

KNOWFOR/PROFOR Global Evaluation
Deep Dive Case Study

**FOREST GOVERNANCE: IMPACTS FROM OUTREACH
AND IMPLEMENTATION OF COUNTRY
ASSESSMENTS**

October 2017

Ken Rosenbaum, Muhammad Najeeb Khan and Nalin Kishor

Introduction

One of the four major themes in PROFOR's portfolio of projects is governance.¹ Two project development objectives of PROFOR's forest governance work are to deepen knowledge in this area and strengthen capacity to implement governance assessments. This deep dive looks at three assessment-related projects: two country-level assessments and an online training effort.

PROFOR's work in forest governance assessment goes back over ten years, with several notable milestones. In 2009, PROFOR produced a study of the elements of forest governance and created a participatory assessment tool based on that study. A 2010 conference in Stockholm led to a joint FAO–PROFOR Framework document supplying a consensus definition of forest governance. PROFOR revised its tool to reflect this Framework in 2012. In 2014, PROFOR and FAO produced a consensus guide to good assessment practice.

PROFOR's current work on assessment, under KNOWFOR, treats the PROFOR tool, the FAO–PROFOR Framework, and the good practice guide as foundational knowledge to be disseminated. The dissemination tasks fall under two pillars, which reflect the project development objectives. One is general dissemination of assessment knowledge. The other is support to conducting assessments in individual countries. The following table gives an overview of how the sub-activities under this program are expected to contribute to intermediate outcomes.

Table 1: Programmatic TA activities and their contribution to achieving the Program's intermediate outcomes.

X = primary influence

Pillars and Activities	Intermediate Outcomes			
	1 Sharing Knowledge	2 Improved Consensus	3 Enhancing Skills	4 Supporting Action
Pillar I: Dissemination, knowledge- sharing, and skills-enhancement				
--Translations of the guide	X	X		
--Webinars	X	X		
--Bite-sized learning products (blogs, podcasts)	X	X		
--e-learning course	X	X	X	
--Opportunistic outreach (e.g. international conferences)	X			
Pillar II: Initiating and improving action in countries	X		X	X

¹ The other three themes are livelihoods, cross-sectoral issues, and financing sustainable forest management.

--Advanced country-specific training and implementation				
---	--	--	--	--

The country-specific projects reviewed for this evaluation were applications of the PROFOR participatory assessment tool in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) and Mozambique. In DRC the results of the assessment fed into a Bank Economic Sector Work (ESW). In Mozambique, the results fed into planning for the Bank's Forest Investment Program (FIP).

The online training effort consisted of webinars, podcasts, and an online course designed to disseminate the Framework and good practices guide.

Each project is presented below with descriptions of context, planning, and outcomes. A unified discussion section following the project descriptions draws lessons from the three examples.

Congo, DRC

Overview

In the first half of 2015, the World Bank carried out a participatory forest governance assessment in the DRC with funding from PROFOR. In four one-day workshops in Kisangani, Bandundu, Mbandaka, and Kinshasa, facilitators administered a questionnaire to seventy-four stakeholders from public administration, civil society, private sector, and development partners. This section of the evaluation reviews the context, planning, implementation, and impact of the participatory forest governance assessment.

Data Sources

The main source of information for this evaluation included three key informants who were involved in the DRC assessment as World Bank staff. Data was also extracted from a completion report and the Forest Sector ESW report for the DRC project. Two of the three key informants were sent a questionnaire, which they responded to via email. Following this, a phone interview was conducted with all informants to obtain further information regarding their responses. The third informant provided information over the phone, which was complemented via email.

Context of the Project

This assessment was part of the larger forest sector Economic Sector Work (ESW) for DRC implemented in 2015. The ESW's general objective was to take stock of the

state of affairs in the forest sector in the DRC, building off and updating the previous such study carried out in 2007. It took place in the context of a broad World Bank development goal of reinforcing the capacity of the forest administration and including rural populations in the forest agenda. The outcomes for this larger work were expected to be the identification of opportunities for improving governance, the identification of investment opportunities in the sector, and improved design of the resulting forest interventions, for the medium and long term.

The Bank's focal point for DRC saw the PROFOR governance assessment tool as suited to the task at hand. A key desirable characteristic of the tool was its reliance on different stakeholders for systematic information gathering on the state of forest governance. The tool convened stakeholders and had them work together to arrive at consensus scores for a customized set of indicators.

The PROFOR governance team (in the PROFOR Secretariat) saw the application of the tool in Congo DRC as potentially influential and agreed to provide technical and financial support for its application.

Project Planning

Planning for use of the PROFOR tool involved three tasks. One was preparation of background materials on the state of governance. These were used to help inform the deliberation of stakeholders when they scored the indicators.

The second was customization of the PROFOR indicator set. This involved selecting a manageable set from a large initial collection of indicators and translating the indicators into the local language. The team used the bank of about 130 indicators from the PROFOR template and selected 52 most suited to the DRC context. These were further refined and customized to the DRC context, based on inputs invited from sector experts.

The third step was identification of stakeholders to score the indicators. In this case, the stakeholder lists built upon the membership of existing consultative forest councils, but special efforts were made to include civil society members and representatives of informal loggers (chainsaw logging). (Further details on participants' profiles are below).

Project Implementation

Processes and Products

What were the outputs and reach of the project (including gender disaggregation)?

The outputs of the project were: (1) Four consultative workshops to score governance indicators of the assessments, and (2) a final report on assessment of forest governance in DRC.

- **Consultation workshops to score governance indicators**

Under the patronage of the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (the Director of the Direction Études et Planification / Studies & Planning Directorate had been designated by the ministry as the main focal point), the consultation phase was carried out by a team of two experts (national + international) during the month of March 2015. The team travelled to the capitals of the three forest provinces of Équateur, Bandundu, and Orientale, respectively Mbandaka (1), Bandundu-ville (2) and Kisangani (3). A final consultative round was organized in the country's capital of Kinshasa (4).

All four consultations listed above succeeded in gathering the relevant audiences. The participation in each workshop was as follows:

Table 2: Workshop participation in DRC

Location	Dates	Participants (incl. women)	Admin	CS (incl. IPs)	PS	Other (academia, partners)
Mbandaka	Feb 28 th	16 (1)	5	7 (2)	1	3
Bandundu-ville	Mar 14 th	19 (2)	12	4 (1)	2	1
Kisangani	Mar 20 th	21 (4)	10	6	2	3
Kinshasa (national)	Mar 25 th	18 (5)	11	2	1	4
TOTAL		74				

*Note - Admin: civil servants from forest administration but also nature conservation, agriculture, land use planning, etc.

CS: civil society, i.e. representatives from CSOs, Indigenous Peoples (IPs) local village/development committees

PS: private sector, i.e. representatives of logging company, both industrial and artisanal loggers

Other: professors, students, technical and financial partners

This was the first PROFOR-funded forest governance assessment that invited artisanal/ informal loggers to participate in scoring the assessment. Women made up more than 15% of participants in the aggregate.

The format chosen was a one-day workshop gathering about twenty people from the four main stakeholder groups: public administration, civil society, private sector and partners. The task of selecting relevant participants was simplified by the existence of so-called consultative forest councils. Those committees were created by the 2002 Forest Law and are the official technical bodies in charge of coordinating and monitoring the forest sector, both nationally and in the provinces. Each committee is comprised of about twenty-five members, mostly from the administration (forests, nature conservation, land tenure, land use planning,

agriculture, rural development, tourism) but also from civil society (NGOs, local communities and indigenous peoples), private sector (logging concessions/federations, artisanal loggers) and universities (professors). In Kinshasa, selected donor representatives also participated. The team liaised with each council's facilitator and invited around twenty members of each council to the consultation exercise.

• **Final Report** of the stakeholder consultation to score the forest governance indicators. The final report summarized the four rounds of consultations and outlined recommendations.

Five main recommendations were offered to address governance challenges emerging from the diagnostic assessment:

1. Revising/updating the 2002 forest code and disseminating it to the public and populations in their respective local languages;
2. Drafting a national forest policy (based on the notion of sustainable resource management and resulting from a national vision/land use plan) with a focus on developing the wood value chain, training professionals (capacity building and research programs), putting in place a timber tracking system, imposing management plans and certification/standards, and clarifying revenue-sharing mechanisms;
3. Reducing the informal aspects of the sector and creating disincentives for illegal logging and other forest crimes;
4. Revamping and simplifying the forest fiscal system through reestablishing the fundamental role of the *Fonds Forestier National* (National Forest Fund) in charge of collecting taxes;
5. Decentralizing the forest authority and management power to the territorial entities for a smoother implementation of local projects and policies.

Reach: The report was disseminated to the participants and to the government (Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development) to inform future policy actions in the forest sector. To this end, a briefing with the ministry was held. After being validated by the client, the report was also shared with other stakeholders including civil society, academic research centers, donors and the private sector.

As one of its primary objectives, the report has informed a World Bank piece of Economic and Sector Work (ESW) that is taking stock of the DRC's forest sector and its governance, and which will inform any future interventions in the sector. In parallel, the government is considering the results in the ongoing development of its forest policy.

Did the engagement process and knowledge product fit the case?

From the responses received by key informants interviewed, the design of the engagement process was deemed adequate, but the assessment itself could have

been better adapted to the local context of DRC. The task team leader (TTL) and his team that were finalizing the questions of the assessment consulted the local Bank staff/organizers. However, from the stakeholder feedback received it appears that further customization and pre-testing should have been undertaken. Some indicators were reported as being “too generic” and could have been fine-tuned by holding discussions with Congolese forest sector actors. Furthermore, according to the first informant, the assessment was not appropriately translated from English to French, which led to some confusion.

According to the second key informant: “the design of the assessment and workshops was fine, but the enabling environment was lacking”. This is pointing to the fact that the timing of the assessment was not the most opportune in that the recommendations could not be translated into actions for impact.

Were knowledge practices (processes or products) enhanced by feedback?

Although there were no formal feedback questionnaires or means to gather feedback after the workshops, the participants did provide feedback informally to the organizers and it was largely positive. The first key informant states, “feedback was rather good from questions and comments received at the end, especially the fact that the Bank had taken the time (and money) to meet them in their localities. However people were disappointed by the absence of immediate concrete follow up actions”.

Did they take into consideration the needs of women and girls?

According to the first informant: ““I don’t recall such specific indicators on women and girls but some participants, including women, expressed some views specifically regarding the role played by girls and mothers in the forest sector, in particular the demanding nature of work carried out for the collection of wood and the charcoal-based cooking activities as well as some lack of involvement in the decision circles”.

Were they relevant to users’ needs? Did they reach target users?

There was a general sense as expressed by the organizers of the workshops and authors of the assessment that the products were useful and reached the intended audiences. The second key informant expressed his view that the mix of participants was appropriate, but more could have been done to bring in senior level decision makers.

The main product was the report and its input into the forest sector ESW, which was a set of policy notes taking stock of the evolution of the policy, social, economic and physical context of the productive forest sector of the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), making that information available to all interested parties as a common basis for discussion. This ESW was intended to help the government make strategic decisions and propose an agenda for the forest sector’s regulatory and institutional reform over the coming years.

Outcomes

Were decision makers better equipped?

As mentioned earlier, one of the key groups that was given representation and empowered through the workshops was the group of informal/artisanal loggers. According to the first key informant, the informal loggers did make up an unconventional and very important segment of the participants to bring to the table, even though they were few in number. Their concerns were legitimate and it was clear that they needed a voice.

In the informant's words "they [the informal loggers] did bring added value, because in DRC the forest sector is mostly artisanal loggers/permit holders, and big industrial concessions are very few, many are not operational, or are bankrupt. The types of issues brought up by the informal/artisanal loggers included issues of taxation, administrative burden, difficulty of purchasing and moving equipment to provinces, no retail stores in remote areas, no access to markets, and energy/electricity issues in remote areas. These were major concerns and obstacles to their livelihoods. The regulatory framework does not account for informal loggers, and the forest code is geared towards concessions. The informal loggers feel harassed because they aren't regulated properly."

The government officials who attended the workshops were not too open about some of the issues related to corruption as it may have reflected poorly on their specific organizations' work, whereas the civil society, academia and others such as private loggers did voice their concerns regarding corruption issues.

In terms of decision makers, there was not much distinction in terms of which actors played more important roles than others. The heads of the provincial committees were for obvious reasons very helpful in terms of organizing, logistics etc. Some civil society members may have been more vocal about certain issues than administration officials. Some female participants had fair points raised about their unequal treatment in the forest sector economy and the need for training and education for females.

Looking ahead: A \$120M fund under the Central African Forest Initiative (CAFI) has been proposed for DRC for the next few years. As part of this fund, \$10M has been allocated for a program on Sustainable Forest Management, to be administered by AFD, a French development agency. This program tackles the challenges of illegal logging including looking at the policy level and regulations on artisanal logging, as one of its areas of focus. The findings and recommendations of the DRC diagnostic will be considered in the program preparation phase, as it will provide a baseline and key questions to be addressed in the governance of the forest sector.

What, if any program outcomes were realized in terms of policy or practice changes?

In terms of the recommendations that came out of the consultation exercise in the report, many of them did not get much traction, despite being distributed widely to

public administration officials and civil society. According to the first key informant, only one recommendation, regarding the drafting of a National Forest Policy, is progressing somewhat.

One of the later outcomes has been the findings of the diagnostic being used in the drafting of the programmatic Country Forest Notes, an initiative that began in late 2016 as part of the World Bank's Forest Action Plan implementation and monitoring.

What other factors or actors contributed to these outcomes and what conclusion can be drawn about the extent to which the project contributed to these outcomes?

The reasons provided by the informant for recommendations such as the reform of the Forest Code not moving forward mostly have to do with the political context in DRC — the presidential elections, the tension with the opposition, and in general a tough political climate which has led to many of the reforms being put on standby — with forestry sector taking a back seat for the time being as it is not a priority for the government. The informant had similar views on the recommendation about decentralization, which he said was moving along on paper, but not significantly in practice.

The current president did not step down from office last year at the end of his term, leading to political tensions. The Minister of Environment has changed three times since then, making things worse for pursuing any policy reforms in the forest sector. At this point WBG project leads in DRC are merely trying to minimize the risks to existing projects, and waiting for the right moment to reengage in the policy dialogue.

How are these changes relevant or significant to poverty reduction, biodiversity conservation, or climate change?

Provided that the recommendations of the diagnostic are translated into actions, it is likely that higher rural incomes will be generated from forestry activities, particularly small-scale manufacturing.

Were there unexpected outcomes, positive or negative?

The first key informant expressed that many of the participants might have come to the workshops with expectations of getting support to resolve their specific grievances, or to find funding for continuation of projects that they were or had been involved in previously. It is not clear whether this was a result of miscommunication of the objectives of the workshop before inviting the participants or not.

Does more need to be done to achieve sustainable, implemented change?

According to the first key informant, it is difficult to say whether the workshops and the report achieved sustainable, implemented change. The exercise was relevant and useful in informing the Bank's sectoral work, but the challenge remains in national ownership of the information generated. The demand for the assessment, both as a baseline for assessing and measuring forest governance, as well as for implementing the recommendations that it proposes, needs to come from within the country. This apparently was not achieved in the course of this initiative.

The second key informant was of a similar view that the assessment was Bank-driven and not really demand-driven from the countryside, which limited the uptake of the knowledge generated. Also the political will and enabling environment for reform was lacking at the time.

Mozambique

Overview

In 2016, PROFOR supported the application of its forest governance diagnostic tool in Mozambique to better understand the myriad of governance challenges confronting the sector and to identify homegrown, consensus-based solutions.

The activity customized a forest governance indicator set. It then used this indicator set in two field workshops to systematically gather information from multiple forest sector stakeholders.

The findings and emerging implications were channeled into the Forest Investment Program (FIP) project for the country and have significantly shaped the actions geared to improving governance for Mozambique. Equally important, the diagnostic exercise has identified a handful of priority indicators that the government and the FIP project can use for periodic assessments of the status of forest governance.

The subsequent sections review the context, planning, implementation, and impacts of the activity supported by PROFOR.

Data Sources

This case adopts the performance story reporting approach and relies on building up the case evidence (on influence/impacts) by principally gathering information from key informants knowledgeable about the activity. The most important and current information comes from responses to structured questionnaires filled in by

five informants,² followed by additional probing and requests for clarifications. The PROFOR activity concept note and completion report, and the reports produced during implementation provided complementary information.

Context of the Project

Weak forest governance is a key indirect driver of forest loss in Mozambique. Illegal logging is an important symptom of weak forest governance in Mozambique. To a large extent illegal logging drives the exploitation levels of hardwood species from natural forests far above the annual allowable cut. Improving the policy environment and better enforcement, and improved incentives for compliance would result in a more sustainable use of the forest resource as well as a consistent revenue base for funding government actions. The application of the forest governance diagnostic tool was seen as an important way to pinpoint policy and enforcement gaps, and to craft solutions fit for purpose.

While PROFOR supported the diagnostic activity,³ two other complementary activities were ongoing—a Financial Assessment of Forest Concessions which aimed at conducting a comprehensive financial analysis of the natural forest management business, and an application of the Restoration Opportunity Assessment Methodology (ROAM), aimed at developing the basis for efficient landscape-level restoration planning. The government saw this suite of three activities as part of a single effort to identify needed reforms and expressed a strong commitment to act on the findings.

Project planning

The project aimed to identify key governance reform needs, starting by collecting existing information on forest governance and then complementing that with new information, collected systematically from all the stakeholders involved in the use and management of forests. Vetting and validation of this information and of the emerging findings and recommendations was a critical part of the project. Reflecting these objectives, the work was organized into the following six main steps:

1. Preparation of a detailed PowerPoint to reflect the current status of information on forest governance in Mozambique, i.e., initial stock taking of forest governance,
2. Customization of the PROFOR forest governance indicators for Mozambique and their translation into Portuguese,

² One these key informants actually comprised four World Bank staff members, leading the implementation of this activity, who filled in a questionnaire collectively and then provided additional feedback individually.

³ WWF also contributed with around \$50,000, mostly for travel and logistical arrangements of civil society and local communities' representatives.

3. Training local staff in Maputo, Zambezia, and Cabo Delgado and the staff of MITADER in a forest governance e-learning course (distance learning), offered by the World Bank/PROFOR in Washington,
4. Organizing two three-day workshops (in Cabo Delgado and Zambezia) to score the indicators following an in-depth training of local stakeholders,
5. Evaluation of results and preparation of an assessment report, and
6. Validation of the findings at a national seminar and the finalization of an action plan.

Project implementation

Processes and Products

What were the outputs and reach of the project (including gender disaggregation)?

The products and activities completed in this project include (a) a background paper on the current governance situation of the Mozambique forest sector (as a long PowerPoint), (b) two provincial workshops to assess forest governance, held in Cabo Delgado and Zambezia, (c) a national workshop for validation of the findings from the provincial workshops, (d) a report on the forest governance assessment, in full and summary versions, and (e) a press release given to the main national newspaper.

Women were represented in all workshops, both as facilitators and participants.

The target audience included all stakeholders of the forest sector, and this activity, in general, reached out to them. They were engaged during the exercises in the provincial workshops, where there were both plenary debates/discussions and breakout sessions in which varied stakeholders were deliberately mixed together in small groups.

Decision makers in the government and in the FIP program made up a special class of the target audience. The project involved these stakeholders in project design and planning, both to improve the project and to increase their ownership of the results.

More than 100 copies of the report presentation were distributed for different stakeholders, in Portuguese. Government, private sector, civil society, community, academia, and media stakeholders have received the summary report. Articles, notes, and presentations are being prepared for further dissemination and awareness-raising.

One key informant suggested that the knowledge products need to be still more widely distributed, to government institutions outside of the main ministry that deals with forests (MITADER).

Did the engagement process and knowledge product fit the case?

Based on the comments of the key informants, the process and knowledge products fit the case well.

Were knowledge practices enhanced by feedback?

There was not a great deal of change to the practices based on feedback received during the project. However, as planned in the project design, the project tapped local experts to customize the PROFOR tool on participatory forest governance assessment to fit the Mozambique context. The customized instrument was used in the workshops, and key indicators from the instrument will be used in future periodic forest governance assessments.

Did they take into consideration the needs of women and girls?

As noted above, women actively took part in the workshops. The workshops scored a specific indicator on the participation of women in forest sector decisions. One of the regional workshops nominated the gender indicator as a priority for ongoing monitoring.

Were they relevant to users needs?

Users report being satisfied with the activities and knowledge products. As discussed below, key decision makers have already begun to apply the knowledge products.

Outcomes

Were decision makers better equipped?

The assessment produced a report of the current situation of forest sector governance in the country, which is and will be central to the understanding and subsequent improvement of forest governance, as sought by the Government at the moment. The assessment has had a fundamental impact on the stakeholders' understanding of the current situation of decision making around forests, and it is a solid guiding basis to the design of the World Bank's Forest Investment Program in Mozambique (MozFIP).

What, if any program outcomes were realized in terms of policy or practice changes?

The assessment report has:

1. Supported Mozambique's forest law review to a significant extent,
2. Built tools for subsequent monitoring of the country's forest sector governance, and
3. Identified key changes needed to reform forest sector policies in Mozambique. These have been taken into account in MozFIP project

activities. The priority indicators that were identified during the assessment exercises have been incorporated into the results framework of the project. (The FIP project's plans have recently been finalized for implementation).

Update: Activities begun under the project will continue with the completion of a literature review on forest governance in Mozambique, the development of a communication strategy for forest governance, exercises on forest governance assessment in two or three additional provinces (with the support of WWF), and a forest governance assessment of progress achieved, in the second and fourth year of the MozFIP project.

What other factors or actors contributed to these outcomes and what conclusion can be drawn about the extent to which the project contributed to these outcomes?

Among the factors contributing to the influence of the project are—

- High-level government involvement and support.
- Active involvement and support of WWF, which is also taking the assessment protocol and holding scoring workshops in two or three additional provinces.
- Concurrent reform efforts (a concessions review and a pilot application of ROAM, a rejuvenation of the regional miombo network), which reinforced the sense of commitment to change.
- Linkage to MozFIP, with its potential for providing funding to undertake the identified reforms.

These factors are important, but they do not detract from the contribution of the PROFOR assessment. The direction for reform has largely emerged from the results of the PROFOR work.

How are these changes relevant or significant to poverty reduction, biodiversity conservation, or climate change?

Deforestation is a serious concern in Mozambique, tied to climate change, loss of habitat, and loss of economic opportunities for forest-dependent people. Although there are no changes visible yet on the ground, the forest law review, the investments from MozFIP, and subsequent monitoring of progress towards governance reform should all help Mozambique to conserve its forests and put them to sustainable uses.

Were there unexpected outcomes, positive or negative?

The key informants did not identify any unexpected outcomes.

Does more need to be done to achieve sustainable, implemented change?

The project has provided a good foundation for change. Achieving change depends on follow-through, but it appears that the government and other key stakeholders are well poised and well committed to follow through.

Online Learning

Overview

From 2015 to 2016, PROFOR co-sponsored a series of eLearning activities about forest governance assessment. These included design and delivery of a five-module online course, three one-hour webinars, and three short podcasts. This section of the evaluation reviews the context, planning, implementation, and impact of the project. It focuses on the most elaborate of the activities, the online course.

Data Sources

This evaluation used data from three sources. The first was data collected in the delivery of the activities. These data included information that the users gave upon registration and records generated by online platforms documenting user participation. The second source was data collected in surveys of the users after they accessed the online course or webinars. Some of this data came from surveys administered routinely by the World Bank's eLearning platform when participants complete an activity. Some came from surveys designed and carried out just for this evaluation, administered in December 2016 and January 2017. The third source was key informants who worked on or were influenced by the project. The principal author of this sub-case study was one of those informants.

Context of the Project

This project was a knowledge-related extension of work done on earlier PROFOR and World Bank forest governance activities. From the concept note:

In 2009, to encourage systematic improvement of forest governance, the World Bank published a detailed look at just exactly what forest governance entailed: *Roots for Good Forest Outcomes: An Analytic Framework for Forest Governance Reforms*.

In 2010, the Bank, PROFOR, FAO, and SIDA cosponsored a symposium on measuring forest governance, which drew representatives from NGOs, international development organizations, and country governments. The meeting urged for the development of a universal framework and vocabulary for forest governance assessment, and out of that came the FAO-PROFOR *Framework for Assessing and Monitoring Forest Governance*.

The *Framework* described what people should measure, but not how to measure it. In 2012 PROFOR and FAO began work on a consensus document on forest governance measurement. The resulting handbook of good practices, *Assessing Forest Governance: A Practical Guide to Data Collection, Analysis, and Use*, was launched in June 2014.

PROFOR now is supporting the dissemination of the *Framework* and the

Guide ... with the intention of encouraging their widespread use. To that end, PROFOR has developed a multi-component program of dissemination, training and implementation. The development and conduct of an e-learning course is an integral part of this program.

Project Planning

This project's main objective was knowledge uptake. The project built on the earlier work described under "Context of the Project" above, taking the knowledge generated in those efforts and offering it to receptive people.

PROFOR relied heavily on the educators at the World Bank's Open Learning Campus (OLC) to improve the impact of the knowledge products. For example, the webinar presenters from PROFOR initially conceived of the webinars as straight-out lectures with slides. The OLC webinar producer had the presenters reformatted the webinars as shorter talks including interactive polls and nearly half of each webinar set aside as a question-and-answer session. The producer also came up with the idea of recording brief podcasts based on the webinars.

The educators at OLC also coordinated production of the online class, shaping its format and approach. The PROFOR team served as subject matter experts and facilitators, outlining the overall content of the five-module class. The OLC team designed the format of the modules, which included a narration with animated slides, in-course quizzes, a final quiz for each module, a social-media-style discussion room for each module, and practical exercises for each module. Working to fit the format, the PROFOR team produced a written script, quizzes, exercises, discussion questions, and storyboards for each module. The OLC team critiqued these based on educational quality and the PROFOR team revised them accordingly. When both teams were satisfied with the material, OLC sent the material to a developer to create the final interactive modules.

Project Implementation

Processes and Products

What were the outputs and reach of the project (including gender disaggregation)?

The outputs of the project were—

- **Three webinars** on forest governance assessment, each about an hour long. The webinars were presented live with audience interaction in the first half of 2015 over the World Bank's OLC platform. The recorded sessions remain available on YouTube for viewing. Table 3 shows the number and gender ratio of participants for the three webinars.

- **Three podcasts**, each about five to ten minutes long, covering the same topics and made around the same time as the webinars. These are available through the World Bank's iTunes channel.

Table 3: Webinar participation and viewership

Webinar	Number of participants at initial offering (Jan–Mar 2015)	Percent female	Number of YouTube views, Feb–Oct 2016	Average YouTube viewing time
Introduction to forest governance assessment	53	49%	22	10 minutes
Doing an assessment	20	35%	3	1 minute
Using an assessment	8	37%	1	1 minute

Source: OLC records

- **A five-module interactive, facilitated online course** on forest governance assessment. Compared to the webinars and podcasts, this course involved more participants and offered a greater depth of knowledge. We also have collected more feedback from its participants. The remainder of this case assessment will look at the impact of the course rather than the webinars and podcasts.

The OLC has offered the course three times in 2016 and will offer it twice in 2017. Each time, PROFOR has provided facilitators to respond to questions, evaluate the participants' work, and comment in the discussion forums. Table 4 shows the number of registrants and the gender ratios for the three offerings. These numbers include some overlapping registrations. For example, six people who registered but did not complete the first offering also registered for the second offering. Also, the class registration numbers include up to four accounts used for testing and instructor access to the classes. Completion data for the third offering of the course are not available because a few students are still engaged in the course.

Table 4: Online class registration

Class offering	Number registered	Percent female	Earning certificate of completion	Percent female
January 2016	159	36%	14	36%
May 2016	143	29%	11	45%
October 2016	96	38%	N/A	N/A

Source: OLC records

As Table 4 shows, the number of people who registered for the sessions was much higher than the number of people who earned a certificate. To earn a certificate, registrants had to watch the module presentations, take and pass the quizzes,

participate in the discussion groups, submit practical exercises for evaluation, and take a survey on the course. A registrant who was not interested in a certificate could simply watch each module. We do not have system-generated data on how many views each module had. We do have such data on the number of people who took the quizzes. Table 5 shows that about a third of registrants took the first module quiz, and that quiz taking declined as the course went on. Our December–January survey asked non-certificate earners how many modules they viewed, and the responses show a drop similar to that in the quiz data, suggesting that people were not simply skipping the quizzes—fewer people actually viewed the later modules.

Table 5: Number of people taking the completion quiz at the end of each module, January and May 2016 offerings

Offering	Total registered	Module 1	Module 2	Module 3	Module 4	Module 5
First	159	59	41	30	25	23
Second	143	42	25	21	20	20

PROFOR and the OLC recruited course participants using list servers popular with the natural resource development community, announcements on the OLC site, PROFOR’s usual outreach channels, and targeted email to colleagues known to be active in governance assessment. Prospective students could apply through the OLC website.

For the initial offering, the course had 471 applicants, far too many people for the facilitators to evaluate and assist during the course. Using some basic data collected during the application process, including occupation, employer, and reason for interest in the topic, the facilitators selected about 130 initial participants. The facilitators gave preference to people who were known to or appeared to be active in forest policy. PROFOR and OLC admitted additional people in response to requests from Bank staff and other colleagues.

PROFOR and OLC were less aggressive in publicizing the second offering and had 161 applicants, resulting in a much higher acceptance rate. The third offering had still fewer applicants, and PROFOR accepted almost all except for those who seemed to have no connection to the forest sector or who had attempted to take the course before and had performed too poorly on the practical exercises to award credit.

Did the engagement process and knowledge product fit the case?

The fit of the engagement process to the case is difficult to judge. On the positive side, the course has engaged a large number of participants, most of whom have been active in the forest sector. Some enrolled because they were actually engaged in governance assessment. Another group of participants were students or academics. They will perhaps not apply the knowledge immediately, but the course learning may serve them in the longer term.

On the negative side, our engagement of students probably could have been more effective. This evaluation will discuss this more below under lessons learned, but briefly, engagement includes many factors: recruitment, securing student commitment to do the work, accommodation of student needs, and interaction.

- We were fairly good about advertising the course and recruiting applicants, especially for the first class offering, as indicated by the large number of qualified people who applied.
- The OLC platform is inherently less good at securing commitments from students: it costs nothing but a few minutes of time to apply or enroll, so students may have little commitment to follow through with the coursework. If anything, the instructors made commitment worse by sending out course acceptance notices only a week before the classes began, causing some students scheduling problems.
- We were fairly good at accommodating the course to student needs. For example, we were generous in granting extensions of time to complete coursework, extending the six weeks scheduled for each offering to ten weeks or more. However, some students experienced chronic Internet connectivity issues that we had little control over.
- Finally, we had a mixed record on interaction. We tried to be highly responsive to student inquiries directed at the facilitators and we gave personal feedback on each exercise that students submitted. However, we only gradually accepted the need for the facilitators to be active in the discussion sections.

Regarding the knowledge product itself, again, for some participants it was a very good fit. The participants who earned certificates completed a survey upon finishing the course. As might be expected among this highly engaged group, almost all gave positive scores (scores of five or better on a seven point scale) when asked to rate the course's usefulness and quality. They similarly agreed that the course increased their skills and that the course materials equipped them to learn. However, we cannot draw conclusions about the larger participant set from this small motivated group.

Both the course and the webcasts saw a drop in participation between the portions that deal with forest governance in general and the portions that deal more specifically with data gathering and governance assessment. This may be normal attrition, but it may also reflect a wider interest in the broader topic, suggesting that the course could have spent more time on the general topic and less on the specific.

The weakest aspect of the knowledge product may have been the discussion sections. Participants had to make comments in the discussion sections to get credit for each module. Many students made cursory comments to secure credit and did not follow up if people responded to their remarks. Few real conversations emerged.

Were knowledge practices enhanced by feedback?

After the first delivery of the online class, the PROFOR and OLC teams discussed how to improve the class. Being concerned with how few people actually submitted practical exercises for evaluation, the teams decided to require participants to submit exercises from three of the modules rather than all five. They also made small changes to the interactive exercises. These steps did not markedly increase the percentage of students earning certificates. The exercises did not appear to be barriers to the really motivated students. In fact, some students submitted all five exercises for feedback even though the certificate requirement was reduced to three.

The OLC advisors also encouraged the PROFOR facilitators to become more active in the discussions, posing questions and drawing out real discussion. The facilitators were more active during the second and third class offerings, but probably could have done still more.

Did they take into consideration the needs of women and girls?

The knowledge products did not take major steps to consider the needs of women and girls, however—

- The course modules showed images of women as well as men attending meetings, collecting data, and working in the field.
- Admission to the webinars and course was not restricted by gender.

Were they relevant to users needs?

In the exit surveys of the twenty-five participants who earned certificates in the first two offerings of the course, when asked to rate the course's relevance to their needs on a seven-point scale, the average score was 6.2.

Outcomes

Were decision makers better equipped?

In the December–January surveys, when asked to rate on a one-to-five scale whether they thought the course would be useful to them in future work, the average rating was 4.4 among people who earned certificates (N=14) and 4.2 (N=31) among all those responding. Just over half of all respondents gave the course a top rating (a “5” rating). Only two respondents said the course learning would not be at all useful (a “1” rating).

The same survey asked if the course made the participants interested in learning more about forest governance. The average ratings were 4.6 among certificate holders and 4.3 among all respondents.

The survey asked if the course influenced the participant's thinking about forest governance. The average responses were 4.3 among certificate holders and 3.8 among all respondents.

What, if any program outcomes were realized in terms of policy or practice changes?

In the same surveys, people were asked (1) if they had used what they had learned and (2) if the course had helped them engage in forest policymaking. Here, the average scores were lower, in the 3.0-to-3.3 range (out of 5). As one respondent noted, it is too soon since the end of the course to bring up examples of impacts to forest policymaking.

What other factors or actors contributed to these outcomes and what conclusion can be drawn about the extent to which the project contributed to these outcomes?

Many outside factors contributed and will continue to contribute to the influence of the course. The participants' ability to study and absorb the material depended on their motivation, the competing demands on their time, the quality of their Internet connection, and other factors. Their ability to apply what they learned depends on their employment and all the factors affecting forest administration, law, and policy.

A course like this is likely to have a small influence on most of its students and perhaps a large influence on a few students. These influences will play out over time. It is simply too soon to tell the full outcome story.

How are these changes relevant or significant to poverty reduction, biodiversity conservation, or climate change?

In the December–January survey, some of the respondents reported (in an optional comment box) on how they were using their knowledge. Here are some of the more noteworthy examples:

- In a participatory governance assessment in Vietnam for REDD+
- In teaching and training
- In managing a forestry land dispute
- In a watershed assessment
- In designing and conducting a mid-term review of a Forest Policy and Strategy
- In planning and implementing a responsible forestry project involving a large number of stakeholders

Note also that the class participants included people who are likely to apply the knowledge by virtue of their position, including—

- Bank staff working on forests and climate change with the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility
- Bank staff working on the Forest Investment Program
- Staff of an international conservation NGO preparing to use assessments to set advocacy priorities and monitor impacts of advocacy programs

In all, thirty-eight people on the Bank staff registered for the class in 2016.

Were there unexpected outcomes, positive or negative?

The small percentage of participants who earned certificates was a surprise to PROFOR, but apparently not to the OLC.

Although the class was designed for general outreach, it proved useful for training Bank staff for specific projects, such as a governance assessment in Mozambique.

Does more need to be done to achieve sustainable, implemented change?

Certainly more could be done. The course will be offered again in 2017, broadening its reach. PROFOR will continue to offer backstopping advice to Bank staff interested in applying what they have learned in the class.

Discussion of the Three Projects

Did this case demonstrate any promising practices?

In the DRC and Mozambique projects, PROFOR took an established tool and adapted it to new circumstances. The experiences reinforced the finding that this is a versatile and effective tool, both for assessing governance and for spreading knowledge about governance to stakeholders.

The DRC project additionally demonstrated the value in reaching out to normally isolated stakeholders — in this case, the artisanal loggers. This group brought attention to governance of small-scale harvesting, processing, and use, which are issues that assessments often overlook, particularly in the case of DRC where large-scale commercial logging concerns have taken up most of the attention.

In both these projects, the local organizers had apprehensions about scoring the tool's indicators with mixed groups of stakeholders. In DRC, the fear was that people would be afraid to speak candidly before other stakeholders, and in Mozambique the concern was also that mixed groups would have trouble reaching consensus. As things turned out, these were not significant problems. The workshop organizers promised stakeholders that indicator scores would not be attributed to specific people or groups, which encouraged open discussion for most participants, although some government employees still were reticent to speak in public. And the mixed stakeholder groups proved capable of respectful dialogue and agreement.

The online learning project shows the potential for using online classes to disseminate forest knowledge. Between printed copies and downloads, probably hundreds of people have seen the two documents (the “Framework” and the “Guide”) that underlie the forest governance assessment course, but few of those people have delved into the documents closely. The hundred-plus people who have worked through Module 1 of the course have a much deeper grasp of the Framework. The few dozen who have gone through the whole course and earned a certificate have a much more thorough knowledge of assessment than if they had merely read the Assessment Guide.

If time and funds permit, it would be worthwhile to develop and deliver other online courses inspired by PROFOR work, covering other topics in forest policy and development.

Were there lessons learned? Were there things we would do differently in hindsight?

The field assessment projects offered several lessons:

- Users of the PROFOR tool can trust the method of having small mixed stakeholder groups score the assessment indicators. The resulting discussions are rich and productive, and they educate the stakeholders about each other's needs and opinions. Frank participation and even consensus are more likely than one might think. If people seem uncomfortable being candid in public, later discussion of results one-on-one during the vetting process can bring out these more sensitive issues.
- Early notice to stakeholders about the scoring workshops is important. In Mozambique, stakeholders who got early notice of their regional workshop participated in larger numbers and came better prepared.
- Managing stakeholder expectations is important. In DRC, many stakeholders assumed that because the World Bank wanted to hear about their problems, the Bank was ready and able to address those problems. When the stakeholders came to realize that the assessment was a first step in a longer process of having the government address generic problems, they were disappointed. In future, organizers should be sure that stakeholders understand the purpose of the scoring workshops. In particular, stakeholders should know that the workshops are not for airing personal grievances but for diagnosing systemic problems.
- On a related point, an assessment will be more influential if it is linked to supportive decision makers who are steering a well-resourced reform effort. The DRC assessment fed into a Bank study, while the Mozambique assessment fed into a Bank investment program. The Mozambique assessment is more likely to be influential.
- Complementary analytic work, happening in parallel, can amplify an assessment's impact. In Mozambique, the PROFOR assessment, a concessions review, and the ROAM assessment all pointed to the need for reforms, mutually strengthening each other and increasing the probability of transforming new knowledge into action.
- The World Bank name adds weight to an assessment. In DRC, stakeholders were more willing to participate when they learned that the World Bank was sponsoring the work. But the World Bank name is not enough. Ultimately, government buy-in and long-term commitment are better indicators that an assessment will lead to good governance reforms.
- Political instability can make constructive reforms difficult.

The online learning project offers its own lessons:

Depth of influence and choice of dissemination approaches: Others have noted that broadcast methods of spreading knowledge (e.g., publications) may reach many people but they have less influence on a given person than methods involving customized instruction or assistance. The experience with the online course tends to support this observation. When PROFOR publishes a document or a toolkit, it gets relatively broad exposure but most readers' thinking may be little changed. When PROFOR offers customized technical assistance, it reaches fewer people but the impacts are easier to demonstrate. When it offers a course like this, with some personal interaction, it probably achieves an intermediate level of influence.

Which of these three approaches is the optimal strategy? That is probably the wrong question to ask. The optimum is a balanced mix of the approaches. Where PROFOR has existing tools that it has distributed through general publications or applied in site-specific projects, an in-depth online course would often be a good addition to the dissemination portfolio.

The need for good recruiting: Course facilitators learned three lessons about recruiting participants for online learning. The first is to publicize the course through many channels, including personal connections and word of mouth. The facilitators were most aggressive in publicizing the course for the first offering, and that brought us by far the largest and most interesting group of applicants.

The second is to engage the applicants and keep them informed about the admissions process before the course begins. The OLC platform by default tells each applicant that he or she has been waitlisted. Prospective participants can submit applications up until the beginning of the course, and people may get very short notice that they have been admitted into the class. The facilitators heard from applicants that they were surprised to be admitted after being weeks on the "waitlist" and that they hadn't set aside the time to participate in the class. In future, the facilitators need to admit most people two to four weeks before the class begins.

The third is to improve the selection process. This is an area where the facilitators acknowledge that they still have room to learn. Applicants have ranged from having no experience with the forest sector, through graduate students, early to mid career people, and senior managers, to retired people. The facilitators have found that people outside the sector lack the background to complete the practical exercises or contribute in a meaningful way to the group discussions. The facilitators were initially excited to admit senior officials and people they knew were thinking about conducting assessments. However, many of these people dropped out of the course, presumably because they lacked the time. So, the facilitators have learned to avoid people from outside the sector and have learned not to expect much from very senior people, but still have much to learn about selecting enthusiastic, well-performing students in other categories.

More engagement: In future classes, facilitators should increase their engagement with the participants. The class discussion sections clearly work the best when the

facilitators ask questions and prod participants to post responses. Constructive criticism of exercises seems to boost student's performance in later exercises.

Does this case shed light on the Theory of Change assumptions of KNOWFOR?

Here are the key assumptions behind KEQ1:

- *More focus on translating knowledge for specific priority groups will increase uptake*

The Mozambique project supports this assumption in part. For example, the difference in the length of notice given to stakeholders in the two regional workshops and the resulting difference in participation showed the need to support preparation for rural community stakeholders.

However, in some sense, it was important to treat stakeholders equally during the actual activities. The equal treatment and deliberate mixing of diverse stakeholders in small groups in the workshops (as opposed to segregating stakeholders into groups with similar interests) proved to promote engagement and consensus building. In the end, this consensus gave the workshop findings greater weight.

Rather than outputs targeted to individual stakeholders, the Mozambique project produced three key knowledge products and drew on them as needed to reach different groups. An output geared to the general public (a press release) helped reach that broad audience. Report summaries were useful in reaching most stakeholders, while the full report has reached the more sophisticated and engaged stakeholders.

The DRC project also offers some experiences that support the need for careful customization to the target audience. Informants noted that the translation of the PROFOR indicators from English to French was poorly done in some cases, which affected the understanding of most participants. Also, informants thought that more attention to gender would have produced more insights in that area. Lastly, the laws and regulations for artisanal loggers are different or altogether non-existent, which changed the context of the assessment for them. If these issues had been better considered, it would have added value to the assessments.

- *Dialogue, engagement and exchange of ideas and knowledge co-production with decision-makers are crucial to influencing policy and practice.*

The facilitators of the online course believed that increased engagement with the students improved participation. In a weak sense, that supports this assumption, but there was no objective evidence that interaction or influence increased between offerings.

More can be said about this assumption from the experience with the assessments. In Mozambique, regular discussions with the FIP project leaders gave them influence over project design and ensured the uptake of results. Also, as one key informant wrote, “Decision-makers from the government were involved in the activity from the beginning (selection of indicators), and one in particular spoke positively about the assessment and the value it brought to them.”

In DRC, lack of engagement contributed to the low influence that the exercise had on policy and practice. During the workshops, some key decision makers were absent, and others were present but held back from participating fully. After the report was ready, not enough was done to engage key decision makers on its results, findings, and recommendations. More dialogues should have been arranged to discuss the final product.

- *Adaptive management and refining the approach based on monitoring and reflection will increase uptake*

None of the projects offers support for this. In the online class, the changes that the facilitators made between offerings did not have an objectively documented effect on uptake. The assessments did not apply adaptive management.

- *It is possible to enhance uptake by applying lessons from other projects even in highly individualised contexts.*

The online class benefited from the experience that the OLC staff had with other learning projects, but not necessarily from other PROFOR work.

In Mozambique, consultants familiar with applications of the PROFOR tool in other countries advised the local team. Tapping this experience enhanced the effectiveness of uptake for this activity.

The DRC assessment learned from previous examples in Burkina Faso and Liberia. The team were encouraged to apply these lessons in DRC knowing that the tool worked in those countries. French language materials, developed for Burkina Faso, were drawn upon in DRC.

Annex 1. List of Key Informants

Congo, DRC

1. Julian Lee, Environment Specialist and TTL
2. Etienne Benoist, Consultant-WB.
3. Laurent Valiergue, Senior Forestry Specialist and Sector focal point.

Mozambique

1. Andre Aquino, Sr. Natural Resources Mgmt. Specialist, TTL
2. Werner Kornexl, Sr. Natural Resources Mgmt. Specialist, co-TTL
3. Celine Lim, WB
4. Muino Taquidir, WB-Maputo
5. Fane Macueia, Professor-UniLurio. Mozambique

Annex 2. Structured Questionnaire for key informants in the Congo DRC and Mozambique sub-cases.

1. What was the project's intended knowledge audience? (§III.A).
2. Are you satisfied with project design in terms of maximizing knowledge uptake? (§III.A) In particular, are you confident that project target knowledge products will reach priority groups? How do you rank your confidence level (not confident, low, medium, high) (§V.C).
3. How, if at all, did knowledge product development plans change during the project in response to new information or stakeholders' suggestions? (§IV.A.3)
4. What knowledge products did the project actually produce? (§IV.A.1)
5. How satisfied are you with project's approach to reflect issues relevant to women and girls (§IV.A.1 & .4)
6. Are you aware of any knowledge dissemination activities besides the reports, such as briefings, workshops, conferences, press releases, and presentations If yes, can you describe them and highlight their potential impacts? If not, what kind of knowledge dissemination activities besides the reports, such as briefings, workshops, conferences, press releases, and presentations you think should have been more impactful, and hence, carried out? (IV.A.1 & .2).
7. How many copies of printed knowledge products have been distributed? In what languages? If not already published, how many copies do you think should be published and in what languages? Please explain as and why the number and languages you suggest is justified. (§§IV.A.1 & .B.1).
8. Can you think about the key target audience, including key decision makers, in government, the donor community, the NGO community, etc. that should have absolutely received or should receive these knowledge products? (§§IV.A.5 & .B.1)
9. To what extent did this project achieve or not achieve its desired effect? And in particular, will the project contribute to any practice or policy changes? (§IV.B.2)
10. How well or poorly did the project design fit the country context? (§IV.A.2, .5)
11. Will people be better equipped to make and influence decisions because of this project? Can you provide an example of as and how this project will end up enhancing stakeholders' policy and decision making skills with regard to natural resource management? Can you point to specific decision makers that will benefit the most because of this project? (§IV.B.1)

12. Did involving the decision makers in project design, execution, or reporting increase the project's impact? If yes, how? (§V.C).
13. Can you point to how this project will contribute to any changes affecting poverty reduction, biodiversity conservation, or climate change? (§IV.B.3)
14. How, if at all, did you apply experience from other projects in shaping the knowledge dissemination practices of this project? (§V.C)
15. Were there things that should have been done differently in hindsight? What could have been done that might have made this project even more influential and impactful? (§V.B and & .C). What relevant lessons can you point to, from the other sector studies, which this could have followed, for better influence?
16. Were there good things done and shouldn't be forgotten, practices that can be used again in other projects? (§V.A & .B)
17. Are you satisfied with the way project targeted/is targeting its knowledge products to reach priority groups? (§V.C). Or would you have done targeting differently?

Annex 3. Evidence base: Overall Strength of Evidence rating Congo, DRC

Category	Description	Met Y/N	Evidence
High	1.Evidence is provided in the form of a published document available in the public domain that has been peer reviewed.	Y	The ESW (for the forest sector) report, published after peer review, and is available in the public domain.
	2. Evidence is published on an official Government website and is directly relevant to the claim.	N	
	3 Evidence is triangulated through 3 different categories of evidence. For example, expert informants concur with this finding, and there are also 2 examples of documented evidence of the finding from different sources.	N	
	4. Where directly relevant testimony / user experience is collected with a statistically representative sample, or with the population.	N	
Medium			
	1. Where directly relevant testimony / user experience is collected using saturation sampling (over 20 participants).	N	
	2. Where highly credible testimony is provided: for example, an email from a government official who is the target of the knowledge product.	N	
	3. Administrative data that is directly relevant to the claim– such as participant records about who attends meetings to comment on reach or evidence about achievement of a report being published.	Y	From the detailed activity report which has the lists of participants and some feedback provided by them.
	4. Where there is triangulation between at least 2 weaker forms of evidence (see below)	Y	In the form of responses to questions asked in this evaluation, by 3 respondents representing the World Bank.
Low			
	1.Evidence that is written in a text provided by a third party	na	
	2.Evidence that relies on a single respondent's claim.	na	
	3.Evidence that relies on internally produced documents written by the claim maker that offer opinion rather than substantiated observations.	na	

Congo, DRC-Overall Strength of Evidence rating suggested: MEDIUM.

Mozambique

Category	Description	Met Y/N	Evidence
High	1.Evidence is provided in the form of a published document available in the public domain that has been peer reviewed.	Y	The Project Appraisal Document (PAD) for the MozFIP project has been published after peer review, and is available in the public domain.
	2. Evidence is published on an official Government website and is directly relevant to the claim.	Y?	
	3 Evidence is triangulated through 3 different categories of evidence. For example, expert informants concur with this finding, and there are also 2 examples of documented evidence of the finding from different sources.	N?	
	4. Where directly relevant testimony / user experience is collected with a statistically representative sample, or with the population.	N	
Medium			
	1. Where directly relevant testimony / user experience is collected using saturation sampling (over 20 participants).	N	
	2. Where highly credible testimony is provided: for example, an email from a government official who is the target of the knowledge product.	N	
	3. Administrative data that is directly relevant to the claim– such as participant records about who attends meetings to comment on reach or evidence about achievement of a report being published.	Y	From the detailed activity reports which has the lists of participants, and findings and recommendations.
	4. Where there is triangulation between at least 2 weaker forms of evidence (see below)	Y	In the form of responses to questions asked in this evaluation, by 5 respondents representing the World Bank, and academia.
Low			
	1.Evidence that is written in a text provided by a third party	na	
	2.Evidence that relies on a single respondent's claim.	na	
	3.Evidence that relies on internally produced documents written by the claim maker that offer opinion rather than substantiated observations.	na	

Mozambique-Overall Strength of Evidence rating suggested: MEDIUM.

e-Learning

Category	Description	Met Y/N	Evidence
High	1.Evidence is provided in the form of a published document available in the public domain that has been peer reviewed.	Y	The ESW (for the forest sector) report, published after peer review, and is available in the public domain.
	2. Evidence is published on an official Government website and is directly relevant to the claim.	N	
	3 Evidence is triangulated through 3 different categories of evidence. For example, expert informants concur with this finding, and there are also 2 examples of documented evidence of the finding from different sources.	N	
	4. Where directly relevant testimony / user experience is collected with a statistically representative sample, or with the population.	Y	Course participants sign-in information (covering all participants, for example, to determine gender participation)
Medium			
	1. Where directly relevant testimony / user experience is collected using saturation sampling (over 20 participants).	Y	Exit surveys (at the time of course or webinar completion) from OLC and later surveys conducted specifically for this evaluation
	2. Where highly credible testimony is provided: for example, an email from a government official who is the target of the knowledge product.	N	
	3. Administrative data that is directly relevant to the claim– such as participant records about who attends meetings to comment on reach or evidence about achievement of a report being published.	Y	Records of who has viewed webinars, completed course modules, or earned course certificates
	4. Where there is triangulation between at least 2 weaker forms of evidence (see below)	Y	Open comments captured in surveys; information (claims) from a course facilitator; the concept note (planning document) for the project
Low			
	1.Evidence that is written in a text provided by a third party	na	
	2.Evidence that relies on a single respondent's claim.	na	
	3.Evidence that relies on internally produced documents written by the claim maker that offer opinion rather than substantiated observations.	na	

e-Learning-Overall Strength of Evidence rating suggested: MEDIUM.

Annex 4: Gender responsiveness rating

Congo, DRC: Below average/acceptable (Women participated in all workshops required for the completion of the assessment, but the final knowledge product does not consider gender aspects specifically).

Mozambique: Acceptable (The first and third criteria in the “acceptable” category of the uptake rubric have been met).

e-Learning: Acceptable (The first and third criteria in the “acceptable” category of uptake rubric have been met).