Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the***BRA/09/G32 -* Catalyzing the Contribution of Indigenous lands to the Conservation of Brazil’s Forest Ecosystems** (PIMS # 3600.)

The essentials of the project to be evaluated are as follows:

Project Summary Table

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Title: |  | | | | | |
| GEF Project ID: | | 2934 |  | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | | *at completion (Million US$)* |
| UNDP Project ID: | | 3600 | GEF financing: | 6,000,000 | | 6,000,000 |
| Country: | | Brazil | IA/EA own: | 400,000 | | 400,000 |
| Region: | | Latin America | Government: | 24,018,151.94 | | 24,018,151.94 |
| Focal Area: | | BD/SFM | Other: | 3,777,570 | | 3,777,570 |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): | | SFM-SO1; BD-SP3 | Total co-financing: | 28,195,721.94 | | 28,195,721.94 |
| Executing Agency: | | FUNAI | Total Project Cost: | 34,195,721.94 | | 34,195,721.94 |
| Other Partners involved: | | MMA and Indigenous Organizations | ProDoc Signature (date project began): | | | 30/10/2009 |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | | Proposed:  30/10/2014 | Actual:  31/08/2016 |

Objective and Scope

The project was designed to adopt a ground-tested and officially recognized strategy for environmental management in Indigenous Lands (IL) by Indigenous Peoples (IP) for the effective conservation and sustainable use of forest biodiversity. The Project will achieve this through the following three Outcomes and their related Outputs: (i) Mechanisms and tools have been developed that enable Brazil’s ILs to be recognized and strengthened as effective areas for conserving forest biodiversity, natural resources and the environmental services, (ii) A network of ILs modeling environmental management practices for conservation in different forest biomes is in place and is being effectively managed by the indigenous peoples and organizations, and (iii) Sustainable and replicable models of forest management , based on ethno-management principles, are piloted in selected ILs from different forest biomes. Direct global benefits to be delivered include: an increase in the area (4,563,933 ha) of representative forest ecosystems of Brazil under conservation through the recognized environmental goals of ILs located in areas of high priority for biodiversity conservation; maintaining forest habitats in these areas at same or higher levels; improved connectivity between PAs; and improved management effectiveness in the RAs.

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects.

The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

Evaluation approach and method

An overall approach and method[[1]](#footnote-1) for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact,** as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR ([Annex C](#_TOR_Annex_C:)). The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence‐based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Brasília, including the following project sites: Bracuí IL in Rio de Janeiro (nearby Paraty) and Cachoeirinha, Lalima e Taunay-Ipegue ILs in Mato Grosso do Sul (nearby Miranda). Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: the Brazilian Cooperation Agency (ABC), the National Indigenous Affairs Foundation (FUNAI), Ministry of Environment (MMA), the Brazilian Articulation of Indigenous Peoples (APIB), The Nature Conservancy (TNC), the Institute for Society, Population and Nature (ISPN), Technical and Regional Consultants, and UNDP.

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in [Annex B](#_TOR_Annex_B:) of this Terms of Reference.

Evaluation Criteria & Ratings

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework ([Annex A](#_TOR_Annex_A:)), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact.** Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in  [Annex D](#_TOR_Annex_D:).

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Ratings:** | | | |
| **1. Monitoring and Evaluation** | ***rating*** | **2. IA& EA Execution** | ***rating*** |
| M&E design at entry |  | Quality of UNDP Implementation |  |
| M&E Plan Implementation |  | Quality of Execution - Executing Agency |  |
| Overall quality of M&E |  | Overall quality of Implementation / Execution |  |
| **3. Assessment of Outcomes** | **rating** | **4. Sustainability** | **rating** |
| Relevance |  | Financial resources: |  |
| Effectiveness |  | Socio-political: |  |
| Efficiency |  | Institutional framework and governance: |  |
| Overall Project Outcome Rating |  | Environmental : |  |
|  |  | Overall likelihood of sustainability: |  |

Project finance / cofinance

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Co-financing  (type/source) | UNDP own financing (mill. US$) | | Government  (mill. US$) | | Partner Agency  (mill. US$) | | Total  (mill. US$) | |
| Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Actual | Actual |
| Grants |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Loans/Concessions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * In-kind support |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

Mainstreaming

UNDP supported GEF financed projects are key components in UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programmes. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender.

Impact

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.[[2]](#footnote-2)

Conclusions, recommendations & lessons

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions**, **recommendations** and **lessons**.

Implementation arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Brazil. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

Evaluation timeframe

The total duration of the evaluation will be 30days according to the following plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Timing | Completion Date |
| **Preparation** | 03 days | October 10th, 2016. |
| **Evaluation Mission** | 07 days | October 20th, 2016. |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | 10 days | October 31st, 2016 |
| **Final Report** | 10 days | November 14th, 2016. |

Evaluation deliverables

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Deliverable | Content | Timing | Responsibilities |
| **Inception Report** | Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method | No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission. | Evaluator submits to UNDP CO |
| **Presentation** | Initial Findings | End of evaluation mission | To project management, UNDP CO |
| **Draft Final Report** | Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes | Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission | Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs |
| **Final Report\*** | Revised report | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft | Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC. |

\*When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluator is required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report.

Team Composition

The evaluation team will be composed of 2 international /national evaluators*.* The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects; one of the evaluators will be designated as the team leader and will be responsible for finalizing the report. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The Team members must present the following qualifications:

* Minimum 15years of relevant professional experience.
* Knowledge of UNDP and GEF.
* Previous experience with results‐based monitoring and evaluation methodologies.
* Technical knowledge in natural resources management, and/or biodiversity and/or sustainable forestry management or other related areas.
* Experience in evaluation and/or implementation of projects with indigenous peoples is an asset.

Evaluator Ethics

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex E) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the [UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'](http://www.unevaluation.org/ethicalguidelines)

Payment modalities and specifications

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| % | | Milestone | |
| 40% | Following submission and approval of the 1st draft terminal evaluation report | |
| 60% | Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report | |

Application process

Applicants are requested to apply by e-mail by September 30th, 2016. Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions. The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in English with indication of the e‐mail and phone contact. Shortlisted candidates will be requested to submit a price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs).

UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

Annex A: Project Logical Framework

| **Project Strategy** | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Target** | **Verification Sources** | **Assumptions** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **LONG TERM**  **OBJECTIVE** | Consolidation of Indigenous Lands (ILs) as essential protected areas for the conservation of biodiversity in Brazilian forest ecosystems and as constituent part of the National Protected Areas Plan (PNAP) and Environmental Management Policies for Indigenous Lands. | | | | |
| **IMMEDIATE OBJECTIVE:**  A ground-tested and officially recognized strategy for environmental management in Indigenous Lands (IL) by Indigenous Peoples (IP) is adopted in Brazil for the effective conservation and sustainable use of forest biodiversity | 1. Increase in the area (ha.) of representative forest ecosystems of Brazil under conservation through the recognized environmental goals of ILs that by the end of the project are:  (i) incorporated into a network of ethno-management practices for conservation of different forest ecosystems in Brazil  (ii) identified as contributing to long term targets of PNAP and part of IL Environmental Management Plan with specific strategies for implementation | 1. Currently ILs in different forest biomes provide conservation to forest biodiversity but the contribution to national conservation plans and targets is not measured nor are the IPs management practices readily translated into terms that can be recognized and funded through resources available for biodiversity conservation. The potential for contribution to Brazil’ conservation goals is thus not fully recognized.  *% of biome under protection in SNUC\*; in all ILs; and that is currently measured & recognized conservation network*   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Biome | % ha. in SNUC | % ha.in  ILs | % of # and ha. ILs in network | | Cerrado/P.\*\* | 6.0 | 8.0 | 0 | | Caatinga | 3.5 | 2.5 | 0 | | A.Forest \*\*\* | 4.0 | 3.0 | 0 | | Amazon | 14.0 | 21.0 | 0 | | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Biome | (i) ILs (ha.) in network with recognized BD goals | (ii) ILs (ha) in long term plans1 | | Cerrado/ P | 186,542 | 559,626 | | Caatinga | 87,620 | 262,860 | | A.Forest | 194,064 | 582,192 | | Amazon | 4,128,833 | 12,386,499 |   1*These will be determined as part of the*  *Project. But here an estimate is made that, at the end of the project, the area in the plan will be triple that in the network*  (iii) % contribution to conservation goals   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Biome | % of # IL s in network | % in ha ILs in network | % ha.IL in plan \* | | Cerrado/P\*\* | 10 | 0.09 | 0.27 | | Caatinga | 5 | 0.10 | 0.30 | | A. Forest\*\*\* | 6 | 0.17 | 0.51 | | Amazon | 30 | 1.0 | 3.00 |   \**SNUC is the Brazilian National Protected Area System*  *\*\* This includes ILs in the Pantanal with transition forest*  *\*\*\* Atlantic Forest* | 1.(i) Project Reports; approved ethno-management plans; BD monitoring reports  1. (ii) Relevant sections of the IL Environmental Management Plan and NPAP | -The government maintains current commitment to work as a partner of the IPs to ensure conservation in ILs.  -The IPs continue participating in conservation of ILs and show at least current levels of interest for engagement with project  -IPs continue to show a unified and consistent voice through the regional IOs- Indigenous Organizations  -IOs have sufficient capacities to participate in the execution and monitoring of the National IL Environmental Management Plan thereby up-scaling lessons learnt through project to fully unleash IL contribution to conservation targets  -Climate changes negatively affect the biodiversity in ILs |
| 2. % forest cover ILs that serve as Reference Areas (RA) remains at least same or more (as measured by Satellite images)  [*more accurate estimates of forest cover will be determined as part of ethno management plans and some adjustments may be made to figures*] | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | IL (RA) [[3]](#footnote-3) | % forest cover | METT[[4]](#footnote-4) | | 1 | 98 | 64 | | 2 | 98 | 69 | | 3 | 98 | 78 | | 4 | 60 | 80 | | 5 | 40 | 83 | | 6 | 90 | 64 | | 7 | 45 | 34 | | 8 | 90 | 64 | | 9 | 98 | 71 | | 10 | 40 | 44 | | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | IL (RA) | % forest cover | METT | | 1 | 98 | >77 | | 2 | 98 | >77 | | 3 | 98 | >85 | | 4 | 70 | >90 | | 5 | 50 | >90 | | 6 | 90 | >77 | | 7 | 55 | >52 | | 8 | 90 | >77 | | 9 | 98 | >77 | | 10 | 50 | >52 | | 2.Satellite images and ethno-management plans and monitoring systems |
| 3. Increased management effectiveness in ILs that serve as Reference Areas | See table in row above | See table in row above | 3. Adapted METTS |
| 4**.** Increase in IP capacities for leading and up-scaling environmental management actions for conserving representative forest ecosystems in Brazil   * IOs, with institutional &technical capacities to execute & monitor IL National Plans & projects * Indigenous initiatives/centres for training in environmental management for BD conservation & sustainable use of natural resources | * Today COIAB, FOIRN and CIR have institutional capacity for the execution of ethno-management and ethno-zoning plans. None has the capacity to execute a national plan of environmental management. * A Centre for Indigenous training exists in the Amazon CAFI and in 2006 trained 15 IPs in environmental management but this does not include standards and practices for ethno-zoning for BD conservation. Other regions do not have Centres or trained IPs | * All IO of the 5 regional networks have strengthened capacities\* for environmental management and to execute & monitor IL National Plans & projects. * 20 IP in each of the biomes have skill\* required for ethno-environmental management   \**This will be measured by a scorecard to be developed as part of the project’s Output 1.4* | Staff profiles in IOs  Certificates of Course Completion in the CFIs  Scorecards to be developed in project and applied at end of year 1; mid-term and end of project |
| **OUTCOME 1**  Mechanisms and tools have been developed that enable Brazil’s ILs to be recognized and strengthened as effective areas for conserving forest biodiversity, natural resources and the environmental services | 5.Existence of recognized environmental management standards and targets in Indigenous Lands | A National Protected Areas Plan (PNAP) exists to guide the establishment of a comprehensive system of protected areas including contributions from ILs s but no specific targets, standards or practices for these are defined.  In Sept 2008, a working group (GTI) was established to elaborate a proposal of National Policy for Environmental Management in IL | A National Conservation Plan for Indigenous Lands that contains targets for conservation of representative forest ecosystems through environmental management \* exists and is harmonized and integrated with the NPAP and adapted to the environmental and social needs of ILs  \**this Plan would be aligned with and form part of a National Policy on Environmental Management of IL (PNGATI)* | National Policy for Environmental Policy in ILs (PNGATI)  IL Conservation Plan  Proceedings of Meetings of FUNAI and MMA/SBF on harmonizing Plans  Project Reports. | -National Policy on Environmental Management in ILs is developed in timely manner with support from FUNAI and MMA thereby increasing the dialogue on more effective environmental management  -State Environmental Agencies incorporate the new policies to support ethno-management plans at levels that enable the replication of experiences across all States  -Contribution of ILs to BD in each forest biome is successfully measured in IL. RA during the project life  -Increase in the public resources for fficient to support new strategies of environmental management is at levels high enough to upscale experiences from RA |
| 6. Resources from existing  biodiversity conservation sources used to achieve basic operating standards for environmental management in ILs | ILs currently do not receive funding for environmental management activities from public funding sources for biodiversity conservation.  Isolated support from NGOs to undertake environmental management and/or territorial surveillance activities in the ILs of Oiapoque, Amapá and Kayapó | At least 5 of the Reference ILs will receive at least 50% of the costs of basic operations\* from new funding mechanisms that include resources currently only available for biodiversity conservation in PA. environmental services compensation  *\*The project will work to determine costs of meeting basic operational standards and will test different funding mechanisms.* | Budget resources from FUNAI and MMA destined to environmental management in IL.  Financial reports of ILs |
| 7. Staff competencies and skills in MMA, IBAMA, ICMBio, FUNAI, OEMAs and/or municipal agencies) aligned to implement and follow specific norms and regulations for ethno-management and ethno-zoning in ILs. | * <20% of MMA/SBF trained on ethno-management and ethno-zoning plans for ILs * <15% of FUNAI has core groups of staff trained on environmental management and sustainable use activities in IL * OEMAs do not have staff trained on environmental activities in ILs * IBAMA and ICMBio * Staff requirements in MMA/SBF and FUNAI do not include profiles for IL/IP and biodiversity conservation respectively | * At least 20% increase in the number of MMA and FUNAI staff trained to implement and use such norms * At least 1 staff member in the OEMAs of the states of SC, MS, BA, PE, AM, PA, AC and RO trained to monitor these norms and regulations * IBAMA and ICMBio * Competency profiles for MMA/SF and FUNAI have been adjusted to include IL/IP and biodiversity conservation respectively | Project Reports; report on the development of qualification programs.  Annual monitoring reports.  Legal register of the submissions to the judiciary. |
| 8. Regulations adopted for environmental management in ILs including regulations on:   * ethno zoning in ILs * land-use in areas surrounding ILs * management of overlapping IL and UCs * sustainable use of forest resources of IL | * 0 * 0 * 0 * 0 | * At least 3 categories of ethno-zoning recognized for: conservation, sustainable use and restoration. * At least 1 regulation regarding land-use in the areas surrounding ILs e.g creation o IL buffers zones * Norms on homologizing management plans and ethno-plans of IL and UC * Agreed-upon standards and limits for use of forest resources | 8. Specific decrees instituting each of these regulations |
| 9. Existence of surveillance and monitoring plans with standards and practices defined to support the implementation of ethno zoning and plans | * Only ILs that were part of PPTAL in the Amazon have surveillance and monitoring protocols and carry out inspection activities in ILs but these do not contain environmental monitoring nor are they related to specific ethno- zones and their goals * ILs in other forest biomes do not have surveillance and monitoring protocols and only have Indigenous Surveillance (observation) Stations that are not related to zoning | * All the IL reference areas have established surveillance Protocols and undertaken environmental monitoring * 50% of the ILs composing the network have established Surveillance Protocols and are developing environmental monitoring systems | Environmental monitoring reports  Surveillance Protocols  METT  Project Reports |
| **OUTCOME 2:**  A network of ILs modeling environmental management practices for conservation in different forest biomes is in place and is being effectively managed by the indigenous peoples and organizations | 10. Number of ethno-management plans in ILsthat are:   * developed and tested * have defined conservation goals * are officially recognized as meeting established norms for conservation by environmental and indigenous agencies in each regional | * 5 communities in Oiapoque are testing environmental management strategies * 0 * Today about 60% of the RAs have conserved areas but their contribution to biodiversity conservation is not measure not recognized officially by relevant institutions ( eg FUNAI and IBAMA/OEMAS) | * 10 tested ethno-management plan with defined sustainable use, conservation practices, zones and goals relevant for each of the four forest biomes * 30 more ILs developing ethno management plans * All plans in reference areas are officially recognized as meeting norms by environmental agencies in each region | * Ethno-management Plans and Ethno-zoning maps * Project Reports * Official documents recognizing Plans | -Implementation of the ethno-management plans effectively demonstrate the contribution of ILs to conservation of BD  -Ethno-management experiences are efficient and guarantee high replicability  -Coordination processes allow an efficient replicability and exchange of experiences within the life time of the project at regional and national levels |
| 11. Degree of replication of experiences from Reference Areas to other ILs that improve management effectiveness as measured by increase in the METT scores of a sample of 23 ILS | METT for a sample of 23 ILs:  Poor: 0  Fair: 9  Good: 9  Excellent: 5 | All Poor and Fair have reached at least Good Scores  All Good have reached Excellent Scores  All Excellent have remained Excellent | METT reports |
| 12. % of indigenous curricula that include information on BD & environmental management   * IP schools in network * IP schools nationwide * IP training centers (CFI) | * 0% of 30 (at least 1 per IL of network) * 0% of 2422 (FNDE 2006) * 1 for the whole Amazon region. | * 50% of IP schools in network * 10% IP schools across country * 100% of 5 CFI | * School curricula * CAFI curricula * Project reports |
| **OUTCOME 3**  Sustainable and replicable models of forest management , based on ethno-management principles, are piloted in selected ILs from different forest biomes | 13. Reduction in un-sustainable extractive practices in the RAs | The base line values will be established by ethno-zoning and ethno-management plans | 100% reduction in the *caatinga*, *cerrado* Atlantic forest and in the Amazon biome. | Project reports and ethno monitoring reports | -Fragmented areas subject to restoration activities show the conservation of BD  -Pressure on natural resources in ILs increases as new resource use-options become more effective.  -Population levels in some ILs are at levels that enable new agro-ecological options to cover dietary needs and this reduce deforestation |
| 14. Increase in the % of IP diet derived from the new agro-ecological production systems in ILs Reference Areas in the Caatinga, Cerrado and A.F | IPs in Amazon get food from in the IL.  IPs diet in Cerrado and the Atlantic Forest comes from locally grown crops and food bought in regional markets  IPs in Caatinga grow and gather food in IL, exerting high pressure on the few resources available  *Base line values will be established by ethno-zoning & ethno-management plans* | Community inside IL subsist with production derived from agro-ecological production within the zones delimited for this use | Project Reports |
| 15. Increase in the income derived from the trade of NTFP, including:   * Honey (melipona) * Fruit: Cashew, açaí, baru * Handicraft: liana, croá | Income unknown at present. Unit prices are   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | Product | Amt. | Price R$ | | Amazon | Açaí | 1 lt. conc. | 9.60 | | Native Bee Honey | 235g. | 18.50 | | Babaçu soap | 90g. | 2.00 | | Cerrado | Baru nut toasted | 200g. | 12,00 | | Capim Dourado bag | 19x13x7  cm | 56.00 | |  | Caainga Croá | 1m2 | 20.00 |   Note: The exact value of the income will be measured by end of year 1. | * ILsin Cerrado, Caatinga, and Atlantic Forest with at least one income-generating agro-ecological activity * In the Amazon, 3 of the 4 RAs with trading activities implemented | - Adapted METT and Project Reports  - Amount of Income |
| 16. Area of fragmented forest restored in IL of A. forest with native species to improve connectivity | The base line values will be established by ethno-zoning and ethno-management plans | At least 40% of the fragmented areas that are critical to connectivity are in the process of restoration with native species | Project Reports  IL Environmental monitoring reports |

Annex B: List of Documents to be reviewed by the evaluators

* PRODOC;
* Annual PIRs – Project Implementation Reports (2010-2016);
* Annual Operational Plans (AOPs/POAs);
* Mid-Term evaluation;
* Project Tracking Tools;
* List of technical reports/documents produced and respective Terms of Reference;
* Financial data including co-funding data and audit reports, whenever applicable;
* Minutes of the Final Seminar of the Project;
* Sample of Project Communication Materials.

Annex C: Evaluation Questions

*This is a generic list, to be further detailed with more specific questions by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on the particulars of the project.*

| **Evaluative Criteria Questions** | | **Indicators** | **Sources** | **Methodology** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels? | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? | | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
| Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards? | | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
| Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? | | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
| **Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?** | | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |

Annex D: Rating Scales

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution*** | ***Sustainability ratings:*** | ***Relevance ratings*** |
| 6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings  5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings  4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS)  3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings  2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems  1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems | 4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability | 2. Relevant (R) |
| 3. Moderately Likely (ML):moderate risks | 1.. Not relevant (NR) |
| 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks  1. Unlikely (U): severe risks | ***Impact Ratings:***  3. Significant (S)  2. Minimal (M)  1. Negligible (N) |
| *Additional ratings where relevant:*  Not Applicable (N/A)  Unable to Assess (U/A | | |

Annex E: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form

**Evaluators:**

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people’s right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people’s right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders’ dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form[[5]](#footnote-5)**

**Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System**

**Name of Consultant:** \_\_     \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Name of Consultancy Organization** (where relevant)**:** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.**

Signed at *place* on *date*

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Annex F: Evaluation Report Outline[[6]](#footnote-6)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **i.** | Opening page:   * Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project * UNDP and GEF project ID#s. * Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report * Region and countries included in the project * GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program * Implementing Partner and other project partners * Evaluation team members * Acknowledgements |
| **ii.** | Executive Summary   * Project Summary Table * Project Description (brief) * Evaluation Rating Table * Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons |
| **iii.** | Acronyms and Abbreviations  (See: UNDP Editorial Manual[[7]](#footnote-7)) |
| **1.** | Introduction   * Purpose of the evaluation * Scope & Methodology * Structure of the evaluation report |
| **2.** | Project description and development context   * Project start and duration * Problems that the project sought to address * Immediate and development objectives of the project * Baseline Indicators established * Main stakeholders * Expected Results |
| **3.** | Findings  (In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) must be rated[[8]](#footnote-8)) |
| **3.1** | Project Design / Formulation   * Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators) * Assumptions and Risks * Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design * Planned stakeholder participation * Replication approach * UNDP comparative advantage * Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector * Management arrangements |
| **3.2** | Project Implementation   * Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation) * Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region) * Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management * Project Finance: * Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (\*) * UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (\*) coordination, and operational issues |
| **3.3** | Project Results   * Overall results (attainment of objectives) (\*) * Relevance(\*) * Effectiveness & Efficiency (\*) * Country ownership * Mainstreaming * Sustainability (\*) * Impact |
| **4.** | Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons   * Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project * Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project * Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives * Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success |
| **5.** | Annexes   * ToR * Itinerary * List of persons interviewed * Summary of field visits * List of documents reviewed * Evaluation Question Matrix * Questionnaire used and summary of results * Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form |

Annex G: Evaluation Report Clearance Form

*(to be completed by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and included in the final document)*

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

UNDP GEF RTA

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](http://www.undp.org/evaluation/handbook), Chapter 7, pg. 163 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office:  [ROTI Handbook 2009](http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/M2_ROtI%20Handbook.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. RA: Amazon: 1.Mamoadate, 2.Igarapé Lourdes, 3.Andirá Marau. Cerrado/Pantanal: 4.Pirakuá, 5.Lalima. Atlantic Forest: 6.Xocleng de Ibirama, 7.Caramuru-Paraguaçu, 8.Guarani do Ribeirão Silveira, 9.Guarani do Bracui. Caatinga: 10.Pankararu [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. The ranges were established using the WB/WWF METT slightly adapted to better fit the ILs. Total points = 87 points, including additional items and excluding questions 24, 25 and 26. Poor= < 25% (0–22 points); Fair=26–50%: (23–43 pts), Good= 51–76%: (44-66 pts); Excellent= 77–100%: (67-87 pts)- see ANNEX 6 on the METTs. Management effectiveness tools designed for IL will be developed as part of the project to more accurately measure strengthened management [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)