Securing rights and restoring land:

midterm evaluation Jordan

Securing rights and restoring land: midterm evaluation Jordan

June 24th – 28th

Summary

Work in Jordan to strengthen rights and restore lands has taken a major stride over the past one year, after a slow start to the project implementation in 2010. The team has focused on building relationships between project partners, building capacities for participatory planning between communities and government, strengthening community confidence and trust, and identifying locally acceptable solutions to securing rights and strengthening governance. As a result four villages within the study sites have reached agreement over protecting grazing lands through the traditional Al Hima system and have identified and excluded small parcels of land temporarily from grazing. Some sites have now been protected for approximately one year and are showing signs of improvement through increased vegetative cover and diversity.

Many lessons have been learned, but overall the results are impressive and show significant promise. The national TV station has run a 30 minute documentary on the project work in Jordan. The Ministry of Agriculture is planning to revise its national rangelands strategy in order to build on the 'securing rights and restoring lands for improved livelihoods' local governance approach. There remains a gap in terms of technical advice – the new governance arrangements open up new opportunities for rangeland improvements and IUCN should bring more expertise to bear in this field

now. There is now an increased drive to communicate lessons and results, and to scale-up the entire project approaches and the revival of Al Hima in other parts of the country as well as regionally.

Delays in access to project funds have slowed down implementation in early 2012 and IUCN must improve the speed of its financial reporting. IUCN must also clarify the current partnership arrangements in order to clarify co-finance matters, particularly in regards to the Jordanian Organic Society for Farmers (JOSF). Monitoring processes must now focus on methods for partners to track progress in governance, and how partners make linkages in governance changes to long term improvements in livelihoods and environmental conditions. A key evaluation outcome has been recognised and emphasised as the need for effective communication by IUCN, on the unique opportunities as well as challenges faced while conducting governance work. In particular that governance work, although slow to deliver tangible results in the short-term, has high value, long-term and large-scale benefits to be obtained by adopting a patient approach, low on cost, but highly demanding on time, human resources and monitoring.

Introduction and approach for the evaluation

This evaluation was conducted in accordance with European Commission expectations, to evaluate the progress of the project in Jordan (as part of a wider four-country evaluation). During the evaluation period, wider issues were explored – treating the EC project as a component of a longer-term initiative (Al Hima) that is emerging in Jordan.

The evaluation was conducted in an approach that complemented ongoing community-based participatory approaches that project partners and communities were familiar with. Participatory approaches were also used to ensure ownership by communities/partners, and allow the participants to reflect on participatory plans made in the previous two years.

The evaluation focused on the following five major issues (see Annex 1 for more detailed Terms of Reference):

1. Review progress in the implementation of project activities – are partners delivering according to the EC requirements? Are they on track to complete the project in the allotted time?
2. Review progress towards the project goals and objectives (review activities against the theory of change) – how are our activities taking us towards our objectives? What assumptions is the project making and how do they stand up to scrutiny?
3. Review of challenges – what challenges are being overcome? What challenges still need to be resolved, and what modifications to the project will this require? What lessons should be learned about project design based on these challenges?
4. How effective is the project monitoring strategy? What lessons is the project yielding so far and what more monitoring and evaluation is required?
5. What is already known about the next steps after this project is implemented? What follow up activities are needed and what are the fund raising priorities?

The evaluation consisted of a day with the IUCN project team identifying delivery challenges and updating on overall progress and constraints; a day with project partners and community delegates to evaluate project progress and also to demonstrate the participatory evaluation methodology to the participants; two days repeating the evaluation process in the project sites; a final day with

project partners to reflect on lessons and ways forward. The two days spent at the project sites included both field visits and community workshops, each of approximately 4 hours.

The workshop methodology was highly participatory in order to draw on reflections of community members and partners. The basic methodology (which is outlined in more detail in Annex 2) consisted of two steps:

1. Discussion and agreement over the overarching vision and broad aims of the initiative (thinking further ahead than the limits of this project);
    a. Part 1 focused on the larger ambitions of the project in order to shift attention away from delivery of outputs and towards how the overall implementation process contributes to long-term ambitions such as empowerment, governance, self-sufficiency etc.
    b. Part 1 also gave a good insight into how the project goals and objectives are understood by different participants.
2. Discussion and analysis of progress in implementing activities and how they contribute to achieving the overall vision.
    a. The discussion with project partners focused more on activities as defined by the project, whereas the community discussion focused on the activities they had prioritised through their Community Environmental Management Planning (CEMPs) processes.

Finally each meeting closed with an open discussion around relationships, identified changes and what happens in the future (questions of sustainability).

A short overview of the project

The basic challenge that the project is attempting to address is the degradation of the rangelands that provide the primary productive resource for Jordan's livestock keepers, many of whom are marginalised and face a number of development challenges. Many factors have contributed to the degradation of this resource, including policies to intensify livestock production, restrictions on mobility, competing industrial and agricultural demand for water resources, and political marginalisation of livestock keepers, such as the Bedouin. Possibly the most profound factor has been the nationalisation of land that has undermined customary arrangements for managing land. The result is that traditional practices of protecting rangelands and maintaining seasonal patterns of grazing, fundamental to rangeland ecology, no longer operate.

The project will address this challenge by securing rights as a platform for improved governance and better application of sustainable land management practices. The project has established dialogue over governance solutions within communities, and between communities and government: specifically the Ministry of Agriculture through the Department of Rangelands. The intention is to identify opportunities for securing rights that are both legally and culturally acceptable and which will enable sustainable management of resources. The project is attempting to revive the Al Hima system, which is a traditional land management practice with conservation benefits that is known throughout the Arab speaking world with strong cultural and religious acceptability.

The project approaches governance through a strong participatory approach that is designed to bring all stakeholders into dialogue to find mutually acceptable solutions to their perceived

problems. The process of dialogue is at the heart of everything in the project: it is used to define activities, to establish partnerships, to find legal solutions over land disputes, and to identify and address policy gaps or barriers. The individual solutions differ in each case, and communities are supported to identify locally-acceptable opportunities. The four villages and their specific solutions are summarised as follows:

1. **Bani Hashem:** The community (supported by their governorate) has identified 1500 hectares of official forest land that they have described as "the last green area" in the rapidly industrialising Zarqa river basin. Negotiations between the Bani Hashem community and the Department of Rangelands, involving the prime minister's office were carried out to provide the community with the right to manage the lands as rangelands. Approval was given to the community to manage the 1500 Ha on the condition that the government maintained some control and management was successful. Bani Hashem has developed a local tribal law, called "Mathak Sharaf", to help enforce the new land management system by restricting grazing. Mathak Sharaf has been approved by the governor and strengthened through the support of the local police who can help enforce the law. The Ministry of agriculture has established a community group to take the process forward (the CBO is called Hima Bani Hashem).

2. **Duleil:** Duleil means "shade" in Arabic, an indicator of the once heavily forested area, now largely devoid of trees. After a community exchange visit Duleil community members have agreed to stop cultivating an area of approximately 100 hectares initially, to allow vegetative regeneration and provide livestock fodder. Atriplex seedlings were provided by the government to demarcate the boundary (atriplex is not a good fence, but it is an indigenous plant that thrives in these drylands).

3. **Halabat:** The community identified a significant area of land that is currently owned by the Ministry of Tourism and Antiquities. They have negotiated with the department to have access to the land and to manage it in order to demonstrate improvements through livestock keeping (the land is currently idle and heavily degraded through lack of management). They will integrate management of this area with the management of adjacent areas in order to create a larger buffer zone of environmental rehabilitation.

4. **Hashmiyah:** a government project (through JOSF – a project partner) was designed to rehabilitate a state-owned forest (note – dryland forests such as these are open canopy rangeland-forests that provide important livestock forage). However, after the work began the community demanded JOSF adopt IUCN's approach to conferring rights to the community. JOSF finally accepted the terms and has given the community access to 50 hectares as a trial to demonstrate that they have the capacity to restrict access, to manage and to restore the rangelands but on the condition that if they are not capable the land is taken back into government care.

Project Success

Overall the project in Jordan shows remarkable progress through consultation and negotiation undertaken during the early phases of the project. Some sceptical government departments (e.g. Departments of Forestry and Antiquities) are already softening their stance and see that communities have a strong capacity to manage natural resources communally. Overall the **general acceptance of the project approach by the Ministry of Agriculture**, and the changing attitudes in

other ministries, are one of the most important outcomes of the project and are key to the overall success.

Community relations have changed, both within and between communities, through the dialogue processes. The communities have acted upon majority of the solutions they identified, an indication that internal dialogue has been constructive and solutions oriented. Similarly, the dynamic between communities has become more constructive. During the evaluation workshop with Bani Hashem and Hashmiyah, the Hashmiyah community stated that they were waiting to do more work until the government or another partner repaired a traditional water point. In riposte the Bani Hashem community said they were proud that they were achieving all their results alone and they were not waiting for anybody's support. This dynamic is very healthy and there is a sense of pride developing around the ability of each community to overcome their own challenges.

Gender relations have changed substantially during the project, with some actions implemented by women, but increasing scope for men and women to collaborate on natural resource management. The Bedouin communities have strong customs that have prohibited interaction between men and women in public fora, but this appears to be breaking down. During the Duleil and Halabat workshop, the Halabat women joined the Duleil group (which is dominated by women), since they are not permitted to interact in the public discussions with their own men. At this meeting the men from Halabat requested the women to join them, which was noted to be an important achievement.

The establishment of 4 hima sites is a major achievement, although two of the sites are very new and it remains to be seen if they can establish regulations. Nevertheless, the Bani Hashem and Duleil sites have been established for a year now and already show signs of increased vegetation cover. It may take a long time to demonstrate direct links to livelihood improvement, but in the meantime communities are benefiting from the encouragement of their own success and empowerment. Importantly, in the community discussions, many participants identified environmental goals as part of their vision – it was notable that income and economic goals were not the only motivations for land rehabilitation. Whilst Bani Hashem shows the most obvious evidence of improved vegetation as a result of creating the Al Hima site, Duleil has already seen an increase in the presence of partridge, and is hopeful that the Hima site will soon become a favourable partridge nesting site again. This may bring its own dividends and the project will explore opportunities for revenue generation in relation with this environmental service. However, shot-gun cartridges at the site indicate that partridge hunting may need to be controlled if the partridge were to nest at the site without being extirpated.

Relations between communities and government have markedly improved and this is one feature that is most motivating for both community members and government extension officers involved in the project. Several community members remarked on how they now saw the government in a more positive light as a service provider and as an institution that is more responsive to their needs. Government staff noted that they had gained respect for the capacity of the communities to work towards their own solutions and had found a number of common goals on which they could work together.

Motivation of government increased dramatically during the project, from being generally sceptical of the proposed governance approach to now championing the approach. The Government of Jordan intends to revise its national rangelands strategy and has requested IUCN support (under this

EC project) to revise the strategy so that it incorporates Al Hima as a management approach. This creates a good entry point for IUCN to achieve project objectives related to policy change. The Director of Rangelands has also expressed his motivation to see this project succeed, to see new initiative take off from where this one finishes, and to ensure other initiatives adopt the 'IUCN' approach. This has already been achieved by insisting that JSOF – a government agency – adopts IUCN's approach. The Director of Rangelands also highlighted the skills that are needed to do the work well and the current lack of such skills in government – such capacity development was recommended as a vital component of future scale up.

An example of government motivation is a basic rangeland flora assessment conducted in the project sites by the Department of Rangelands as a baseline for the project, (currently being translated by IUCN to publish on the website). This flora assessment has identified indigenous plants in the project site and their uses: a number of the plants have grazing or medicinal value, however it does not include all non-palatable or non-medicinal plant species.

Challenges

The project has identified a number of challenges that are emerging as the partners gain experience in the approach. Underlying implementation challenges appear to be few and the greater challenges lie in capturing and communicating the real outcomes of the work.

Monitoring and evaluation is a critical challenge, because it is difficult to accomplish but also because it is vitally important to demonstrate to everybody involved in the project what is really changing. The significant changes are in relationships and behaviour and these can only be captured in a highly qualitative sense. The communities and government staff who participate in the project are keenly aware of such changes and it is important to capture and communicate their testimony. Monitoring higher level impacts will be challenging through this project. It is our expectation that the higher level impacts will be profound because they will be built on strong and durable governance, but such impacts will take several more years to fully manifest. In the meantime IUCN must grapple with the challenge of tracking the incremental changes that will lead to long term impact and must carefully evaluate the assumptions that are made about the link between outcomes and impacts. To this end the project's Theory of Change (already completed) and monitoring strategy (being drafted) are critical to successful communication and adaptive management.

A challenge will be faced in moving from governance to livelihood outcomes and IUCN must strengthen the technical input it provides to the project. Strengthened governance has demonstrated, through the exclusion areas and the improved levels of consultation and participation, the potential to achieve significant environmental improvements. Communities are demonstrating what they are capable of using their local and indigenous knowledge. However, there are also important lessons that can be drawn from published sources in the fields of environmental science and rangeland/dryland ecology, as well as from other experiences around the world, that need to be brought to bear on the project sites – through appropriate fora or exchange visits. For example, advances in rangelands management and using livestock as a tool for land rehabilitation will provide great opportunities for innovation in Jordan. IUCN presented some work on rangelands management during the partners meeting (day 2 of the evaluation) and a representative from the Royal Jordanian Botanical Gardens pointed out that they are researching similar issues and are

interested in collaborating on this project. IUCN should tap into this opportunity and others in order to accelerate rangeland improvements.

Similarly more effort is required in building income generating opportunities on the rangelands improvements. Communities showed a number of medicinal plants that have recovered during the first year of protection and plans should be taken forward to improve marketing and sustainable management of these resources. We recommend funds to be allocated towards processing facilities (e.g. making tea bags for infusions of medicinal plants like *Artemesia herba alba*).

Community dialogue and mediating in conflict is a major challenge that will always be part of this type of governance work. It takes unique skills, and the successes in Jordan are testimony to two or three dedicated staff from within the project partnership as well as the dedication of a small number of key community members. The staff noted their genuine fear of land conflicts as they embarked on the work and have identified the reduction in hostilities as an important indicator of change and growing trust. The Director of rangelands also noted this challenge and highlighted the importance of carefully selecting and training the right people to ensure such work continues to escalate. Overall however partners have reported growing trust and willingness to confront and discuss land issues without fear that all such discussion automatically will lead to loss of land rights. An important lesson is that, given these understandable fears, community-to-community experience sharing (e.g. through exchange visits) is an important way to initiate the governance dialogue. In this regard, success should breed success as more opportunities for such dialogue are established.

Multistakeholder approval is essential to the long term success of this initiative, and local governance arrangements are initially fragile and could be undone by one non-cooperative investment from government or an international donor. However, all stakeholders have their goals and objectives and may be resistant to aligning their plans with those of the community. It is important to invest significant time and energy in building partnerships and gaining trust between all stakeholders (including international NGOs). A useful approach is to ensure that the community plans are truly owned by the community and represented as community plans, rather than the plans of the implementing agency (in this case IUCN or AWO). This can be challenging given the demands of each agency to see its brand or logo on all outputs. However, IUCN should continue to promote the community plans on behalf of the community and insist that new initiatives and investments respect and adhere (as far as possible) to the community-based process.

Flexibility is also an essential part of the governance approach, and is sometimes challenging given the need to adhere to pre-determined project plans. However, there has been value in being able to demonstrate to government and the community that IUCN is responsive: a key dimension of good governance. An example is the insistence of the government that IUCN add another site for the sake of local acceptability. Although this was outside the project plan it was felt important to respond to the government desires to show a collaborative and responsive spirit.

Patience and time are required to build relationships and there are concerns that the demand to deliver project outputs could encourage partners to move too fast for the communities. IUCN's slow pace of implementation in the first two years reflects the patient approach that has been taken and it is clear that, since community agreements have been reached solid foundations have been created for rapid implementation of follow on activities. Nevertheless, follow on projects must be designed

to allow continued dialogue and partners should avoid projects that demand rapid implementation on the ground.

Financial reporting has been the principal challenge in this project and has led to delay in implementation during 2012. The 2010 financial audit took 8 months to complete and therefore the 2011 funds did not arrive until mid-year 2012. However, work has resumed after a short delay and it is hoped that the 2011 report will be submitted more smoothly so that 2012 funds will arrive in good time. Specific training has been provided to the Jordanian finance officer to comply with EC regulations and ongoing support is now being provided from IUCN's Brussels office. Furthermore, IUCN has instituted 3-monthly reporting to identify reporting errors in advance of the annual report which is expected to speed up reporting in future.

Project Lessons

Lessons for the Jordanian Component Project

Specific lessons and recommendations to the Jordanian project partners for strengthening their initiative.

Improve financial reporting. The coordination unit should give greater support to Jordan to speed up financial reporting processes. Measures have already been taken to improve reporting, including translating all receipts as they are received and preparing quarterly reports to the coordination unit so that anomalies can be addressed sooner.

Improve narrative reporting. The coordination unit recommends changing the style of reporting so that project logic and coherence is more evident. A revised reporting format will be used in future so that the project can report according to its own rationale first and then convert reports into specific EC formats as required. This will minimise overlap and misleading information since many activities contribute to multiple objectives.

Strengthen the provision of technical guidance on environmental management and rangelands management. In particular it is recommended to use the Al Hima approach to pioneer rangeland management practices that use herbivore impacts as a tool for better water and nutrient cycling. It is also recommended to monitor such approaches closely and communicate their benefits, and to use the EC project component on economic valuation to demonstrate the value of traditional herding and land management practices.

Specifics in project sites:

1. Bani Hashem – recommend to work on a rangelands management plan and conduct action research into rangelands management approaches that favour rehabilitation of the land. Recommend to invite the Royal Jordanian Botanical Society to advise on herd management strategies, including the use of penning animals on rangelands to concentrate manure/seeds on degraded patches and use of intensive short-term grazing practices. The flora assessment could be expanded to include a greater range of productive and non-productive plants to give a stronger baseline. As Bani Hashem is the most advanced site it is important to now identify ways to translate improved environmental condition into either improvements in

livelihoods or other economic incentives for sustained good governance. However, it is also recommended to avoid an overt focus on material benefits and support the community communicate the non-material values that they derive from the environmental improvements.

2. Duleil – the community should be supported to develop a rangelands management plan that is based on controlled livestock grazing. Recommend that the government also conduct a Biodiversity assessment (e.g. flora assessment, bird or wildlife assessment) to help establish indicators for monitoring. As with Bani Hashem, identify economic incentives for sustained good governance and also develop non-material incentives, including through communication around improvements in biodiversity.

3. Halabat – recommend developing a rangelands management that integrates the land owned by the Department of Antiquities with the wider environment. Monitor environmental improvements on the Department of Antiquities land using visual evidence to demonstrate the value of improved management. Open dialogue with the Department of Antiquities to gauge their interest in the environmental condition and its value for encouraging tourism.

4. Hashmiyah – finalise the basic agreement over land rights and governance arrangements and work to maintain good relations with JOSF. JOSF may be defensive now, but they are also important for scaling up the work nationally. Recommend to develop future activities to build the capacity of their staff for strengthening governance.

Lessons for wider consumption

These lessons are drawn from the project evaluation and should be shared with other projects to help strengthen their approach. They should also inform future initiatives in relation to dryland governance by IUCN and other partners.

Government collaboration is crucial. It is important to work within the existing legal framework, but it is also possible to create precedents where the legal framework is unclear (which may often be the case). Working with government to achieve this is much more likely to be successful and reduce the risk of political conflict. Government staff may be fully aware of the shortcomings of existing policy and can be powerful advocates of change.

Explicitly focus on strengthening community relationships. This was not an intentional goal of the project, but was one of the earliest outcomes and has been critical to the success of the project. This is both through improved opportunity for negotiation (within communities) and improved dialogue for learning and inspiration between communities.

Strengthen gender equity. Equity is an important principle of good governance. Whilst the evaluation cannot say definitively that gender equity is an absolute requirement for success, the following observations can be made:

- It is evident that promoting the role of women in the project has not been harmful and has not impeded progress;
- Promoting the role of women is likely to have reduced the risk of entrenching inequity through governance work;
- Promoting the role of women has contributed to wider women's empowerment which will bring additional benefits.

Spend time and resources on stakeholder engagement. Although this is time consuming and expends a lot of energy, multi-stakeholder engagement is another key to success. Many partners collaborating to achieve the same ends will have a much greater combined impact than those same partners striving for different goals, or taking divergent approaches. The implication is that the underlying "good governance" that is established cannot be owned by one institution (in this case IUCN under the EC project). It should be owned by the community and they should be supported to insist that all development partners respect and support the rules and regulations. Evidently this requires intensive negotiation since many development partners will have established plans and expectations.

Flexibility in implementation of activities is vital, and is related to the previous point. All development partners must respect governance principles and this means being responsive and consultative. This principle fails if the development partner has a pre-ordained plan that they are obliged to adhere to. Project activities should be designed in such a way as to allow adequate flexibility and to be determined and driven by community plans.

Allocate sufficient resources to negotiation and relationship-building: do not dismiss workshops and planning meetings as trivial and unnecessary, but rather see them as integral and fundamental components of strengthening governance. The result is that it is possible to achieve striking outcomes at low overall cost, but with a high demand on human resource capacity (skills as well as time, staff as well as communities). The current project design, with its significant space for CEMPing (Community Environmental Management Planning), illustrates how planning can be an integral project component or objective rather than a precursor to project delivery.

Monitoring of behavioural change is essential but challenging. The outcomes of good governance are changes in attitude and practice, and this is expected to lead to long-term sustainable desired changes in terms of real impacts. Outcome-mapping approaches are strongly recommended to track changes in relationships between different stakeholders and have been initiated through the Theory of Change exercise (see annex to this report). Short-term reliance on impact indicators is discouraged as it is likely to push interventions towards immediate deliverables with no regard for process and sustainability.

Give greater priority to high-quality monitoring of such complex process-based initiatives. In future all initiatives should allocate greater resources for monitoring and see monitoring and evaluation as part of the participatory process rather than an extractive assessment – monitoring of governance can be part of an adaptive management strategy used by communities and other local partners. Ideally monitoring tools should be designed and implemented at project inception and the project should conduct an appropriate and thorough baseline which are then built upon and revisited at the end of projects to analyse the change in both quantitative and qualitative means. However, in reality the process of implementing good governance is highly informative and difficult to predict and therefore monitoring strategies must be flexible and responsive and must change iteratively during the project.

Give greater priority to monitoring environmental indicators. Indicators of ecosystem change and changes in species diversity can be highly informative of underlying governance improvements. They also address a major motive of participating communities: this evaluation demonstrated that economic motives are not the sole driver of participation. At project inception a biodiversity

monitoring strategy should be established that can be repeated on a biannual basis to take into account seasonality. Community members can devise and adopt the monitoring techniques with technical support, and continue to use it as a tool to measure how effective their management practices are into the future.

Build capacities and sensitivity for strengthening governance. People that can work effectively with communities often make it look simple, whilst other people are unable to grasp even basic concepts: a lot of the difference is down to the character and values of the individual and this is difficult to 'build', as noted by the Director of Rangelands. Nevertheless, a concerted effort to build awareness of governance and to identify partners or staff with the relevant aptitudes is essential and can help to demonstrate how a governance-approach works. Government extension staff can play a major role in shifting attitudes within their own institutions.

Ensure that improved governance leads to valued impacts, even in the relative short-term. Although short-term impacts can be risky if they encourage short-cuts that evade appropriate governance processes, communities also need to see genuine improvements in a realistic space of time. However, this does not necessarily mean economic benefits. The evaluators were struck by the number of community members that cited environmental improvements as their motivation for engaging in the project. Having said this, it is also important to demonstrate economic incentives and to ensure that economic improvements do not undermine governance, for example through unsustainable extraction or inequitable opportunities.

Recommendations

The lessons outlined above should be captured at different levels in the project. The following recommendations summarise the lesson and suggest where they can be addressed.

Project delivery

1. Speed up financial reporting by:
    a. Adopting all recommendations from the 2010 audit;
    b. Translating all receipts from Arabic into English when they are submitted;
    c. Submit interim financial reports to the coordination unit during the course of the year so that verification can be made sooner
    d. Provide greater direct support from coordination unit during annual reporting window.
2. Seek clarity on the JOSF partnership from the EC to ensure that co-finance obligations are met.
3. Simplify the narrative reporting procedure to avoid losing the message. We recommend to submit a narrative report according to the project rationale rather than the framework logic (which disaggregate activities). Then translate this into the activity-based report according to donor specifications, but maintaining the cohesion of the original report.

Project strategy

1. Sustainability could be ensured through national scale up. We recommend to continue to prioritise supporting the government to revise its national rangelands strategy. To this end we strongly recommend maintaining a strong partnership with government, and giving them a strong role in future evaluations.

2. Increase the level of high quality technical advice to the project sites, in the fields of rangelands management and environmental management. IUCN should give greater support through the Global Drylands Initiative and the World Initiative for Sustainable Pastoralism (note: fact sheets on pastoralism have already been translated into Arabic).

3. Improve the level of monitoring to track governance progress and to increase understanding of changes in livelihood and environmental indicators.

4. Improve communication of the project to partners and to other stakeholders. Emphasise strong communication of 'process' – what it is and what difference it makes. Prioritise getting more stakeholders involved and presenting the initiative as an overarching development framework rather than "IUCN's approach".

5. Pay greater attention to improving livelihood outcomes, but recognise the limitations of the project. Livelihoods improvements as delivered by the project are to be seen as incentives for sustainable management rather than a high-level solution to broad-based poverty. However, the governance framework provides a platform for other initiatives for economic development and therefore the project will contribute to long term sustainable development by engaging other stakeholders more strongly.

6. The project should identify ways to increase capacity building of government staff. This could be achieved through exposure visits or captured through development of a follow-on project in partnership with government.

Contribution to global learning

1. Follow up on interest from the League of Arab States to promote greater adoption of the Hima governance approach in the Arab region (already being pursued through a new GEF-funded initiative that is under development).

2. Document the process of strengthening governance, the challenges of delivering long-term sustainability whilst under pressure to demonstrate short-term results. Highlight the value of a long-term process and the associated costs: low financial commitment but highly demanding in terms of skills and human resource time, including monitoring.

3. Use the lessons from this initiative to inform development of global tools on governance including IUCN's global governance framework.

4. Link lessons into dialogue at the level of the Convention on Biological Diversity, UN Convention to Combat Desertification and UN Framework Convention on Climate Change. Specifically support government partners (i.e. Jordanian focal points) to champion governance as the platform for meeting obligations under these conventions and aim to get text adopted that will allow greater scale-out of experiences in other countries.

5. Capture lessons on the benefits of working in close partnership with both government and communities, recognising the unique value of IUCN as a membership organisation with specific convening powers. Analyse the benefits that go beyond the project, for example in strengthening wider governance and civic responsibility. Analyse also the steps to ensure equity between government and communities and the process of building a productive working relationship.

6. Capture lessons on the role of women in strengthening governance and the risks of ignoring their role.

7. Capture lessons on how to blend science and indigenous knowledge for effective delivery of sustainable development.

Annexes

Annex 1: General Terms of Reference

Davies, 20/04/2012

Objective of the evaluation: **review project progress, identify challenges and propose modifications for finalisation of the project**

6. Review progress in the implementation of project activities – are we delivering according to the donor requirements? Are we on track to complete the project in the allotted time?
7. Review progress towards the project goals and objectives (review activities against the theory of change) – how are our activities taking us towards our objectives? What assumptions are we making and how do they stand up to scrutiny?
8. Review of challenges – what challenges are being overcome? What challenges still need to be resolved, and what modifications to the project will this require? What lessons should we learn about project design based on these challenges?
9. How effective is the project monitoring strategy? What lessons is the project yielding so far and what more monitoring and evaluation is required?
10. What do we already know about the next steps after this project is implemented? What follow up activities are needed and what are the fund raising priorities?

Review progress in the implementation of project activities

- Review of all project documentation
  - Are all project documents complete, up to date and effectively organised and used?
  - Review of all reports – are community plans well documented? Do communities and local partners maintain copies of these plans?
- Review of workplans
  - How realistic are planned activities? Are they up to date?
  - What has performance against workplans been like so far?
- Review of planning and coordination deliverables
  - Review of Community Action Plans
  - Discussion with communities about planning processes and how they use the plans
  - Discussion with other project partners about project process – planning, meetings, wokshops etc.
- Review of actions on the ground
  - How do you judge the technical merit of project interventions to address desertification or economic development?
  - Are these the highest value actions that could be conducted with the funds available?
  - How well do actions on the ground respond to community priorities?
  - Are these actions adequate to address desertification at scale, and what would be required for them to go to scale?
- Other deliverables
  - What is our opinion of the technical quality of publications and other communications?
  - What other deliverables should be considered?

Review progress towards the project goals and objectives

- Review of Theory of Change together with key project partners and community representatives
  - How is the ToC understood amongst these stakeholders?
  - How well does the ToC actually represent what we are trying to achieve?
  - What important issues are overlooked by the ToC?
  - What important actions are needed, beyond this project, to deliver our ToC?
  - What obstacles lie between our actions and our intended goals?
  - What assumptions are we making, and how realistic are they?
- Review of progress
  - How well does the monitoring strategy reflect the theory of change? Is the strategy adequate?
  - What indicators of change are being collected already and what are they telling us?
  - How effectively are our actions moving us in the desired direction?
  - How effective is the project process as opposed to delivery of activities? How do we assess level of ownership, participation and understanding amongst partners and communities?
  - What have been the most significant changes brought about so far by the project in relation to different steps in the theory of change?
  - What is the evidence of changes in attitude and behaviour during the project?
  - What surprising (unplanned) outcomes have occurred (positive and negative)?
  - What further monitoring and evaluation is required?
- Review of project partnerships
  - Are the current partnerships working effectively to deliver on our ToC?
  - What are the strengths and weaknesses of current partnerships?
  - Are the partnerships enough to deliver our ToC? Which other partners are needed?
- Sustainability
  - What sort of sustainability is the project aiming to deliver?
  - How is this being monitored and how is the project performing?

Review of challenges – what challenges are being overcome? What challenges still need to be resolved, and what modifications to the project will this require? What lessons should we learn about project design based on these challenges?

- Challenges in project delivery
  - Administrative and management challenges
  - Funding and co-finance challenges
  - Performance of different project partners
- Challenges in achieving project impact
  - Following on from the previous section, what are the key barriers to successful outcomes/impacts?
- Recommended changes
  - Changes to partnerships, budgets, workplans, implementing arrangements, project outputs etc.
  - Changes to overall strategic approach
- Lessons and how to use them

○ What is the audience for the lessons learned in project implementation? How can relevant information be conveyed – how can ICUN learn as an institution?

What do we already know about the next steps after this project is implemented? What follow up activities are needed and what are the fund raising priorities?

- Areas of intervention that need continuation
- Areas of interventions worth scaling up
- Opportunities for project continuation – compared with IUCN exit strategy
- Roles and responsibilities for next steps in project development or continuation

Proposed outline of each country evaluation

This outline does not allow for travel to the field. Additional days should therefore be inserted where required. This plan can be modified according to the needs of each country.

Day 1	Review of project documentation with project team, meetings with support staff and technical coordinators

Day 2	Meeting with key project partners – full day (6 hours)
	    Simple workshop format with presentations of project outline, feedback on progress and partnerships, breakout sessions to discuss performance etc.
	    Anticipate 2-4 government participants, 2-4 NGO participants and 2-4 community representatives

Day 3	Meeting with communities – full day (6 hours)
	    Similar to workshop on day 2, but less formal and with more space for community members to debate on key questions
	    Will use a simple exercise for performance monitoring, but also need more general opinions on IUCN's strategy/approach
	    Anticipate 10-20 community members to participate

Day 4	Meeting with communities – full day (6 hours) – if required (some countries may engage all communities in Day 3 which would be more appropriate) As day 3
Day 5	De-briefing with project partners and project team, feedback on lessons and discussion about progress in the second half of the project (half day meeting)

Annex 2: Jordan MTE agenda and outline

Day	Meeting	Key questions	Methodology
Sun 24th	IUCN project team, support staff and technical coordinators – IUCN ROWA Office Fadi / Fida/ Amer (FC) , Lara(PD) and RD	• Review of the Mid Term Evaluation Process • Review of documentation • Review of work plan and deliverables • Review of Theory of change and monitoring strategy • Review of impacts monitored to date • Review of partnerships • Sustainability (more for day 5?) • Challenges in delivery (including reporting and financing difficulties) • Challenges in achieving impact • Recommended changes to the project • Lessons that we can learn – learning strategy for the future (day 5?)	One to one or group meetings
Mon 25th	Key project partners – full day (6 hours)	• Overall what are we trying to achieve? • What did you plan to do? • Why was this important/relevant?	Group discussions (see outline below)
Tue 26th	Meeting with communities – full day (6 hours) Similar to workshop on day 2, but less formal and with more space for community members to debate on key questions	• What did we achieve? What didn't we achieve? • What constrained us? • What will you differently next time? • Lessons for the future • How is the approach going to be sustained beyond the project?	
Wed 27th	Meeting with communities – full day (6 hours)	• What is the value of participatory planning? Is it just about delivering our project or are there bigger ambitions? • What is the technical merit of the different interventions? How are we contributing to reversing desertification etc.? • Sustainability: how is our work helping to change things in the long term? What should be the next steps to maintain continuity and achieve sustainability?	General discussion and feedback
Thu 28th	De-briefing with project partners and project team, feedback on lessons and discussion about progress in the second half of the project (half day meeting)	• Review of monitoring strategy and impacts monitored to date • Review of partnerships • Sustainability – what do we have to do to sustain work moving forward? • Recommended changes to the project to improve either delivery or impacts • Key questions for global learning that this project can contribute to	One to one meetings

Group work activities

Form groups to address the following questions. Groups should be split appropriately – for example by gender.

1. Overall what are we trying to achieve?
    a. We will try to get everybody to articulate exactly what are the higher ambitions of the project – 30 minute discussion
2. Groups to discuss the questions in the grid below (we will discuss these at length first to see if we all agree)
    a. Group discussion for up to 2 hours followed by feedback to the wider group

What did you plan to do?	Why was this relevant to the overall goal?	What did you achieve?	What didn't you achieve?	What constrained you?	What will you differently next time?	What lessons can you take for the future?	How will actions be sustained beyond the project?

General discussion

Questions for general discussion after the group work:

1. What is the value of participatory planning? Is it just about delivering our project or are there bigger ambitions?
2. What is the technical merit of the different interventions? How are we contributing to reversing desertification etc.?
3. Sustainability: how is our work helping to change things in the long term? What should be the next steps to maintain continuity and achieve sustainability?

Possible additions
1. Most significant change exercise
2. Range ecology presentation

Low level observations
1. Other deliverables – one to one discussions with experts, publication of community opinions etc. – quality and usefulness of our outputs
2. How well are we identifying the local experts? How does the project mobilise Indigenous Knowledge?

Annex 3: Theory of Change

Assumptions

Assumptions

Big Assumptions

Partnerships Developed: Multistakeholder forums established at local level

Exchange Visits

Development of CEMP

Increased Capacity for CEMPs

Agreement on rules, regulation, responsibility and roles

Hima Established

Baseline Studies

Economic Valuation

Community Lessons Learning

Processing Capacity

Policy Dialogue Forum Created

Increased Awareness of the role of Governance

Better Coordination among Resource Users

Better Coordination between Community and Government

Increased Trust between Stakeholders

Participatory Processes Institutionalised Locally

NRM Rules Respected by all Stakeholders

Improved Rangelands Management Practices Implemented

Policies Support Hima and CEMP Approaches

Greater Market Access and Awareness

Increased Awareness of Policy and Governance Barriers

Increased Awareness of Rangeland Values

Improved Rangelands Condition

Increased EcosystemServices

Increased Income from Rangelands Biodiversity