**.1-Annex 1: TORS of the Terminal Evaluation**

**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**“Improving policy and practice interaction through civil society capacity building” implemented through the Open society Initiative for Southern Africa (OSISA)** PIMS 3982.

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

**Project Summary Table**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Title: | **Improving Policy and Practice Interaction Through Civil Society Capacity Building** | | | |
| UNDP Project ID: | PIMS 3982 | **Project financing** | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | *at MTE (Million US$)* |
| ATLAS Project ID: | 00062285 | GEF financing: | 1,740,000 | 1,287,000 |
| Country: | Namibia | UNDP: | 1, 500,000 | 0 |
| Region: | Sub Saharan Africa | Others: | 2, 448,180 | 1,875,000 |
| Focal Area: | Sustainable Land Management (SLM) | Total co-financing: | 3,948,180 | 1,875,000 |
| GEF Focal Area Strategic Program | **EBD (Ecological Biodiversity)** | Total Project Cost **in cash**: | 5,688,180 | 3,162,000 |
| Executing Agency: | Open Society Initiative for Southern Africa (OSISA) |  |  |  |
| Other Partners involved: | - Equator Initiative - Environment Development in Third World (ENDA) | ProDoc Signature (date project began): | | 27th July 2012 |
|  | Planned closing date:  Jun 2015 | Revised closing date:  Dec 2015 |

**Objective and Scope**

The Sub-Saharan Africa Regional Capacity Building for Civil Society project is a regional project funded by the Global Environment Facility (GEF), which is aimed at strengthening the capacity of Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) working in the area of sustainable land management (SLM). Through support to these CSOs, a stronger and more effective civil society will enhance the effectiveness of government efforts to implement the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification’s (UNCCD) program of work, facilitate the work of communities to prevent and/or control land degradation and promote the use of more effective and SLM practices. This will be achieved through stronger participation of civil society and grassroots communities in key SLM policy processes such as the *TerrAfrica* program, which also includes the Comprehensive African Agriculture Development Program (CAADP) and land management compacts championed by the New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD). By increasing the involvement of local stakeholders in the international debate on environment and human development, Africa-based CSOs will be well placed to articulate regional views and help negotiate better deals for the region while ensuring that resources mobilized are utilized in a transparent and accountable manner.

This project will therefore remove the barriers to CSO effectiveness to facilitate community participation in SLM within the context of the UNCCD Ten Year Strategy, whose **goal** is to improve the socio-economic development and livelihoods of rural communities in Sub-Saharan Africa through SLM. Its **objective** is to empower local grassroots organizations in Sub-Saharan Africa to participate and influence the implementation of the UNCCD, *TerrAfrica* and other SLM processes, programmes and policies. This objective will be achieved through two related interventions with three outcomes:

1: Capacity building of CSO to facilitate community participation in national, regional and international SLM policy and programs. Under this intervention, the project will strengthen the policy, practice and science/knowledge cycle to increase systemic and individual capacity of civil society to facilitate communities to tackle land degradation, adapt to climate change, and participate in land use and land investment decision-making processes. The intervention is expected to yield two key outcomes:

* Increasing technical capacity of CSO to support on-the ground-SLM initiatives and knowledge based advocacy; and,
* Establishment of partnerships for effective coordination and knowledge transfer.

2:Enhancement of*community voices and innovation in SLM:* This will be achieved through one key outcome (outcome c) - International SLM dialogue and policy processes effectively informed by community opinion and knowledge.

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 <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/gef/undp-gef-te-guide.pdf> .

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 have 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* 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 Windhoek- Namibia*,* including the following project sites: Johannesburg, Dakar and Ouagadougou*.* Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

| **Stakeholder** | **Role in the Project** |
| --- | --- |
| Local communities of SSA | The ultimate beneficiaries of the project are the local communities of Sub-Saharan Africa, whose health and livelihoods are directly or indirectly impacted by land degradation.  Under -Equator Initiative  SLM prize winners: Zoramb Naagtaaba Association — Burkina Faso (the full list of the winners of the Equator Prize for selection will be provided to the consultant to choose from). Support will be given by Equator Initiative Staff whose names appear below:   1. Eileen de Ravin Manager 2. Eva Gurria Programme Consultant |
| SLM based CSO’s | CSOs are both beneficiaries as well as implementers of the project. They are the sources of information on knowledge gaps analyses, and applicants for the Equator Prize for innovative SLM interventions. More importantly, they will provide the vehicle for sustaining project initiatives once GEF funding ceases, through their activity in the planned CSO coordination mechanism.  Coordination Mechanism Thematic Leaders:   1. William Nkhunga -Kusamala Institute of Agriculture and Ecology-Lilongwe, Malawi 2. Moussa Halilou- JEDD-Niamey, Niger 3. Robert M. Isingoma-Conservation of Natural Resources (CECOD)-Kampala, Uganda 4. Ernest Maganda-RENADUC- FIEF-Kinshasa, RDC 5. Aissatou Billy Sow-AGUIPER-Conakry, Guinea |
| UNDP | The UNDP Namibia country office is the implementing agency for the project.   1. Neil Boyer Country Director 2. Nico Willemse Team Leader-Energy and Environment 3. Albertina Iiyambo Finance Associate 4. Eyram Atiase Project Assistant-UNV 5. Phemo K. Kgomotso Technical Specialist – Ecosystems and Biodiversity-UNDP GEF –BPPS, Regional Service Centre for Africa |
| OSISA | OSISA is the lead implementing partner, responsible for overall project coordination and also implementation of Outcome 1 through their Southern Africa Resource Watch (SARW) functional program.   1. Siphosami Malunga Executive Director 2. Colin Warner Operations Director 3. Masego Madzwamuse Economic Justice Programme Manager 4. Claude Kabemba Director of the Southern Africa Resource Watch 5. Nume Mashinini Grants Manager 6. Willis Ombai Project Coordinator 7. Moratuoa Thoke Project Assistant 8. Mimi Kankolongo Project Assistant |
| ENDA | ENDA is one of the implementing partners, and is responsible for implementation of Outcome 2, which focuses on establishing a functional CSO coordination mechanism.   1. Secou Sarr Director, ENDA Energie, Dakar 2. Emmanuel Seck Project Manager ENDA Energy, Dakar 3. Fatimata Kaba Project Specialist ENDA Energy, Dakar |
| Equator Initiative | Equator Initiative is one of the implementing partners, and is responsible for implementation of Outcome 3, which includes recognizing communities for innovative SLM interventions.   1. Eileen de Ravin Manager 2. Eva Gurria Programme Consultant |
| NEPAD | NEPAD endorsed the project document and is represented in the project steering committee (both as the secretariat for TerrAfrica and as a member of the SAG-   1. Rudo Makunike Coordinator, *TerrAfrica* Partnership – NEPAD – Johannesburg, South Africa |
| TerrAfrica Partnership | TerrAfrica was envisioned to provide guidance to the project, and also participate as a member of the project steering committee.  1. Frank Msafiri SUSWATCH - Nairobi, Kenya  2. Ernest Compaore SPONG – Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso |
| SSA Governments | Under UNCCD commitments, governments are obliged to include a wide spectrum of stakeholders, including local communities, in process of establishing and implementing their national action plans (NAP’s) and complementary country strategic investment frameworks (CSIF’s). We need to cite some governments in the region that the project has been working with like Senegalese, Ghanaian, Kenyan etc. |
| UNCCD | UNCCD Secretariat are members of the steering committee   1. Marcos Montoiro NGO and Civil Society Liaison Officer 2. Boubacar Cisse/Susan Lakop African Regional Representative for the UNCCD Secretariat |
| Global Mechanism | The GM is a member of the Special Advisory group (SAG) of TerrAfrica and was slated to be part of the Steering Committee for the project |
| Drynet | Drynet was envisioned to continue providing collaboration and guidance to its members as they participate in this project. ENDA is a member of Drynet. Publication of Drynet Newsletter has been continued by the project under ENDA |
| IUCN ESARO & WARO | IUCN facilitated project preparation and committed USD 900,000 in parallel co-financing. Their contribution included support with knowledge products on specific topics, as a support to Outcome 1. |

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, 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 / co-finance**

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 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.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

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 learnt**.

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)