an accountable set up in the respective countries and in the programme organisation as a whole. Some aspects of planning and decision-making have turned out to be quite lengthy when it is being based on common development all along its way towards decision-making. This applies to the time it took to get agreements, programme plans, monitoring frameworks and some of the strategies in place. The process appears sometimes to be quite demanding and appears to have contributed towards delays in some aspects of programme implementation. Certain aspects of developing plans, strategies and approaches in the programme could possibly benefit from being further facilitated by a lead partner and then presented to the other partners for decision-making (such as monitoring and guidance on plans for implementation).

Programme approach is supportive of the respective partners organisational performance and the strategic approaches for selected subject areas are in place. The programme approach has a good fit with the respective partners general function as organisations and is clearly appreciated by the various partners. Implementing in line with a programme approach was new to all the partners and has been an important learning experience for the partners. The longer-term, phased approach, the flexibility, and the organisation-wide support in the programme is highly appreciated. The objectives of the programme are in line with the objectives of the respective partner organisations. That said, it should also be noted that introducing the more holistic and flexible programme approach (as opposed to previous project collaborations) have been rather time consuming and complicated. A lesson learned here, is that the programme approach necessitate better introduction. Getting strategies and its concomitant strategic approaches covering different aspects of the programme work in place is important when implementing a programme, but this has been quite demanding. All in all, it is assessed that these strategic approaches are now in place, giving a smoother programme implementation in the future.

Good local and national ownership to the programme. In the respective sites, it is assessed that there is a significant ownership to the programme. Forest user groups and other local groups are fundamentally interested in being involved in sustainable management of the resources, and the programme is working seriously on building their capacity. Local government authorities are likewise being involved and appear to be very interested in and feel ownership to the programme intervention. At the national level, there is, in the relevant forest authorities (with mandate over forest) a significant ownership of the programme, which is seen as contributing to the roll out of national policies on participatory forest management. The programme strategic approach builds on implementation in local sites in order to ensure evidence, lessons learned and actual impact on the ground. Hence, effective links between the partner head office and the site offices are needed. These links have been somewhat uneven in some cases and it is something that requires a constant focus in the implementation. Local ownership is dependent on a credible site presence of the partner organisations.

Involvement of stakeholders has generally been rather comprehensive. The review finds that the relevant and most important stakeholders are meaningfully involved in the programme. The partner organisations know the areas and the subject matter and have throughout the years been analysing and selecting stakeholders to work with. The partnership approach with civil society and government at local and national levels appears well implemented in the programme. Stakeholder analyses per se in the start of the programme have not been undertaken; and are probably not needed in the contexts. Opportunities for providing more input to training of forestry staff at a more national level and hence sharing important lessons learned could be further explored. Further opportunities to involve the private sector could also be further investigated.

Collaboration within Birdlife is contributing to the programme and the programme is contributing to Birdlife globally. Overall, the role of Birdlife International is seen as important in the programme. The membership of an international organisation gives an important experience of working towards a common goal. Experiences are shared and trainings provided through Birdlife International and there is a strong incentive to share experiences within the network and at meetings in Birdlife International. Good coordination of different projects and programmes is being promoted through the affiliation. Birdlife has also proved to be a good channel for directing funding to country based partner activities. DOF plays an important role in Birdlife International, and specifically the issues of indigenous peoples, inclusion, and gender are areas where DOF and its partners in the programme are seen as having a particular expertise within the Birdlife organisation. DOF has played a key role in Birdlife position paper on IPs and DOF promotes a rights-based approach within Birdlife.

2.8 Sustainability

Sustainability of the programme activities is found to be relatively good. National scale-up is likely and opportunities exist to put further focus on model development for participatory forest management. The programme is implemented in a way, where sustainability is considered and given priority. Overall, the sustainability is assessed to be good. The programme interventions show a good level of sustainability especially when it comes to the political, organisational, social and environmental level. The technical and financial sustainability is largely found to be good, but a number of the activities are seeing some problems in terms of their technical and financial sustainability (nurseries, some of the IGAs, facilitating new local based organisations, etc). There are good prospects for institutionalisation and national scale-up of the programme achievements within the participatory forest management process in the respective countries. In supporting national scale-up, it is found that the programme could have an added focus on development of concrete models and further case stories. This is relevant in all three countries. In development of models and case stories it should be recognised that models for replication should be based on a premise with relatively limited direct support and backup to the respective participatory forest management areas. This is because; development of expensive and work intensive models will not create convincing models for scale-up.

Support to income generating activities and livelihoods are relatively sustainable. The sustainability of the interventions to improve livelihoods is generally good. Overall, livelihoods depend on sustained access to forest resources and ecosystem services and this is sustained in the programme. Livelihoods also depend on the success of IGAs facilitated through the programme. IGA support is generally assessed as being delivered in ways that promote sustainability with some showing good prospects for replication and scale up. Some IGAs are technically and organisationally more sustainable than others and there are prospects for having a more strategic approach to focus in the future on the most sustainable IGAs and their modes of delivery.

Sustainability in partnerships is an important aspect of the programme. The programme has strong partnerships and this adds to the sustainability of the programme. Being members of Birdlife International promotes ownership to the results and creates more sustainable impacts in terms of advocacy being owned by a broad membership organisation. Working together with other NGOs is also contributing to sustainability through networking, sharing and getting a stronger voice together. Although there are good partnerships, it is believed that further collaboration with the more development oriented and rights-based NGOs could add further value to the programme.

Overall programme sustainability is good and prospects for sustainability are supportive of partial phase out in some of the sites within the next programme phase. Based on the current experience, it appears that the programme is relatively sustainable. Sustainability will increase with an added focus on replication and national level scale-up in the coming years of the programme. Phase out or exit strategies or plans in support of sustainability are so far not developed. This is work in progress, and there are good input and discussions on how to address a phase 2 with a limited budget. The further development of the second phase of the programme should consider the site- specific phase out/exit strategies carefully.

2.9 Management, financial management, budgets and cost effectiveness

Programme institutional set up and programme management are working well. The programme institutional set up appears to be working well. DOF is allocating the required resources and time to programme management in the form of the two international department staff, and the leadership of the organisation provides management oversight to the programme. At partner level, all partners have a professional and

competent management of the programme with the programme being given significant attention within the overall management of organisation. It is assessed that the programme is managed in accordance with the required professional standards and rules and regulations set down by CISU and by the partners.

Financial management has been adjusted and updated and are functional and satisfactory. The review finds that the programme partners overall has a satisfactory financial management in place. DOF has a professional financial management in place, which is compliant with the procedures for receiving and handling public funds in Denmark. This capacity has been applied to the programme financial management as well. Notwithstanding this, there have been some financial management issues related to the adaptation to CISU financial management modalities. The follow-up on the recommendations and requirements from previous assessments (especially the CISU monitoring in 2016) has been or are in the process of being addressed (refer to section 2.3 above and to Annex 1). All partners are running dedicated budget- and accounting software that individually are in line with their respective financial management procedures in the organisations. The systems are, however, different across the programme countries. All partners have a number of other donor-funded projects/programme and have been through various forms of audits and check by donors (due diligence processes) and have been found capable in terms of their financial management procedures. Each of the partners has received clean audits from their respective auditors. DOF has undertaken regular financial management supervision and have together with partners been through an on-site process with the MANGO Health Check and the Accountability Dialogue Tool. All in all, the financial management is assessed to be compliant.

Most of the allocated budget is expected to be utilised in 2017, but in order to make efficient use of the remaining allocated, the remaining not-planned part of the budget and the budget margin, a three months no-cost extension is recommended. Budgets are not output based and too detailed on activities. The budget for the current phase is considered to be sufficient. After an initial under-spending, the budget performance is now on track and all three countries are expected to spend most of their allocated budgets within 2017. The not-planned part of the budget will only be partially spent in the current phase, the budget margin will not be spent and part of the allocated budget will likewise not be spent within 2017. Hence, in order to utilise this part of the funding, there will be need for a no-cost extension of about three month. The no-cost extension will be used to carry on the work of the partners as well as to initiate a number of more strategic activities (like participatory monitoring on results/changes and work on TOC). There is also need for a budget revision in the remainder of the Phase 1 as there are over and under-spending on the detailed activity budget lines. Generally, it is found that the current budget is too detailed with too many budget lines, making budgeting and budget performance difficult to match. The budget is in accordance with standards provided in the programme, but since it is not output-based, the budget is not giving the correct picture of how much it costs to produce the various outputs; especially capturing how staff and running costs are used to produce outputs is not possible to see as long as staff and running costs are not allocated to outputs. Developing an output-based budget with better allocation of staff and running costs to outputs (possibly following a defined percentage allocation to outputs) would be useful for the management of the programme in the next phase. The total Danish man-hours in the programme comprises around 12,3 % of the total cost, given the important role played by DOF technically and managerially in the programme, this is considered to be a fair percentage.

Cost effectiveness in the programme is considered to be relatively good. It is generally assessed that the programme is relatively cost effective in producing results. This applies within the countries and in the programme as a whole. Cost-effectiveness is reportedly a recurrent theme in the planning and the follow-up between and within the partners in the programme. The programme operates in several countries and at multiple levels and appears to be able to deliver results at these multiple levels. All in all, the programme is assessed to have relatively positive relationship between results and costs when compared to similar programmes in the regions. The delivery of activities and results that are deemed to be relatively sustainable is also contributing to a positive value-for-money assessment. A specific aspect in the cost structure of the programme is the relatively high staff time allocation in the respective organisations to run the programme. Given the type of activities (advocacy, capacity development, strategic developments), there is a well-defined and argued need for allocating staff time to such activities. Such “soft-ware” activities require relatively more staff time than “hard-ware” delivery. Allocating sufficient staff-time in all the partner organisations in the programme is a key in delivering the outputs related to many of the programme areas.

2.10 Results framework, M&E, reporting and knowledge management

The results framework of the programme is well developed and gives a good guidance to programme implementation although poor in supporting monitoring and with far too many indicators. The

programme results framework has been translated into country specific results framework for the programme with similar programme objectives, outputs and indicators for all the countries. These results frameworks are found to be sound in terms of their objectives and outputs but with too many indicators, which makes monitoring very challenging. Milestones are giving a good overview on how progress is with activity implementation. The programme has 53 indicators at the objective and output levels. Only some of them are strategic indicators showing contributions to change. Managing 53 indicators is not feasible and there is need to have much fewer indicators (maximum 15 indicators) that are being followed. The results framework and the programme approach, in general, necessitate good continuous monitoring, which is producing feedback to management and systematic input to lessons learning.

Baselines and surveys have so far not been able to form the basis for a good system for continuous monitoring of result and contribution to changes. Results from the surveys and baselines have been used to give further guidance to the programme related to choice of areas, selection of indicators, target groups and activities. How the baselines will be used in the future to strengthen monitoring is not clarified. And, although the baselines might contribute to longer-term monitoring of certain parameters in conservation and socio-economic development, it appears that the baselines and survey will not in itself provide for the needed platform for continuous monitoring of how the programme is performing in terms of results and contribution to change.

Programme monitoring works on the level of activity monitoring but much less in terms of results monitoring. The challenges in programme monitoring are recognised. The M&E manual has not fully been used as the basis for the on going monitoring in the programme. Monitoring according to Most Significant Change (MSC) has not really taken off. Among partners there is not an agreed approach to how to go about monitoring of changes/results. The overwhelming number of indicators is also a hindrance to effective monitoring. Activities are being monitored, but there is no systematic consideration on how the programme is contributing to change. Hence, the reporting is done largely on activity level and giving lessons learned, but is weak on results. This actually means that the programme is underreporting on the results that have been created. It is recognised that monitoring of results remains a challenge in the programme and it is something that is being worked on by the programme. There is a need for having some form of programme-wide support to development of monitoring that is addressing change/results and is participatory. The review team recommends that a system of participatory monitoring using focus group discussions in selected communities be implemented in the programme.

Local based monitoring of natural resources is important and could be further enhanced by involving focus groups in documentation of natural resource trends. The programme has developed important activities on local based monitoring of natural resources (LBM). The review finds that it a very good tool to secure local empowerment and to secure more sustainable use of the forest resources. Also in the LBM, it would be useful to include local focus group discussions as an added approach to capturing local knowledge in a participatory way and as a way of getting good feedback on trends in the status of natural resources as well as providing useful input to management.

Reporting gives a lot on activities and lessons learnt but little in terms of results. Reporting in the programme is linked to the M&E used in the programme. Reporting is therefore focused on activities undertaken and with lots of lessons learnt being reported as well. There is, as stated earlier, limited reporting of achievements at objective and output levels. The consequence is that the reports simply do not give a good picture of how the programme is progressing in terms of it achievements of objectives and outputs. There is need for being more strategic in reporting, but this is intricately linked to having an M&E system that can provide inputs in terms of achievement of results. Still, reporting is understood to be quite long and demanding in its current form.

A lot of lessons are being learned, experience is used in advocacy, but knowledge management needs to be more strategic and systematic. Lots of experience is being gained, the experience and evidence is used in evidence-based advocacy and the experience and lessons learned have been used in programme development, but the lessons learned are not gathered for presentation in a systematic way. The current lessons learning in the programme is too much ad hoc and need to be put into a more strategic and systematic framework of knowledge management (What do we want to know? Why and for what use? How do share it?). The programme has tried to seek guidance on best ways to handle lessons learning and knowledge management is such a programme, but has so far not been able to link with other actors on the most effective way of handling programme relevant knowledge management. This is an area where CISU could seek to facilitate more thematic sharing in professional networks of its members. The programme is important in terms of generating valuable experience and the links within Birdlife give additional opportunities for sharing experience. The programme is in many

ways a rather novel initiative within Birdlife in terms of its strong emphasis on seeking integration between sustainable development and conservation. The review finds that making an effort in developing models for participatory forest management in the respective countries under different management regimes and contexts, and communicating such models nationally (among those working with participatory forest management) and internationally (through Birdlife) might be an approach that would guide and systematize knowledge to a larger degree. Specifically with regards to results of the income generating activities, the programme is learning a lot, the learning is being reflected in the future developments for the income generating activities, but as above, there is not a framework as such to put the lessons learned into, hence, there are hindrances to systematic learning and documentation in terms of how to work with income generating activities.

2.11 Review conclusions and recommendations

There is satisfactory performance and good progress of the programme, and the strategic approach of the programme is sound and supportive of civil society strengthening. Phase 1 results are to a large extent on track as assessed from the review of the programme activities and their impacts. Results framework of the programme has been developed and progress is demonstrated although poorly monitoring and reported on at the objective and output levels. Results appear to be under-reported.

Some of the sites are demonstrating improvements in the state of forest and eco-system services as well as in the livelihood opportunities for poor people. Also, participatory forest management practises are showing improvements in several of the sites. Overall, the progress in component 1 is assessed to be satisfactory with good national level/partner capacity building and good national advocacy activities being implemented. Also the progress in component 2 is assessed to be satisfactory with participatory forest management contributing to improved livelihoods and reduced pressure on ecosystem in some of the sites. Progress in Component 3 on CSO strengthening at local level and on local CSO involvement in advocacy is assessed as being satisfactory.

Poverty reduction is being directly addressed under the programme and the programme is making important contributions to poverty reduction in the respective sites with good progress being made. Local civil society is being strengthened, especially in relation to forest user groups. Forest user groups are demonstrating increased empowerment and capacity building and organisational support from the programme has helped them to be able to manage their own activities and demand for their rights. The programme has a sound focus on advocacy and many advocacy activities are being undertaken.

Partner capacity is generally found to be adequate. The partners in Uganda, Kenya and Nepal are relatively strong organisations with long history of working with conservation and people and with an expressed commitment to support local communities in sustainable livelihoods in order for poverty reduction and sustainable management of natural resources to be achieved together. The capacity of BCN, the new partner in the programme, is considered to be relatively strong. DOF is well placed to implement the programme. Capacity building in the programme is progressing well and all partners are learning valuable new skills.

The programme strategy is relevant and so is its translation into practise. A Theory of Change would be useful in supporting programme monitoring and management. The support to income generating activities in forest adjacent communities is generally well implemented although it could be made more strategic. Supporting savings and loans group in forest adjacent communities is a valuable approach to community empowerment and poverty reduction. The modalities for supporting communities varies within the programme, in many cases the support is provided through existing service providers in other cases the programme is directly doing the service delivery. The most strategic and sustainable way of providing such support is through existing service providers. Supporting forest management planning is important and should continue to focus on sustainable use.

The programme is satisfactorily addressing inclusiveness and equity, and a rights based approach is being applied. Forest user groups play a key role in local civil society and in advocacy where they put demand on duty bearers. The programme is working effectively to strengthen the forest user groups. Advocacy is working well and is linked also to collaboration with government at various levels.

Synergy is promoted and there is a good reinforcement between components and countries. Programme preparation and inception has been thorough, but has also been time consuming and demanding. Partner collaboration in the programme is supportive of programme implementation and functions well. Aspects of planning and strategy development have taken quite long and the decision making process in the programme steering could be further facilitated for speedier decision making. The programme approach is supportive of the

partners organisational performance, and strategic approaches for selected subject areas are in place. Common membership of Birdlife has facilitated better programme implementation.

There is good local and national ownership to the programme and involvement of stakeholders has generally been rather comprehensive. Opportunities for providing more input to training of forestry staff at national level and hence sharing important lessons learned could be further explored. Opportunities to involve the private sector could also be further investigated.

Sustainability of the programme activities is found to be relatively good. Sustainability in partnerships is an important aspect of the programme. National scale-up is likely and opportunities exist to put further focus on model development for participatory forest management. The support to income generating activities and livelihoods are relatively sustainable and there are prospects in the future for having a more strategic approach to focus on the most sustainable income generating activities and their modes of delivery. Overall programme sustainability is good and prospects for sustainability are supportive of partial phase out in some of the sites within the next programme phase.

Programme institutional set up and programme management are working well. Financial management has been adjusted and updated and are functional and satisfactory. DOF and partners have followed up and addressed most of the recommendations from the 2104 Cap/App and there is good progress in follow up on the recommendations and requirements from the 2016 CISU supervision visit and report. Most of the allocated budget is expected to be utilised in 2017, but in order to make efficient use of the remaining allocated, the remaining not-planned part of the budget and the budget margin, a three months no-cost extension is recommended. Budgets are not output based and too detailed on activities. Cost effectiveness in the programme is considered to be relatively good. International and national staffing and man-hours are needed and justified for project implementation.

The results framework of the programme is well developed and gives a good guidance to programme implementation. Baselines and surveys have seen significant efforts and created relevant knowledge to guide the programme, but have so far not been able to form the basis for a good system for continuous monitoring of result and contribution to changes. Programme monitoring works on the level of activity monitoring but much less in terms of results monitoring. The challenges in programme monitoring are recognised and there is a need to develop a participatory monitoring system that captures results and change. Reporting gives a lot of information on activities and lessons learnt but little in terms of results, there is need for more strategic reporting. A lot of lessons are being learned, experience is used in advocacy, but knowledge management needs to be more strategic and systematic.

It is recommended to:

1. Develop a Theory of Change (TOC) and use the TOC to guide programme monitoring and management.
2. Ensure that programme steering is further facilitated for speedier decision-making by having selected partners further taking a lead in developing plans and strategies and letting other partners comment on this.
3. In future, seek to develop an output-based budget and ensure less detailed budget lines for activities.
4. Seek a three months no-cost extension for the current phase.
5. In future, plan for a phase out in some of the sites within the next programme phase.
6. Ensure a more strategic approach to income generating activities including a focus on the most sustainable activities and on only providing such support through existing and capable service providers.
7. In supporting local civil society, ensure a continued focus on working with forest user groups and ensure that supporting other local civil society structures is sustainable over time. Related to this, ensure that support to forest management planning continues to be focused on sustainable use of the forest in line with the objectives of the forest user groups.
8. In future collaboration with stakeholders, seek opportunities for providing more input to training of forestry staff at national level and thereby facilitate scale-up. Also seek further opportunities to involve the private sector in relevant programme activities.
9. Seek to develop a participatory monitoring system that captures results and programme contribution to change. Linked to this, seek to have more strategic reporting that includes reporting on results and contribution to change. Ensure more strategic and systematic knowledge management including putting further focus on models development for participatory forest management.

3. Pre-appraisal of Next Programme Phase

3.1 Key features of next phase programme

The current **indicative outline** of phase II has been presented in various documents and in discussions with the programme partners. It has the following key features:

- The programme will continue in all the three partner countries with the same partners as phase I.
- Development and immediate objectives will remain the same as in phase I, and the components will remain the same. The strategic approach will largely remain the same, but with adjustments in accordance with the lessons learned and related to having a more strategic focus in the implementation. Outputs will be adjusted to accommodate the increased focus in the programme and to do away with redundant outputs.
- Programme will continue to work with national level and the same sites in the specific countries, the planned expansion to two sites in Nepal will continue. Phase out or partial phase out of support to some sites will be undertaken during phase II and apply to one site in Uganda and one site in Kenya.
- The existing partnerships in the programme will continue and such partnerships will be strengthened. Scale-up will be a focus in the next phase.
- Activities will be further focused on strategic activities and have an added focus on replication, it will, amongst others, include a focus on selective sustainable income generating activities with more focus on business aspects. No new groups will be worked with and the programme will only work with what groups are already there and seek to support them in further achieving sustainability. More work will be through established service delivery organisations and there will be clearer agreements on the conditions including exit strategies for collaboration.
- The work with supporting CSOs/Forest user groups will continue and include supporting their access to local and national government and further strengthening of forest user groups (in their multiple functions) including a focus in supporting rights and rights of access of forest user groups. Networking of CSO will be supported.
- Advocacy work will continue at national and local level, possibly with expanding national level advocacy for scaling up. Advocacy will focus on best ways of doing and promoting participatory forest management.
- Capacity development work will be continued but will also be focused further and will include government institutions responsible at different levels for participatory forest management. Experience and knowledge exchange including exchange visits will be further stressed.
- The phase will see continued work on inclusion and will see further collaboration with human rights and development CSOs.
- The phase will be guided by a TOC and better and more participatory monitoring of achievements will be undertaken. Lessons learning will be more systematic and there will be more active knowledge management in the programme.

3.2 The next phase programme preparation process

The preparation so far has focused on presentation of general ideas. So far the preparation for the possible next phase programme has been limited to presentation of general ideas and considerations for the future. Each partner has presented ideas for the next phase and together they give a picture of an outline for the next phase. There is no concept note for the next phase programme developed at this stage. The further development process is awaiting the review cum pre-appraisal. The assessment made in this pre-appraisal is based on these general ideas presented.

3.3 Assessment of the programme's coherence, relevance and expected results

Good coherence of the next phase is foreseen. Overall, it is assessed the next phase of the programme will continue to have a good coherence between countries, strategic approach and the various components. This coherence will build on the partners being active in practise on the ground with promoting participatory forest management as well as them being active with working on the national level with advocacy, policies and promotion of scale-up activities.

Overall relevance of the next phase is expected. The strategic approach to promoting participatory forest management through the integration of conservation, poverty reduction, rights and livelihoods development will continue to be sound. The strategic approach in the current phase, where communities and households are benefitting from a more sustainable management of land and forest including deriving ecosystem services from better managed forest areas, will be continued in the second phase and this strategy is deemed to be relevant and supportive of poverty reduction in the target areas. The relevance of the next phase would be in line with the relevance of the current phase, but also up-dated in terms of having fewer and more strategic activities. It will continue to be relevant in relation to the Policy for Danish Support to Civil Society.

Expected results will be both relevant and contributing to important changes towards sustainable participatory forest management for the benefit of all. The expected results will be improvements within the following major areas: Partner capacity; Advocacy around participatory forest management at national level; Sustainable management of forest ecosystem and improved livelihoods and poverty reduction in sites; Inclusion and equity in socio-economic development and forest governance at sites; Local civil society capacity and empowerment; and Improved local level advocacy in support of fair and sustainable participatory forest management. Generally, these results are assessed to be both relevant and of significant importance. Results will differ in relation to sites and in relation to the length of cooperation between the partners. Generally, it is found that more sustainable results will be generated in sites and with partners where there has been long-term collaboration.

Phase II will be a progression of the current phase, but will continue to work on the longer-term objectives. Overall, the next phase outline is assessed to be a strategic development and progression, which is based on best practices and lesson learnt from the current phase. The progression is related to increased focus on working through empowering local organizations, the ability to be able to have a more strategic focus overall in the programme, the further functioning of the programme partners as facilitators rather than implementers, and the increased focus on building national replication. That said, there will be a number of activities and approaches, which are supporting longer term goals, that will be continued in the next phase. They might appear to be “more of the same”. This is, however, what should be expected from a programme being conceived and developed as a longer-term/multiple phases programme.

Some sites will be phased out or partially phased out in the next phase and overall it is deemed feasible to adjust activities so as to accommodate the reduced 2nd phase budget. It is assessed to be feasible and desirable to continue in the existing programme sites in the next phase as well as to continue with the expansion to one more planned programme site in Nepal. It is deemed too early to phase out any sites in the current phase. However, phasing out or partially phasing out of some of the programme sites during phase II will be needed and also sensible from a sustainability point of view. To do that, further development of exit and phase out strategies are needed. In order to address the reduced budget for phase II, it is needed to have a more strategic focus on fewer and the most essential activities in the programme sites. This is deemed to be possible to implement in such a way that the reduced budget for the next phase is still able to cover the prioritised activities in the sites.

Addressing governance, rights, inclusion and advocacy are important aspects of the next phase. As outlined, the next phase will also focus on promoting rights of target groups to benefit from participatory forest management and will also have a significant aspect of advocacy. Addressing governance and supporting local empowerment will be part of the approach and this is deemed both relevant and an effective way of supporting better implementation of participatory forest management. The specific inclusion of poor and vulnerable groups in the programme is proposed to be continued and further developed in the next phase. The current phase has helped identify poor and vulnerable groups, and activities in the second phase are outlined so as to build even more on this targeting. Specific targeting of activities, which makes it possible for these groups to improve on their livelihoods, should build on lessons learned in the current phase (this includes amongst others promoting specific work with IP groups, promoting livelihoods financed through savings and loans groups, targeting forest adjacent areas with highest incidence of poverty, and promoting sustainable forest use for those vulnerable groups that are most forest dependent).

Development of exit strategies will have to be part of next phase development. The outline for the second phase of the programme indicates that it is relatively well demarcated and that it reflects important aspects of institutionalization of participatory forest management. It does not, at this stage, include explicit exit strategies. The further development of the next phase will have to include more explicit exit, sustainability and

institutionalization strategies in the countries of operation (such as models, training, local empowerment/sustainability).

Results framework and monitoring and evaluation will have to be adjusted in some important ways for the next phase. Next phase will have to develop a results framework with indicators that are significantly adjusted and focused on much fewer and more strategic indicators. It will have to develop an M&E system that is better in capturing results and that are giving a better picture of how the programme is contributing to change in line with a developed TOC.

3.4 Assessment of the Partnerships

There is likely to be a continuation of the good partnership relations in the programme, but it can also be expected to have development towards assigning specific roles of various partners in the partnership. The partnerships for phase II will remain the same as the current phase, and it is assessed that the technical and financial capacities of the partners are satisfactory and well placed to implement the phase II of the programme. Ownership of the programme among partners remains strong for the phase II. Partnership development will be focused on more exchange of experience, further support to each other and also south-south exchange. It is overall found that there are good potentials for further development of the partnerships. Roles in the partnerships have the potential to be further developed with assigning specific roles to specific partners in accordance with their respective comparative advantages. It is assessed that the partnerships can be sustained also under a situation with budget cuts. Birdlife International will continue to play an important role in training, experience exchange and common reference. The current ideas for a second phase of the programme are in line with DOF thinking and strategy on their international engagement. Further involvement of DOF volunteers and of DOF international committee in the second phase of the programme are likely to be included in the development of the next phase. Learning from DOF membership and advocacy work in Denmark will continue to be part of the partnership.

3.5 Assessment of target group and stakeholder participation

There is a relevant level of target group participation including involvement in ideas for future programme work. The outline for the next phase of the programme includes continuation and expansion of those interventions that addresses local empowerment and opportunities for target group participation. It is assessed that the next phase will include a significant level of target group participation and empowerment. The programme has an on going exchange with stakeholders on the way forward for the programme and this has contributed to a considerable involvement of stakeholders including rights-holders and duty-bearers in providing input to the future of the programme and in general to a good level of involvement.

3.6 Assessment of the programme's sustainability

Overall, the sustainability of the next phase is considered to be good and advocacy activities of the next phase will continue to contribute to sustainability. Clear sustainability strategies should be developed. The programme activities for the next phase are likely to be relatively sustainable. The partners involved in the programme are all rather strong advocacy organisations promoting more sustainable management of natural resources. The next phase is assessed to also have a focus on supporting national advocacy functions of the partners as well as the more local level advocacy with local civil society addressing the issues related to specific sites. Generally, the opportunities for the various partners to fulfil their advocacy functions in the next phase are assessed as being good. With the national partners being well-established member organisations with good prospects for being organisationally sustained in the future, their advocacy work has likewise good prospects for being sustained over time. That said, and taking the strain on budgets available to CISU programme organisations into account, the programme should also develop sustainability strategies to accommodate the option of the second phase being the last phase in the collaboration funded under CISU.

Supporting communities and local civil society are expected to have sustainable impacts also in the next phase. The support provided to communities and local civil society has a significant focus on creating sustainable and lasting changes in empowerment and in livelihoods. Much of the work is assessed to have a good track record of creating sustainable impacts (livelihood improvements are being sustained and some of them further replicated, local civil society continues to draw local support and is recognised as local stakeholders). The outline for the second phase indicates that activities will be focused on those activities that have seen most sustainable impacts, so prospect for sustainability of local empowerment and livelihoods are assessed to be good.

Capacity development will continue to contribute to sustainability. The outline for the second phase indicates a continued focus on assisting local partners and target groups in developing their capacity so as to be able to sustain whatever activities they are involved in. In that way, the issue of dependency following the expiry of the next programme period is being addressed, however, as indicated earlier there is still need to further develop exit and phasing out strategies as part of the detailed development of the next phase.

3.7 Assessment of the programme size, budget, coverage and cost-effectiveness

Budget size and prioritisation point at a strong strategic focus in activities in the next phase. The next phase programme size is limited to DKK 10,5 million over a three years period due to the budget reductions that CISU has had to implement. It is a given that the next phase needs to see serious focus in activities. But it is deemed feasible to have such a focus in light of the fact that a lot of preparatory activities have already been undertaken and that lessons learned indicate what are the most essential activities to implement. Covering field-level activities in tandem with a focus on national advocacy is seen as a needed strategy, also for the next phase. Overall, it is believed that the programme would still be able within the reduced budget to contribute importantly to achievement of the objectives and to the change needed in order to scale-up participatory forest management.

Coverage needs to be the existing countries and sites, but with exit and phase out strategies developed for the next phase. The countries of implementation should, in order to have a meaningful programme and given the important and promising process on going in the respective countries, continue to be all three existing countries. Likewise, it would be necessary and meaningful to continue in the existing and planned sites. However, during the next phase it should be clear that some of the sites would see a phase out or a significant phase down to a few strategic support activities (probably one site in Uganda and one in Kenya). Hence, exit and sustainability strategies must be developed.

The second phase cost-effectiveness is considered to be relatively good. Cost effectiveness of the next phase of the programme is assessed on one hand to be improved as many activities will be scaled-up and out, and with cost of preparation and development already undertaken in phase I. On the other hand, cost effectiveness will be negatively impacted by the reduced budget where you, no matter what, will have some of the running costs of the programme not being possible to reduce accordingly. Key cost-effectiveness mitigation measures under a reduced budget in the second phase will be to focus on fewer and the most strategic activities with the most directly impacted and engaged stakeholders. All in all, it is assessed that the second phase and the implementing partners will have a cost effectiveness that is more or less equal to the present cost-effectiveness.

Budget allocations need to consider feasible country programmes and sufficient funding to ensure qualified input from DOF. The division of budgets in the next phase should consider budget size in partner countries and budget for DOF input. As DOF input is vital and justified in supporting the programme technically and managerially it will be needed at a level only some 15% lower from the current level (rather than a cut of 33% in line with the general budget cut). This is needed even if this would constitute a higher percentage of the total budget, that is, from the current level of 12.3 % to somewhere between 15 and 16 % of the budget. Hence, DOF Danish man-hour input should be in the order of DKK 1,6 million out of the DKK 10,5 million. DOF input would still compare to other Danish organisations that are receiving CISU funding and are providing strong technical and managerial support to programmes.

Some matching funding from the programme might be possible in the next phase. Given the strong commitment to implementation of the programme and given that all partners are raising funds for a variety of interventions from a variety of sources, it is deemed feasible that some matching funds for programme implementation from partners will be possible to raise. The indicated 5% matching funds from DOF is assessed to be feasible in the second phase, as long as the type of matching funds can be brought in from other matching projects.

3.8 Pre appraisal conclusion and recommendations

The pre-appraisal recommends that a second phase of the programme be developed. The second phase should be seen as a progression of the on going work of the current phase, hence, it is not going to be fundamentally different from the current phase. It is, however, the intention to have a significantly more focused and slimmer second phase of the programme. The next phase programme is assessed to be feasible and the support to a next phase is justified. Based on the presented outline and ideas for the second phase, the pre-

appraisal recommends that a new phase of the programme is developed and subsequently presented for approval given that its development has taken into consideration the findings and conclusions in the review and pre-appraisal.

The assessment of the next phase shows in relation to the CISU assessment criteria:

Accumulated experience and capacity. The programme partners have the right experience and capacity to implement the programme. Partner capacities are considered to be relevant. DOF continues to be well placed as the Danish partner to implement this type of programme.

Programme partners and partnership. The current partnerships of the programme are also relevant for the next phase of the programme. The programme level cooperation among partners including the PMC appears to be functional and would be useful also to apply in the next phase of the programme.

Target groups – rights holders and duty bearers. An important level of target group and stakeholder participation is expected. This applies to rights holders as well as duty bearers. The participation by stakeholders fostered in the current phase is likely to continue in a new phase of the programme.

Programme strategy, relevance and expected outputs. The programme strategy for the next phase is understood as largely a continuation and updating of the current strategy with more focus on sustainability strategies. This is assessed as being a sound strategy. Coherence of next phase is assessed to be relatively good. Important results at national and local level are expected and the programme will continue to be relevant. Results framework and especially indicators will need to be adjusted for the next phase. The next phase is assessed to be feasible and justified.

Sustainability and long-term impact. Sustainability at community, local civil society and at national level is expected to be good. Sustainability within the national forestry sector will see added focus in next phase. Sustainability in participatory forest management locally appears to continue to be satisfactory. Programme sustainability differs and will have to be treated differently depending on area and subject in the next phase. Long-term impacts of the programme are expected to be considerable.

Cost effectiveness. Budget size and prioritisation are pointing at a strong strategic focus in activities in the next phase. Coverage needs to be the existing countries and sites, but with sustainability and phase out strategies developed for the next phase. The second phase cost-effectiveness is considered to be relatively good. Budget allocations need to consider feasible country programmes and sufficient funding to ensure qualified input from DOF. Some matching funding from the programme might be possible in the next phase.

Recommendations related to the pre-appraisal of the next phase:

1. Develop a next phase of the programme with a view of getting approval for next phase programme implementation from 1st April 2018.
2. Ensure that the next phase of programme implementation includes participation of the same partners and countries and with both site level and national level activities. Build on the same strategic approach and continue with the current objectives and components, while ensuring added focus on replication, national scale-up and advocacy in support of that. Ensure a strong focus in activities on the most strategic and sustainable activities. Continue to develop sustainability strategies for the whole programme.
3. Develop a TOC for the next phase and use this to guide monitoring and management
4. Continue working with the present sites and include the planned expansion to one additional site in Nepal. Ensure that phase out strategies or partial phase out strategies (with focus on few strategic support activities) are made for one site in Uganda and one site in Kenya. The phase out or partial phase out during phase II should apply to those sites that have seen the longest engagement from the partners in Uganda and Kenya.
5. Ensure a focus in the support to forest adjacent communities including fewer and proven income generating activities with good business potential, only facilitate delivery through established service delivery organisations, and no new groups to be formed or supported.
6. Ensure a next phase focus on addressing governance, rights, inclusion and advocacy

7. Ensure a focus in supporting and capacity building of local civil society on existing forest user groups and other proven CSO structures including their networks. Do not seek to establish or facilitate alternative CSO structures.
8. Make sure that for the next phase a result framework is developed that can be monitored in terms of results and contribution to change including much fewer and more strategic indicators. Make sure that M&E in the next phase is participatory and can better capture results and can give a better picture of how the programme contributes to change in line with a developed TOC. Linked to this, seek to have more strategic reporting that includes reporting on results and contribution to change. Ensure more strategic and systematic knowledge management including putting further focus on models development for participatory forest management.
9. Ensure that the budget for the next phase (DKK 10,5 million over three years) includes sufficient funding for activities and for national and international staffing that are crucial for supporting the implementation of the activities and creating the outputs. Work on allocating some matching funds to the programme in the order of 5% from DOF coming from other supportive projects. Develop an output-based budget and ensure less detailed budget lines for activities.
10. Continue the same partnership arrangements as in the current phase, but also ensure that division of roles in the partnership facilitates more streamlined decision-making within the programme set up.

Annex 1 Overview of previous assessments and the status of follow-up

The status of the follow-up on the 2016 CISU supervision is as follows:

- Rec.: Simplify reporting and focus reporting on programme contribution to change in relation to a TOC. Status: This has not yet been done, but it is something that will be developed further in the coming year. DOF and partners recognise that they are relatively weak on results monitoring and reporting.
- Rec.: Assess capacity to use MSC approach in monitoring as compared to monitoring linked to TOC. Status: The programme is grappling with MSC and seeks ways of getting a better monitoring of change/results. Will be addressed as part of the above recommendation.
- Rec.: Quarterly financial reports to include annex with expenses in excel. Status: Done
- Rec.: Consider separating TA from supervision/monitoring visits/functions. Status: Partly done, financial supervision separate from TA. However, technical supervision/monitoring has not been separated, this is considered not to be feasible due to budget constraints and due the integrated nature of the technical assistance and the supervision of technical issues. In DOF, the International Committee is supervising the programme, but involvement of the Programme Advisory Group in further supervision work would be useful. Separation of TA from supervision/monitoring in a next phase needs further clarification as it is possible to separate financial monitoring and supervision from the TA, but it is however more challenging to separate TA for technical supervision and monitoring.
- Rec.: Use budget control software rather than manual extraction of Excel reports. Status: Done, DOF is now generating financial data directly from Navision into Excel report.
- Requirements: On the payment and transfer protocols. Status: Done, there is a separate bank account for the CISU grant and payments are now made from the CISU account to the DOF main account every quarter after expenses have been incurred and with no payments on accounts. DOF should, however, ensure that they provide clearer description and documentation of that they follow the CISU/UM guidelines.
- Requirements: On account reconciliation. Status: Done, reconciliation is done at year-end and this is shown in the notes of the annual accounts. There should however be provided further documentation on all aspects of the reconciliation between the account that are undertaken.
- Rec.: On use of time registration software. Status: This is in progress and about to be implemented.
- Requirement: On anti-corruption policy. Status: Done, the anti-corruption policy could however be improved by including the procedures for orientation of donors of detection of corruption issues.
- Rec.: On financial supervision of partner complying with DOFs responsibility to CISU. Status: Done, DOF are undertaking financial supervision of partners.
- Requirements: On audit contracts and management audits. Status: Done, there are updated contracts with auditors in DK and in partner countries undertaking management audits as part of the audit process.

The status of the follow-up on the 2014 Capacity Assessment/Appraisal 2014 is as follows:

- Rec. 1. On formalised systems for lessons learning and database development. Status: This has partly been done, lessons learned are being collected, but a formalised database has not been developed. What is needed is more a framework for collecting, analysing and communicating lessons learned. The suggest work on models for participatory forest management would be serve this purpose.
- Rec. 2. Attention to raising membership of the organisations. Status: Done, the partners have specific activities aimed at increasing membership, more importantly, there is significant activities to involve a higher number of participants in the programme activities at the local level (though not as members of the partner organisations, which would also be misguided approach).
- Rec. 3. Develop business models and shortlist of IGAs. Done, value chain analyses and business planning and model developments are being done in the programme at the various site/partner levels. This aspect can and will be further strengthened in the future and will be focused on strategic IGAs. Selection of strategic IGAs would have to be done at site-specific level.
- Rec. 4. Enhance partners' communication tools for general communication and advocacy. Done, communication tool development and advocacy part of the programme activities.
- Rec. 5 and 6. Develop guidance and MOUs on collaboration with local government and local civil society structures. Done, the programme is guiding the partners in local level collaboration and MOU are generally signed with different local stakeholders including local government.
- Rec. 7. Undertake an inception phase for the programme. Done

- Rec. 8. Have exchange visits and Skype contact between partners. Done, there are regular Skype contacts and exchange visits are done in relation to the PMC meetings.
- Rec. 9. Develop M&E common guidelines. Done, there is a M&E manual, the programme is being monitored and follows common guidelines. What has been less developed is the monitoring of results and contribution to change.
- Rec. 10. Discuss and finalize gender and IP policy paper. Done.
- Rec. 11. Get involved in social issues/development networks. Done, partners are involved in networks that include development/social issues actors.
- Rec. 12. Increase time allocated to DOF social scientist from 30 hours to full-time. Not done, the 30 hours allocation was considered sufficient and there were budget constraints to have more DK hours.
- Rec. 13. Ensure that communication becomes a central aspect of the programme. Done, communication has a central role in the advocacy and information coming from the programme.
- Rec. 14. DOF international staff to join in international events/meetings. Done, and DOF is active in Birdlife International.

**TERMS OF REFERENCE
REVIEW cum PRE-APPRAISAL TO PREPARE FOR A
NEW PROGRAMME PHASE**

The purpose of the Review cum pre-appraisal is twofold. One is to assess the current programme phase performance and the other is to pre-appraise the proposed new programme phase outline/elements and provide recommendations on changes required in order to improve or change future strategies and activities. The Review cum pre-appraisal is commissioned by CISU.

1. Background and tasks regarding review cum pre-appraisal of DOFs program: "Integrating Livelihoods and Conservation. People Partner with Nature for Sustainable Living".

The *Integrating Livelihoods and Conservation. People Partner with Nature for Sustainable Living* Program began January 2015 and is expected to end its first phase on 31. December 2017. DOF is implementing the Program in Kenya, Nepal and Uganda with the 3 national BirdLife Partners Nature Kenya, Bird Conservation Nepal (BCN) and NatureUganda. Activities with local communities are currently implemented at 6 sites, 3 in Kenya, 1 in Nepal and 2 in Uganda. Because BCN was a new partner for DOF only one site was chosen in Nepal for the first phase. The sites are all forested Important Bird and Biodiversity Areas (IBAs), according to BirdLife criteria, with substantial human population in or around the areas.

The long term development objective of the Program is to:

Reduce the destruction of forested IBAs and contribute to the realisation of best participatory forest management practices for the benefit of all.

The 3 Program objectives are:

1. *Program partners have increasing capacity to strategically work with the integration of poverty reduction and nature protection;*
2. *Participatory forest management contributes to improved livelihoods of poor communities, and reduce pressure on ecosystems and biodiversity;* and
3. *Local civil society groups are empowered to engage in rights based advocacy and political processes.*

The Program is steered by a Program Management Committee (PMC) consisting of two representatives from each partner, including DOF. The PMC meets once annually and has skype consultations on a quarterly basis. The PMC is responsible for jointly reviewing, revising and planning the Program. The PMC will next meet for the 3rd annual PMC meeting in Uganda in March 2017. One focus of the meeting will be the planning of Phase 2. The Program has now been implemented for almost 2 years. Because it is a Program with a longer term perspective and a more strategic approach than a typical, project, the intervention was more thoroughly prepared during the Inception phase. This caused some delay because some of the initial activities took longer than anticipated by the South partners. Also, it has been a challenge to move from a project to a program approach but all partners welcome the Program concept because it offers a long-term perspective and is more flexible than many projects.

1.1 The programme organisation's previous programme phase learning and track record

1.1.1 Summary of the *programme organisation's* key learning in previous programme phase – reflecting structure and content of the "Programme status report year 2" document.

- The Program approach and objectives remain valid also for the second phase. The thorough preparation and strategic approach of the Program took longer than anticipated but is essential for quality, sustainability and

a sound learning process. Working with several partners from several countries is an asset when there are good relationships, a common goal and understanding

- The large turn-over of government officers and how to build capacity of the institution rather than the individual is a challenge
- Networking and advocacy at higher levels takes a lot of partners' time and resources which are often not paid for and for which they often do not have a full-time responsible staff delegated to this working area
- Not surprisingly at site levels progress and lessons vary according to the local context and the challenges are not the same
- At all sites, local CSOs continue to need support to become more independent, more representative and better at networking and advocacy. It takes time
- It also takes time to build sustainability of economic activities and to ensure that all benefit equally. On the other hand, some IGAs have provided direct benefits, both through skills training and economic benefits which are expected to be sustained. Positive results in biodiversity and forest protection take a long time and cannot yet be fully documented at this point in time, but the review of the forest management plans and capacity building and continuous involvement of important stakeholders continue to be considered the best approach to securing better forest management

1.1.2 *The programme organisation's* track record and issues to consider in the new programme phase process (as identified in consultation with CISU).

- how to strengthen strategies to empower local CSOs and approaches to improved livelihoods
- include a reflection on the Theory of Change of the present programme, with the view of making a ToC explicit in the new phase.
- Assessing the capacity of BirdLife Nepal as a new partner to the programme
- Follow up on CISU monitoring report with a focus on financial recommendations.

1.2 The programme organisation's proposed new programme phase summary (including description of core partners) – reflecting content of the “Programme status report year 2” document.

The “Integrating Livelihoods and Conservation – People Partner with Nature for Sustainability” Program (PPN Program) will continue with the same four partners, namely DOF, Bird Conservation Nepal (BCN), *Nature*Uganda and Nature Kenya - all four partners being the national Partner in the BirdLife International Global Partnership.

Coordination and synergy:

Similarly, the PMC set-up will be continued during the next phase with at least one annual PMC meeting and Skype meetings at regular intervals. It will be considered to have at least one more (site-based) staff from each partner attending the PMC (and Skype) meetings, to ensure more hands-on perspectives and close follow-up. More focus will be put on ensuring a conducive working environment for all staff working on the Program, in particular for the partner secretariat staff to better support and build capacity of local/site-based staff for a better delivery of the Program and better functions of partners in general. The MSC approach has not yet been explored as planned in the first phase but will continue to be an important contribution to monitoring and will be supported by training. It is also envisaged that partners become more familiar with TOC and will use it already in the planning of the next phase.

Since the budget will most likely be considerably less in the next phase not all relevant activities can be continued. Some Inception activities (baselines, formulation of policies and guidelines, setting up of field offices etc.) will not be duplicated in the second phase; others will have to be cut down. Cost effectiveness, synergy and collaboration will be key to bring more benefit for less money. The final plan for the second phase and how partners will adapt the second phase to the reduced budgets will be drafted at the PMC meeting between partners in March 2017.

Strategic adjustments:

At the overall strategic level, the preliminary plan is to keep the strategic approach to the three components with minor alterations, but revise the outputs and main activities:

- As some of the outputs are expected to have been achieved at the end of Phase 1, some parts of Component 1 will be scaled down. There will be a strengthened focus on advocacy, public awareness and networking at all levels to ensure more sustainability and impact of efforts. This could also include improving the fundraising capabilities of partners

- The strategy for Component 2 shall ensure a more targeted approach that focuses on ensuring a higher sustainability of investments by e.g. strengthening savings and loans groups and cooperatives and making them more equitable and attractive for local beneficiaries. The forest management and use work through forest user groups/CFM groups/CFAs shall focus more on ensuring sustainability of the groups (organisational strength, networking, advocacy and communication skills, fundraising) and forging closer ties with duty bearers/authorities and other stakeholders to showcase sustainable forest resource use, income generation and biodiversity conservation. It is envisaged that Nature Kenya and NatureUganda review their program sites in order to decide whether it is feasible with reduced funds to continue a high level of activities at all sites or whether some should be phased out or scaled down. In Nepal it is envisaged to possibly upscale activities by adding one more site, as Nepal moves from being a pilot country. BCN has suggested to add another forest site in the same District as the current site. This will also depend on the assessment of BCN, see 1.1.2 above.
- The strategy for Component 3 shall emphasize support to local forest user groups/CFM groups/CFAs and other CSOs/CSGs in order to build stronger and more independent groups and organisations, involve more members to become active, reach out to and collaborate with other CSOs/CSGs/stakeholders/networks and generally to become more skilled to contribute actively to and improve impact of their advocacy, public awareness and other activities. This is especially true for women members. The focus on women and poor/marginalised households shall continue. The proportion of the budget should probably increase a bit for Component 3.

Programme approach:

It seems necessary to work more focused with the Program approach as a topic of its own. This could be done through more learning exchanges between Program partners, but also through gathering experiences from other NGOs, organisations, institutions etc. regionally and globally. This should also lead to better learning procedures, documentation, internal and external reporting and sharing of experiences. The training in the use of social media and other media-skills during the first phase and the Program Advocacy Strategy are envisaged to contribute to more focused and effective public awareness campaigns and increased and/or more active memberships. Partners are expected to be more strategic and visible in their advocacy. The CISU funded project for building capacity for biodiversity mainstreaming which is also implemented with the 3 Program partners is expected to also support this.

More attention on inclusiveness and equity is important both on gender perspectives and in ensuring that all segments of the target groups are reached with the Program activities, including specifically address those that are most difficult to involve by using alternative methods/strategies. More cooperation with women organisations and networks could be a way forward to increase engagement of women in advocacy and decision making. Another key concern is to build-in activities to ensure institutional capacity of government stakeholders (e.g. districts, counties and national level parastatals) to ensure fulfilment of their role as duty bearers to ensure sustainability.

Partner portfolio:

In the programme countries key partners will continue to be the three local Bird Life organisations, and by further developing the programme approach the aim is to cultivate synergies in regard to participatory forest management and joint learning opportunities among the three core partners: **Nature Kenya** is a registered membership-based NGO based in Nairobi and with a membership of over 1000. The NGO has 51 employees, comprised of 20 full-time core and 31 project contract employees. **Nature Uganda** is a registered membership organisation with over 3000 members and 30 employees, a secretariat in Kampala and four branches offices across Uganda. **Bird Conservation Nepal (BCN)** is a registered membership based organisation with 700 members and 20 employees.

Alignment with BirdLife International will be continued:

BirdLife International. BirdLife International's Secretariat is based in Cambridge, UK, with 6 regional secretariat offices around the world. The Program will closely liaise with Bird Life International's secretariat in Cambridge, Nairobi and Singapore to ensure that the Program and BirdLife's overall strategic approaches are coherent and mutually supportive in order to benefit from the capacity and resources within BirdLife. The alignment between DOF and BLI has been considerably enhanced by DOF staff Charlotte Mathiassen's part time secondment to the BirdLife Secretariat since December 2016.

Budget reduction:

The current slash of 40% in the funding ceiling in the CISU Program modality seems currently unavoidable, although it depends on how CISU and Danida/MoFA agrees to phase-in the larger NGOs that doesn't qualify

for an agreement directly with Danida/MoFA into the CISU Program modality. Therefore, the Program is currently operating with the 40% slash as a given fact that necessitates a similar reduction of 40% on the total phase 2 Program budget. The cuts on the budget will mean that all redundant activities on all three Components will be removed. As has been pointed out above, the volume of support to Component 1 (particularly capacity building) will be slimmed, IGAs in Component 2 will have to be cut substantially, focused and probably channelled through savings and loans groups and cooperatives. Moreover, the likelihood of phasing out 1-2 program sites will be considered if the above doesn't get the budget sufficiently down. The 'luxury' of having the 'Not planned activities' budgetline could also be sacrificed, also depending on whether the CISU Program Budget format remains the same.

The budget reduction is a sensitive issue as it demands that the partners will experience the cut down differently. This will be one of the discussion points at the PMC workshop in Uganda 28. February-3. March.

2. Objective

The review cum appraisal aims at providing information about lessons learned in the previous phase programme with a view to improving future activities. In dialogue with the programme stakeholders a review of the progress made in the previous programme phase and a pre-appraisal of the proposed new programme phase outline/elements will be conducted. The review cum appraisal will take point of departure in lessons learned identified by *the programme organisation* (refer to "Programme status report year 2" document and Programme status report year 1).

The consultant will:

- Assess the current programme phase performance and identify and qualify key lessons learned (those mentioned in the Programme Status report year 2 as well as those identified during the review itself).
- Pre-appraise the proposed new programme phase outline/elements and provide recommendations on changes required in order to improve or change future strategies and activities.

3. Output/rapport

3.1 Debriefing note

A debriefing note will be presented when concluding the field visit.

3.2 Debriefing workshop

A debriefing workshop in Denmark presenting main findings and recommendations to programme organisation and CISU. The final report reflects inputs given during the workshop.

3.3 Report (max 15-20 pages)

A combined review cum appraisal-report which recommends whether the proposed programme should be supported by CSF or not, and which reflects lessons learned and recommendations for future activities.

4. Scope of work

The ToR for the review cum appraisal should include, but not necessarily be limited to the following elements. The ToR must be adjusted to reflect issues of significance to the applicant organisation and the programme. If one or more elements are left out of the final ToR proposed, it should be justified.

4.1 Review of programme phase 1:

Overall performance and strategic approach

Applicant organisation:

- assess how follow up on the capacity assessment has taken place as part of the programme – including organisational structure and management, professional capacity, role as civil society actor in Denmark, networking and international affiliations.
- Assess the follow up on the capacity assessment, incl. the follow up on the CISU monitoring visit 2016 plus recommendations.

Contextual developments, programme implementation and results:

- assess the contextual developments and how they have accommodated by the programme. Assess the progress made towards the achievement of programme phase 1 results at objective and output levels, including how it is relating to the Danida Civil Society Policy.

Programme strategy and synergy:

- assess the appropriateness of the programme strategy and how it is relating to the Danida Civil Society Policy.
- Assess the programme synergy, including coherence between programme components;
- Assess the approach to empowering local CSOs and approaches to improved livelihoods (component 2+3), including the extent to which the components cohere and reinforce each other

In the case of *DOF*, the review of the overall performance and strategic approach is in particular to focus on:

- Steering of the Program: In the opinion of Program partners the PMC set up works well. The PMC allows all partners to have equal opportunities for influencing and planning the Program.
- Capacity, skills and resources of partners: How does the Consultant estimate the capacity and resources of the partners?
- Inclusiveness and equity: To which extent is the Program able to address inequity and gender issues and to ensure that women, poor, indigenous peoples etc. are sufficiently benefiting from and involved in the Program?
- Local Conservation Groups/Site Support Groups/Forest User Groups and other CSGs: How has the Program contributed to build the organisational strength and independence of these groups and to ensure enhanced capacity, participation and equity between the members.
- The preparation of the Program (baselines, strategies etc.): How has it contributed to a more strategic programmatic approach, better cooperation and a knowledge based approach to implementation
- On this basis assess the overall programme approach and include reflections on the theory of change of the programme, with a view to more explicitly including a ToC in a subsequent phase of the programme.

Partnership approach and local ownership

Partnership approach– assess how cooperation with partners has taken place, including the functioning of a programme management/coordination body, shared responsibility and accountability, the capacity of *the programme organisation* to provide technical support to its partners and the added value contributed by *the programme organisation* to the activities and/or the partners, and south-south interactions.

Local ownership: assess the participants/target groups and how their relation to the programme has played out. Assess the degree of ownership felt by participants/target groups as regards relevant programme components and to what extent they have been actively and meaningfully involved.

In the case of *DOF* the review of the partnership approach and local ownership is in particular to focus on:

- Stakeholder involvement: Have the most important stakeholders been sufficiently involved and benefit from the Program (e.g. training), have all important stakeholders been involved and have partners based their choice of stakeholders on a sufficient stakeholder analysis?
- assessing joint programme management and the function of the Programme Coordination Committee and how this could be enhanced (see also above).
- Assess the capacity of Bird Life Nepal as a new partner to the programme
- Assess the role of BirdLife International and how membership of an international affiliation, including the role of *DOF* in the affiliation, has contributed to the programme

Quality assurance plus monitoring and evaluation approach

Follow up on capacity assessment: Assess how *the programme organisation* has taken account of recommendations regarding the programme made in the capacity assessment.

M&E plus learning approach in relation to programme phase 1: Assess how *the programme organisation* and partners have approached monitoring and learning, including M&E systems, systematization of experience and knowledge management approaches (data and information collection, management and dissemination) and how/to what extent this has contributed to the development of the programme.

In the case of *DOF* the review of the quality assurance and M&E approach is in particular to focus on:

- assessing utilization of the Monitoring and Evaluation Manual developed in December 2013 by partners (local application)
- Assess the follow up on the Assessment Committee recommendation on carefully to consider how best to strengthen the systematic learning and documentation related to the results of the IGAs (refer to Assessment Committee note 14-1574-PR-dec DOF)
- assessing relevance of indicators and milestones.
- assessing reliability of data and identification of collection of supportive data.
- assessing basis for developing a M&E approach that includes an more explicit Theory of change, and a focus on reporting at outcome level.

Sustainability

Programme sustainability and long-term impact:

- assess the appropriateness of the programme sustainability (politically, organisationally, socially, technically, financially and environmentally), and assess to what extent the proposed lasting improvements are still valid.
- assess the state of the country specific plans for phasing out, as outlined in the original programme document and in light of the reduced budget for phase 2.
- assess the various sustainability aspects, incl. how to secure national ownership/institutionalization of the programme achievements in the specific countries of operation.

In the case of *DOF* the review of sustainability is in particular to focus on:

- assessing the sustainability effect of programme in terms of enhancement of improved livelihood for target groups
- assessing the sustainability effect of programme in terms of advocacy capacity within BirdLife partners - and relevance of link to BirdLife International

Budget and cost-effectiveness:

Budget and financial management: assess to what extent follow-up on capacity assessment observations/recommendations in regard to financial management has taken place.

Cost-effectiveness:

- assess the reasonability of the relationship between programme costs and results. Assess whether the programme has provided value for money, by comparison with similar programmes in the same country/region, and by assessing the programme's own cost structure.
- assess the cost-effectiveness of the partners (in view of the cost of local operation and investments).

The consultant will present findings on programme achievements and key learning based on the review of the programme phase 1.

4.2 Pre-Appraisal:

The pre-appraisal of the outline/elements of the proposed new programme phase is to be based on the review of key learning in phase 1 (= TOR 4.1) and the planned application in the new phase as described by the applicant in the annex ““Programme status report year 2” document”. The pre-appraisal will assess the feasibility and consider the appropriateness of the proposed outline/elements of the new phase. The pre-appraisal will provide the basis for the development of the programme document, providing that a new phase is to be recommended. The pre-appraisal will to the extent possible consider the number 2-5 assessment criteria for programmes:

Assessment of the partnership:

- Technical and financial capacities
- Ownership of the programme
- Potential for development of the partnership, including how the partners, incl. BirdLife International, and their roles and respective value added could evolve - in light of the programme being in its second phase and the budget cuts.
- assess to what extent the programme is conceived in tandem with DOF's work in Denmark and how this can be further enhanced.
- In light of the advice given by the assessment committee when approving phase I of the programme the cost effectiveness of the partners will also be assessed.

Assessment of target groups/participants and their relation to the intervention:

- Target group participation and empowerment
- Involvement of key stakeholders including duty bearers in programme establishment

Assessment of the programme's coherence, relevance and expected results:

- In relation to application of Right based /advocacy methods for promoting integrated livelihood and conservation
- Program sites: In view of the much lower budget an assessment of whether to phase out some sites or cut down considerably on support.
- Relevance of strategy in relation to natural resource management on community/household level.
- Summary of results to be achieved – subdivided into results for partners with previous Danida funding and partners included for the first time in this program
- Assess the extent to which the programme empowers poor and vulnerable groups and improve their conditions, and recommend how this focus can be enhanced.
- Relevance of program indicators for a new phase
- To what extent the planned programme is “more of the same”, and what constitutes progression.
- Are Programme phases well demarcated and with an explicit exit strategy, reflecting strategies on institutionalization and developments in participatory forest management in the countries of operation.

Assessment of the programme's sustainability:

- On partner level: how will national partners and BirdLife be able to carry out their role as advocates for conservations and improved livelihood
- On community level: how will Local Civil society groups be able to sustain their work on improved livelihood and advocacy
- Assess whether plans for phasing out programme support are planned in a manner where local partners or target groups are not left in an unfortunate position of dependency when the programme period expires.

Assessment of the programme's cost-effectiveness:

- Appraise the cost-effectiveness in terms of budget size and partner portfolio (countries of implementation)
- assessing to what extent budget reduction (budget size) would affect cost- effectiveness and how this possibly can be mitigated in the new phase (size of partner folio, prioritization, etc.).
- How can a program budget reduction best be implemented. Reductions in partners/program-countries or reductions in activity level and or number of sites
- Can matching funding be a realistic possibility for DOF and partners to pursue?

Based on the above, the consultant will present the appraisal of the proposed new programme phase outline/elements in the form of an overview summarizing conclusions in relation to the six criteria's in the CISU Guideline for Programmes, and relevant needed recommend changes required in order to improve or change future strategies and activities.

5. Method

The review cum appraisal will combine work in Denmark and a field visit to a selected programme country/region. Involvement of additional southern partners can be done either via phone/skype.

The field visit will include:

- A 8-10 day travel to a selected programme country/region
- it will involve two or more core partners

5.1 Document analysis

- List all relevant documents

5.2 Group and individual interviews with relevant stakeholders

Should at least include:

- *The programme organisation* BoD, staff and/or volunteers
- Relevant networking partners
- Relevant CISU staff
- Responsible CISU assessment consultant

5.3 Field visit:

List core activities:

- Interviews with partners at both operational (secretariat) and political level (BoD)
- Workshop
- Debriefing meeting/workshop

5.4 Debriefing workshop

A debriefing workshop presenting main findings and recommendations to *the programme organisation* and CISU

6. Team

External consultant Martin Enghoff (NORDECO)

7. Governance and management of the review cum appraisal

CISU is the commissioner of the review cum appraisal and the CISU management is responsible for contracting issues, for signing off TOR and the final approval of the review cum appraisal report.

The appointed CISU advisor is responsible for briefing the consultant about the task and the day to day administration and arrangements.

The CISU assessment consultant involved will be invited to comment on both TOR and draft report.

8. Time schedule

16 working days including field visit.

Table 4: Proposed time schedule for Review cum Appraisal:

Date	Task:	Participants involved
6.3 – 10.3.2017	Documents/ Desk review and preparation, incl. ToR finalization (2 days)	Consultant / CISU/ DOF
13.3	Meeting with DOF in DK (0,5 day)	Consultant/DOF

Date	Task:	Participants involved
14.3	Travelling to Uganda (1 day)	
15.3-19.3	Meetings and field visits in Uganda (5 days)	Consultant/NU
20.3-21.3	Meetings in Kenya (2 days)	Consultant / NK
22.3	Travel to DK (1 day)	
23.3	Skype meeting with BCN, follow up meeting DOF , debriefing note (1 day)	Consultant/DOF/BCN
24.3	Debriefing workshop (0,5 day)	DOF/CISU/Consultant
27.3-31.3	Draft review/appraisal report (2 days)	Consultant
3.4	Draft report delivered	
10.4	Comments to Draft report	BirdLife partners and DOF
13.4	Submission of final draft (1 day)	Consultant

9. Annexes:

Obligatory annexes:

- Programme document phase 1
- Assessment Committee Note (phase 1)
- Programme Status Reports
- Budget status
- Track record document (compiled by CISU)
- Programme Midterm Status document
- Previous reviews, capacity assessments, evaluations etc.
- Organizational strategy