**Less Burnt For A Clean Earth:**

**Minimization of Dioxin Emission from Open Burning Sources in Nigeria**

**Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference**

INTRODUCTION

Nigeria’s National Implementation Plan for the Stockholm Convention estimates that scavengers burn approximately 20% of the collected waste at dumpsites, mainly for recuperating valuable waste streams. The project’s incremental strategy is to organize and bring the informal scavenger sector into the formal waste management sector. By doing so, the project’s focused incremental efforts will result in reduced UPOPs emissions from two sources: open burning of collected waste and open burning of uncollected waste.

With funding from UNDP/GEF, a project was conceived to assist the Federal Government of Nigeria through the Ministry of Environment to aid the reduction of open burning of *collected* and *uncollected* waste will be significant by the implementation of IWMS together with UPOPs targeting activities. UPOPs releases from the open burning of collected waste in dumpsites in the two pilot cities (Kano and Onitsha) are estimated to be: 489.1 g I-TEQ/a. The project’s incremental input to sort waste and organize scavengers will remove the incentive to burn waste in the pilot site dumpsites, preventing the burning of 20% of collected waste and avoiding the release of 97.8 g I-TEQ/a.

The project has reached its end-of-life and as such a final project evaluation is being planned in accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures which stipulates that 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 *Less burnt for a clean Earth: Minimization of dioxin emission from open burning sources in Nigeria Project* (PIMS # 4221)

Objective and Scope

The project was designed to: enhance human health and environmental quality by reducing releases and exposure to unintentional Persistent Organic Pollutants (UPOPs) originating from unsustainable municipal and agricultural waste operations. This objective is to be achieved through the project three components:

* **Component 1**-legislative strengthening and policy development.
* **Component 2**-reduction of UPOPs emissions through introduction of new practices and approaches in municipal waste handling.
* **Component 3**-reduction of UPOPs emissions from burning of farm fields in preparation for planting.

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](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/UNDP-GEF-TE-Guide.pdf). 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 (Kano and Anambra States*),* including the following project sites (Dambatta, Doguwa, Kabuga-Jambolo and Ezinifite-Okpuno). Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: Federal Ministry of Environment, Kano State Ministry of Environment, Kano State Agricultural & Rural Development Authority, Kano State Refuse Management & Sanitation Board, Anambra State Ministry of Environment, Anambra State Waste Management Authority, Residents of kabuga-Jambolo and Ezinifite-Okpuno Communities, Members of the Project Steering Committee, Agricultural Programme Coordinators in Dambatta and Doguwa; and Farmers.

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 (see  [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

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.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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**.

Implementation arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Nigeria*.* 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 *30* days over a time period of *11* weeks according to the following plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Timing | Completion Date |
| **Preparation (Recruitment)** | *3* days | *1st – 5th July 2015* |
| **Evaluation Mission** | *15* days | *15th –30th July 2015* |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | *10* days | *Between: 1st August – 14th August 2015* |
| **Final Report** | *2* days | *Between: 15th August - 30th August 2015* |

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: 12th July 2015 | Evaluator submits to UNDP CO |
| **Presentation** | Initial Findings | End of evaluation mission: 30th July 2015 | To project management, UNDP CO |
| **Draft Final Report** | Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes | Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission: by 14th August 2015 | Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs |
| **Final Report\*** | Revised report | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft: by 6th September 2015 | 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 *(1 international and 1 national evaluators).* The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. 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 *of ten* years of relevant professional experience
* Knowledge of UNDP and GEF
* Previous experience with results‐based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
* Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s)

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 |
| *15%* | At contract signing |
| *50%* | Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report |
| *35%* | Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report |

Annex A: Project Logical Framework

| **Result** | **Indicator** | **Baseline value** | **Target** | **Means of verification** | **Risks/Assumptions** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Goal**: Reducing releases and exposure to unintentional POPs originating from unsustainable waste operations. |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Objective:** Enhance human health and environmental quality by reducing releases and exposure to unintentional POPs originating from unsustainable waste operations. | # of g TEQ/annum released due to open burning of collected and uncollected municipal waste. | **Onitsha:**  94.9 g TEQ/a from open burning of collected waste at dumpsites.  7.12 g TEQ/a from open burning of uncollected waste. | 20% reduction in open burning of collected waste at dumpsites and 100% reduction in open burning of uncollected waste:  - 19 g TEQ/a reduction by yr 4from collected waste burning.  - 7.12 g TEQ/a reduction by yr 4 from openburning of uncollected waste. | Project reports; on-site monitoring  Field surveys/interviews.  Emission data reporting. | * Selection and application of new approaches is optimal. * Less UPOPs will be emitted as a result of this project. |
|  |  | **Kano:**  394.2 g TEQ/a open burning of collected waste at dumpsites.  78 g TEQ/a from open burning of uncollected waste. | 20% reduction in open burning of collected waste at dumpsites and 100% reduction in open burning of uncollected waste:  - 78.8 g reduction by yr 4 from collected waste burning.  - 78 g TEQ/a reduction by yr 4 from open burning of uncollected waste. |  |  |
|  | Number of g I-TEQ/a UPOPs reduction calculated per type of cropland (maize and millet) area where burning is reduced. | TBD (g I-TEQ) at project inception. | Reduced by \_20%\_ g I-TEQ by end of project. | PIR reports; calculation records; Field visits. |  |
| **Component 1. Legislative Strengthening and Policy Development.** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 1.1Stakeholders assess and quantify baseline data on UPOPs generation from open burning of MAW.** | - Updated MAW source inventory and UPOPs release figures from open burning of MAW.  - Updated emission data on UPOPs in pilot states and by projection for the country. | Preliminary data based upon minimal fieldwork and ground checking. | More comprehensive UPOPs estimate elaborated and adopted by FMoE, incorporated into Stockholm convention report. | National report to Stockholm convention.  Published emission data reports at Federal level for states. | Commitment of MOE remains firm and cooperation between State and Local Government institutions is secured |
| Output 1:Demonstration of Inventory of UPOPs sources and releases in two pilot sites. | # of people trained with demonstrable ability to conduct inventory. | No State-level staff in Nigeria are currently trained to do this | At least 10 staff persons each in Anambra and Kano States and test scores above 80%. | Training records; Comparison of exam results from before/ after training.  Inventory reports. | Personnel turn over does not negate benefits of training.  Capacity development activities address actual capacity needs. |
| Output 2. Monitoring and reporting mechanisms in place and operational. | Online reporting format available for each state to fill in online. Interactive website tracking UPOPs reporting from different Nigerian states. | No website or reporting format. | Website with reporting formats for each participating state shows “at a glance” status of UPOPs for each state. | Visit actual website. | Internet access will be sufficient for each participating state to utilize such mechanism. |
|  | # of States submitting annual reports on UPOPs from open burning. | No reporting mechanism; not states reporting. | 2 states by end of year 1. 10 states by end of year 2.  20 by end of year 3. | Actual reports of UPOPs from open burning. Database review. | States may not dedicate sufficient resources to reporting work. |
| **Outcome 1.2Federal waste management policy adopted and UPOPs reduction strategy endorsed.** | # of state EPA endorsing draft policy on MAW management. | No MAW management policy in place. | At least 15 state EPA endorse policy by end of year 3. | Project reports  Published Policy, regs. | Cooperation between Federal and local authorities is positive |
|  | Legislative branch endorses MAW management policy. | No legislative branch endorsement. | Endorsement of policy by Cabinet by end of year 3. | Legislative gazette. |  |
|  | # of Federal Agencies and State EPA adopting new MAW strategy. | No federal or state-level MAW strategies in place. | FMoE endorses strategy by end of year 3. At least – State EPA? Endorse Strategy by end of year 3. | Endorsement letters. Government gazette or other reports. | Federal and State level organizations will be able to agree on a common strategy. |
| Output 1. National municipal and agricultural waste management policy developed. | Draft and final versions of policy developed and reviewed in timely manner. | No policy developed or in place. | Policy draft completed by end of year 1. Stakeholder review completed by end of year 2.  Submitted to legislative branch by beginning of year 3 of project. | Draft policy and final policy documents. | Government will maintain interest in drafting and passing a policy despite normal changes in representation. |
| Output 2. Federal UPOPs reduction implementation strategy. | # of people on national committee for waste management trained in MAW UPOPs issues & frequency of committee meetings/year. | No people trained on MAW UPOPs source and release issues.  Committee does not meet regularly. | Every member of committee trained by end of year 2.  Meeting 2x year by end of year 2. | Strategy document itself. | The completion of the strategy will successfully compete with other pressing priorities within FMoE. |
| **Outcome 1.3Technical by-laws and guidance adopted by pilot state EPA.** | By-laws for MAW management-related UPOPs drafted and adopted by each pilot site city council. | No by-laws or guidance available at state EPA level for UPOPs. | New by-law adopted by at least 2 city councils total in pilotsites by end of year 2. | Surveys/interviews | By-laws, unless carefully crafted, may run aground on local politics. |
|  | Evidence of the use and application of by-laws and guidance notes in waste management practice. | No guidance notes/no use. | Main elements of guidance notes and by-laws incorporated into work plan materials in each pilot state. | Surveys/interviews.  Work plans and outreach materials. | By-laws, unless carefully crafted, may run aground on local politics. |
| Output 1. Technical by-laws, state and municipal guidance covering UPOPs reductions in waste management developed. | City council by-laws drafted, reviewed and gazetted in timely manner. | No existing by-laws or regulations | By-laws drafted by end of year 1.  By-laws adopted by end of year 2. | Published by-laws | City and state governments will be proactive on this issue. |
|  | Guidance notes drafted and adopted in timely manner. | No guidance notes. | Guidance drafted by end of year 1.  Guidance adopted by end of year 2. | Published guidance notes. | City and state governments will be proactive on this issue. |
| **Outcome 1.4. Federal and state municipal waste policy setting and enforce­ment capacity increased.** | # of judicial and state environmental protection officials in pilot sites with measurably improved knowledge and skills. | No training in UPOPs minimizing management practice or enforcement of existing environmental pollution laws. | 20 officials in each pilot state have completed training and have measurably improved knowledge and skills. | Comparison of before and after training quiz results. | Macro-economic trends do not undermine local economic development initiatives. |
|  | % ofmain actors in waste creation, storage, transportation and dumping who are familiar with IWM and UPOPs reduction principles. | Approximately 5-10%. Baseline in two pilot sites to be measured at project inception. | 60-75% by end of the project. | Survey results. | Incentives for learning the rules and following them and disincentives for not doing so are sufficient. |
| Output 1. Strengthened capacity in UPOPs minimizing MAW management practice. | Training needs assessment  Training workshops on enforcement, UPOPs reducing waste management practice. | No training needs assessment, workshops or materials made available to officials at state level. | Training needs assessment completed by EoY 1.  Training program 50% completed by EoY 2 and 100% completed by EoY 3. | Project reports/PIR. | Resources and political will sufficient to sustain and build upon capacity. |
| **Component 2. Reduction of UPOPs emissions through new prac­tices/approaches in municipal waste handling.** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 2.1. UPOPs emissions reduced through improved sorting of municipal waste.** | Volume increase in waste sorted prior to depositing in dumpsite. | 0 tonnes/year.  Waste is largely not sorted and is dumped in site where burning is the norm. | At least 50% of waste tonnage collected in each pilot site is sorted for priority non-recyclable materials in each pilot city by end of project. | Field visit to sorting center and dumpsite; reports. | Partnership with Federal, State and City program officials will be able to coordinate needed joint actions on a timely basis. |
|  | Specific incremental steps taken to strengthen baseline IWM strategies with UPOPs-specific priorities and practices (BAT/BEP) | No UPOPs-specific elements included in baseline IWM strategies. | Onitsha and Kano strategies revised/strengthened w/respect to UPOPs release reductions and formalized sorting goals and milestones. | Revised strategy documents. | Local authorities will be open to and support of modifications to IWM strategy documents. |
|  | # of dumpsites upgraded to reduce/prevent burning;  # of hectares of upgraded dumpsite land where burning is impossible. | Zero  Zero | - At least 10 by end of project. Upgrading of designated dumpsite in the 8 LGA of Kano and the 2 LGA of Onitsha by year 2 of project.  - At least 70 hectares by end of project. | Field visits; PIR; other project reports. | Partnership with Federal, State and City program officials will be able to coordinate needed joint actions on a timely basis. |
| Output 1. Introduction of waste separation at selected communities. | Number of residential estate and commercial plazas and institutions that sign on the separation programme in pilot states | No formal waste separation programme | 10% of residential estates, commercial and government institutions in pilot states with separation programing place by year 1 of project | Survey on site monitoring, project report | The project will successfully learn from other experiences on how to get people to modify their daily routine. |
|  | Level of increase in community awareness. | Baseline TBD at project inception through local surveys. | Community level awareness of UPOPs in Kano and Onitsha cities increased 30% by year 2. | Survey results – baseline and target. | Awareness will translate into improved participation in and support of adopting new practices. |
|  | Number of State EPA, Waste management authority and community “block leaders” trained in waste sorting. | No EPA, WMA or block leaders identified or trained. | At least 10 EPA and WMA staff trained in each pilot;  At least 20 community leaders in each pilot LGA. |  |  |
|  | # of key stakeholders trained in “train the trainer programme on UPOPs reduction sorting”. | Stakeholders not assessed or formally recognized or trained. | Citywide train the trainer activities cover 25% of key stakeholders in IWM (state/local government, civil societies, media, private investors). | Train the trainer records |  |
|  | Citywide targets for sorting. % of city offices participating in program to sort materials not a priority for recycling. | No targets, not milestones to measure success.  None of the city offices or departments within pilot cities participating. | Targets in place as part of approved citywide IWM Strategy by end of project’s first 18 months. At least 5 participating by EoY 2; 10 by EoY 3; and 20 by EoY 4. | Project reports, field visits/interviews. | There will be continued synergy development among regulatory agencies and key stakeholders. |
| **Outcome 2.2. UPOPs emis­sions reduced through improved composting.** | # of neighbourhoods with active sorting and composting programmes in the metropolitan local government areas of pilot states. | N0 neighbourhoods participating in sorting or composting. | Sorting and composting programmes in 8 local government areas (LGA) of Kano &2 LGA of Onitsha by end of year 4. | Surveys, interviews, project reports and onsite monitoring. | The tripartite cooperative arrangement on IWM will facilitate funding mechanism and adequate release of funds. |
| Output 1. Establishment of composting program and collection of compostable waste at communities in 2 pilot cities. | Presence/absence of basic infrastructure for composting (collection, composting, bagging). | None present | Collection and composting infrastructure in place by end of year 1.  Bagging of compost underway end of year 3. |  |  |
|  | # of restaurants participating in composting program. | Zero. | At least 10 by EoY 2; 20 by EoY 3, and 40 by EoY 4. | Programme reports; field visits. |  |
| Output 2. Develop market for composted matter in pilot areas. | Volume of compost sold to commercial buyers. | Zero. | At least 2 tonnes per quarter sold by end of project. |  | Composting program will be able to produce the right type of compose to meet the market’s needs. |
| **Outcome 2.3: Five States participating in federal IMSWM program replicate best practices.** | # of states incorporating UPOPs-specific priorities into their IWM strategies. | Zero | At least 5 by end of project. |  |  |
|  | # of states and cities adopting by-laws and guidance notes on UPOPs reducing IWM practices. | Zero | AT least 5 by end of project. |  | The penalties for violating the by-laws will be so low as to diminish the usefulness of these. |
|  | # of city and State staff in non-pilot areas trained in UPOPs-reducing practices. | Zero | At least 100 by end of project. | Before and after training quiz results. |  |
|  | # of BAT-BEP for UPOPs reduction developed and circulated for replication. | No BAT-BEP developed in Nigeria for UPOPs. | At least 5 by end of project. | Published BAT and BEP. | Strengthened Laboratories and trained manpower |
| **Component 3. Reduction of UPOPs emissions from agricultural land clearing.** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 3.1. Open burning of stubble on farm fields is reduced through changes in agricultural practices.** | # of hectares in which alternative approaches to agricultural waste (AW) burning at 3 pilot-sites in Kano state have been introduced by farmers. | Zero hectares. | By the end of the project, alternatives have been introduced in each pilot area of Kano: 20 ha at Mandobi; 20 ha at Danbatta, and 20 ha at Dogwa. | Field visits; PIR; maps. | Farmers will embrace the benefits to not burning. |
|  | Number of hectares of farmland burned in a year. | -- Hectares of cropland stubble burned/year.  Baseline TBD at project inception. | At least 10 farmers not burning cropland in preparation for farming.  Hectares/year burned | Project reports; on-site monitoring.  Field interviews. | Farmers will be receptive to the “case” and incentives to stop stubble burning. |
| Output 1. Clarification and elaboration of UPOPs challenges in the agricultural sector with a focus on Kano state. | UPOPs agric burning data refined for Kano State;  Respective area of lands per crop determined. | No refined data. | Supportive data refined by end of year 1;  UPOPs from agric burning clarified and specified by end of year 2. | Reports; Records; data sets. | Needed data will exist and be made available to the project. |
| Output 2. Increased level of farmer and agriculture officials awareness of the impact of burning farm fields, both from an agronomic and UPOPs perspective. | % of awareness among clearly defined target groups of farmers and agriculture officials. | Awareness level TBD at project inception. Few farmers are aware of UPOPs releases through burning of agricultural land. | Increase of at least 50% by end of project. | Before and after surveys. | Awareness will translate at least partially into changed practices. |
|  | # of training workshops organized for extension officers and farmers.  # extension toolkit and # training manuals developed for extension officers and farmers | Innovative approaches to burning not known. | At least 8 workshops held by project end for extension officers/farmers.  1 Toolkit,2 training modules by end year 1 and in full use by middle year 2. | Training materials  Workshop reports  Project reports | Sustained policy support to sustainable management of agricultural land |
| Output 3. Alternative approaches to stubble burning at pilot sites in Kano introduced and replicated. | # of additional farms replicating alternative approaches to burning. | Zero | Alternatives replicated for at least 20 additional farms across Kano. | Field visits, PIR, project reports. |  |

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

The project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, midterm review report, progress reports, project files, and any other document requested for by the evaluators.

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[[3]](#footnote-3)**

**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[[4]](#footnote-4)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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[[5]](#footnote-5)) |
| **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[[6]](#footnote-6)) |
| **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. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. 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-6)