



Mid-term evaluation of the project " Improving Lake Chad management through building climate change resilience and reducing ecosystem stress through implementation of the Strategic Action Programme for the Lake Chad basin

Atlas Project Number/Grant Identification Number: 00086651
UNDP-GEF PIMS identification number: 4797

Acknowledgments

At the end of this evaluation, the consultant would like to thank the actors who participated in this exercise by sharing their experience with the LCBC - UNDP project. This includes the project staff, the LCBC staff, and the IUCN staff. The consultant would also like to thank the national focal points who took their time to give their views on the implementation of the project and the solutions envisaged to meet the current challenges it faces. Finally, the consultant would like to thank the UNDP staff (Chad Country Office and Regional Office) for their collaboration.

By Alexandre Diouf
Program Evaluation Consultant

Table of contents

Acknowledgements	2
Acronyms and abbreviations	5
Summary	7
Description of the project	7
1. Summary of project progress	8
2. Mid-Term Evaluation and Performance Summary Table	9
Conclusions and recommendations.....	11
Recommendations	12
Introduction	14
1. Objectives of the evaluation	14
2. Methodology.....	14
3. Ethics	16
4. Limitations of the evaluation	16
3. Structure of the Evaluation Report.....	17
Description of the project	17
1. Development context	17
2. Problems that the project seeks to address: threats and obstacles targeted	18
3. Project description and strategy.....	20
4. Institutional Arrangements.....	20
5. Project timeline and milestones	21
6. Main project actors.....	21
7. Theory of change	23
Results	24
1. Project strategy	24
i) Logical framework analysis and project indicators.....	25
ii. Risk analysis and assumptions	27
2. Progress toward achieving results	29
i. Analysis of Progress Towards Outcomes	29
ii. Remaining Barriers to Achieving the Goal	42
3. Project Implementation and Reactive Management	43
i) Institutional arrangements	43
ii) Work planning	44
iii) Funding and co-financing.....	44
iv) Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems	46
Design of the monitoring and evaluation system	46
Implementation of monitoring and evaluation	46
v) Stakeholder Engagement.....	47
vi) Environmental and social safeguards	47
vii) Reporting	47
viii) Communication and Knowledge Management	48
4. Sustainability	48
i) Financial risks to sustainability	48
ii) Socio-economic sustainability	48
iii) Environmental sustainability	49

iv) Institutional framework and governance risks	49
v) Overall risks of the LCBC project.....	49
Conclusions and recommendations	50
1. Conclusions	50
2. Recommendations.....	52
Annexes.....	54
1. Terms of Reference (excluding annexes to the ToR)	54
2. List of interviewees	68
3. List of documents reviewed	68
4. Matrix of Evaluation Questions.....	69
5. Data Collection Tools.....	73
i) UNDP Management Interview Guide	73
i) Interview Guide for GEP/UNDP (Coordinator, Monitoring and Evaluation) and NCE.....	74
vi) Interview guide with the LCBC PMU.....	75
vii) LCBC Focal Point Interview Guide.....	76
viii) Interview Guide for IUCN and Other Implementing Partners	77
6. Scoring scales	80

Acronyms and abbreviations

ADB	African Development Bank
BGR	German Federal Institute for Geosciences and Natural Resources
BLT	Lake Chad Basin
BMZ	German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (Bundesministerium für Wirtschaftliche Zusammenarbeit und Entwicklung)
BRIDGE	Building River Dialogue and Governance (IUCN project) http://iucn.org/about/work/programmes/water/wp_our_work/wp_our_work_bridge/
CDB	Convention on Biological Diversity
CoP	Conference of the Parties
DRR	Disaster risk reduction
EU	European Union
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GEP	Project Implementation Group
GIZ	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit
IRAD	Agricultural Research Institute for Development
IRD	French Research Institute
IUCN	International Union for Conservation of Nature
PMU	Project Management Unit
IW	GEF International Waters Thematic Area
IW: LEARN	International Water Knowledge and Resource Exchange Network
IWRM	Integrated water resources management
LCBC	Lake Chad Basin Commission
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
NGO	Non-governmental organization
NOT	Strategic Action Program
NTFPS	Non-timber forest products
PAN	National Action Program
PANA	National Adaptation Program of Action
PRESIBALT	Program to Rehabilitate and Build Resilience in Lake Chad Basin Systems (AfDB)
PRODEBALT	Lake Chad Sustainable Development Support Program (AfDB project)
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
SAP	Strategic Action Plan
SAPRB	REgional Strategic Plan for Biodiversity
SDG	Sustainable development goal
TDA	Cross-border diagnostic analysis
ToR	Terms of reference
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
USD	US Dollar

Summary

Overview table

Project title: Improving Lake Chad management through building climate change resilience and reducing ecosystem stress through implementation of the Strategic Action Programme for the Lake Chad basin	
Countries: Cameroon, Niger, Nigeria, Central African Republic and Chad	Implementing Partner: Lake Chad Basin Commission (LCBC)
Management methods: Implemented by an IGO	
Country Program/UNDAF Outcome Area 2: Rural Development and Food Security <i>Outcome 2.3: Sustainable management of natural resources and the environment and the establishment of climate change adaptation and mitigation mechanisms are supported.</i>	
UNDP Social and Environmental Review Category: Low	UNDP Gender Marker: GEN 2
Atlas Project Number/Grant Identification Number: 00086651	Atlas Output Number/ Project Identification Number: 00093875
UNDP-GEF PIMS identification number: 4797	GEF Identification Number : 4748
Expected start date: April 2018	Estimated completion date: March 2023
LPAC date: June 2016	
FINANCING PLAN	
<i>LDC Fund</i>	5,830,000 dollars
UNDP TRAC resources	250.000 dollars
(1) Total budget managed by UNDP	6,080,000 dollars
MATCH COFINANCING (<i>any non-cash co-financing managed by UNDP</i>)	
UNDP	1,933,290 dollars
LCBC	5,884,250 dollars
Government	216,238,733
GIZ	9,476,031 dollars
IUCN	2,500,000 dollars
1. Total amount of co-financing	236,032,304 dollars
2. Total amount of project funding (1) +(2)	242,112,304 dollars

Description of the project

Lake Chad is home to a growing population, which must urgently address the effects of climate change on the basin's water resources and ecosystem. It provides millions of people living in Cameroon, CAR, Chad, Niger, and Nigeria with diverse environmental services, such as provisioning (food and water), sustaining (land and nutrient cycling), regulating (groundwater replenishment, carbon sequestration, air purification), and cultural (recreation, spirituality, education).

Environmental resources are essential for the survival of the population of Lake Chad, both for their livelihoods and their economic activities. The accelerated degradation of water resources and ecosystems is exacerbated by the current security situation and the subsequent migration of livestock and people searching for a better life. In 2008, with support from an earlier UNDP-GEF project, the countries and the LCBC were able to prepare a regional transboundary diagnostic analysis (TDA), culminating in adopting a regional Strategic Action Program (SAP).

This UNDP-GEF project intends to initiate the implementation of the SAP. It has the overall **objective of** *achieving ecosystem-based, integrated and resilient management of the Lake Chad Basin through the implementation of agreed policy, legal and institutional reforms and investments that improve water quality and quantity, protect biodiversity and sustain livelihoods*. Achieving this objective will address concerns about the capacity of the LCBC and its member states to design and implement sustainable management policies and end unsustainable land and water use practices in accordance with the SAP and the regionally adopted Water Charter. To achieve this objective, the project will achieve six outcomes:

1. A strengthened LCBC capable of: (i) Developing and implementing policies, investments and improved integrated ecosystem-based lake management through enhanced basin-wide monitoring; and (ii): Developing and managing regional projects in accordance with the basin's priorities expressed in the Lake Chad SAP and other relevant strategic documents for the Lake Chad Basin
2. Strengthened and harmonised approaches to implementing sustainable legal and policy instruments across the Lake Chad Basin countries leading to greater water availability through effective conjunctive use management of surface and groundwater
3. Technical capacity and awareness of national ministries, institutions and other stakeholders (e.g. academia, civil society) strengthened to contribute to the sustainable management practices of the natural resources in the Lake Chad basin at both national and basin levels
4. LCBC and member States operating and utilizing data and information from Management Information System for effective and sustainable Land, Water, and Biodiversity Resources management
5. LCBC, national governments, and local communities gain practical experience and upscaling validation on sustainable ecosystem management and alternative livelihoods
6. Assessment of stress reduction and livelihood strengthening activities identified in the SAP leads to a broad investment programme to further assist SAP implementation

1. Summary of the project's progress

The project "Improving Lake Chad management through building climate change resilience and reducing ecosystem stress through implementing the Strategic Action Programme for the Lake Chad basin" is in its second year. It started with a significant delay preceded by a substantial time lag between project development and the start of field activities. These delays were mainly due to administrative problems and the need to refine the document given the changing context of the intervention area. To date, the project has succeeded in developing draft documents for strategies such as the Strategic Action Program (SAP), the Regional Strategic Action Program for Biodiversity (RSAP) and the transboundary strategy for disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation. After an internal review by the experts of the Executive Secretariat of the LCBC, these documents were amended and validated at the level of the member states through national consultations... However, they have not yet been validated at the regional level. Expressly, it should be noted that the technical validation of the SAP should be followed by adoption by the Council of Ministers for eventual implementation. Due to the prevalence of COVID, the meetings of the Council of Ministers and several meetings planned by the project were held online. Also, some project activities could not be held because of restrictions taken by the States in the framework of the response to the pandemic. Similarly, those that depended on the approval of strategic documents could not be held and were rescheduled. These include the detailed mapping of potential donors to the

LCBC SSP, the operationalization of the Inter-Ministerial Councils (IMCs), the establishment of strategies to empower these IMCs, and the identification of investment opportunities based on the activities identified in the SSP. Although the mapping of invasive plants, including control strategies, has been developed and the intervention sites agreed upon between the LCBC and IUCN, activities related to their valorization and IGAs based on the exploitation of natural resources have not effectively started. This is due to the search for consensus, the emergence of Covid 19 and unsuccessful attempts to identify implementing partners for certain activities. As a result, most of the project's targets have not been met at mid-term, and several activities have yet to be initiated in the field.

2. Mid-Term Evaluation and Performance Summary Table

The table below shows the performance of the project:

Table: Summary of Project Performance

Project Strategy		
	S	<p>The project is aligned with the strategic planning documents of the LCBC and the five countries with respect to combating the effects of climate change and environmental degradation in the Lake Chad Basin.</p> <p>The project responds to the need for additional regional and national support to initiate the implementation of the actions identified in the 2008 SAP, to help the LCBC, but especially its member states, to strengthen certain aspects of their environmental management and to better harmonize the approaches of the different countries by initiating pilot SAP-related actions in the communities.</p>
Evaluation of progress towards the achievement of outcomes		
<p>1. A strengthened LCBC capable of: (i) Developing and implementing policies, investments and improved integrated ecosystem-based lake management through enhanced basin-wide monitoring; and (ii): Developing and managing regional projects in accordance with the basin's priorities expressed in the Lake Chad SAP and other relevant strategic documents for the Lake Chad Basin</p>	MU	<p>The majority of the strategic orientation documents have been finalized but have not yet been validated at the regional level because of the restrictions that accompanied Covid 19 and the need to have consensus on their content. National review and validation workshops have been held in the 5 member states. They are waiting to be approved by the Council of Ministers.</p> <p>The institutional and organizational diagnosis of the LCBC is completed and the LCBC capacity building plan validated.</p>
<p>2. Strengthened and harmonised approaches to implementing sustainable legal and policy instruments across the Lake Chad Basin countries leading to greater water availability through effective conjunctive use management of surface and groundwater</p>	U	<p>The guidance note on the harmonization of national policy, legal and financial instruments of the LCBC for implementing the water charter has been produced and validated at the regional level. Countries will use this note to harmonize national policy, legal and financial instruments.</p>
<p>3. Technical capacity and awareness of national ministries, institutions and other stakeholders (e.g. academia, civil society) strengthened to contribute to</p>	MU	<p>Through a partnership with GWP, the project trained 30 trainers (1/3 of whom were women) from member states on IWRM. Four out of five countries have subsequently replicated this training with 25 national experts each, of which 1/3 are women, for a total of 100 people trained on IWRM.</p>

<p>the sustainable management practices of the natural resources in the Lake Chad basin at both national and basin levels</p>		<p>In order to undertake a socio-economic impact assessment of COVID in the BLT, 30 National Experts were trained (online) on post-covid rehabilitation needs assessment (CRNA) methodologies.</p> <p>The project also supported the organization of a hackathon in Chad to promote innovative solutions for crisis management and post-crisis recovery. This competition involved 761 young promoters and the funding of 3 microprojects for their development and incubation.</p> <p>In the same vein, the project supports a research center through the financing of a pilot project on domestic waste management.</p> <p>On the basis of the capacity building plan of the LCBC, 15 executives (including 5 women) of the Executive Secretariat of the LCBC were trained in project management and reporting. Likewise, 50 managers, including 1/3 women, from the member states were trained on innovative financing mechanisms for biodiversity and climate change.</p> <p>Finally, to facilitate online work during the Covid period, the project has provided computer equipment, office automation and internet access to the LCBC national focal points (computers, printers, modem....)</p>
<p>4. LCBC and member States operating and utilising data and information from Management Information System for effective and sustainable Land, Water, and Biodiversity Resources management</p>	U	<p>Some preparatory activities were organized in exchanges with GIZ and BGR on the functionality of the working group at the regional level.</p> <p>In addition to these exchanges and in partnership with IUCN, the project supported the prevention of conflicts related to access to water resources in the Logone sub-basin.</p> <p>The acquisition of 10 hydrometeorological stations has been made to facilitate data collection. To date, the system is not yet functional.</p>
<p>5. LCBC, national governments and local communities gain practical experience and upscaling validation on sustainable ecosystem management and alternative livelihoods</p>	U	<p>This component is behind schedule. IUCN, which is in charge of it, has finalized most of the preparatory activities</p> <p>.</p> <p>A regional workshop to launch the activities was held in June 2021 and a workshop to validate the invasive plant mapping as well.</p> <p>For IGAs based on invasive plants, the selection process of local NGOs/CSOs is underway in the 5 member states.</p> <p>With regard to IGAs related to natural resource management, selection and monitoring committees have been set up and calls for proposals for microprojects have been published for Cameroon (Waza) and Chad (Zakouma). 38 microprojects for the same number of farmers' organizations were selected (20 in Waza & 18 in Am-Timan) for a total envelope of approximately XAF 107 151 714.</p> <p>At the same time, following a call for expressions of interest, 2 Microfinance Institutions have been identified in the same areas and agreements are being signed.</p> <p>-)</p> <p>Finally, the consultant in charge of the gender evaluation has been recruited and the evaluation is currently being developed.</p>
<p>6. Assessment of stress reduction and livelihood strengthening activities identified in the SAP leads to a broad investment programme to further assist SAP implementation</p>	U	<p>No activities had been initiated under this component at the time of the mid-term review because their implementation depends on the validation of the SAP</p>
<p>Evaluation of project implementation and adaptive management</p>		
	MS	<p>The project has established governance structures, notably the Technical Committee and the Steering Committee. However, there is still a lack of clarity in the anchoring of the PMU within the LCBC and the project's support capacity by the interim Technical Directorate. The project has</p>

		<p>established a decision-making chain with the supervision of the coordinator by the LCBC and by UNDP.</p> <p>The steering committee has met three times, as has the technical committee. The financial execution rate is low because of the appearance of COVID and problems resulting from the implementation of the reform which led to a reshuffling of the staff of the Technical Directorate of the LCBC with the effect of postponing or cancelling certain planned activities.</p> <p>To accommodate travel restrictions, the project encouraged international consultants to mobilize national consultants to assist with data collection and promoted national workshops to review documents for ownership. Finally, the COPIL met in virtual mode twice because of restrictions imposed in response to COVID 19. The PMU is in constant discussion with the LCBC to find consensus. The project has adapted slightly to the challenges it faces, even if the response to some remains slow.</p>
Sustainability assessment		
	ML	<p>Moderate Risks: Risks are identified by the project and continue to receive close attention. Risks related to insecurity and the political transition situation in Chad could threaten the effective implementation of the project.</p>

Conclusions and recommendations

The project is relevant because it is directly related to the needs of the beneficiary countries to achieve concerted water management and combat the effects of climate change in the region. The project aims to build on the update of the TDA to update the SAP and develop the SRAP and the document for reducing vulnerability to risks and disasters in the region.

At the halfway point, the project was able to finalize the draft of the three strategic documents but could not have them technically validated at the regional level due to the effects of the Covid. Since the date of the next Council of Ministers has not yet been set. However, the majority of the upcoming activities depend on the approval of these documents. This is mainly the work planned at the country level and ongoing planning with the development of operational work plans, investment plans, identification of investment opportunities and implementation of concrete actions identified in these strategic documents.

Capacity building of the LCBC is one of the objectives of the project. This strengthening of the LCBC is achieved through targeted training and the establishment of procedures for data generation and information sharing among member states and with relevant development actors. The project has undertaken to participate in the data generation effort by making available to the LCBC ten automatic weather stations that have been acquired and installed at strategic locations on the Lake. These stations complement other stations purchased by other projects. They will participate in generating the hydro-climatic information necessary not only for better monitoring of the water resource but also for good planning, allowing to anticipate floods or other parameters characteristic of climate changes. It should be noted that the various partners who embark on the purchase of hydrometeorological stations must ensure that the devices they purchase can connect to the system that the LCBC will establish to avoid that the systems being isolated from each other. In addition, as part of the strengthening of the LCBC, the training provided helps to improve the performance of LCBC and Focal Point staff.

In the context of the revitalization of the IMCs, it is recognized that these councils are in place in all countries, but they are not yet functional. The non-functionality of the IMCs is partly due to the lack of animation and topics to be discussed in these councils. In addition, the financing of the IMC meetings is quite heavy, and the project has provided only limited support.

The outreach activities planned by the project will provide opportunities to discuss with communities, their representatives, and national stakeholders issues related to water

management and the effects of climate change. These activities had not begun at the time of this review.

The partnership with IUCN is beneficial for the project as it is an organization with a good level of knowledge of the area and a recognized mastery of the theme. At the halfway point, the project has just completed the selection of sites to host pilot projects for invasive plant recovery and natural resource management. The project does not have sufficient funds to scale up the pilot activities. Therefore, it is essential that these pilot actions be well documented and that the knowledge gained from them be shared and used to search for potential investments to be made in the basin. It is crucial for the project and for the participating communities not to lose sight of the pilot research aspect that future activities must have to benefit more in the future.

Recommendations

The following recommendations were made at the end of the evaluation:

#	Recommendations	Priority	Recipient
1	Quickly organize a UNDP (Chad and NCE) and LCBC meeting to clarify the anchoring of the PMU in relation to the LCBC Directorates/Divisions	High	LCBC - UNDP
2	Develop a business continuity strategy for the project in the event of a major crisis for the years 2022 and 2023	High	PMU
3	Update the environmental and social safeguards of the project	High	PMU
4	Strengthen the thematic and geographic focus of project interventions at the local level by aligning Component 3 activities with Component 5 intervention sites	High	LCBC-PMU
5	Submit the strategic documents developed to the technical committee for validation pending approval by the Council of Ministers and obtain an endorsement for the continuation of activities until the SAP is validated.	High	Project Steering Committee
8	Rapidly replan project activities to complete actions before the planned end of the project	High	PMU
9	Hire a part-time consultant to assist in knowledge management, development of communication tools, and to provide the communication component of the project, which will improve communication on results achieved and knowledge sharing	Moderate	LCBC - UNDP
10	Establish practical and harmonized monitoring and evaluation tools and build the capacity of actors to use them.	High	Project

Introduction

The project "Improving the management of Lake Chad by implementing the Strategic Action Program for the Lake Chad Basin to build resilience to climate change and reduce stress on ecosystems" is funded by the GEF to benefit the LCBC and its member states. Its objective is to "Achieve ecosystem-based, integrated and resilient management of the Lake Chad Basin through the implementation of agreed policy, legal and institutional reforms and investments to improve water quality and quantity, protect biodiversity and sustain livelihoods. This mid-term review comes two years after the start of the implementation of activities between October and December 2021.

1. Objectives of the evaluation

The overall objective of the mid-term review is to assess the progress made in achieving the project's objectives and outcomes as specified in the project documents "Improved Management of Lake Chad through the Implementation of the Strategic Action Program for the Lake Chad Basin to Enhance Resilience to Climate Change and Reduce Stress on Ecosystems", (PIMS 4797). The review seeks to confirm whether the project is on track, particularly with project design, schedule, budget, and sustainability, and to assess early signs of project success or failure to identify necessary changes to put the project on track to achieve its intended results. The mid-term review examined the project's activities and results and its governance and management to date. It synthesized lessons learned to improve the design and implementation of project activities. The partners' results, effectiveness, processes, and performance were also questioned. The mid-term review promotes learning and knowledge sharing to inform policies, strategies, programs, and projects. Recommendations are provided to the project to improve its performance, sustainability, effectiveness, and impact.

2. Methodology

The review was conducted in several phases:

- A preparatory phase that consisted of the presentation of the activity and the collection of data and documents from the LCBC and the project and other supporting partners to allow for a document review;
- A field mission by the consultant to Ndjamena to collect data from project staff, LCBC staff and UNDP staff
- And finally, a phase of data analysis and report writing.

During the preparatory phase, the consultant had to conduct a kick-off meeting, a document review, and the kick-off report preparation.

i. Scoping meeting with the LCBC GEF and UNDP team

The scoping meeting was held online on September 13, 2021. It brought together the consultant with the project management team (Coordinator, Monitoring and Evaluation Officer, Administrative and Financial Officer), the UNDP Chad team and the GEF Focal Point. The meeting allowed the PMU to introduce the consultants to the LCBC Technical Director and his team and to briefly explain the context, the purpose of the evaluation, the duration of the mission, and expectations. The project coordinator gave a brief presentation

of the project. This scoping meeting ended with identifying key documents and the list of potential institutions and individuals that the consultants would receive from the project at the end of the meeting and marked the official start of the evaluation.

ii. Documentary review

The document review included all documents identified in the ToR, the minutes of the Project Steering Committee meetings, and other held meetings.

iii. Identification of persons and institutions to be interviewed

The Focal Points at the national level were invited to participate in a quick online survey. The non-exhaustive list of institutions met is presented in the following table:

Table 1List of institutions interviewed

• UNDP Chad Staff (2)
• LCBC Staff (4)
• Project staff (2)
• Regional Technical Advisor (1)
• IUCN Staff (2)
• National Focal Points (5)

iv. Development of collection tools

Following the literature review, the consultant developed data collection tools. Interview guides were also developed for discussions with the selected individuals/institutions. This evaluation adopted a qualitative face-to-face, online, and telephone approach to consider the constraints of Covid-19 prevalence. However, quantitative data from secondary sources were collected.

v. Development of the start-up report

The consultant prepared an inception report that summarized all of the previous steps and outlined the next steps in the process. After approval by the LCBC and UNDP-NCE, the inception report constituted the framework for the evaluation.

Following the approval of the inception report, the consultant conducted a field mission to Chad to collect data.

vi. Data collection

The data collection was first done through a review of the documentation available at the LCBC and PMU levels and a pre-briefing with the LCBC Technical Director (TD) assisted by the Director of Cooperation and Projects (DCP) who provided clarifications and orientations. Then, interviews were held with the project coordinator and the Monitoring and Evaluation Officer, the LCBC Administrative and Financial Director, the LCBC Project Identification and Development Expert, the UNDP Chad Sustainable Development Unit Head, the UNDP Chad Monitoring and Evaluation Officer, the IUCN project coordinator, and the IUCN Regional Program Officer. An interview was also organized for the UNDP-NCE Regional Technical Advisor. Finally, specific surveys concerning the implementation of the project at the national

level and the views of the focal points were conducted with the National Focal Points of all LCBC member countries. The Focal Points in Niger, Cameroon, Central African Republic and Chad responded to the survey.

vii. Data analysis

The data collected was analyzed and the results interpreted to formulate recommendations and proposals.

viii. Writing the report

The report was written on the basis of data collected from various sources.

3. Ethics

The evaluation approach adhered to high ethical standards in full compliance with the ethical principles of the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG), including protecting the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees, and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing data collection and reporting. The consultant ensured the security of information collected before and after the evaluation, and protocols to ensure the anonymity and confidentiality of information sources were put in place and followed. Knowledge and data collected as part of the evaluation process will also be used only for the evaluation and not for any other purpose without the express permission of UNDP and its partners.

In the context of Covid-19, the evaluator conducted his investigation in strict compliance with the preventive measures enacted by the authorities.

4. Limitations of the evaluation

The limitations of the evaluation are both natural and operational. The natural limitations relate to the prevalence of Covid-19 at the time of this evaluation and the methodology adopted, which means that the context of the evaluation and the nature of the tools adopted imply a possible divergence of views among interviewees. These divergences can sometimes be due to the different experiences of the stakeholders or to the bias that one party or another may have. To address these issues, the consultant collected data directly in Chad (LCBC headquarters and PMU) and shared a link with the country-level Focal Points to provide their input through an online survey. The consultant made several triangulations of the interview results in order to draw representative conclusions about the situation.

Finally, the consultant was constrained by the short time frame of the evaluation, which did not allow for visits to all the countries involved in the project and direct interviews with all the stakeholders in those countries. To address this, the consultant decided to conduct online and telephone consultations with most stakeholders who had a good connection. Since field activities at the community level had not begun at the time of this MTR, it was not deemed necessary for the consultant to travel to the project's target communities.

Finally, given the prevalence of Covid-19 during this evaluation, the consultant did not organize focus groups to avoid the risks associated with contaminating participants at these

gatherings. To compensate for this, he favored discussions with key informants at the institutions involved.

3. Structure of the evaluation report

To help better understand the work of this mid-term evaluation, we have structured this contribution into three parts.

The first part, which focuses on the description of the project, presents its context, then the problems that the project seeks to address, the description of its strategy, the agreements related to its implementation, its timetable and milestones, and finally, the main stakeholders involved in its implementation.

The second part presents the results of the evaluation, which are based on an analysis of the following four criteria: the relevance of the strategy adopted by the project, the effectiveness with which the mid-term results were achieved, efficiency, and sustainability, in particular the implementation of tools and mechanisms to ensure the sustainability of the interventions.

Finally, the report proposes recommendations that implementing partners could adopt to implement this project further and for its complete success.

Description of the project

1. Development context

The project covers all countries in the Lake Chad Basin. This area is subject to insecurity caused by armed gangs, including the Boko Haram group, which has been active in the region since 2009. This crisis currently affects the Northeast of Nigeria, the Far North region of Cameroon, the Lake Chad Province and the Diffa region of Niger. All of these areas are currently targeted by the project. It is estimated that more than 17 million people are currently living in the affected areas in these four countries. Moreover, this crisis has developed in a region of chronic fragility, where poverty, underdevelopment, gender inequality, unemployment, and lack of opportunity for youth fuel extremism and are compounded by environmental degradation and the impact of climate change. It has already triggered significant population displacement within countries and across borders. The four affected countries are hosting more than 2.4 million internally displaced people.

Chad, which hosts the headquarters of the project and the LCBC, is going through a rather critical situation with the death of its president. A Transitional Military Council (TMC) was established as a result. A Transitional Charter temporarily replaces the Constitution. It provides for the implementation of a peaceful transition, of limited duration (18 months), including all political currents and civil society and leads to the organization of free and transparent elections, to allow a return to democratic institutions.

Meanwhile, the Central African Republic has been rocked by unrest for decades, but the rebelled coup in March 2013 to overthrow the president plunged the already vulnerable population into a continuing crisis. Since then, the country has experienced ongoing instability punctuated by attacks by armed groups in several parts of the country.

Niger has also been shaken by attacks from armed groups for more than a decade and by the influx of refugees from Nigeria and Mali. In December 2020 and February 2021, elections were held in Niger, marking the country's first political transition.

Cameroon is also struggling with Boko Haram armed groups and secessionist groups in the North and Far North. This part of the country has long been a victim of the instability that arose with the expansion of the activities of the Boko Haram group in Nigeria.

Nigeria is mainly affected by the Boko Haram group, which started in the northern part of the country. The country lives with the rhythm of attacks perpetrated by this group against state institutions and local communities. These attacks have triggered retaliation by the army and large-scale population movements.

Despite this ongoing instability, the Lake Chad Basin is home to a growing population, which must urgently address the effects of climate change on the basin's water resources and ecosystem. It provides millions of people living in Cameroon, CAR, Chad, Niger and Nigeria with diverse environmental services, such as provisioning (food and water), sustaining (land and nutrient cycling), regulating (groundwater replenishment, carbon sequestration, air purification) and cultivating (recreation, spirituality, education).

Environmental resources are essential for the survival of the population of Lake Chad, both for their livelihoods and for their economic activities. The accelerated degradation of water resources and ecosystems is exacerbated by the current security situation and the subsequent migration of livestock and people in search of a better life. In 2008, the countries and the LCBC were able to prepare, with the support of an earlier UNDP-GEF project, a regional TDA, culminating in the adoption of a regional Strategic Action Program (SAP).

The Lake plays a vital socio-economic role, as it was a large water reservoir and provides water to more than 30 million people. It promotes the riparian populations' development, fishing, trade, and food agriculture. Obviously, the natural resources in freshwater are a finite good on the one hand, and on the other hand, the demand of consumption needs per person is growing year by year.

Since 1963, Lake Chad has lost nearly 90 per cent of its water volume, with devastating consequences for people's food security and livelihoods who depend on fishing and irrigation-based agricultural activities for their survival. As Lake Chad shrank, the population grew with the arrival of millions of displaced people from areas most affected by conflict.

The causes for this situation are many and varied. The decrease in rainfall in this part of Africa, exacerbated by successive severe droughts in the 1970s and 1980s, is considered by experts as the main cause. Demographic pressure and global warming also cause to be considered. This drying up is also due to the advance of the desert, the abusive and almost permanent deforestation of green spaces for firewood, and various other anthropic activities such as irrigation or bad fishing practices.

2. Problems the project seeks to address: threats and barriers targeted

The UNFCCC Cop 21 in Paris (December 2015) highlighted the major problem of the sharp loss of volume (90%) and area (90%) of Lake Chad over the past 45 years. Indeed, the basin has recorded several years of declining rainfall. In addition to climate change threats, the Lake Chad Basin SAP (the result of an TDA), designed and adopted by the riparian countries in 2008, lists a number of interrelated transboundary issues to be addressed:

1. **Variability of hydrological regime and availability of drinking water:** The drastic decline in the availability of drinking water in the BLT is of major concern. This is a result of the variability in the hydrological regimes of the rivers and rainfall patterns in the

region. Among the root causes of the overall degradation of the lake and its ecosystems are the lack of sustainable development policies in the political agendas of the member states to manage population pressure and the lack of awareness among stakeholders. The degradation of the ecosystems has resulted in a continuous decrease in access to water, crop failure, livestock deaths, collapse of fisheries and wetlands, etc. Among the socio-economic consequences of these impacts, the SAP cites food insecurity and deterioration in the health status of the population. Variability in the hydrological regime and availability of drinking water is the main problem because of the above impacts and because it induces or promotes the other six transboundary problems.

2. **Water pollution:** This is one of the direct causes of wetland biodiversity loss. The use of agrochemicals for commercial cotton and rice production and the increasing exploitation of oil in Chad, without effective environmental regulations and standards, will exacerbate inorganic chemical pollution and eutrophication of the Lake soon. In addition, the increasing urbanization resulting from oil exploitation in Chad is likely to increase the production of household waste and oil spill pollution. There are real risks of acute depletion of fisheries and general ecological degradation if these trends continue.
3. **Decline in the viability of biological resources:** the stress caused by the overexploitation of the natural resources of Lake Chad jeopardizes the capacity of plant and animal species to maintain their normal rate of regeneration. There is a lack of appropriate and harmonized policies and plans among member states to regulate activities at the basin level, but also a lack of awareness of environmental issues among local populations. This also exacerbates the loss of biodiversity and the variability of the hydrological regime and the lack of drinking water.
4. **Biodiversity loss** refers to the loss of plant and animal species and the degradation of ecosystem health. It is rooted in population growth, lack of sustainable development in political agendas and lack of environmental awareness. The result is exacerbated poverty resulting from the declining productivity of ecosystems and available resources. It also contributes to the reduced sustainability of biological resources.
5. **Ecosystem loss and modification:** TDA identifies a profound disruption of habitat and communities within the lake and river environment. For example, the lake has changed from an open water body to a swampy environment, with approximately 50% of the wetlands destroyed. This is largely the result of declining flows due to the lack of sustainable development policies in the member states and insufficient environmental awareness. The loss/modification of ecosystems is most evident in the decline of certain fisheries and rice cultivation, but also in the loss of biodiversity and the decline in the viability of biological resources.
6. **Sedimentation of rivers and water bodies:** this has led to channel flows, reduction of lake tributaries with channel detour and colonization of silted sites by invasive species. It is largely the result of unsustainable agricultural practices on marginal lands. It is rooted in inadequate environmental awareness, population pressure, and the absence of sustainable development in the political agenda of member states.
7. **Invasive Species:** The lake is invaded by *typha* and water hyacinth. Typha is also a severe problem in the Komadougou Yobe basin, and the *Quelea* genus is the main avian pest in the entire basin. Invasive species very often thrive because of poor water resource

management, weak enforcement of environmental rules and standards, etc. *Typha* clogs channels and diverts waterways, *Quelea* destroys crops, and both cause loss of livelihoods, contributing to poverty.

Recognizing that the TDA was more than a decade old and that the knowledge base of the region has grown significantly since then, including climate variability and change and groundwater resources, GIZ and this project undertook to update the SAP, and to develop the SAPRB and the Regional Strategy Framework for Disaster Management and Climate Change Adaptation.

3. Project description and strategy

To achieve this goal, the project will achieve six outcomes:

1. A strengthened LCBC capable of: (i) Developing and implementing policies, investments and improved integrated ecosystem-based lake management through enhanced basin-wide monitoring; and (ii): Developing and managing regional projects in accordance with the basin's priorities expressed in the Lake Chad SAP and other relevant strategic documents for the Lake Chad Basin
2. Strengthened and harmonised approaches to implementing sustainable legal and policy instruments across the Lake Chad Basin countries leading to greater water availability through effective conjunctive use management of surface and groundwater
3. Technical capacity and awareness of national ministries, institutions and other stakeholders (e.g. academia, civil society) strengthened to contribute to the sustainable management practices of the natural resources in the Lake Chad basin at both national and basin levels
4. LCBC and member States operating and utilising data and information from Management Information System for effective and sustainable Land, Water, and Biodiversity Resources management
5. LCBC, national governments and local communities gain practical experience and upscaling validation on sustainable ecosystem management and alternative livelihoods
6. Assessment of stress reduction and livelihood strengthening activities identified in the SAP leads to a broad investment programme to further assist SAP implementation

The project seeks to strengthen the LCBC in its role as a regional organization to coordinate better the actions of member countries in the joint management of water and the fight against the effects of climate change in the Lake Chad basin. This strengthening of the LCBC involves the provision of strategic documents such as the SAP, the SRAP and the regional document for risk and disaster reduction. The strengthening of the LCBC also involves strengthening the LCBC national focal points so that the work in each country can be more effective and contribute to advancing the LCBC agenda.

4. Institutional arrangements

UNDP and the LCBC are implementing the project. It is managed by a Project Management Unit (PMU) that works directly with the LCBC and, through the PMU, with the LCBC National Focal Points in each of the five member countries. IUCN is working on Component 5, under the supervision of the PMU. The World Bank, which was identified at the time of the project's development to work on component 6, was not finally mobilized.

The project is under the direction of the Steering Committee, which is the highest decision-making body. The Steering Committee makes administrative, financial, and programmatic decisions regarding the project. It reviews and approves performance reports and work plans and makes strategic decisions regarding implementation.

The steering committee was established with the Decision 008/20219/LCBC/SE which institutes it and sets its operating procedures. This steering committee is composed of :

- The first commissioners of the LCBC member states or their representatives
- Three representatives of the Executive Secretary
- Three UNDP representatives
- Two representatives of the Technical and Financial Partners of the LCBC
- A representative of the host country's beneficiary organizations
- A representative of the women's organizations of the host country
- A representative of the host country's youth organizations.

At the time of this evaluation, the steering committee had already met three times.

A technical committee composed of the PMU, the Technical Directorate and technicians from the LCBC and UNDP, meets every six months or ad hoc as needed to provide technical support to the project and provide technical solutions to its challenges. Since the beginning of the implementation, the technical committee has met three times.

5. Project timeline and milestones

The FIP for the project was approved in June 2013. A fairly long period passed for the development of the project document which was only endorsed in May 2017. The project was finally signed in December 2018. Five months later, in May 2019, the kick-off workshop was held. The first disbursement occurred six months later in January 2020. The project had three steering committees: in 2019, in July 2020 and in April 2021. Its mid-term review was due in June 2021 and the final evaluation in September 2023.

6. Main actors of the project

The project's primary stakeholders are the governments of Niger, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Nigeria and Chad. These five countries have common interests in the proper management of the lake from which the riparian populations derive the majority of their livelihood needs. They play an essential role in defining policies and guidelines and in financing.

The LCBC, as a sub-regional institution for the management of the Lake Chad Basin, is the second stakeholder in the project. It benefits from institutional and organizational strengthening support that will enable it to carry out its mandate better. Through the project, the LCBC will have strategic and operational documents that will enable it to expand the scope of its actions in its member states. The LCBC has a vested interest in the project's success because it will enable it to be more effective in its current role.

The riparian communities are the largest part of the direct beneficiaries of the project. These communities live mainly from agriculture, livestock, handicrafts, fishing and very often use the lake as a means of transport to move themselves or their goods. For the most part, they are

breeders, farmers, fishermen, fishmongers' associations, women's associations practicing market gardening and handicrafts, traditional hunters and woodcutters, and users of non-timber products who derive their subsistence and income directly from the basin.

Other stakeholders include national NGOs/CSOs involved in natural resource management at the national level, development and environment sector programs and projects, universities and research institutions, religious organizations, customary authorities, and other civil society organizations that play an important role in sensitizing local communities to the value of conserving and protecting BLT for their sustainable livelihoods.

UNDP is another stakeholder in the project. It is the recipient agency for the funds and provides oversight for the project.

At the level of each member country, the project can work in collaboration with the following dedicated persons and agencies

Country	Structures
Cameroon	National Focal Point LCBC MINEPAT
	Head of Planning Department, MINEPAT
	Secretary General Ministry of Environment, Nature Protection and Sustainable Development (MINEPDED)
	National Biodiversity Focal Point Ministry of the Environment
	Technical Advisor in charge of biodiversity mainstreaming, Ministry of Environment, Nature Protection and Sustainable Development
	Technical Advisor in charge of the Elaboration of the REDD Strategy and the National Climate Strategy, GIZ - Ministry of Environment IUCN ;
	Head of Environment UNDP Country Office
Nigeria	Focal Point LCBC / Federal Ministry of water resources
	Federal Director of Water Resources
	Sector Managers
Central African Republic	The 2 national LCBC focal points
	The Minister of Forestry and his team
	The Chief of Staff of the Minister of the Environment and his team
	The National Biodiversity Coordinator
	The National Climate and REDD Coordinator
	The GEF National Focal Point
	The Director General of Hydraulic Resources
	the 2nd Vice-President of the National Assembly and some members of the Parliamentary Committee in charge of the environment and natural resources
	The Director of Meteorology and Hydrology
	The Director of the Plan
	UNDP Country Office Environmental Officer
Niger	LCBC Focal Point, Director General of Water Resources Management
	The Directorate of Hydrogeology, Ministry of Water

Country	Structures
	PANGIRE
	The National Environmental Assessment Office
	The National Center for Ecological and Environmental Monitoring
	The National Institute of Statistics
	National Council for the Environment and Sustainable Development
	General Directorate of Rural Engineering
	The General Directorate of the Environment
	UNDP Country Office Environmental Officer
Chad	LCBC Focal Point, General Technical Directorate of Hydraulics and Sanitation, Ministry of Environment, Water and Fisheries;
	Directorate of Environmental Education and Fight against Climate Change, Ministry of Environment, Water and Fisheries;
	Direction de la Foret, Ministry of Environment, Water and Fisheries
	COMIFAC Coordination
	The head of the Sustainable Development Unit of the UNDP Country Office

7. Theory of change

The theory of change is supported by analyses and consultations with key project stakeholders and lessons learned from the experience of LCBC and its partners about what works and what does not work in different contexts. It helps identify solutions to effectively address the causes of the identified problems and guides decisions about the approach to take. Finally, it helps to identify underlying assumptions and risks critical to identifying and reviewing the entire process to ensure that the chosen approach will contribute to the desired change.

	Assumptions	Change
1	The LCBC has sufficient capacity to address strategic issues in the region	The quality and quantity of water in Lake Chad will be significantly improved, biodiversity protected, and people's livelihoods strengthened.
2	An enabling environment for SAP implementation exists (national/regional governance / (e.g., improved local governance, harmonized policies, legislation and practices on DRM)	
3	Institutions and other actors have sufficient capacity with strong involvement popular and community	
4	The LCBC has appropriate mechanisms and instruments for resource mobilization for the implementation of community-based natural resource management actions	

Results

1. Project strategy

The project's objective is to achieve ecosystem-based, integrated and resilient management of the Lake Chad Basin through the implementation of agreed policy, legal and institutional reforms and investments to improve water quality and quantity, protect biodiversity and sustain livelihoods. This project objective is aligned with the vision articulated by the LCBC in the Vision 2025 document which states that: "The Lake Chad region would like to see by 2025, Lake Chad - "Shared Legacy" and other wetlands sustainably conserved to ensure economic security of the freshwater ecosystem resources, biodiversity and sustainable water resources in the basin and their use should be equitable to meet the needs of the basin's population and thus reduce poverty levels. . This vision of Lake Chad would also like to see the following two principles in the shared basin:

- A Lake Chad Region where regional and national authorities accept responsibility for the conservation of freshwater, ecosystems and biodiversity, and for the integrated and sound management of the basin for sustainable development
- A Lake Chad region where each member state has equitable access to safe and sufficient water resources to meet its needs and rights, and to conserve its freshwater resources, ecosystem and biodiversity.

In addition to the 2025 vision, it should be noted that the project is also aligned with the solutions identified in the SAP in its expected results. Indeed, the SAP presents an agenda for enhanced regional environmental cooperation among member states over the next fifteen years. To improve the environmental status and protect the ecosystems of the Lake Chad Basin, the SAP sets out five regional objectives to be achieved and identifies environmental interventions to be undertaken at national and regional levels. The SAP complements the NAPs and sets clear objectives and targets that should lead to an investment plan of priority actions to be submitted to the international community.

The project recognizes, as have all the countries around the Lake Chad Basin, that the transboundary problems that constitute the past, present and future social risks faced by the riparian populations of the conventional Lake Chad Basin are the product of the combined impacts of accelerated global climate change and unsustainable resource use practices by a growing population driven by institutional failures. The end result of transboundary problems is persistent poverty in the subregion. In its preliminary analysis, the project recognized that the population pressure around the Lake was a source of tension because of the accelerated degradation of the environment due to anthropogenic action. Indeed, forty-nine million people live in the Lake Chad region, exploiting its rich natural resources and its relatively constant supply of water, fodder, and fertile land throughout the year.

The region was once a food production centre, with local markets supplying produce to Cameroon, Chad, Niger and Nigeria. However, poor management of natural resources, poor coordination between the different countries in the region, and the widespread impact of climate change have contributed to a significant deterioration in the capacity of the lake's natural ecosystem. Agricultural soils and pastures have been extensively degraded, resulting in a significant reduction in food productivity and, consequently, employment opportunities, especially for young people living in rural areas, who represent a high percentage of the population. Recognizing this problem, the LCBC and UNDP have put together a set of

activities that would allow countries to monitor the degradation of the Lake, provide opportunities for riparian populations to benefit from green activities that can significantly reduce the rate of degradation, and establish economically viable and environmentally sustainable business models with these populations that could potentially benefit the majority of the riparian communities. This vision of the LCBC predates the project and the latter has been linked to it with the activities it contains.

Indeed, in 2008, with the support of an earlier UNDP-GEF project, the countries and the LCBC were able to prepare a regional cross-border diagnostic analysis, culminating in the adoption of a regional Strategic Action Program (SAP).

The project aims to achieve ecosystem-based, integrated and resilient management of the Lake Chad Basin by implementing agreed policy, legal and institutional reforms and investments that improve water quality and quantity, protect biodiversity and sustain livelihoods. This objective is expected to address concerns about the capacity of the LCBC and its member states to design and implement sustainable management policies and to end unsustainable land and water use practices under the SAP and the regionally adopted Water Charter. In addition, the Lake Chad Basin Commission LCBC presented a plan for development and adaptation to climate change in Lake Chad back in 2015 (COP21). This plan proposes sustainable intensification of livelihoods based on what makes them efficient and resilient (mobility, multi-activity, multifunctionality). This is consistent with the expected results and strategy of the project.

Therefore, it can be said with certainty that the expected results and the activities planned within the project framework are perfectly consistent with the needs of the stakeholders, especially those of the beneficiaries.

i) Logical framework analysis and project indicators

Results Framework: The structure of the results framework is comprehensive and straightforward with a clear and coherent intervention logic. It includes one objective and seven complementary outcomes. Together these outcomes have thirty-five performance indicators analyzed (with associated targets) to see how they align with SMART (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Realistic, Time-bound) criteria. Proposals for reformulations are made when the indicator has serious deficiencies:

	Indicator	S	M	A	R	T	Observations
1	Number of countries implementing SAP actions	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Number of countries implementing at least one SAP or regionally validated SAP action
2	Total number of SAP actions implemented in the basin	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
3	Status of ratification of the Water Charter	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Number of countries that have ratified the water charter
4	Gender mainstreaming in the implementation of the SAP (and the NAP)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
5	The Council of Ministers approves the update of the SAP	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
6	The Council of Ministers adopts the Biodiversity protocol	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
7	Risk and Disaster Reduction Protocol adopted by the Council of Ministers	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
8	Donor Advisory Committee Meetings	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Donor Advisory Committee meeting held
9	Mapping of donors	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Existence of donor mapping

	Indicator	S	M	A	R	T	Observations
10	The LCBC provides the Council of Ministers with reports on donors, project coordination, and the status of implementation of the SAP and the Water Charter	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Comprehensive and high quality performance reports are provided by the LCBC to the Ministerial Council
11	LCBC staff trained in project management and reporting	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Number of LCBC staff trained in project management and reporting
12	National staff trained in project management and reporting	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Number of people trained at the national level on project management and reporting
13	Number of countries with harmonized water management policies	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
14	Number of countries with a functioning IMC	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Number of countries whose IMC met at least once every six months.
15	IMC facilitate approval of the updated SAP at the national level	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
16	Approved IMC financial and operational sustainability plans	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
17	Number of countries with joint operating policies	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
18	Number of national staff trained in water management	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
19	Number of meetings/workshops for researchers/academics	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
20	Number of new joint projects by basin institutions	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
21	Environmental awareness meetings/workshops in each country	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
22	Increased level of community awareness on water, environment, climate change	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Number of community awareness sessions on water, environment and climate change
23	Multi-level participatory monitoring approach designed and implemented	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Number of countries in which a multi-level participatory monitoring approach is implemented
24	Agreements on data exchange protocols	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Number of countries that have validated the data exchange protocol
25	Adoption of the program by the Member States	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
26	Strengthened national data/information management capabilities	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Number of countries that received at least one data management support
27	Support of the IW:LEARN network	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Implementation of the project web page on the IW LEARN platform
28	Number of active pilot projects created	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
29	Number of national/local projects with EU funding	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
30	Gender mainstreaming and women's empowerment through the implementation of the Gender Action Plan	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Number of countries implementing the gender action plan
31	Number of replication strategies.	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Number of replication strategies implemented
32	Financial commitment for replication	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Amount of financial commitment for replication
33	Number of investment opportunities identified	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
34	Number of feasibility studies conducted	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
35	Potential investments identified, with possible sources	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Same as flag 33 - Can be deleted

The six components have a set of thirty-five indicators associated with them. By analyzing the indicators and their targets with the SMART matrix, it becomes clear that several of them can be refined to be fully usable. The indicators in question are fourteen in number, and suggestions for rewording them have been made in the table above to facilitate their next use.

ii. Risk analysis and assumptions

A series of assumptions and risks were identified in the formulation phase and some mitigation options were proposed. Regarding the assumptions, there are four major ones which are

1. There is a sufficient level of regional security that allows the implementation of community actions around the Lake Chad;
2. Communities have an interest in being involved in the design and implementation of relevant actions;
3. The LCBC reorganization is implemented and functioning as planned;
4. There is a willingness of countries to participate in the project and address the issues identified in the TDA and SAP.

The first assumption has not yet been realized. Indeed, several areas of the project are currently under the control of armed groups. The third assumption is underway but has not been finalized.

With respect to risks, the project had identified five major risks with mitigation measures to be used.

Risk	Level	Attenuation	Situation at mid-term
Political instability could affect the implementation of actions at the country level	Moderate	UNDP and the LCBC Secretariat will work closely with the national representatives to the LCBC to identify potential problems and recommend specific interventions to reduce these potentially negative impacts. The participation of all countries in the Project Board and the LCBC reports to the Council of Ministers will also provide a framework for addressing potential issues at the national level.	The risk remains Moderate. At mid-term, changes in line ministries in Niger, Chad, and Cameroon have somewhat disrupted the implementation of activities. Similarly, in CAR and Chad respectively, the post-election crisis and the transition process have made it very difficult to stabilize staff. Focal points have been changed several times since the beginning of the project. Several of the countries will have elections in the coming months, which could impact implementation. The risk is now relatively high.

Risk	Level	Attenuation	Situation at mid-term
The multiplicity of interventions for implementing the SAP without effective coordination by the LCBC could diminish the expected results and create duplication.	Low	UNDP and other partners (GIZ, ADB) have begun to work together to establish a partner platform under the authority of the LTBC (Output 1.4) for better coordination of interventions and donors. It is hoped that this donor coordination (as well as related monitoring and evaluation and implementation reporting, e.g., of the SAP) will become routine for the LCBC and that the Council of Ministers will be briefed annually on donor actions.	The risk of multiple interventions has been eliminated. In the meantime, the LCBC has been able to begin the process of reorganization and finalization of the recruitment of its Technical Director. The arrival of the new Technical Director will allow for better coordination of the LCBC's projects through the consultations and meetings that will be organized and through the programmatic analysis and subsequent actions that will be taken at the level of the LCBC's technical management with regard to project planning and implementation. The risk of lack of coordination on the part of the LCBC is thus very low.
Environmental variability and climate change could alter ecosystem functions and reduce ecosystem services.	Moderate	Decisive actions will be initiated within the framework of the project (Component 5) and the interventions of other partners (e.g., GIZ and AfDB) to improve the management and resilience of the basin's ecosystems. This work will be done in coordination with the recent Lake Chad Climate Resilience and Development Plan (presented at UNFCCC COP 21)	Environmental degradation is following its pre-project course and continues to alter ecosystem functions. Component 5 actions have not begun on the ground at the time of this evaluation. This risk remains medium.
Insecurity in the area - frequent terrorist attacks or acts of banditry - may compromise the implementation and monitoring of the program	High	The security and intelligence services of the LCBC member states have agreed to work together to provide a common and coordinated response to the current security challenges posed by the threats of terrorism. Similarly, UN security assessments and guidelines will inform the situation.	The security situation at the mid-term evaluation had deteriorated in some project areas. The risk remains high.

Risk	Level	Attenuation	Situation at mid-term
The staff of the sectoral ministries lack the technical capacity to implement the activities	Moderate	The project plans to provide appropriate training, especially for Component 3. The UNDP-GEF project intends to strengthen the countries' capacities to meet the requirements in terms of data/information collection and harmonization of basin management policies in order to help managers and users to support key activities.	The risk associated with the technical capacity of ministry staff is still medium. It should be noted, however, that at the national level, the LCBC focal points who support the implementation of project activities are experts in the targeted fields.

At the time of this assessment, the risk associated with future health deterioration due to Covid 19 is still high. Covid 19 appeared in Africa in 2020 and has disrupted people's habits in their aspiration to live in a ventilated house or socialize. This risk will continue in the medium term even if only a few cases are at the country level. The same is true of the risk of disruption to implementation due to Chad's upcoming elections and transition process, which is scheduled to lead to elections in 2022. Given that both the PMU and the LCBC are in Chad, it is clear that any potential disruption in the country will slow down the implementation of the project. With respect to COVID 19, care should be taken to ensure that national focal points and LCBC staff continue to work remotely with the available infrastructure and be prepared to hold important meetings online not to delay the work. Concerning the elections and transition in Chad, the project should put in place a contingency plan for the continuation of its activities should the situation in the country deteriorate. Among the possible measures, temporarily relocating the activities centre to Nigeria or Cameroon could be considered. The choice of these two countries is justified by the fact that air links to their capitals are not too difficult from other countries.

The project strategy is rated as Satisfactory

2. Progress toward achieving results

i. Analysis of progress towards results

Component 1: A strengthened LCBC capable of: (i) Develop and implement policies, investments, and improved integrated ecosystem-based management of the lake through enhanced basin-wide monitoring; and (ii): Develop and manage regional projects in accordance with basin priorities expressed in the Lake Chad SAP and other Lake Chad basin strategic documents.

At the time of the mid-term evaluation, the project was in the process of developing or polishing the strategic documents: the SAP, the LCBC Protocol on Biodiversity and the Disaster Risk Reduction Response Plans.

With regard to the SAP, the project recruited a consulting firm in collaboration with the LCBC to update the SAP. The internal revisions of the SAP have revealed shortcomings in the documents, which have been passed on to the consultancy firm, which has noted them and taken them into account in a second version of the document.

The Member States reviewed this second draft. The latter made recommendations which were again transmitted to the BET which provided a third draft. The project then undertook to bring together the national focal points of the LCBC to share with them the strategic axes proposed in the document. This work led to the production of a final draft before its adoption at the regional level.

With respect to the LCBC Biodiversity Protocol, at the time of this mid-term evaluation, the project recruited an international consultant to develop a Strategic Action Program for Biodiversity (SAPB) for the LCBC, including an agreement on regional targets. The consultancy produced preliminary documents of the diagnosis, strategic framework, and financing plan for biodiversity in the BLT. They were reviewed in national workshops in the 5 member states and comments were made and taken into account by the consultant. These documents were submitted to the reading committee that was set up to finalize them. At the time of the mid-term evaluation, this process was finalized and validation was pending at the regional level. However, it should be noted that some of the focal points are not aware of the progress in the development of these documents. Given that some of these focal points changed during implementation due to institutional changes in their countries, a communication problem could be at the root of this problem.

Similarly, under Component 1, an international consultant was hired to develop a cross-border strategic framework for disaster risk management and climate change adaptation. This document has undergone the same steps as the previous ones, contains three sub-parts, and is currently being finalized. At the time of this evaluation, the following documents were awaiting validation at the regional level:

- The improved draft of the state of play of Disaster Risk Management/Climate Change Adaptation in the Lake Chad Basin including disaster risk mapping (pending validation);
- The improved draft of the Strategic Framework Document for Disaster Risk Management / Climate Change Adaptation in the Lake Chad Basin with a multi-year action plan (pending validation);
- The draft plan for capacity building in Disaster Risk Management / Climate Change Adaptation (pending validation)

A consultant was also hired to develop a capacity-building plan for the LCBC. His work was conducted in collaboration with the LCBC through participatory meetings. To date, the institutional and organizational diagnosis is available and validated, as is the capacity-building plan.

During this period, the project also organized a training workshop for 50 executives including 13 women from the LCBC and its member states, including representatives of the network of parliamentarians and civil society organizations were strengthened on innovative mechanisms for financing biodiversity and climate change through a regional workshop for exchange and sharing of experiences.

The project also organized a training session that aimed to help build the capacity of the LCBC Secretariat to develop quality projects as part of SAP implementation and to appropriate standardized tools and methods to manage them effectively and report better on SAP

implementation levels. Fifteen people took part in this capacity building workshop. Thus, the capacities of 15 experts were increased with this training. Likewise, the LCBC focal points all received a set of computer equipment from the project to appropriately perform their tasks.

The strategic documents that the project has developed under component 1 are all awaiting validation by the Council of Ministers. It currently appears that these documents, on which many future activities depend, will not be approved by the Council of Ministers, whose date has not yet been set. Given that the Council of Ministers is held once every six months, there is a significant risk that the project will have to wait six months for these approvals. The implementation of project activities is already behind schedule, and having to wait another six months to continue the execution of certain important activities could significantly impact the achievement of the project's objectives.

In conclusion of what has been said before, the performance under component 1 is Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)

Component 2 "Strengthened and harmonized approaches to the sustainable implementation of legal and policy instruments in the Lake Chad Basin countries promoting increased water availability through effective management of conjunctive use of surface and groundwater

At the time of the mid-term evaluation, an international consultant was working on the formulation of a guidance note for the sustainable implementation of legal and policy instruments in the Lake Chad Basin countries. National consultants have been mobilized by the international consultant in the member states and data collection has been carried out with the support of the national LCBC focal points. The guidance note was made available and its validation at the level of each Member State. The five member states (CAR, Niger, Nigeria, Cameroon and Chad) have already held national workshops to discuss and amend the documents produced by the consultant. The guidance note was validated at the regional level during a workshop in Abuja.

The Council has not yet approved the SAP of Ministers. Since this step has not been taken, it has not been possible to map the donors in detail and to organize their consultative meetings. However, the SSP draft provides a rough mapping of the stakeholder landscape. The delay in the approval of the three strategic documents will impact LCBC in the long term; indeed, the project may not achieve its objectives over time as many future activities depend on these approvals. The crisis induced by covid 19 has slowed the pace of work by preventing the meetings scheduled for these approvals. These documents will not be approved, in all likelihood, in 2021. The

The project will need to find ways to continue implementing important activities that do not require approval by the Council of Ministers.

Performance under component 2 is unsatisfactory (U)

Component 3 "Technical capacity and awareness of national ministries, institutions and other actors (academics, civil society, etc.) strengthened to contribute to sustainable natural resource management practices in the Lake Chad Basin at the national and regional levels".

At the time of the mid-term evaluation, a call for proposals to all NGOs, CSOs, or structures specializing in capacity building, community awareness, and environmental education was issued unsuccessfully and reissued in December 2020. The final selection was not made for reasons related to the necessary optimization of the contribution of all stakeholders. The call was again unsuccessful. An exit strategy has been discussed and consists of mobilising at each member state's level a national NGO/CSO intervening in the basin. A new national appeal has been issued to them.

In the framework of improving the capacity of national research and higher education institutions, a call for micro-projects allowed the identification and awarding of three ideas on the basis of a selective process, namely: (i) the project platform to fight against Gender Based Violence (GBV); (ii) the project my pharmacist; and (iii) the biogas project. These projects, in addition to receiving US\$ 4,000 each for their development, will benefit from incubation within the partner organizations. It should be noted, however, that work with national research and higher education institutions has not yet begun.

The project has undertaken to partner with GWP for training on IWRM. Thirty national cadres from the five states have already been trained and Chad, Niger and Central African Republic have replicated the training at the national level by training another twenty-five national experts each.

Component 3 activities were slow to start because the project could not identify a partner to implement them. The project needed to find an organization that could develop a comprehensive outreach plan and implement it in all five countries. Since the search for a regional partner was unsuccessful, the project set out to find national organizations capable of doing the work in each country based on a program and strategy that would be defined by the project. Suppose the idea is good and allows to restart the activities under this component. In that case, it should be seen that this will require an additional human investment from the project to develop the awareness strategy and the related tools and to train the national organizations to choose in their use, all this, in a concern of harmonization of approaches.

Performance under Component 3 is Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)

Component 4 "The LCBC and member states manage and use data and information from the information management system for effective and sustainable management of land, water and biodiversity resources

At the time of the mid-term evaluation, the project had not initiated the implementation of this component. Nevertheless, exchanges had taken place with GIZ to set up a working group on the subject. At the same time, the project undertook to purchase ten hydrometeorological stations to participate in the generation of data in the Lake Chad basin.

Performance under component 4 is unsatisfactory (U)

Component 5 "LCBC, national governments and local communities gain practical experience and scale-up validation of sustainable ecosystem management and alternative livelihoods".

At the time of the mid-term evaluation, IUCN had just completed the administrative procedures to begin this work. The project has not begun to implement the activities planned for this component. However, preparatory activities have taken place, mainly in the following areas

- the establishment of selection and monitoring committees for microprojects
- the call for proposals for microprojects of farmers' organizations (Chad and Cameroon)
- the screening of microprojects of which 38 microprojects were selected (20 in Waza & 18 in Am-Timan) for a global envelope of approximately XAF 107 151 714
- the call for expressions of interest for the selection of Microfinance Institutions (MFIs)
- The screening of the calls for tender for the selection of MFEs leading to the selection of 2 MFEs to accompany the communities (FINADEV in Chad & Crédit du Sahel in Waza, Cameroon)

The project is behind the original planning in this component. The project has not been able to promote the activities planned in the prodoc, nor has it established viable economic models that can be used at scale for the communities. After discussions and deliberations between the LCBC, the PMU and the member states, the selection of sites to host activities.

Performance under component 5 is unsatisfactory (U)

Component 6 "Evaluation of stress reduction and livelihood improvement activities identified in the SAP leads to a broad investment program to better support SAP implementation"

Activities for this component have not yet started. Pre-feasibility studies and the identification of investment opportunities, can only be done after approval of the SAP and other strategic and operational documents.

By agreeing to pass the approval of the strategic documents to the technical committee, the project could continue its activities without losing more time. At the time of this mid-term review, activities under this component had not started.

Performance under component 6 is unsatisfactory (U)

The following table shows the level of achievement of results for each performance indicator at the time of the mid-term evaluation:

Project strategy	Indicator	Reference level	Mid-term target	Target at the end of the project	Level and mid-term evaluation ¹	Success rating	Evaluation rationale
Objective of the project Achieve ecosystem-based, integrated, and resilient management of the Lake Chad Basin through the implementation	Number of countries implementing SAP actions	The LCBC and countries have developed several strategies (SAPs, NAPs) and investment plans (LCBC Five-Year Investment Plan, Climate Resilience Plan), but their	NOT Validated at the regional level	All countries implementing SAP (and NAP) actions		MU	At mid-term, no country has begun to implement the SAP actions. Indeed, the SAP could not be validated at the regional level. The project nevertheless undertook to organize reading workshops at the national level, at the end, the countries sent the consultant their comments, which were used. The adoption of the SAP at the regional level depends on the Council of Ministers and will probably not take place this year.

¹ Highly satisfactory (HS), satisfactory (S), marginally satisfactory (MS), moderately unsatisfactory (MU), unsatisfactory (U) and highly unsatisfactory (HU)

Project strategy	Indicator	Reference level	Mid-term target	Target at the end of the project	Level and mid-term evaluation ¹	Success rating	Evaluation rationale
of agreed-upon policy, legal, and institutional reforms and investments that improve water quality and quantity, protect biodiversity, and sustain livelihoods.		meaningful implementation is slow to begin.					
	Total number of SAP actions implemented in the basin	0		On average, 10 actions per country before Year 5		U	At the halfway point, no SAP actions have been implemented due to the Council of Ministers' non-validation of this important document.
	Status of ratification of the Water Charter	3 countries have ratified the Water Charter (Feb. 16).	A plea is made to the CAR for the ratification of the charter	All countries have ratified the Water Charter		MS	The water charter was developed and at the start of the project three countries had already ratified it. The CAR has finally ratified the charter but has not yet transmitted the legal instruments to the LCBC.
	Gender mainstreaming in the implementation of the SAP (and the NAP)	The LCBC has a gender strategy, but there is no Gender Analysis or Gender Action Plan.	Finalization of the gender analysis Integration of gender issues in the updated SAP	SAP and NAP implementation activities guided by a Gender Action Plan, designed on the basis of the Gender Analysis, in accordance with and in support of the LCBC Gender Strategy.		MS	At the time of this evaluation, UNESCO was conducting in-depth gender analysis, but this work is not yet complete. It should be noted, however, that it is dependent on UNESCO. In the meantime, the version of the SAP received by the project takes into account gender aspects
Result 1 A strengthened LCBC capable of: (i) Develop and implement policies, investments, and improved integrated ecosystem-based management of the lake through enhanced basin-wide monitoring; and (ii): Develop and manage regional projects	The Council of Ministers approves the update of the SAP	The 2008 SSP exists and needs to be updated.	Updated SAP, including gender mainstreaming and women's empowerment issues validated by the Council of Ministers	Updated SAP, including gender mainstreaming and women's empowerment issues, adopted by all countries by Year 3		MU	The SAP is being finalized. The next Council of Ministers, scheduled for the second week of December, will not receive the finalized SAP in time. Given that the Councils of Ministers are held at six-month intervals, it is feared that the adoption of the SAP will take place at the end of the first half of 2022.

Project strategy	Indicator	Reference level	Mid-term target	Target at the end of the project	Level and mid-term evaluation ¹	Success rating	Evaluation rationale
in accordance with basin priorities expressed in the Lake Chad SAP and other Lake Chad basin strategic documents							
	The Council of Ministers adopts the BD protocol	No BD protocol	The Regional Strategic Action Plan for Biodiversity is validated and the national and territorial action plans are being developed	BD Protocol adopted before Year 4 DRR Protocol adopted before Year 4		MU	Like the SAP, the Regional Strategic Action Plan for Biodiversity is in its draft version. All the States have already organized their reading workshops and transmitted their comments taken into account. The final version should go to the Council of Ministers, which has not yet been done.
	Risk and Disaster Reduction Protocol adopted by the Council of Ministers	No approach adopted for the DRR protocol.	A Cross-Border Strategy Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction is validated at the regional level by the Council of Ministers			MU	Likewise, the countries have drafted and commented on the protocol and is awaiting passage to the Council of Ministers.
	Donor Advisory Committee Meetings		Participation of the Donor Advisory Council in the technical validation of the revised SAP	The Donor Advisory Committee meets annually.		U	The Donor Advisory Committee meeting has not yet taken place, as the SAP has not been validated.
	Mapping of donors		Donor mapping is available and validated	Mapping of donors updated every year		MS	The SAP contains a mapping of potential donors. Its validation is therefore dependent on the validation of the SAP itself.
	The LCBC provides the Council of Ministers with reports on donors, project coordination, and the status of implementation	The LCBC was assisted with the administrative and technical aspects.	The validated SAP proposes a monitoring and evaluation system	LCBC prepares reporting indicators for monitoring the SAP and the Water Charter (Year 1)		MU	The SAP has not been validated. Its draft version contains a monitoring and evaluation framework that has not yet been used.

Project strategy	Indicator	Reference level	Mid-term target	Target at the end of the project	Level and mid-term evaluation ¹	Success rating	Evaluation rationale
	n of the SAP and the Water Charter						
	LCBC staff trained in project management and reporting	To date, there is a lack of training and assistance in donor mapping and monitoring of SAP implementation .	3 agents before Year 2 5 other agents before Year 5 3 agents per country/year (75 in total, ensuring gender equality by encouraging female participation as much as possible) (Number of participants disaggregated by registered gender)	LCBC provides effective reporting to the Year 2-5 Council of Ministers		MS	LCBC staff have been trained in project management and mechanisms for mobilizing innovative financing.
	National staff trained in project management and reporting	To date, there is a lack of training and assistance in donor mapping and monitoring of SAP implementation .	3 agents before Year 2 5 other agents before Year 5 3 agents per country/year (75 in total, ensuring gender equality by encouraging female trainees to participate as much as possible) (Number of participants disaggregated by registered gender)	LCBC provides effective reporting to the Year 2-5 Council of Ministers		MS	The National Focal Points have received training on mobilizing innovative financing.
Result 2 Strengthened and harmonized approaches to the sustainable implementation of legal and policy	Number of countries with harmonized water management policies	Harmonization benchmark to be set in Year 1.	a. Yes (Review of national legal and institutional frameworks and provision of	3 countries before Year 3 5 countries before Year 5		U	A diagnosis of water management policies was made and validated in Abuja during a meeting with the national focal points. Similarly, the project supported the development of a guidance note validated at the regional level for the implementation of water management policies. At

Project strategy	Indicator	Reference level	Mid-term target	Target at the end of the project	Level and mid-term evaluation ¹	Success rating	Evaluation rationale
instruments in the Lake Chad Basin countries that promote increased water availability through effective conjunctive surface and groundwater management			a guidance note validated at the regional level + roadmap)				mid-term, no country has yet put the policy in place; the project aims to support 2 to 3 countries in the coming months.
	Number of countries with a functioning ICD		b. 2 Countries (Pilot Projects) a. Yes b. At least 1 Country holds a session a. Draft CIM / Country Revitalization Strategy	ICDs active in all countries before Year 4.		MU	IMCs exist in all countries but are not functional. The challenge of the theme to be discussed and the financing is essential.
	MICs facilitate approval of the updated SAP at the national level		b. Involvement of ICDs in the revision of the SAP	All MICs are actively supporting the SAP update and approval process in their respective countries.		MU	At the national level, workshops were held to review the SAP. These workshops brought together technicians from the ministries whose missions are covered by the SAP. These workshops provided the consultants with guidelines for finalizing the SAP
	Approved MIC financial and operational sustainability plans		a. Financial and operational sustainability plans contained in the national IMC revitalization strategy drafts	3 countries before Year 4 5 countries before Year 5		U	The financial and operational sustainability of the MICs is the responsibility of the countries. The project has set aside a small budget to support them over the next two years, but has not yet begun advocacy or defining a clear strategy for their sustainability.
	Number of countries with joint operating policies		2 (as a pilot	3 countries before Year 4		U	No country is yet committed to the implementation of common operating policies as the SAP provides such guidance but is not yet adopted.
Result 3 Technical capacity and	National/local training programs	The LCBC has received significant	a. Elaboration of national	5 training programs defining capacity building		MU	The LCBC has partnered with GWP (Global Water Partnership) to bring the theme back to water management.

Project strategy	Indicator	Reference level	Mid-term target	Target at the end of the project	Level and mid-term evaluation ¹	Success rating	Evaluation rationale
awareness of national ministries, institutions and other actors (academics, civil society, etc.) strengthened to contribute to sustainable natural resource management practices in the Lake Chad Basin at the national and regional levels	Number of national staff trained in water management	training at the regional level. Benchmark for national capacity development to be set in Year 1	program drafts (1/country) b.1 guide and awareness materials At least 1 training at the regional level and 2 trainings at the national level	activities developed and approved by the first CSP National experts: 10 (directly) and 30 (indirectly) per country by Year 5; Academics/Researchers: 20 (directly) 100 (indirectly) per country by Year 5 Water users: 40 (directly) and 100 (indirectly) prior to Year 5;			Four experts from each member state were trained in IWRM. In Nigeria, Chad and CAR, the experts have trained another thirty experts at the national level. Cameroon and Niger are in the process of preparing for national training.
	Number of meetings/workshops for researchers/academics		b. 10 (directly) and 30 (indirectly)	4 meetings before Year 5 (Number of participants disaggregated by registered gender)		U	This activity has not yet started. The project has not yet organized specific meetings or workshops with researchers and academics.
	Number of new joint projects by basin institutions		c.N/A	3 per country before Year 5		U	No new joint projects have been initiated at the time of this evaluation.
	Environmental awareness meetings/workshops in each country		d.N/A	3 per year (Years 2 to 5) per country		MU	In collaboration with UNDP's Development Acceleration Laboratory, the project has signed an agreement with a local organization on waste management and activities are ongoing
	Increased level of community awareness on water, environment, climate change		The conceptual foundations are laid b. N/A c. 0 a. Development of materials and a roadmap	Survey results indicate a 100% increase by Year 5		U	Outreach activities have not yet begun.
Result 4 LCBC and member states manage and use data and information from the information management system for	Multi-level participatory monitoring approach designed and implemented	Monitoring is defined in the Water Charter, but implementation and data sharing are limited	Inventory of the existing situation a. Support the creation and operation of a working group at the	Draft program adopted Year 2, tested and finalized by Year 4		U	This activity has not yet begun. The multilevel participatory monitoring approach has not yet been defined

Project strategy	Indicator	Reference level	Mid-term target	Target at the end of the project	Level and mid-term evaluation ¹	Success rating	Evaluation rationale
effective and sustainable management of land, water and biodiversity resources			regional level b. 1 working group session c. N/A				
	Agreements on data exchange protocols		Approval by Member States of the monitoring system and guidelines (monitoring system)	Data exchange protocols (consistent with the Water Charter) adopted prior to Year 3		U	There is no agreement yet on the data exchange protocols.
	Adoption of the program by the Member States			Approved by all countries by Year 5		U	The program is not yet in place.
	Strengthened national data/information management capabilities		a. Upgrade of the Data Management System	3 national experts per country trained to use the LCBC data management system		MU	The project is purchasing ten hydrometeorological stations to participate in the collective effort to generate and share data. These stations have just been acquired but have not yet been installed to provide the required data.
	Support of the IW:LEARN network		a. IW:LEARN website set up	IW:LEARN website set up within 6 months of project start-up 2 IWC conferences with 2 LCBC delegates supported for each. 1 experience note produced before Year 3, and 3 before Year 5 The sharing project (exchange, twinning) with 2 other basins before Year 5 (Number of participants disaggregated by registered gender. Qualified women are strongly encouraged to participate in the		U	The web page has not yet been set up because the project has not accumulated enough knowledge that can be capitalized and posted.

Project strategy	Indicator	Reference level	Mid-term target	Target at the end of the project	Level and mid-term evaluation ¹	Success rating	Evaluation rationale
				training organized by the project).			
Result 5 LCBC, national governments and local communities gain practical experience and scale up validation of sustainable ecosystem management and alternative livelihoods	Number of active pilot projects created	No project	At least 10 projects in progress	10 projects from all countries completed by Year 5 Specific RH/SE indicators/targets (kg/year, ha of grass removed, individuals supported, household income increased, etc.) prepared before Year 1 Orientation and information sheets prepared for each pilot and community intervention site prior to Year 5.		U	No pilot project has yet been set up. IUCN has just completed identifying sites and micro-projects (38 micro-projects) in Chad and Cameroon.
	Number of national/local projects with EU funding	135 and 34 respectively in Waza and Zakouma sites	At least 10 communities are identified and funding mechanisms are implemented to support them	10 projects completed in the basin by Year 5.		U	No projects have yet been implemented. Discussions on the communities to host the projects are still ongoing.
	Gender mainstreaming and women's empowerment through the implementation of the Gender Action Plan	There is a LCBC gender strategy, but no specific Gender Analysis or Action Plans	An action plan is developed and available	Gender analysis and gender action plan prepared to guide implementation of community activities, once target communities are identified		MU	The consultant in charge of the elaboration of the gender action plan has been recruited and has started the activity that will be backed up by the gender study that UNESCO is currently conducting.
	Number of replication strategies.	No replication strategy	Good practices and lessons learned from implementation	National replication strategy designed for each country and approved by the IMC.		U	No replication strategy has yet been identified and implemented.

Project strategy	Indicator	Reference level	Mid-term target	Target at the end of the project	Level and mid-term evaluation ¹	Success rating	Evaluation rationale
			on are identified				
	Financial commitment for replication	No financial commitment for replication		Funding identified for replication activities Direct beneficiaries of the pilot project interventions: 200 people (40% women) in Wazi 150 people (50% women) in Zakouma (To be revised during implementation, once sites/communities are confirmed).		U	No financial commitment has been obtained for the replication.
Result 6 Evaluation of stress reduction and livelihood improvement activities identified in the SAP leads to a broad investment program to better support SAP implementation	Number of investment opportunities identified	There is no pre-feasibility study or investment opportunity analysis that helps the LCBC attract the resources required for SAP implementation .	N/A	At least two viable investment opportunities (on average) identified per country		U	No investment opportunities have been identified.
	Number of feasibility studies conducted			A pre-feasibility study done at the basin level.		U	No feasibility study was done at the time of this evaluation.
	Potential investments identified, with possible sources			A \$100 million pipeline established in connection with potential SAP actions, with interim financial sources identified		U	The SAP investment plan is not yet available, as SAP is not yet available

As the table above illustrates, of the thirty-four indicators assessed, on a six-point² scale ranging from Very Satisfactory to Very Unsatisfactory, six are MS (yellow), eight are MU (yellow) and twenty are U (red). The indicators in red are those where the progress of the activities is too slow to expect to reach the final result in time or the indicators corresponding to activities that have not yet been initiated.

The project did not reach most of its mid-term targets, as defined in the PRODOC, mainly because of Covid 19. Also, the deterioration of the security situation in some areas prevented some activities.

With the Covid 19 crisis, the project came to a halt. Indeed, the restrictive measures on travel and meetings that were put in place had a substantial impact on the implementation of activities and the finalization of products. This finalization always required consultations that could not be held in person because of the situation. The project has finally adapted to working remotely, but this comes with its challenges in several areas, notably the lack of a telephone network and very often the difficulty of concentrating participants with online meetings that last for days.

ii. Remaining barriers to achieving the goal

The biggest challenge for the project to achieve the objective is the validation of the strategic documents, on the basis of which the rest of the activities are based. The Council must approve these strategic documents of Ministers of the LCBC, which meets only every six months. At the time of this evaluation, the date of the 2021 Council of Ministers had not yet been set. In any case, although technically validated, strategic documents such as the SAP, the SAPRB, and the disaster risk reduction framework cannot be approved this year. This means that we will have to wait until 2022 to approve these documents at the next Council of Ministers. This would likely be another source of delay in implementation, as the project is already behind schedule on some activities. Similarly, the second major challenge in implementing the activities planned for the coming years will be the cross-cutting consideration of the pandemic in the implementation of activities. Indeed, the health crisis due to Covid 19, which appeared in 2020, has changed the global, regional and national context. This pandemic has emerged in the Lake Chad Basin as both a health crisis and a humanitarian and development crisis. At the time of this assessment, the emergence of the Omicron variant of Covid 19 poses the risk of movement restrictions and regrouping. Thus, the implementation strategy for certain activities requiring large regional gatherings (workshops, meetings, capacity-building sessions) will have to be reviewed to adapt it to the health crisis context.

Finally, the upcoming elections in Chad and the transition process that could end in 2022 or 2023 pose a significant risk to the project's ability to continue its activities without problems. It should also be noted that there was a difficulty in reconciling the countries' agendas for the organization of certain important events and in some cases the mobilization of the focal points in the implementation of the project.

In addition, the institutional anchoring and clarification of the PMU's roles and responsibilities for all stakeholders could potentially impact the implementation of project activities.

Project implementation follows the procedures outlined in the project document. However, the PTA 2020 and 2021 have taken into account the realities on the ground and an emphasis has been placed on the effective participation of all stakeholders and the establishment of strategic

² Highly satisfactory (HS), satisfactory (S), marginally satisfactory (MS), moderately unsatisfactory (MU), unsatisfactory (U) and highly unsatisfactory (HU)

partnerships to ensure constructive synergy of action. Therefore, it is clear that project activities will be affected and must necessarily take this into account for further implementation.

This report has reviewed the major events of 2020 and part of 2021 and the main results achieved by the project to date. While emphasis will be placed on the effective start-up of components 3, 5 and 6, it appears that the project will still face the health crisis and associated restrictive measures in 2022 and 2023. The project intends to comply with governmental requirements and put in place an appropriate implementation strategy with the following general principles

- The implementation of a strategy adapted to the context in order to achieve the expected results;
- Validation of strategic documents at the regional level and their distribution at the national level;
- Programming the bulk of the activities over the first half of 2022;
- The use of national consultants;
- Mobilization and leadership of the LCBC National Focal Points in the implementation of activities at the country level;
- The need to strengthen national focal points for the implementation and monitoring of activities at the country level.

3. Project implementation and reactive management

i) Institutional arrangements

The day-to-day management of the project is entrusted to the PMU, which is composed of a coordinator, a monitoring and evaluation manager, an administrative and financial manager and an administrative and financial assistant. The PMU is housed in a building owned by the LCBC. The coordinator is responsible for the supervision of the PMU team and the daily implementation of activities. According to his Tdr, he works under the direct supervision of the Executive Secretary of the LCBC.

It should be noted that LCBC has 2 types of project management modes:

- Projects such as Presibalt and Prolac... whose resources are directly managed by the LCBC are under the supervision of the Technical Director.
- Projects such as GEF UNDP, RSS, GIZ...which have management entities (PMU, Secretariat...) work in close collaboration with the Technical Directorate under the supervision of the Executive Secretary.

The misunderstanding that arose from this particularity complicated the situation for the PMU... The nature of the relationship between the PMU and the LCBC is strongly correlated to the clarity of the working relationship between them. As an example, activities planned for the first half of 2021 have been postponed or cancelled by the LCBC Interim Technical Directorate. Another practical example of potential problems arising from this situation is the fact that the coordinator must seek dual approval (from UNDP and the LCBC) for many of his tasks, often with questions about the order in which these approvals are obtained. There is a need for UNDP and LCBC to quickly re-discuss the roles and responsibilities of each party in the implementation of the project.

The project has a steering committee, but discussions with some of the actors show that, unlike all the LCBC projects, it is the only one whose steering committee members are ministers and the conclusions of this steering committee are directly endorsed by the ministerial session composed of these same ministers. Since the launch of this project, there has been a real difficulty in bringing together the members of the steering committee on the scheduled date. Consequently, there is a need to align it with the other projects of the LCBC so that the steering committee is composed by Experts and their work submitted to the adoption of the Council of Ministers. Given that the project has long been in difficulties to launch its activities and that few incisive decisions have been taken to unblock the situation, it becomes normal to ask about the steering committee meetings. Since the beginning of the project, three committees have met and the decisions taken have not allowed these problems to be resolved in time. The role of the steering committee needs to be revisited and its meetings need to be more systematically held to expose problems and challenges in a broad way and to require appropriate solutions at the end of these meetings. The project also has a technical committee that meets on a regular and ad hoc basis to discuss ways to support implementation. The technical committee meetings are convenient and comprehensive.

While the organizational structure of the LCBC for the project is clear and the roles of all parties are clearly illustrated in a project organization chart, it is clear from the data available to the mission regarding the management and oversight of the LCBC that there is the issue of the project's linkage to the LCBC that needs to be discussed.

Half of the project indicators are on track while the other half are behind their mid-term targets. This suggests that the coordinating team needs to revisit its management and planning approach to ensure that the program is on track and able to achieve its pre-established objectives and outcomes by the end of the project.

ii) Work planning

The project provides annual work plans submitted to the steering committee, which approves them. These annual work plans are then broken down into semi-annual work plans whose implementation is monitored by the technical committee, which gives its opinion and helps the PMU move forward with the implementation of activities. When establishing the work plans, the PMU tries as much as possible to coordinate its interventions with other UNDP and LTBC activities so as not to have two major activities taking place at the same time. The work plans are continuously monitored and updated in collaboration with the technical committee.

iii) Financing and co-financing

At the time of the mid-term evaluation in November 2021, the financial execution rates of the LWBC components are given in the following table:

Program components	Estimated budget	Budget spent	Financial implementation rate	Analysis
Component N°1 Capacity Building	905,000	741443	82%	Effective transboundary management of the Lake watershed through a strengthened Lake Chad Basin Commission. Even if the strategic

				documents to be established under this component have not yet been approved, substantial investments have already been made to obtain the drafts already shared and commented by all stakeholders.
Component N°2 Infrastructure	552,381	336462	61%	Establishment of effective and sustainable national governance structures to support the SAP and Water Charter.
Component N°3. AGR	1,150,000	186423	16%	Strengthened capacity of national ministries, institutions, and other stakeholders (e.g., academia, civil society) to support policy harmonization, monitoring, and improved management of the Lake Chad Basin Ecosystem
Component 4: Program Management	610,000	95116	16%	Monitoring, Modeling and Data/Information for Integrated Management of Basin Water, Land Resources and Biodiversity
Component N°5	1,835,000	277312	15%	Implement pilot projects based on targeted communities to demonstrate the benefits of stress reduction at the local/national/regional level in support of SAP implementation
Component N°6	500,000	122006	24%	Pre-feasibility studies to identify investment opportunities for the Lake Chad SAP
Component N°7	527,619	318 615	60%	Program management
Total program	6,080,000	2 077 377	34%	In general, the project is behind in the execution of the budget with 34% that has been used. This is due to the fact that : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the majority of the meetings that were to be organized for the validation of the documents were not held or were held online. - Activities under components 5 and 6 are significantly behind

Parallel co-financing of the project is estimated at :

Institutions	Amount
UNDP	1,933,290 dollars
LCBC	5,884,250 dollars
Governments	216,238,733
GIZ	9,476,031 dollars
IUCN	2,500,000 dollars
Total amount of co-financing	236,032,304 dollars

At the time of this evaluation, the activities targeted in the co-financing were underway with their respective budgets. The project is working in collaboration with GIZ which is updating

the TDA, IUCN which is in charge of the activities under component 5 and supports the efforts of national governments in their fight against the effects of climate change and water management in the basin.

The project started with a long delay. Almost five years passed between the planning period and implementation. In the meantime, realities had changed but were not reflected in the project document. It took time to set up its governance bodies and get them up and running. Since many activities depend on SAP approval, and covid has prevented meetings budgeted for SAP adoption, the financial implementation rate remains low. It is 34% at the end of November 2021.

Performance under Implementation and Adaptive Management is Moderately Satisfactory (MS)

iv) Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems

Design of the monitoring and evaluation system

In the Prodoc, M&E tasks and responsibilities are clearly defined in the detailed monitoring plan and are to be carried out through: (i) monitoring and supervision missions of the project's progress; (ii) technical monitoring of indicators; (iii) monitoring activities at the LCBC country level; (iv) mid-term and final evaluations (independent consultants).

The monitoring and evaluation system is at two levels and involves several stakeholders. The project coordinator is responsible for project monitoring and evaluation quality at the management and supervision level. He prepares a project progress report (every three months and once a year). On this basis and on an annual basis, the Monitoring and Evaluation Officer prepares the Project Implementation Report (PIR).

Financially, resources are provided for in the design for most of the key elements of the monitoring and evaluation, namely: the mid-term evaluation, the final evaluation and the monitoring missions.

The analysis of the project results matrix shows a balance between quantitative and qualitative indicators, however, some indicators do not have clearly defined targets.

Monitoring and Evaluation performance at entry is Satisfactory (S)

Implementation of monitoring and evaluation

In the implementation, the project has a Monitoring and Evaluation Officer who is responsible for collecting data and filling in indicators. This person initiates and coordinates the reflection with all the actors in order to draw lessons during the implementation. The PMU conducts monitoring missions in the field.

In the field, part of the monitoring and evaluation will be handled by the implementing partners through contractual agreements that describe the quality of the processes, the results and the expected reporting format. The meetings and activities to read the strategic documents that have already taken place have been documented and specific reports exist for each of them. Regarding the activities under components 3 and 5 that will take place directly in the field, the project has not yet established the monitoring tools used by the implementing partners. When

digitised, these tools will be useful very soon with the launch of field activities at the country level with IUCN and other implementing partners and in the context of the continuation of Covid with the emergence of the Omicron variant in the context of the prevalence of insecurity.

The performance of the implementation of Monitoring and Evaluation is Satisfactory

v) Stakeholder Engagement

The LCBC, which is the main interlocutor of the PMU, is involved in the implementation of activities. It participates in the steering committee and the technical committee of the project. At the country level, the interaction of the PMU with the Focal Points is done through the LCBC. The strategic documents that have been produced to date have all been shared with the LCBC and its Focal Points. Reading workshops have been organized to collect the countries' views on the content of these strategic documents. Their comments have been taken into account.

The National Focal Points also facilitate the connection between the PMU and the institutions involved in some of the activities such as training. National governments are represented in the steering committee. Three committee meetings have already taken place and have allowed all those among them who wanted to discuss the project's activities and performance to be heard.

vi) Environmental and social safeguards

The project is classified as "low" in terms of environmental and social safeguards, with low impact environmental and social impacts. No long-term negative environmental impacts are expected. Positive social impacts are expected with the establishment of profitable ecosystem-based income-generating activities. The project's potential negative environmental and social impacts would result mainly from Component 5 activities related to the rehabilitation of sites infested by invasive species and the development of market gardening and cash crop activities. Component 5 activities have not yet started in the field. The selection of the sites that should host these activities has been the subject of negotiations between the countries, the LCBC, IUCN and the PMU. A call for applications has been issued to recruit a consultant to update the CGES. A consensus was reached to reduce the risk of disruption of activities. Given that several UNDP procedures have changed in the meantime and that insecurity continues to prevail, the nature of the risks faced by the project has certainly changed.

vii) Reporting

Meetings related to project activities are well documented. For example, national workshops to review strategic documents were all reported on in a format given to them beforehand. There do not appear to be any follow-up reports that determine the level of utilization of the knowledge acquired by the beneficiaries of the training.

The project is tracking its risks in the UNDP ATLAS system. Project performance reports (PIRs) have been produced for 2020 and 2021.

viii) Communication and knowledge management

The project should create a webpage on the IW:LEARN (International Waters Learning exchange & Resource network) platform. This platform was created to "strengthen transboundary water management worldwide by collecting and sharing best practices, lessons learned, and innovative solutions to common problems across the GEF international waters portfolio. It promotes learning among project managers, national officials, implementing agencies, and other partners." The knowledge generated by the project should be systematized and posted on this page. At the time of this evaluation, the page in question had not been set up. Similarly, very few communication products (except for flyers, factsheets and kakemonos) have been generated since the beginning of the implementation. The project does not have newsletters to communicate on the activities carried out and the results achieved. However, the project's implementation status is available online on the UNDP Chad page and the LCBC website.

4. Sustainability

i) Financial risks to sustainability

The LCBC member states are among the poorest in the world. Rebellions (in all five countries), HIV, malaria, climate change and related natural disasters (droughts and floods) thwart all their efforts to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), in particular SDG1 (No Poverty), SDG2 (Zero Hunger) and SDG13 (Action on Climate Change) The LCBC derives its financial resources from the annual statutory dues of member countries. Unfortunately, these are irregular, which hinders the effective functioning of the organization. Similarly, with the arrival of COVID 19 and its impacts on the economy, the States have reviewed their investment priorities and may seek to meet the immediate basic needs of their people before investing in the safeguarding of the ecosystems around the Lake Chad Basin. The latter investments would take much longer to become visible and therefore may not be a priority. As a result, financial risks are always important to the sustainability of project results.

ii) Socio-economic sustainability

The social risk that was identified at the time of project design was related to the project's potential to have a negative effect on gender equality and/or the situation of women and girls. This risk was rated Low and the measures that would be taken to minimize it were that the Ecosystem-Based Adaptation development activities will privilege these women and girls in the project areas. This risk remains Low at the time of the mid-term evaluation. In addition, socio-political sustainability will arise at the country level but will not affect the overall project. UNDP and LCBC intend to work closely with the National Focal Points to identify potential problems and recommend specific interventions to reduce these potentially negative impacts. The participation of all countries in the project's Executive Board and the LCBC's reports to the Council of Ministers will also provide a framework for addressing potential problems at the country level.

iii) Environmental sustainability

It was noted in the SESP that the project could have an adverse effect on habitats and the ecosystem in general. However, this risk was considered low, even though actions are planned under Component 5 for this project and under other development partners such as GIZ and ADB that also seek to improve the management and resilience of the Basin's ecosystems. This work will be done in coordination with the recent Lake Chad Climate Resilience and Development Plan (presented at UNFCCC COP 21). At the time of the mid-term evaluation, the project's environmental sustainability was not at risk. The actions that will be undertaken in the framework of the implementation of this project will rather be beneficial to the environment. A consultant is being recruited to update the SESP.

iv) Institutional framework and governance risks

The steering committee of the project is mainly composed of Ministers. Since the launch of this project, there has been a real difficulty in bringing together the steering committee members on the planned date because of their often busy schedules. This could cause a problem for the sustainability of the actions. Similarly, the relationship of the project staff to the LCBC is confusing for the stakeholders. The staff of the Management Unit answers to UNDP and, within the framework of the coordinator, to the Executive Secretary of the LCBC. In contrast, the other projects answer to the Technical Directorate. This duality causes frustration on both sides. These two problems have significant negative impacts on the project and could be serious risks for the sustainability of actions.

v) Overall risks of the LCBC project

In accordance with standard UNDP requirements, project risks are monitored periodically. Each quarter, a report is prepared on the level of risk. This report is made to the UNDP country office in Chad. The UNDP country office records progress in the ATLAS risk register. Risks are reported as critical when both impact and likelihood are high (i.e., when impact is rated at 5 or 4 and likelihood at 3 or higher). The measures adopted by the project for the risks are also reported to the GEF in the annual report. The following table shows the status of the risks at the time of the mid-term evaluation:

Description	Level	Impact, Probability and risk assessment	Impact, Probability and risk assessment at mid-term evaluation	Mitigation measures
Political instability could affect the implementation of actions at the country level	Organization	P=2 I=4 <i>Medium</i>	P=2 I=4 <i>Medium</i>	The mitigation measure identified in the Prodoc is still valid: UNDP and the LCBC Secretariat will work closely with the country representatives to the LCBC to identify potential problems and recommend specific interventions to reduce these potentially negative impacts. The participation of all countries in the Project Board and the LCBC reports to the Council of Ministers will also provide a framework for addressing potential issues at the national level.
The multiplicity of interventions for the implementation of the SAP without effective coordination by the LCBC could diminish the	Environment	P=2 I=3 <i>Low</i>	P=3 I=3 <i>Medium</i>	UNDP and other partners (GIZ, ADB) have begun to work together to establish a partner platform under the authority of the LCBC (Output 1.4) for better coordination of interventions and donors. This donor coordination (as well as related monitoring and evaluation and implementation

expected results and create duplication.				reporting activities, such as the SAP) will help establish good coordination among actors.
Environmental variability and climate change could alter ecosystem functions and reduce ecosystem services.	Environment	P=2 I=3 <i>Medium</i>	P=1 I=2 Low	Decisive actions will be initiated within the framework of the project (Component 5) and the interventions of other partners (e.g., GIZ and AfDB) to improve the management and resilience of the basin's ecosystems. This work will be done in coordination with the Lake Chad Climate Resilience and Development Plan (presented at UNFCCC COP 21)
Insecurity in the area - frequent terrorist attacks or acts of banditry - may compromise the implementation and monitoring of the program	Environmental and social	P=3 I=2 <i>Low</i>	P=4 I=4 High	In the Prodoc, it was foreseen that the security and intelligence services of the LCBC member states agree to join their efforts to provide a common and coordinated response to the current security problems related to the threats posed by terrorism. Similarly, UN security assessments and guidelines will inform the situation. This collaboration is real, however, insecurity in some parts of the project areas is very high and prevents good planning of the project implementation. This risk is high at the time of the Mid-Term Evaluation.
The staff of the sectoral ministries lack the technical capacity to implement the activities	Social	P=3 I=3 <i>Medium</i>	P=3 I=3 Medium	The project plans to provide appropriate training, especially for Component 3. The project intends to strengthen the countries' capacities to meet the requirements in terms of data/information collection and harmonization of basin management policies in order to help officials and users to support key activities. In addition, the LCBC Focal Point at the country level is very often tasked with other important tasks as part of their normal work. This means that they cannot always prioritize project actions. This risk is medium in its likelihood of occurrence and potential impact.

Two major risks mark the project at the time of this mid-term evaluation. These are the increased level of insecurity in certain areas of the project and the arrival of Covid 19 and its impacts on all levels, particularly on the financial capacities of countries to invest in safeguarding ecosystems.

Performance under Sustainability is Moderately Likely (ML)

Conclusions and recommendations

1. Conclusions

The project "Improving Lake Chad Management by Implementing the Lake Chad Basin Strategic Action Program to Build Resilience to Climate Change and Reduce Stress on Ecosystems" is a GEF initiative funded for the Lake Chad Basin countries. The project is relevant because it is directly linked to the needs of the beneficiary countries to manage water in a concerted manner and combat the effects of climate change in the region. The project aims to build on the updated Cross-Border Diagnostic Analysis to update the SAP and develop the SRAP and the document for reducing vulnerability to risks and disasters in the region.

At the halfway point, the project was able to finalize the draft of the three strategic documents but could not have them validated by the council of ministers of the LCBC, which is held every six months. Since the date of the next council of ministers has not yet been set, it is feared that these documents will not be approved immediately. However, most future activities depend on these approved documents, mainly country-level work and ongoing planning with the development of operational work plans, investment plans, identification of investment

opportunities and implementation of concrete actions identified in these strategic documents. At mid-term, the activities planned in the SAP could not be implemented because the SAP and the other documents that follow could not be approved.

Capacity building of the LCBC is one of the objectives of the project. This strengthening of the LCBC will involve targeted training and the establishment of procedures for data generation and information sharing among member states and with relevant development actors. The project has undertaken to participate in the data generation effort by purchasing ten automatic weather stations that will be placed at several strategic locations in the basin. These stations complement other stations purchased by other projects. They will certainly help generate the hydro-climatic information necessary for good planning to anticipate flooding or other parameters characteristic of climate change. It should be noted that the various partners who embark on the purchase of hydrometeorological stations must ensure that the devices they purchase can connect to the system that the LCBC will set up to avoid that the systems are isolated from each other. In addition, as part of the strengthening of the LCBC, the trainings provided help improve the performance of LCBC and Focal Point staff. Even if they seem relevant, these trainings should be based on a detailed LCBC training needs assessment, after which the most important trainings could be identified and implemented.

In the context of the revitalization of the Inter-Ministerial Councils, it is recognized that these councils are in place in all countries, but they are not yet functional. The non-functionality of the IMCs is partly due to the lack of animation and topics to be discussed in these councils. In addition, the financing of the IMC meetings is quite heavy and the project has provided only limited support for them. Finally, the CIM meetings should see the participation of several ministers, which has been a problem until now, with the difficulty of reconciling the agendas of all the ministers who are expected to participate. The financial viability of these IMCs is also one of the objectives of the project. The project has not yet established a clear strategy that could lead to the empowerment of the MICs, other than the fact that the governments should take charge of these MICs. It is feared that the situation of the MICs will not be different between the beginning and the end of the project if nothing is done at this level.

The outreach activities planned by the project will provide opportunities to discuss with communities, their representatives and national stakeholders, issues related to water management and the effects of climate change. These activities had not begun at the time of this review. Indeed, the project was unable to identify the perfect partner to carry out these activities. The project finally decided to select several national NGOs to provide the framework and content of the sensitization sessions to harmonize approaches. The areas to host the awareness sessions and community projects should also be identified. Discussions on the zones for these activities are still ongoing and should be completed in the near future. At this level, it should be noted a disconnection between the areas to host the awareness sessions and community projects and those of the activities of component 5 with IUCN on the recovery of invasive plants. Putting these activities together in the same areas would accelerate implementation by avoiding lengthy site selection processes, since these processes have already been completed with the activities of Component 5.

The project intends to support the LCBC and the member states to generate and adequately use the data and information from the information system for the good management of land, water resources and biodiversity. At this level, the project has directly undertaken to purchase ten hydrometeorological stations to be installed at different locations of the lake. It is clear that the equipment is useful but defining the information needs of the countries, based on a clear audit of what exists, the nature and quantity of information that is currently generated remains a challenge. The stations purchased by the project may not work during the project's life if urgent action is not taken to identify the information needs and current capabilities of the system in place.

The partnership with IUCN is beneficial for the project as it is an organization with a good level of knowledge of the area and a recognized mastery of the topic. At the halfway point, the project has just finished selecting the sites to host the pilot projects to valorise invasive plants. The project does not have sufficient funds to scale up the pilot activities. Therefore, it is important that these pilot actions be well documented and that the knowledge gained from them be shared and used to search for potential investments to be made in the basin. It is important for the project and for the participating communities not to lose sight of the pilot research aspect that future activities must take on to reap more benefits in the future.

2. Recommendations

At the conclusion of this evaluation, the following recommendations were made:

#	Recommendations	Priority	Recipient
1	Quickly organize a UNDP (Chad and NCE) and LCBC meeting to clarify the anchoring of the PMU in relation to the LCBC Directorates/Divisions	High	LCBC - UNDP
2	Develop a business continuity strategy for the project in the event of a major crisis for the years 2022 and 2023	High	PMU
3	Update the environmental and social safeguards of the project	High	PMU
4	Strengthen the thematic and geographic focus of project interventions at the local level by aligning Component 3 activities with Component 5 intervention sites	High	LCBC-UGP
5	Submit the strategic documents developed to the technical committee for validation pending approval by the Council of Ministers and obtain an endorsement for the continuation of activities until the SAP is validated.	High	Project Steering Committee
8	Rapidly replan project activities to complete actions before the planned end of the project	High	PMU
9	Hire a part-time consultant to assist in knowledge management, development of communication tools, and to provide the communication component of the project,	Moderate	LCBC - UNDP

	which will improve communication on results achieved and knowledge sharing		
10	Establish practical and harmonized monitoring and evaluation tools and build the capacity of actors to use them.	High	Project

Annexes

1. Terms of Reference (excluding annexes to the ToR)

Country: Chad

Project: Improving Lake Chad management through building climate change resilience and reducing ecosystem stress through implementation of the Strategic Action Programme for the Lake Chad basin

Job Title: International Consultant in charge of the Mid-Term Review (MTR) of the Regional Project " Improving Lake Chad management through building climate change resilience and reducing ecosystem stress through implementation of the Strategic Action Programme for the Lake Chad basin ".

Duration: Forty (40) working days over a period of six (6) calendar weeks from June 21 to August 13, 2021, not to exceed three (3) months from the time the Consultant is hired.

Duty station: N'Djamena

Type of contract : Individual Contract

Target start date of the mission: June 21, 2021

1. INTRODUCTION

This document describes the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Mid-Term Review (MTR) of the GEF-funded large- to medium-scale project implemented by LCBC in collaboration with UNDP, entitled "Improving Lake Chad Management by Implementing the Lake Chad Basin Strategic Action Program to Build Resilience to Climate Change and Reduce Stress on Ecosystems" (PIMS 4797). If the project started with a delay compared to its creation date in ATLAS (January 01^{er}2018) and the date of signature of the project document (Prodoc signed on December 24, 2018), it actually started on November 11, 2019 with an official launching workshop. It is therefore in its second year of actual implementation. These ToRs set out the expectations for this **mid-term project evaluation**. The mid-term review process should follow the guidelines set forth in the document "*Guidelines for Conducting Mid-Term Reviews of UNDP-Supported and GEF-Funded Projects*" available at the address below.

http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/midterm/Guidance_Midterm%20Review%20_FR_2014.pdf.

2. BASIC INFORMATION ABOUT THE PROJECT

The table below describes the project's rationale, objectives, components, main results achieved, area of intervention, implementation period, total budget and expected co-financing.

Project title: Improving the management of Lake Chad by implementing the Strategic Action Program for the Lake Chad Basin to build resilience to climate change and reduce stress on ecosystems		
Countries: Cameroon, Niger, Nigeria, Central African Republic and Chad	Implementing Partner: Lake Chad Basin Commission (LCBC)	Administrative Arrangement: Implementation by an IGO
UNDAF/Country Program Outcome: Axis 2: Rural development and food security Outcome 2.3: Sustainable management of natural resources and the environment and the establishment of climate change adaptation and mitigation mechanisms are supported.		
UNDP Strategic Plan 2018-2021 Output: 1.4.1 Scaled-up solutions for sustainable natural resource management, including sustainable raw materials and inclusive green value chains.		
Product Indicator:		

Natural resources managed under sustainable use, conservation, access and benefit-sharing arrangements: (c) Number of aquatic ecosystems (freshwater or marine) shared under collaborative management	
UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Category: Low	UNDP Gender Marker: GEN 2
Atlas Grant ID: 00086651	Project ID Atlas: 00093875
UNDP-GEF PIMS ID number : 4797	FEM ID number: 4748
Expected start date: April 2018	Estimated completion date: March 2023
Date of CAP meeting June 2016	
Brief Project Description: <p>Lake Chad is home to a growing population, which must urgently address the effects of climate change on the basin's water resources and ecosystem. It provides millions of people living in Cameroon, CAR, Chad, Niger, and Nigeria with diverse environmental services, such as provisioning (food and water), sustaining (land and nutrient cycling), regulating (groundwater replenishment, carbon sequestration, air purification), and cultural (recreation, spirituality, education).</p> <p>Environmental resources are essential for the survival of the population of Lake Chad, both for their subsistence and for their economic activities. The accelerated degradation of water resources and ecosystems is exacerbated by the current security situation and the subsequent migration of livestock and people in search of a better life. In 2008, with the support of an earlier UNDP-GEF project, the countries and the LCBC were able to prepare a regional transboundary diagnostic analysis, culminating in the adoption of a regional Strategic Action Program (SAP).</p> <p>This UNDP-GEF project intends to initiate the implementation of the SAP and has the overall objective of achieving ecosystem-based, integrated and resilient management of the Lake Chad Basin through the implementation of agreed policy, legal and institutional reforms and investments that improve water quality and quantity, protect biodiversity and sustain livelihoods. Achieving this objective will address concerns about the capacity of the LCBC and its member states to design and implement sustainable management policies and end unsustainable land and water use practices in accordance with the SAP and the regionally adopted Water Charter. To achieve this objective, the project will achieve six outcomes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. A strengthened LCBC capable of: (i) Develop and implement policies, investments, and improved integrated ecosystem management of the lake through enhanced basin-wide monitoring; and (ii): Develop and manage regional projects in accordance with basin priorities expressed in the Lake Chad SAP and other Lake Chad basin strategic documents. 6. Strengthened and harmonized approaches to the sustainable implementation of legal and policy instruments in the Lake Chad Basin countries that promote increased water availability through effective conjunctive surface and groundwater management 7. Technical capacity and awareness of national ministries, institutions and other actors (academics, civil society, etc.) strengthened to promote sustainable natural resource management practices in the Lake Chad Basin at the national and regional levels 8. LCBC and member states manage and use data and information from the information management system for effective and sustainable management of land, water and biodiversity resources 9. LCBC, national governments and local communities gain practical experience and scale up validation of sustainable ecosystem management and alternative livelihoods 10. Assessment of stress reduction and livelihood improvement activities identified in the SAP leading to a broad investment program to better support SAP implementation 	
FINANCIAL PLAN	
<i>LDC Fund</i>	5,830,000 dollars
UNDP TRAC resources	250.000 dollars

11. Total budget administered by UNDP	6,080,000 dollars
PARALLEL FUNDING	
UNDP	1,933,290 dollars
LCBC	5,884,250 dollars
Government	216,238,733
GIZ	9,476,031 dollars
IUCN	2,500,000 dollars
12. Total amount of co-financing	236,032,304 dollars
13. Total amount of project funding (1)+(2)	242,112,304 dollars

3. OBJECTIVES OF THE MID-TERM REVIEW

The mid-term review will assess the progress made in achieving the objectives and outcomes as specified in the project document. It will assess early signs of success or failure in order to identify necessary changes to put the project on track to achieve the intended results. The MTR will also review the project strategy and its risks to sustainability. The project outcomes outlined in the results framework will be monitored annually and evaluated periodically during project implementation to ensure that the project is achieving these intended outcomes.

The Mid-Term Review (MTR) is an independent process that begins after the submission of the second Implementation Report to the GEF (IRP) and the MTR report will be submitted to the GEF in the same year as the third IRP. The findings and responses of the mid-term review highlighted in the management response will be incorporated as recommendations for improved implementation during the last half of the project term. The terms of reference, review process, and mid-term review report should follow the standard guidelines developed by the UNDP IEO, as well as the guidelines for conducting mid-term reviews of UNDP-supported and GEF-funded projects. As stated in these guidance documents, the evaluation will be "independent, impartial and rigorous. The consultant hired to undertake the assignment will be independent of the organizations that were involved in designing, implementing, or advising on the project being evaluated. The final report of the mid-term review will be available in English and French and will be approved by the UNDP country office and the UNDP-NCE Regional Technical Advisor (RTA), and endorsed by the Project Steering Committee.

4. APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY OF THE MID-TERM REVIEW

The MTR report should provide credible, reliable, and useful evidence-based information.

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, including documents developed during the preparation phase (i.e., the FIP, UNDP Launch Plan, UNDP/SESP Social and Environmental Review Process), the project document (Prodoc), periodic project reports, including annual project performance reports and the IRP, budget revisions, national and regional policy and legal documents, and any other documents that the team deems relevant to this evidence-based review. The consultant will also review the GEF focal area baseline indicators/monitoring tools initially submitted to the GEF for approval by its CEO, as well as the GEF focal area baseline indicators/monitoring tools at mid-term that are to be completed prior to the start of the mid-term field review mission.

The international consultant in charge of the mid-term evaluation is responsible for establishing the evaluation methodology and the tools needed to collect information that will be presented in the form of a methodological note submitted to the sponsor for assessment and validation. The collection of information will concern both qualitative and quantitative data. He/she will also be responsible for defining the appropriate data collection and analysis methods to best present the expected results of the mission.

The evaluator should follow a collaborative and participatory approach ensuring close engagement with the Project Management Unit, government counterparts including the GEF Operational Focal Point, the UNDP Country Office, the Regional Technical Advisor for Nature, Climate and Energy (NCE), direct beneficiaries and other key stakeholders.

Stakeholder engagement is vital to the success of the MTR. Stakeholder engagement should include interviews with stakeholders who have responsibilities in the project, including the executing agency, implementing partners, the Project Management Unit, key experts and consultants in the relevant field, the project steering committee, stakeholders, universities, local authorities, civil society organizations, etc. In addition, to the extent possible, the consultant in charge of the mid-term evaluation will be able to carry out missions in the member states of the LCBC, with priority given to Chad. Since the COVID-19 pandemic does not facilitate travel to the field, virtual tools should be used if necessary.

The specific design and methodology of the MTR should be the result of consultations between the MTR team and the above-mentioned parties regarding what is appropriate and feasible to achieve the purpose and objectives of the MTR and to answer the evaluation questions, given COVID-19, budget, time and data limitations. The MTR consultant should, however, use gender-sensitive methodologies and tools and ensure that gender equality and women's empowerment, as well as other cross-cutting issues including the SDGs, are integrated into the MTR report.

The final methodological approach, including the timing of interviews, field visits and data to be used in the MTR, should be clearly outlined in the inception report and thoroughly discussed and agreed upon by UNDP, stakeholders and the MTR team.

The consultant must be able to determine the best methods and tools for data collection and analysis. The consultant should be able to propose and discuss the approach to consultation with the project and country office M&E manager and key stakeholders. These approaches should be agreed upon and clearly reflected in the MTR inception report.

The final report of the mid-term review should describe the completeness of the approach taken and the rationale for that approach by making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths, and weaknesses of the review methods and approach.

As of March 11, 2020, the World Health Organization (WHO) declared COVID-19 a global pandemic as the new coronavirus has spread rapidly to all regions of the world. Since March 2020, international travel and flights have been subject to intermittent restrictions. If it is not possible to travel to countries for the MTR mission, the MTR team should develop a methodology that takes into account the conduct of the MTR virtually and remotely, the mobilization of state-level resource persons, including the use of remote interview methods and in-depth desk reviews, data analysis, surveys, and evaluation questionnaires. This methodology should be detailed in the MTR inception report and agreed upon with the UNDP contracting unit.

If all or part of the MTR is to be conducted virtually, consideration should be given to the availability, ability or willingness of stakeholders to be interviewed remotely. In addition, their internet/computer accessibility may be an issue as many government and national counterparts will be working from home. These limitations should be reflected in the final MTR report.

If field data collection/mission is not possible, remote interviews can be conducted by telephone or online (MS Team, Skype, Zoom, etc.). The international consultant can work remotely by contracting national evaluators/consultants in the field if they can operate and travel safely. Similarly, qualified, independent national consultants can be mobilized by the international consultant to conduct the MTR and in-country interviews, provided it is safe to do so.

Thus, any limitations encountered during the MTR process and any adjusted evaluation approach/methodology, if any, that may be necessary to effectively implement the evaluation, including safety tips, extensive desk reviews, primary use of national consultants, virtual stakeholder meetings, and virtual interviews by evaluators, should be detailed in the initial and final MTR reports.

5. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE MTR

The consultant conducting the MTR will assess the following four (4) categories of project progress. See the Guide for Conducting Mid-Term Reviews of UNDP-supported and GEF-funded Projects for more detailed descriptions.

i. Project strategy

Project design:

- Examine the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Examine the effect of any assumptions or incorrect contextual changes in achieving the project outcomes as described in the project document.
- Review the appropriateness of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective pathway to the expected or planned results. Have lessons learned from other relevant projects been properly incorporated into the project design?
- Examine how the project responds to the priorities of the LTBC member states. Examine the ownership of the project by the member states. Was the project concept consistent with the member states' priorities and development plans?
- Examine decision-making processes: Were the perspectives of those who would be affected by the project's decisions, those who might affect the outcomes, and those who might contribute information or other resources to the process taken into account in the project design processes?
- Examine the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design. See Annex 9 of the document "*Guidelines for Conducting Mid-Term Reviews of UNDP-Supported GEF-Funded Projects*" for further guidance.
 - Have relevant gender issues (e.g., impact of the project on gender equality in the project area, participation of women's groups, women's involvement in project activities, etc.) been raised in the project document?
- If there are major areas of concern, make recommendations for improvement.

Results Framework / Logical Framework:

- Conduct a critical analysis of the project's logical framework indicators and targets, assess the degree of achievement of SMART (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Realistic, and Time-bound) targets at mid-term and end of project, and suggest specific modifications/revisions to targets and indicators as needed.
- Are the objectives and outcomes or components of the project clear, practical and achievable over time?
- Examine whether progress to date has led to or could in the future catalyze beneficial development effects (i.e., income generation, gender equality and women's empowerment, improved governance, etc.) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored annually.
- Ensure that the broader development and gender aspects of the project are effectively monitored. Develop and recommend SMART "development" indicators, including gender-disaggregated indicators and indicators that capture development benefits.

ii. Progress toward results

Progress Toward Achieving Outcomes:

Review logframe indicators against progress toward end-of-project targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix and following the guidelines for conducting mid-term reviews of UNDP-supported and GEF-funded projects; color-code progress in a "traffic light system" according to the level of progress achieved; assign a progress score for each outcome; make recommendations based on areas marked as "Not on target" (red).

Table. Progress Matrix (achievement of results against end-of-project objectives)

Project strategy	Indicator ³	Reference level ⁴	Level 1 erPIR (self-declared)	Medium-term target ⁵	End of project objective	Medium-term level and evaluation ⁶	Success rating ⁷	Evaluation rationale
Objective:	Indicator (if applicable):							
Result 1:	Indicator 1:							
	Indicator 2:							
Result 2:	Indicator 3:							
	Indicator 4:							
	Etc.							
Etc.								

Key to the evaluation of indicators

Green= Completed	Yellow= On the objective to be reached	Red= Not on target
------------------	--	--------------------

In addition to the progress made in achieving the outcomes :

- Compare and analyze the GEF baseline monitoring tool/indicators with the one completed just prior to the mid-term review.
- Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the project's aftermath.
- By examining the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further extend these benefits.
- Are the specific issues related to COVID-19 being addressed in the project implementation? What are the limitations of the project with respect to the impacts of COVID-19?

iii. Project implementation and adaptive management

Management arrangements:

- Review the overall effectiveness of project management as described in the project document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and lines of authority clear? Is the decision-making process transparent and timely? Recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of execution of the executing agency/implementing partner(s) and recommend improvements.
- Review the quality of support provided by the GEF Partner Agency (UNDP) and recommend areas for improvement.
- Does the Implementing Agency/Investment Partner and/or UNDP and other partners have the capacity to provide benefits to or involve women? If so, how?
- What is the gender balance of project staff? What steps have been taken to ensure gender balance among project staff?
- What is the gender balance of the Project Steering Committee and Technical Committee? What steps have been taken to ensure gender balance on the Committees?

Work Planning:

- Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and review whether they have been resolved.

³Fill in with data from the logical framework and scorecards

⁴Fill in with data from the project document

⁵ If available

⁶Color code for this column only

⁷Use the 6-point progress rating scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU

- Are the work planning processes results-oriented? If not, suggest ways to reorient work planning to focus on results?
- Review the use of the project's results framework/logical framework as a management tool and examine the changes that have been made to it since the project began.

Funding and co-funding:

- Review the financial management of the project, particularly the cost-effectiveness of interventions.
- Review changes in funding allocations as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and timeliness of these revisions.
- Does the project have appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions about the budget and ensure a timely flow of funds?
- Based on the co-financing tracking table to be completed by the Adjudicating Unit and the project team, provide a comment on co-financing: Is co-financing being used strategically to help achieve project objectives? Does the project team meet regularly with all co-funding partners to align funding priorities and annual work plans?

Sources of co-financing	Name of co-financier	Type of co-financing	Amount of co-financing confirmed for CEO approval (US\$)	Actual amount paid at mid-term review (US\$)	Actual percentage of projected amount
		Total			

- Include the separate GEF co-financing template (completed by the Awarding Unit and project team) that categorizes each co-financing amount as either "mobilized investment" or "recurrent expenditure. (This template will be attached as a separate file).

Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems :

- Review the monitoring tools currently in use: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Are they aligned or integrated with country systems? Do they use existing information? Are they effective? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools needed? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive?
- Review the financial management of the project's M&E budget. Are sufficient resources allocated to monitoring and evaluation? Are these resources allocated efficiently?
- Review the extent to which relevant gender issues have been integrated into monitoring systems. See Annex 9 of the document "Guidelines for Conducting Mid-Term Reviews of UNDP-Supported GEF-Funded Projects" for further guidance.

Stakeholder Engagement:

- Project management: Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?
- Participation and country-driven processes: Do local and national government stakeholders support the project's objectives? Do they continue to play an active role in project decision-making to support effective and efficient project implementation?

- Stakeholder participation and public awareness: To what extent has stakeholder participation and public awareness contributed to progress toward project objectives?
- How does the project involve women and girls? Is the project likely to have the same positive and/or negative effects on women and men, girls and boys? Identify, if possible, any legal, cultural, or religious constraints on women's participation in the project. What can the project do to improve its benefits to women?

Social and environmental standards (safeguards)

- Validate the risks identified in the latest project SESP, as well as the scoring of these risks; are revisions needed?
- Summarize and evaluate revisions made since approval by the DG (if applicable):
 - Risk categorization of the project's global guarantees.
 - Types of risks identified (in the SESP).
 - Individual risk scores (in the SESP).
- Describe and assess progress in implementing the project's social and environmental management measures as described in the SESP submitted at the time of Executive Management approval (and prepared during implementation, if applicable), including any revisions to these measures. These management measures may include Environmental and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) or other management plans, but may also include aspects of project design; refer to question 6 of the SESP template for a summary of the management measures identified.
- A given project must be evaluated against the version of the UNDP Safeguard Policy that was in effect at the time the project was approved.

Reports:

- Assess how adaptive management changes were reported by project management and shared with the Steering Committee
- Assess the extent to which the project team and partners are complying with GEF reporting requirements (i.e., how have they handled poorly rated preliminary assessment reports, if any).
- Assess how lessons learned from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners, and internalized by partners.

Communications and Knowledge Management:

- Review the project's internal communication with stakeholders: Is communication regular and effective? Are any key stakeholders excluded from communication? Are there feedback mechanisms when communication is received? Does this communication with stakeholders contribute to their awareness of the project's results and activities and their investment in the sustainability of the project's results?
- Review the project's external communication: Are appropriate communication vehicles established or being established to express the project's progress and anticipated impact to the public (e.g., is there a web presence? Or has the project implemented appropriate public awareness and information campaigns)?
- For the purposes of the report, write a half-page paragraph that summarizes the project's progress toward the outcomes in terms of contribution to sustainable development benefits, as well as the overall environmental benefits.
- List the knowledge activities/products developed (based on the knowledge management approach approved at the DG approval).

iv. Sustainability

- Validate whether the risks identified in the project document, periodic reports/IRP, and risk register in ATLAS are indeed the most significant and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate and up-to-date. If not, explain why.

- In addition, assess the following risks to sustainability:

Financial risks to sustainability:

- What is the likelihood that financial and economic resources will not be available once GEF support ends (consider that potential resources may come from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income-generating activities, and other funding that will provide adequate financial resources to sustain project results)?

Socio-economic risks to sustainability:

- Are there any social or political risks that could compromise the sustainability of project results? What is the risk that the level of ownership by stakeholders (including governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to sustain the results and benefits of the project? Do the various key stakeholders consider it in their interest that the benefits of the project continue to flow? Is public and stakeholder awareness sufficient to support the long-term goals of the project? Does the project team continuously document lessons learned and share/transfer them to appropriate parties who could learn from the project and possibly replicate and/or expand it in the future?
- The institutional framework and governance present risks to sustainability:
- Do the legal frameworks, policies, governance structures, and processes present risks that could compromise the sustainability of project benefits? In assessing this parameter, it is also important to consider whether the required systems/mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and technical knowledge transfer are in place.

Environmental Risks to Sustainability:

- Are there any environmental risks that could jeopardize the sustainability of the project's results?

Conclusions and recommendations

The international consultant will include a section in the mid-term review report for evidence-based conclusions based on the findings.

In addition, the consultant/mid-term review team should make recommendations to the project team. Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical interventions that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. A table of recommendations should be placed in the report summary. See the "*Guidelines for Conducting Mid-Term Reviews of UNDP-Supported GEF-Funded Projects*" for guidance on the recommendations table.

The consultant *shall make no more than 15 recommendations* in total.

Ratings and notations

The consultant will include in the summary of its report, its assessments of the project results and brief descriptions of the associated accomplishments in a summary table of assessments and accomplishments below. See Appendix E for rating scales. No rating of the project strategy and no overall rating of the project is required.

Table. Summary Table of MTR Ratings and Achievements for the Regional Project "Improved Management of Lake Chad through the Implementation of the Lake Chad Basin Strategic Action Program to Enhance Resilience to Climate Change and Reduce Stress on Ecosystems

Measure	MTR Ratings	Description of the achievements
Project strategy	N/A	
Progress towards results	Objective Achievement Rating: (score on a 6 pt. scale)	

	Outcome 1 Success Rating: (score on a 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 2 Success Rating: (score on a 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 3 Success Rating: (score on a 6 pt. scale)	
	Etc.	
Project implementation and adaptive management	(Score on a 6 pt. scale)	
Sustainability	(Score on a 4 pt. scale)	

6. Deadline

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately Forty (40) working days over a period of six (6) calendar weeks from June 21 to August 13, 2021, and will not exceed three (3) months from the time the consultants are engaged. The tentative schedule for the mid-term review is as follows

ACTIVITY	NUMBER OF WORKING DAYS	COMPLETION DATE
Document review and preparation of the inception report. The report is due no later than two (2) weeks prior to the MTR assignment.	5 days (recommended: 2-5 days)	25/06/2021
Mid-term review mission: meetings with stakeholders, interviews, field visits <i>NOTE: Stakeholder interviews, if conducted virtually, may require more time than usual. Please adjust the number of days and the completion date accordingly.</i>	15 days (recommended: 7-15 days)	16/07/2021
Presentation of initial results - last day of the mid-term review mission	1 day	19/07/2021
Preparation of the draft final report to be submitted no later than three (3) weeks following the mid-term review mission	15 days (recommended: 5-15 days)	06/08/2021
Finalization of the final MTR report/ Integration of an audit trail based on comments on the draft report (within one week of receiving UNDP comments on the project) <i>Note: take into account the time frame for distribution and review of the draft report</i>	4 days (recommended: 3-4 days)	13/08/2021

Note: Options for field visits should be provided in the initial inception report. Flexibility and timelines should be included in the MTR schedule, with additional time needed to conduct it remotely (virtually)

recognizing possible delays in access to stakeholder groups due to COVID-19. Consideration can be given to a contingency period in case the evaluation is delayed in any way due to COVID-19.

7. MID-TERM REVIEW DELIVERABLES

#	Deliverable	Description	Calendar	Responsibilities
1	MTR Start-up Report	The consultant clarifies the objectives and methodology of the review.	5 working days after the start date of the mission, 2 days after the kick-off meeting and no later than 2 weeks before the end of the MTR mission.	The consultant submits the report to the Awarding Unit and the Project Management Unit (PMU). The PMU reviews and validates the report within 2 working days of receipt.
2	Presentation	Initial findings	End of the MTR mission	The consultant presents to the Awarding Unit and the Project Management Unit.
3	Draft MTR Report	Complete draft report (using the content guidelines in Appendix B) with appendices.	Within 3 weeks of the MTR mission	Sent by the consultant to the Adjudicating Unit and reviewed by the RTA, the Project Management Unit, the UNDP Sustainable Development Unit, the UNDP M&E Specialist and the GEF Focal Point.
4	Final report*	Revised report with audit trail detailing how all comments received were (and were not) addressed in the final MTR report	Within one week of receiving UNDP comments on the project	Sent by the consultant in charge of the MTR to the Adjudicating Unit
5	Restitution to the steering committee	A PowerPoint presentation summarizing the main findings of the evaluation will be presented to the steering committee members via videoconference.	After delivery of the final report and according to the schedule of the steering committee meeting not exceeding 6 months	The international consultant will present the final conclusions virtually to the members of the steering committee.

*The final report of the MTR will be submitted in hard copies and in electronic version on a USB key. It must be in English and French. If necessary, the Awarding Unit may choose to arrange for a translation of the report into a language more widely shared by national stakeholders.

**If the MTR period ends before the COPIL, the consultant should make himself available for the presentation of the results.

8. PROVISIONS FOR MID-TERM REVIEW

The primary responsibility for managing this MTR lies with the Adjudicating Unit. The Adjudicating Unit for the MTR for this project is the UNDP Chad Country Office. The Adjudicating Unit will contract with the consultant and ensure that the consultant receives timely per diem and in-country travel arrangements and provides an updated list of stakeholders with contact information (phone and email) if COVID-19 constraints allow. The Project Management Unit, with support from the UNDP Sustainable Development Unit and the UNDP M&E Specialist, will be responsible for liaising with the

consultant to provide all relevant documents, arrange interviews with stakeholders, and organize field visits.

Evaluation Adjudicator:

The UNDP Chad country office is the sponsor of the study and as such, it is responsible for

1. Provide support to Independent Evaluators;
2. Respond to the assessment using the findings appropriately;
3. Allocate the necessary funds and human resources;
4. Be responsible and accountable for the quality of the evaluation process and products;
5. Recommend acceptance of the final report of the Reference Group.

Evaluation Team:

The Expert will be responsible for conducting the actual assessment, submitting the methodological approach, collecting, processing and analyzing the data, developing the draft final report as well as the Power Point presentation and the final report in accordance with the terms of reference.

Evaluation Co-Managers:

The UNDP Chad Sustainable Development Unit, the Project Coordination Unit (PCU) and the UNDP Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist will be responsible for

1. Manage contractual arrangements, budget, and staff involved in the evaluation;
2. Provide support to the evaluation team;
3. Provide the evaluation team with administrative assistance, information and data as required;
4. Review the methodological approach document and evaluation reports to ensure that the final version meets quality standards.

9. COMPOSITION, QUALIFICATION AND TASK OF THE TEAM

The international expert will demonstrate proven experience and proximity to similar projects and evaluations in other regions of the world, particularly in Africa. He/she will ensure the quality of the evaluation to deliver all expected products in a timely manner and will be responsible for the design and writing of the project team's report.

He/she will also be responsible for assessing emerging trends in regulatory frameworks, budget allocations, capacity building, working with the project team to develop the final evaluation itinerary, etc. He/she will be responsible for facilitating contacts with project stakeholders. The main tasks will be to facilitate data collection, processing and analysis in the field.

The consultant may not have been involved in the preparation, formulation and/or implementation of the project (including the drafting of the project document) and must not have any conflict of interest with the project activities.

In the restrictive context of COVID-19, the international consultant will be required to work both face-to-face and at a distance. Provisions for experience in the implementation of distance evaluations would therefore be an asset. The selection of consultants will aim to maximize overall qualifications in the following areas:

A. International Consultant

Education (20 pts Max)

Have, at a minimum, a graduate degree (Bac+5) or equivalent in Development Planning, Natural Resource Management, Climate Change and Sustainable Development, Adaptation and Resilience or in a related social and environmental science discipline.

Experience (80 pts Max)

1. Experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years (10 pts);
2. Experience in evaluating similar projects as an international consultant and team leader at least 5 times (10 pts) ;
3. Relevant experience with results-based management evaluation methods (8 pts);
4. Experience in applying SMART indicators and rebuilding or validating baseline scenarios (8 pts);
5. Competence in adaptive management, as applied to the GEF focal area of Natural Resource Management and Climate Change in a Transboundary Context (8 pts);
6. Demonstrated understanding of gender issues and their linkages to water management and climate change adaptation; Experience with gender-sensitive assessment and analysis (10 pts);
7. Experience working in sub-Saharan African countries and a good knowledge of development issues in the Lake Chad Basin would be an asset (6 pts) ;
8. Demonstrated Communication and Reporting Skills (10 pts);
9. Experience in evaluation/review of development projects within the UN system will be considered an asset (5 pts) ;
10. Experience implementing distance assessments will be considered an asset (5 pts).

Language

- Mastery of written and spoken French.
- Fluency in written and spoken English.

B. General tasks of the international consultant

- Exploit the various reports and other documents;
- Conduct stakeholder consultations;
- Conduct a literature review according to key evaluation criteria (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact);
- Produce the expected deliverables.

C. Specific tasks of the International Consultant

In addition to the general duties assigned to the team, the Mission Leader will be responsible for:

- Submit to the evaluation contractor a coherent and consensual methodological approach that includes the tools needed to collect the information;
- Manage and coordinate the work of the team;
- Coordinate and ensure quality assurance of the MTR including report writing by the team;
- Facilitate stakeholder consultations (if applicable);
- Facilitate feedback sessions;
- Ensure that deliverables (initial inception report, interim report, final report and PowerPoint presentation) are finalized and submitted within the defined timeframe.
- Collect documentation;
- Facilitate and lead stakeholder consultations;
- Conduct field visits.

10. ETHICS

The consultant will be held to the highest ethical standards and will be required to sign a code of conduct (*see Appendix D*) upon acceptance of the assignment. This mid-term evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG "Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation. The MTR team must protect the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees, and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing data collection and reporting. The Expert should also ensure the security of information collected before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure the anonymity and confidentiality of information sources where appropriate. Information, knowledge and data collected as part of the MTR process must also be used only for the MTR and not for any other use without the express permission of UNDP and its partners.

11. PAYMENT TERMS AND SCHEDULE

In carrying out the MTR under the terms of these ToRs, the only facilities that UNDP may grant to the consultant is the use of its premises. All other costs, including transportation costs, shall be indicated in the financial proposal in accordance with the model in Annex H. Only the financial offers of technically qualified applicants will be evaluated. UNDP will reserve the right to provide a vehicle and driver, in which case, the related fees will not be paid to the consultants. Payments will be made as follows:

Tranche	Terms of payment	Calendar	Amount
1	Payment of 20% upon satisfactory submission of the initial MTR start-up report and approval by the Awarding Unit.	After the 7 th working day of the MTR.	Full transportation costs for field missions and living expenses, limited to 20% of the total contract amount.
2	Payment of 40% upon satisfactory submission of the draft MTR report and approval by the Awarding Unit.	After the 30 th working day of the MTR.	40% of the total contract amount.
3	Payment of 40% upon satisfactory submission of the final MTR report and approval by the Awarding Unit and the RTA (via signatures on the MTR Final Report Approval and Validation Form) and submission of the audit trail.	After the 40 ^e working day of the MTR.	Remaining balance of the contract.

Criteria for issuing the 40% final payment⁸(Tranche 3):

- The final MTR report includes all the requirements set out in the consultant's terms of reference and is consistent with the guidance for conducting the MTR;
- The final MTR report is clearly written, logically organized, and specific to this project (i.e., the text was not copied and pasted from other MTR reports) ;
- The audit trail includes the responses and rationale for each comment listed.

⁸The commissioning unit is required to issue payments to the MTR team as soon as the terms of the scope of work are met. If there is an ongoing discussion regarding the quality and completeness of the final deliverables that cannot be resolved between the Commissioning Unit and the MTR Team, the Regional M&E Advisor and Vertical Fund management will be consulted. If necessary, Commissioning Unit management, the Procurement Services Unit, and the Office of Legal Assistance will also be notified so that a decision can be made as to whether to withhold payment of any amount that may be due to the evaluator(s), suspend or terminate the contract, and/or remove the individual contractor from any applicable list. See UNDP's policy on individual contracts for more details:

https://popp.undp.org/_layouts/15/WopiFrame.aspx?sourcedoc=/UNDP_POPP_DOCUMENT_LIBRARY/Public/PSU_Individual%20Contract_Individual%20Contract%20Policy.docx&action=default

NB: Include a forecast for the impact of COVID-19 on the production of deliverables and any reduced payments should this occur.

In accordance with UNDP financial regulations, where it is determined by the Awarding Unit and/or the consultant that a product or service cannot be satisfactorily completed due to the impact of COVID-19 and the limitations of the mid-term review, that product or service will not be paid for. Due to the current status of COVID-19 and its implications, partial payment may be considered if the consultant has invested time in completing a product or service but has been unable to complete it due to circumstances beyond the consultant's control.

2. List of interviewees

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNDP Chad Staff (2) : Sierge Ndjekouneyom, Head of Sustainable Development Unit Gaye Weldadouar, Monitoring and Evaluation Analyst.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LCBC Staff (4) Hycinth Banseka , Technical Director Titdjebaye Nadjingar, Administrative and Financial Director Aminu Magagi Bala , Expert in Environment and Climate Change Marthe Amougu Mintsa , Expert in development and project identification
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project staff (2) Diawoye Keita, Project Coordinator Steve Arnaud Essomba Avom, Regional Monitoring and Evaluation Advisor Naguerim Solyam , Project Financial Manager
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regional Technical Advisor (1) Clotilde Goeman , Regional Technical Advisor
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IUCN Staff (2) Kindi Betolngar, GEF/UNDP/LCBC/CHAD Project Officer Augustin Bitchick Bi Bitchick, IUCN Cameroon Program Officer
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Focal Points (5) Chad National Focal Point Niger National Focal Point National Focal Point of the Central African Republic Cameroon National Focal Point Nigeria National Focal Point (did not respond to the online survey)

3. List of documents reviewed

Documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PIF
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNDP Project Document
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plans Project start-up/launch report
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PIR 2019, PIR 2020

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quarterly progress reports and work plans for the various implementation teams
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Audit reports
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Finalize GEF focal area monitoring tools/base indicators at CEO approval and mid-term (complete specific TTs for this project's focal area)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Joint monitoring mission reports
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All monitoring reports prepared by the project
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Financial and administrative guidelines used by the project team
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operational guidelines, manuals and project systems
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> UNDP country programme document(s)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3 Minutes of the Project Steering Committee meetings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of specific project stakeholders
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft SAP

4. Matrix of evaluation questions

Evaluation criteria	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
1. Relevance of the project: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the LCBC focal area and to local, regional and national climate change and development priorities? Extent to which the project's objectives and activities are consistent with the needs of the target group and the national priorities and policies identified in the LCBC.			
Adequacy between the project objectives and the needs of the beneficiaries (institutions and structures supported)	Level of adequacy between the project and the needs of the populations/institutions in the intervention areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Various Reports Actors: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sponsor's team (UNDP) Managerial staff: LCBC project team, Individual/collective direct beneficiaries Other Implementing Partners: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional Directorates/Decentralized Services Similar projects/programs in the same project areas 	Methods/techniques <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Individual interviews Group interview Triangulation of information Analysis of documents related to the mid-term evaluation.
Consistency between the project and national/local climate change policies	Level of Coherence between the LCBC project and national programs to combat the effects of climate change in the target countries.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Various Reports Actors: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sponsor's team (UNDP) Managerial staff: LCBC project team, Individual/collective direct beneficiaries Other Implementing Partners: 	Methods/techniques <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Individual interviews Group interview Triangulation of information

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Regional Directorates/Decentralized Services <p>Similar projects/programs in the same project areas</p>	Analysis of documents related to the mid-term evaluation.
To what extent are the project objectives still valid	Population needs versus program objectives Stakeholder opinions (see stakeholder opinions)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Various Reports - Actors: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Sponsor's team (UNDP) o Managerial staff: LCBC project team, o Individual/collective direct beneficiaries - Other Implementing Partners: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Regional Directorates/Decentralized Services <p>Similar projects/programs in the same project areas</p>	Methods/techniques <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Individual interviews - Group interview - Triangulation of information <p>Analysis of documents related to the mid-term evaluation.</p>
Conformity of project activities and outputs to the overall purpose and objectives of the project	of activity completion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Various Reports - Actors: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Sponsor's team (UNDP) o Managerial staff: LCBC project team, o Individual/collective direct beneficiaries - Other Implementing Partners: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Regional Directorates/Decentralized Services <p>Similar projects/programs in the same project areas</p>	Methods/techniques <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Individual interviews - Group interview - Triangulation of information <p>Analysis of documents related to the mid-term evaluation.</p>
	of achievement of results	idem	idem
	Qualitative analysis of % of results	idem	idem
	Adequacy of the program with the national orientations of the LCBC and the Plan Tchad Emergent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Various Reports - Actors: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Sponsor's team (UNDP) o Managerial staff: LCBC project team, o Individual/collective direct beneficiaries - Other Implementing Partners: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Regional Directorates/Decentralized Services <p>Similar projects/programs in the same project areas</p>	Methods/techniques <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Individual interviews - Group interview - Triangulation of information <p>Analysis of documents related to the mid-term evaluation.</p>
Adequacy of project activities and outputs with the intended impact and effects	See logical framework Intervention logic Analysis of results and effects/impacts produced (comparison between effects produced and expected effects/impacts)	idem	Same as
Conditions for success/impediments of projects and programs	- Success factors (internal, external) of projects and programs	idem	Same as

	- Factors (internal, external) that hindered the implementation of projects and programs	idem	Same as
2 Effectiveness: to what extent have the expected results and objectives of the project been achieved			
Degree of achievement of the project's objectives	Situation of implementation of the activities Degree of achievement of results Degree of achievement of objectives	- Various Reports - Actors: o Sponsor's team (UNDP) o Managerial staff: LCBC project team, o Individual/collective direct beneficiaries - Other Implementing Partners: o Regional Directorates/Decentralized Services Similar projects/programs in the same project areas	Methods/techniques - Individual interviews - Group interview - Triangulation of information Analysis of documents related to the mid-term evaluation.
What were the main factors that determined whether or not the objectives were achieved?	Opinion and analysis of stakeholders on the factors that influenced (negatively or positively) the achievement of objectives	idem	Same as
Achievement of project objectives	Has the implementation of the project achieved or is it moving towards achieving its main objective?	idem	Same as
Beneficiaries reached (in relation to what was planned)	- Number of beneficiaries reached (relative to what was planned)	idem	Same as
3. Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in accordance with national and international norms and standards? Measure of the relationship between project outputs and the resources used to achieve them			
Were the activities cost-effective?	- Comparison of budget allocation to staff with investments (findings from audits, findings from implementation of audit recommendations and supervision visits) - Existence of procedure manuals (when necessary) - Level of implementation of procedure manuals.	- Various Reports - Actors: o Sponsor's team (UNDP) o Managerial staff: LCBC project team, o Individual/collective direct beneficiaries - Other Implementing Partners: o Regional Directorates/Decentralized Services Similar projects/programs in the same project areas	Methods/techniques - Individual interviews - Group interview - Triangulation of information Analysis of documents related to the mid-term evaluation.
Were the objectives met on time?	- Temporal comparison of the objectives targeted and those achieved	idem	idem
Was the program or project delivered in the most efficient manner compared to other possible approaches	- Cf. Existence and use of the procedure manual and the rate of budget allocation to implementation.	idem	Same as

4. Project impact: is there evidence that the project has contributed to (or enabled) progress towards a reduction in environmental pressures and/or an improvement in ecological status? Positive and/or negative changes induced			
What happened as a result of the implementation of the project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Are there effects whose combinations tend to achieve the intended impact 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Various Reports - Actors: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Sponsor's team (UNDP) o Managerial staff: LCBC project team, o Individual/collective direct beneficiaries - Other Implementing Partners: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Regional Directorates/Decentralized Services <p>Similar projects/programs in the same project areas</p>	<p>Methods/techniques</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Individual interviews - Group interview - Triangulation of information <p>Analysis of documents related to the mid-term evaluation.</p>
What has the project really changed for the beneficiaries?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What a change was aimed at. - What trend of change is induced by the project 		
How many people were affected?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number of people reached and their appreciation of the change brought about by the project at their level 		
5. Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-political and/or environmental risks to sustaining the project's results over the long term? How likely is it that the positive results of the project will be sustained at the end of this project?			
To what extent will the positive results of the project continue after the program ends (sustainability)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project exit strategy ? - What steps have grantees taken to continue after the project 	idem	Same as
What are the main factors that determine the viability or non-viability of the project?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - See underlying elements: 		
Institutional sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Administrative recognition with text governing the various local structures set up 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Various Reports - Actors: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Sponsor's team (UNDP) o Managerial staff: LCBC project team, o Individual/collective direct beneficiaries - Other Implementing Partners: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Regional Directorates/Decentralized Services <p>Similar projects/programs in the same project areas</p>	<p>Methods/techniques</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Individual interviews - Group interview - Triangulation of information <p>Analysis of documents related to the mid-term evaluation.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Organization chart 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Infrastructure housing and ownership of local structures 		

Technical Durability	- Mastery of well-adapted, environmentally friendly techniques (in the various fields of activity of the Pilot ² project		
Financial Sustainability	- Existence of an account in the name of and managed by the managers of the local structures		
	- Sources of funds for the account		
	- Current account level		
Socio-political effect/impact	- Increase in the level of local financial resources of the income of individual direct or indirect beneficiaries	- Various Reports - Actors: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Sponsor's team (UNDP) o Managerial staff: LCBC project team, o Individual/collective direct beneficiaries - Other Implementing Partners: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Regional Directorates/Decentralized Services Similar projects/programs in the same project areas	Methods/techniques <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Individual interviews - Group interview - Triangulation of information Analysis of documents related to the mid-term evaluation.
	- Institutionalization of women's structures in the process of combating the effects of CC		
Effects/impact on the governance of local structures	- Reduction of inequalities at all levels and sustainable and innovative social change		
	- Existence of medium- or long-term strategic itineraries for the different local structures: vision; strategies; action plan		
Effect/impact of local structures on their environment	- Degree of dependence of local structures on the project		

5. Data collection tools

i) UNDP Management Interview Guide

- 1) What do you consider to be the most resounding successes of the project to date?

- 2) How are these success stories unique and important?
- 3) What were the main challenges and issues faced by the project?
- 4) How would you rate the performance of the project to date? In terms of achieving the expected results and meeting the deadlines?
- 5) The project implies a significant participation at the political level of the member states of the LCBC, do you see enough dynamism and will at this level?
- 6) Do you see a solution in the medium term to reduce the delay in the implementation of activities?
- 7) How do you see the collaboration with the LCBC? What would be needed to optimize this collaboration?
- 8) Have you had any unmet support needs from UNDP NCE, Regional Bureau or HQ?
- 9) What motivated the request to reduce the project life from 5 to 3.5 years?
- 10) Was this request made before Covid, was it acted upon? Would it be important to be able to go back on this request?
- 11) What recommendations can you make at this time to ensure that the project achieves its goals over time?

i) Interview Guide for GEP/UNDP (Coordinator, Monitoring and Evaluation) and NCE

- 1) When did you join the project?
- 2) What are the three greatest successes achieved with the project to date
- 3) What are the three biggest problems you face with the project?
- 4) Has the TDA been updated?
- 5) Has the SAP been updated?
- 6) What is the status of the development and adoption of the LCBC protocol for biodiversity?
- 7) What is the status of the disaster risk reduction response plan?
- 8) To date, what has been done to strengthen the capacity of the LCBC specifically?
- 9) What is the status of harmonization of national legal and policy frameworks for joint water management with the water charter?
- 10) To date, how operational are the national inter-ministerial committees?
- 11) What is the status of the training of national authorities in technical and environmental management?
- 12) What has been done to strengthen higher education on LCBC management issues?
- 13) What has been done to date to develop the capacity of the basin's users to participate?
- 14) Where are we with the implementation of the transnational lake monitoring system?
- 15) To what level has the information generated on the basin been shared on the GEF IW LEARN?
- 16) Have you started the implementation of regional and national pilot projects to control species

- 17) What has been done so far to facilitate access to sustainable finance?
- 18) Which IGAs were promoted and how?
- 19) The project implies a significant participation at the political level of the member states of the LCBC, do you see enough dynamism and will at this level?
- 20) Do you see a solution in the medium term to reduce the delay in the implementation of activities?
- 21) How do you see the collaboration with the LCBC? What would be needed to optimize this collaboration?
- 22) Have you had any unmet support needs from UNDP NCE, Regional Bureau or HQ?
- 23) What motivated the request to reduce the project life from 5 to 3.5 years?
- 24) Was this request made before Covid, was it acted upon? Would it be important to be able to back out of this request?
- 25) What recommendations can you make at this time to ensure that the project achieves its goals over time?

vi) Interview guide for the LCBC PMU

- 1) When did you join the project?
- 2) What are the three greatest successes achieved with the project to date
- 3) What are the three biggest problems you face with the project?
- 4) Has the TDA been updated?
- 5) Has the SAP been updated?
- 6) What is the status of the development and adoption of the LCBC protocol for biodiversity?
- 7) What is the status of the disaster risk reduction response plan?
- 8) To date, what has been done to strengthen the capacity of the LCBC specifically?
- 9) What is the status of harmonization of national legal and policy frameworks for joint water management with the water charter?
- 10) To date, how operational are the national inter-ministerial committees?
- 11) What is the status of the training of national authorities in technical and environmental management?
- 12) What has been done to strengthen higher education on LCBC management issues?
- 13) What has been done to date to develop the capacity of the basin's users to participate?
- 14) Where are we with the implementation of the transnational lake monitoring system?
- 15) To what level has the information generated on the basin been shared on the GEF IW LEARN?
- 16) Have you started the implementation of regional and national pilot projects to control species
- 17) What has been done so far to facilitate access to sustainable finance?
- 18) Which IGAs were promoted and how?

- 19) The project implies a significant participation at the political level of the member states of the LCBC, do you see enough dynamism and will at this level?
- 20) Do you see a solution in the medium term to reduce the delay in the implementation of activities?
- 21) How do you see the collaboration with UNDP and IUCN? What is needed to optimize this collaboration?
- 22) Have you had any unmet support needs from UNDP?
- 23) What motivated the request to reduce the project life from 5 to 3.5 years?
- 24) Was this request made before Covid, was it acted upon? Would it be important to be able to back out of this request?
- 25) What recommendations can you make at this time to ensure that the project achieves its goals over time?

vii) LCBC Focal Point Interview Guide

- 1) When did you join the project?
- 2) What are the three greatest successes achieved with the project to date
- 3) What are the three biggest problems you face with the project?
- 4) Has the TDA been updated?
- 5) Has the SAP been updated?
- 6) What is the status of the development and adoption of the LCBC protocol for biodiversity?
- 7) What is the status of the disaster risk reduction response plan?
- 8) To date, what has been done to strengthen the capacity of the LCBC specifically?
- 9) What is the status of harmonization of national legal and policy frameworks for joint water management with the water charter?
- 10) To date, how operational are the national inter-ministerial committees?
- 11) What is the status of the training of national authorities in technical and environmental management?
- 12) What has been done to strengthen higher education on LCBC management issues?
- 13) What has been done to date to develop the capacity of the basin's users to participate?
- 14) Where are we with the implementation of the transnational lake monitoring system?
- 15) To what level has the information generated on the basin been shared on the GEF IW LEARN?
- 16) Have you started the implementation of regional and national pilot projects to control species
- 17) What has been done to date to facilitate access to sustainable finance?
- 18) Which IGAs were promoted and how?
- 19) The project implies a significant participation at the political level of the member states of the LCBC, do you see enough dynamism and will at this level?

- 20) Do you see a solution in the medium term to reduce the delay in the implementation of activities?
- 21) How do you see the collaboration with UNDP and IUCN? What is needed to optimize this collaboration?
- 22) Have you had any unmet support needs from UNDP?
- 23) What motivated the request to reduce the project life from 5 to 3.5 years?
- 24) Was this request made before Covid, was it acted upon? Would it be important to be able to back out of this request?
- 25) What recommendations can you make at this time to ensure that the project achieves its goals over time?

viii) Interview guide for IUCN and other implementing partners

- 1. Since when has your institution partnered with the LCBC-GEF project?

- 2. Who made the first move?
 A. My institution
 B. The LCBC-GEF project
- 3. What is the partnership with the LCBC-GEF project?

Explain.....

- 4. What are the results that have been achieved with your partnership with the LCBC-GEF project?
- 5. Have you started the implementation of regional and national pilot projects to control species
- 6. What has been done to date to facilitate access to sustainable finance?
- 7. Which IGAs were promoted and how?
- 8. The project implies a significant participation at the political level of the member states of the LCBC, do you see enough dynamism and will at this level?
- 9. Do you see a solution in the medium term to reduce the delay in the implementation of activities?
- 10. How do you see the collaboration with UNDP and with the LCBC? What would be needed to optimize this collaboration?
- 11. Have you had any unmet support needs from UNDP or LCBC?

12. Has the partnership with the project had an impact on your institution's capacity to intervene?

(A) Yes B. No

Explain.....
.....
.....
.....

13. Has the partnership with the project had any impact on the beneficiary populations?

(A) Yes B. No

Explain.....
.....
.....
.....

14. Do you find the partnership with the project has advantages and/or disadvantages?

(A) Yes (B) No

Explain.....
.....
.....
.....

15. Do you feel that improvements should be made to the partnership with the project?

(A) Yes (B) No

Explain.....
.....
.....

16. Do you find that adaptations/changes are needed in the partnership with the LCBC-GEF project?

(A) Yes (B) No

Explain.....

.....
.....
.....

17. More generally, what are your proposals/recommendations regarding the partnership with the LCBC-GEF?

.....
.....
.....

II-PROJECT INTERVENTIONS

18. Do you feel that the project's interventions are consistent with the country's priorities in the area of resilience and climate change?

(A) Yes B. No

Explain

?.....
.....
.....
.....

19. Do you feel that the project interventions are well aligned with the priorities of the target areas?

(A) Yes B. No

Explain.....

.....
.....
.....

20. Are the project interventions in line with the priority needs and expectations of the beneficiary populations?

(A) Yes B. No

Explain.....

.....
.....

21. Did the project interventions have an impact on local communities?

(A) Yes B. No

Explain.....
.....
.....

22. Do you feel that improvements should be made to the LCBC-GEF project interventions?

(A) Yes (B) No

Explain.....
.....
.....

23. Are adaptations/changes needed in the LCBC-GEF project interventions?

(A) Yes (B) No

Explain.....
.....
.....

24. What are your proposals/recommendations for future project interventions?

.....
.....
.....

Thank you for your collaboration

6. Rating scales

The evaluation will provide individual scores for all evaluation criteria described in the TOR. Most criteria will be evaluated on a six-point scale as follows: Very Satisfactory (VS); Satisfactory (S); Moderately Satisfactory (MS); Moderately Unsatisfactory (MI); Unsatisfactory (I); Very Unsatisfactory (VSI). Sustainability is rated from "Very Likely" (VL) to "Very Unlikely" (VU).

In the conclusions section of the report, the ratings will be presented together in a table, with a brief rationale referencing the conclusions in the body of the report.



Evaluation of progress toward achievement of outcomes: (one assessment for each achievement and for each objective)		
6	Highly satisfactory (HS)	The objective/achievement should meet or exceed all end-of-project targets, with no major deficiencies. Progress toward the objective/achievement can be an example of "good practice.
5	Satisfactory (S)	The objective/achievement is expected to meet most of the end-of-project targets, with only minor shortcomings.
4	Fairly satisfactory (MS)	The objective/achievement is expected to meet most of the end-of-project targets but has significant shortfalls.
3	Somewhat unsatisfactory (HU)	The objective/achievement is expected to meet most of the end-of-project targets but has major shortcomings.
2	Unsatisfactory (U)	The objective/achievement is not expected to meet most of the end-of-project targets.
1	Very unsatisfactory (HU)	The objective/achievement did not meet the mid-term targets, and is not expected to meet any of the end-of-project targets.

•

Evaluation of Project Implementation and Responsive Management: (one overall evaluation)		
6	Highly satisfactory (HS)	The implementation of the seven components-management arrangements, activity planning, financing and co-financing, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder participation, reporting, and communication-enables effective and efficient project implementation and responsive management. The project can be an example of "good practice.
5	Satisfactory (S)	The implementation of most of the seven components allows for effective and efficient implementation of the project and responsive management, with the exception of a few components that are subject to corrective action.
4	Fairly satisfactory (MS)	Implementation of some of the seven components allows for effective and efficient project implementation and responsive management, but some components require corrective action.
3	Somewhat unsatisfactory (MU)	Implementation of some of the seven components allows for effective and efficient project implementation and responsive management, but most components require corrective action.
2	Unsatisfactory (U)	The implementation of most of the seven components does not allow for effective and efficient project implementation and responsive management.
1	Very unsatisfactory (HU)	The implementation of none of the seven components allows for the effective and efficient implementation of the project and responsive management.

•

Sustainability Assessment: (one overall assessment)		
4	Likely (L)	Negligible risks to sustainability; major accomplishments are on track for project closure and are expected to be maintained for the foreseeable future
3	Somewhat likely (ML)	Moderate risk; at least some accomplishments should be maintained, given the progress toward the achievement results observed in the mid-term review
2	Quite unlikely (MU)	Significant risks that key accomplishments will not be sustained after project closure, with the exception of certain products and activities
1	Unlikely (U)	High risk that project achievements and key outputs will not be sustained