**UNDP/GEF TERMINAL EVALUATION**

**TERMS OF REFERENCE**

**Mainstreaming Agrobiodiversity into Agricultural Production Systems**

**Ethiopia**

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)Mainstreaming Agrobiodiversity into Agricultural Production Systems Ethiopia Project (PIMS #2913.)

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

Project Summary Table

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Project Title:  |  |
| GEF Project ID: | 2913 |   | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | *at completion (Million US$)* |
| UNDP Project ID: | 00075747 | GEF financing:  | 3,863,600 |  3,863,600     |
| Country: | Ethiopia | IA/EA own: |  |       |
| Region: | Africa | Government: | 2,050,000 |       |
| Focal Area: | Biodiversity | Other: | 3,000,000 (UNDP)100,000 (ECF) |       |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): |       | Total co-financing: | 5,150,000 |       |
| Executing Agency: | Ministry of Agriculture | Total Project Cost: | 9,013,600 |       |
| Other Partners involved: | IBC, FCF, Wereda & Kebele | ProDoc Signature (date project began):  | 13/01/2011 |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | Proposed:31st Dec 2015 | Actual:31/05/2016 |

Objective and Scope

 The overall goal of the project is “Improved *in situ* conservation of agrobiodiversity resources (including crop wild relatives) secures biodiversity values, ensures food security and sustains human wellbeing”. The Objective of the project is “To provide farming communities with incentives (policies, capacity, markets and knowledge) to mainstream conservation of agrobiodiversity resources, including CWR, into their farming systems, which will be achieved through three main outcomes. These are: 1.Enabling policy and institutional framework supporting *in situ* conservation of agrobiodiversity and crop wild relatives, 2.Markets provide incentive for farmer uptake of agrobiodiversity friendly practices, particularly for wild *Arabica* coffee, enset, teff and durum wheat and, 3. Crop Wild Relatives and farmer varieties of wild *Arabica* coffee, durum wheat, enset and tef are conserved in *in situ* gene banks and on-farm conservation sites.

The evaluation will cover all activities supported by UNDP/GEF and, where appropriate, activities supported by the host institution, Ministry of Agriculture and IBC. It will also cover activities that other collaborating partners are supporting as part of the co-finance to the project.

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 (*fill in* [*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 the project sites at Illubabor Zone of Oromia National Regional State, southwest Ethiopia (Yayu coffee forest); Minjar Shenkora in North Shewa Zone of the Amhara Regional State (tef enset); Gimbichu Woreda (Durum wheat); and, Kembata and Timbaro (enset).

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 Ethiopia. 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 according to the following plan: date 1st November . 2015

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Timing | Completion Date |
| **Preparation** | *3* days  | 3rd November , 2015  |
| **Evaluation Mission** | *15*days  | 18th November, 2015 |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | *10* days  | 28th November, 2015 |
| **Final Report** | *2* days  | 30 th November, 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.  | 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 **1 international and 1 national consultants**. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The international consultant is the team leader and will be responsible for finalizing the report. 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 10 years of relevant professional experience
* Knowledge of UNDP and GEF
* Previous experience with results‐based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
* Technical knowledge in the biodiversity focal area
* Experience of working in Africa is desirable (for the International Consultant).

The international consultant will lead the overall Terminal Evaluation Report. He will lead the total evaluation exercise and production of the final terminal Evaluation which will be submitted to UNDP and the GEF. The Local consultant will work together with the International Consultant, arrange meetings both in Addis Ababa and at the site level. Provided translation and other similar services for the successful report production..

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 |
| *20%* | At contract signing |
| *40%* | Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report |
| *40%* | Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report  |

Application process

Applicants are requested to apply online http://jobs.undp.org, by (date). 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.

Technical proposals will be rated as per the following matrix. A consultant will have to score a minimum of 70% to be considered for the next *step*. Financial evaluation will be conducted for the qualified and responsive technical proposals (i.e 70% and above). Financial Proposal and Technical proposal will constitute 40% and 60% respectively. The responsive and qualified consultant with the highest combined rate will be issued a contract.

 **CRITERIA FOR SELECTING THE BEST OFFER**

Upon the advertisement of the Procurement Notice, qualified Individual Consultant is expected to submit both the Technical and Financial Proposals. Accordingly; Individual Consultants will be evaluated based on Cumulative Analysis as per the following scenario:

* Responsive/compliant/acceptable, and
* Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation. In this regard, the respective weight of the proposals are:
	1. Technical Criteria weight is **70%**
	2. Financial Criteria weight is **30%**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Weight** | **Max. Point** |
| **Technical Competence (based on CV, Proposal and interview (if required))** | **70%** | 100 |
| * Criteria a. Educational relevance: close fit to post
 |  | 10 pts |
| * Criteria b. Understanding the scope of work and organization of the proposal
 |  | 50 pts |
| * Criteria c. Experience of similar assignment
 |  | 30 pts |
| * Criteria d. Previous work experience in Africa/ Ethiopia
 |  | 10 pts |
| **Financial (Lower Offer/Offer\*100)** | **30%** | 30 |
| **Total Score**  | **Technical Score \* 70% + Financial Score \* 30%** |

 **PAYMENT MILESTONES AND AUTHORITY**

The prospective consultant will indicate the cost of services for each deliverable in US dollars **all-inclusive[[3]](#footnote-3) lump-sum contract amount** when applying for this consultancy. The consultant will be paid only after approving authority confirms the successful completion of each deliverable as stipulated hereunder.

The qualified consultant shall receive his/her lump sum service fees upon certification of the completed tasks satisfactorily, as per the following payment schedule:

| **Installment of Payment/ Period** | **Deliverables or Documents to be Delivered**  | **Approval should be obtained**  | **Percentage of Payment** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1st instalment  | Upon submission and approval of inception Report | MEF, UNDP & RTA, Key stakeholders | 20% |
| 2nd instalment  | Upon submission and approval of First Draft | “ | 30% |
| 3rd instalment  | Upon submission and approval of Final Report | “ | 50% |

 **RECOMMENDED PRESENTATION OF TECHNICAL PROPOSAL**

For purposes of generating quotations whose contents are uniformly presented and to facilitate their comparative review, a prospect Individual Contractor (IC) is given a proposed ***Table of Contents***. Therefore prospective Consultant Proposal Submission must have at least the preferred contents which are outlined in the IC Proposal Submission Form incorporated hereto.

**XI. CONFIDENTIALITY AND PROPRIETARY INTERESTS**

The Individual Consultant shall not either during the term or after termination of the assignment, disclose any proprietary or confidential information related to the consultancy service without prior written consent. Proprietary interests on all materials and documents prepared by the consultants under the assignment shall become and remain properties of UNDP.

Annex A: Project Results Framework

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Project Strategy | Objectively verifiable indicators |
| Goal | Improved *in situ* conservation of agro-biodiversity resources (including crop wild relatives) secures biodiversity values, ensures food security and sustains human well being |
|  | Indicator | Baseline | Target | Sources of verification | Risks and Assumptions |
| **Objective:** To provide farming communities with incentives (policies, capacity, markets and knowledge) to mainstream conservation of agro-biodiversity, including crop wild relatives into the farming systems of Ethiopia | 500ha established by end of the project | In situ conservation happening in many isolated farms holdings, but no consolidated, deliberately set aside area being managed specifically to maintain wild relatives | At least 300ha of on farm/*in situ* conservation sites established by project mid-term and 500ha established by end of the project | Reports of environmental impact assessmentNBSAP progress reports M&E reportsProject technical reports | Effects of climate changeContinued encroachment on natural habitatsDisplacement of traditional varieties by HYVs |
| 3 agro-biodiversity policies revised to mainstream agro-biodiversity conservation and institutional arrangement for their implementation strengthened | Currently agro-biodiversity conservation is catered for in some policies and the IBC has the responsibility at national level for its conservation. There are policy contradictions and several key policies (trade, agriculture, forestry) still do not recognize agrobiodiversity. Institutional arrangement especially mandates at the Woreda and Kebele levels still unclear, and have weak capacities  | At least five policies evaluated for their effectiveness in agro-biodiversity conservation and recommendations for gap filling made by the end of the project;Institutional mandates for agroBD conservation clarified at all levels and Woreda and Kebbele governments in 4 pilot sites have capacity for mainstreaming agroBD conservation and governance to enforce policy and legislation provisions (on AgroBD conservation).  | Policy briefsM&E reportsProject reports | Political good will to enforce and implement policiesPolitical stability  |
| Markets for agro-BD friendly products increased by at least 50% (through expansion of value chains and national and international markets for agro-biodiversity) | Currently there is one international agreement on tef, less than 5% of coffee being sold as speciality coffee, very limited trade on durum wheat or enset.  | At least three value chains with clear national and international markets established by mid-project and five value chains established by end of project | Reports of operational value chainsM&E reportsProject technical reportsReports on assessment of household incomesCertification reports | Demand for agro-biodiversity products is sustainedCompetition from other productsFavourable global market forces |
| Reduced or avoided deforestation and forest degradation and improved forest restoration through Payment of Ecosystem Services as conservation incentives | Awareness of the potential for developing a PES project is very high in the country, and some effort is being put to identify specific areas and design projects aimed at the UNREDD initiative. However, no PES project has been submitted to the CDM yet | At least one PES project (on carbon sequestration with a target of 27.4 M tCO2e ER) initiated through REDD by project mid-term and an integrated forest management/governance structure to ensure continued provision of ecosystem services in place by end of project | REDD baseline reportInventory or satellite image based monitoringProject reports | Encroachment on forests by agricultural expansionEffects of climate change on forestsEffective forest management and governance |
| Enabling policy and institutional framework for *in situ* conservation of agro-biodiversity  | Ministries of agriculture, forestry, trade and industry with policies catering agrobiodiversity conservation  | Currently Agro-biodiversity friendly policies are scattered and inadequate | At least 3 Agro-biodiversity principles mainstreamed into local and national agricultural, trade and industry policies and programs  | Policy papers and briefsProject reportsM&E reports | Political good will and support for agro-biodiversity is sustainedEnabling policy environment  |
| Local government strengthened to enforce policies and improve conservation of agrobiodiversity at the Woreda and Kebele levels in 4 zones | The mechanisms for enforcing policies and legal framework are weak | At least 3 local government authorities assisted to develop capacity and accountability to enforce policies, sectoral guidelines and spatial plans in support of agro-biodiversity increased in 5 pilot areas by end of project | Reports of capacity building activitiesProject reportsReports on framework for policy enforcement | Political goodwill to enforce policiesIt is assumed that there are clear reporting lines and accountability hierarchy |
| Local institutions have farmer variety bylaws and regulations in 4 pilot areas | There are currently no farmer variety policies in pilot areas | At least 4 FV Policies applied in 4 pilot areas & adopted in 12 woredas / 36 kebeles supporting implementation | Farmer variety policy briefsProject reports | Political goodwill to develop policies favourable to FVs |
| National extension programme promote farmer varieties and land races | The National extension service has a strong bias to promote HYVs at the expense of traditional farmer varieties | At least 40% of the farmers in the 4 pilot areas provided with skills and knowledge to increase farm productivity (and food security) by 30% using agro-biodiversity friendly practices | Information packages for extensionReports of meetings with farmersProject reportsProject M&E reports | It is assumed that the national extension service is effective in service delivery and that there will be favourable change of attitude towards FVs |
| CSO enhanced and provide support to communities in integrating FV into farming systems | The existing CSOs lack the capacity to enhance integration of FV in farming systems | At least 60% of the CSOs in pilot areas have skills to actively support communities to integrate at least 4 FV into farming systems, and link such production to private sector markets | Training materials for CSOsReports of CSOs meetings with farmersProject reports |  |
| Extension packages in place in 4 pilot sites using five crops as entry points | There are no extension packages for farmer varieties, making it difficult for them to compete with HYVs | At least 2 extension packages per target crop developed by mid-term and used to promote and integrate farmer varieties into the national extension service package and delivery system by end of project | Description of extension package contentsExtension materialsProject reports |  |
| An effective M&E for assessing conservation status of agro-biodiversity at community level | Conservation status of FVs and CWR is weak and their contribution to local food security is not well documented  | Agriculture programs in the 4 project sites adopt a participatory M&E system for assessing the conservation status of FV and CWR by mid-term and the contribution of CWR and FV to local food security assessed by end of project | M&E documentAssessment reportsProject monitoring reports |  |
| A strengthened national institutional framework for agro-biodiversity | A national institutional framework for agro-biodiversity conservation exists but it is dysfunctional  | A well articulated national institutional framework for agro-biodiversity conservation agreed upon by mid-term and implemented by end of project | Reports of discussionsProject reportsProject monitoring reports |  |
| Markets for agro-biodiversity friendly products promote farmer uptake of agro-biodiversity conservation imperatives | International and national demand for five agro-BD friendly products increased | Though there is a demand for agro-biodiversity products such as honey, there are more opportunities that can be tapped to increase this demand | At least 4 marketing programs identified, differentiated and certified for products from 4 pilot areas (e.g. shade, wild and low caffeine coffee, durum wheat, ensette, teff, noug) by mid-term and non certified agro-BD products grown in shade coffee farms and coffee forests developed and implemented through a supply chain approach by end of project | Profiles of national and international marketsStocks and price listsCertification protocolsProject monitoring reportsReports and descriptions of value chains |  |
| Production, processing and marketing of agrobiodiversity friendly products improved in 4 pilot areas through the formation of cooperatives with strong organizational and operational capacities | There are many local level producer societies but there are major gaps in capacity and in particular they are not differentiated by function (production, processing, marketing); they have very limited operational and organizational capacities and fail to link farmers to markets and credits adequately | At least 50% of local level producer societies for specific crops (such as shade and low caffeine coffee, durum wheat, teff, ensette) in 4 sites promoted as a mechanism of incentives for adoption by linking farmers to markets and credit | Inventories and profiles of local level producersStocks and catalogues of agro-biodiversity productsProject monitoring reports |  |
| Awareness of the importance of Agro-biodiversity-friendly products in promoting conservation and communities’ welfare in Ethiopia raised at local, national and international level | There is limited awareness on importance of Ethiopia’s agro biodiversity; and even more limited awareness of the role this agrobiodiversity plays in local economic development and food security; and limited awareness of the options and potential that exist to use specialized products to promote both local welfare, economies and conservation. Agro-biodiversity friendly products are available but they have not absorbed the available market share  | At least 10 international marketing campaigns (trade fairs, online) to establish Ethiopia as an international source of agro-BD friendly products held by mid-term and production of agro-biodiversity products to satisfy the markets increased by 50% by end of project | Pictures and video recordings of trade fairsMarketing campaign materialsWeb-based catalogues of agro-biodversity productsProject monitoring reports |  |
| Business and financial capacity in place to produce agro-BD friendly products and services in 5 pilot sites | There are limited credit opportunities for SMEs involved in agro-biodiversity friendly businesses | At least 60% of micro and SM enterprises engaged in Agro-BD friendly businesses and services assisted to access credit through partnerships and capacity building of financial institutions by end of project | Profiles of micro and SM enterprises Financial and credit productsAgreements between SME and financial institutionsProject reportsProject M&E reports |  |
| Increased and stable income from certified and non-certified products grown in agro-BD friendly areas (shade coffee farms and coffee forest) in 4 pilot sites | The current income levels from agro-biodiversity friendly products are far below the available market opportunities | At least 2 different international crop certification systems established for shade coffee from coffee forest established by mid-term project and production increased by 50% while allowing 60% of the coffee farmer’s in the site to sell products at a premium by end of project | Crop certification protocolsCatalogue of stocks and prices of agro-biodiversity productsProfiles, names and contacts of farmers |  |
| Verification and monitoring compliance of certification | The available certification process needs to be monitored for compliance  | At least one protocol to verify and monitor compliance of certification developed by mid-project and used effectively by end of project | Protocol for monitoring complianceReports of verification and monitoring |  |
| Crop Wild Relatives are conserved in *in-situ* gene banks (set side areas) that continue to provide “breeding ground for agro-biodiversity” | Four *in-situ* gene banks and on farm conservation sites covering a total of 500,000 hectares established to conserve 4 important crops and their wild relatives of (coffee, ensette, teff, and durum wheat) | The sizes of the current on farm and *in situ* conservation sites needs to be increased by at least 70% | The acreage of *in-situ* /on farm gene banks in 4 sites increased by 250,000 ha by mid-term and increased to 500,000 ha by end of project to ensure conservation of 4 crops and their wild relatives | *In situ* gene bank management plansReports of discussions on management of gene banksMaps of conservation sitesInventories of diversity conservedProject monitoring reports |  |
| Institutional and operational capacities to manage the 4 *in-situ* gene banks in place | The existing capacities to manage *in situ* gene banks are truncated and weak | Capacities for sustainable management of the 4 conservation sites developed by mid-project and areas certified as sources of landraces and wild crop relatives by end of project | Management strategies Capacity building materialsProject monitoring reports |  |
| Operational management arrangements | Despite efforts made by local and regional authorities, the *in situ* gene bank management is still weak | *In situ* gene banks management arrangements in 4 conservation sites agreed by mid-term and operational by end of project | Reports of management system and governanceReports of discussions on managementProject monitoring reports |  |
| Effectiveness of institutions in management of *in situ* gene banks | Degradation of *in situ* gene banks continue unabated since the national and regional institutions charged with the management of *in situ* gene banks lack effective management strategies | At least 4 capacity building programs are developed and implemented by mid-term to ensure 50% of the institutions charged with responsibility for managing the *in-situ* gene banks in 4 sites are effective by end of project | Terms of reference Institutional roles and responsibilitiesTraining materialsProject monitoring reports |  |
| Reduced or avoided deforestation & forest degradation, and improved forest restoration | The current emission is 32 M tCO2e and the national economic system and the local communities are not acquiring global benefits from PES despite the sustained conservation efforts  | At least one Project Design Document (PDD) carbon sequestration target of 27.4 M tCO2e ER as a result of better management and protection of the coffee forest completed and placed on the voluntary carbon market by mid-term and initial financial benefits accrued by end of project  | Carbon sequestration project reportsAgreements on carbon marketsReports of discussionsProject monitoring reports |  |

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

**Project Documents**

1. GEF Project Information Form (PIF)
2. Project Document and Log Frame Analysis
3. Project Implementation Plan
4. Implementing/Executing Partner arrangements
5. List and contact of details of project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Boards, and other partners to be consulted
6. Project sites, highlighting suggested visits
7. Mid Term Review and other relevant evaluations and assessment
8. Annual; Project Implementation Report (APR)
9. Project budget, broken out by outcomes and outputs
10. Project Tracking Tool
11. Financial data
12. Sample of project communications materials, i.e. press releases, brochures, documentaries etc.

**UNDP Documents**

1. Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF)
2. Country Programme Document (CPD)
3. UNDP Strategic Plan

**GEF Documents**

1. GEF focal area strategic program objectives

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 shortcomings4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS)3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems1. 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 risks1. 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[[4]](#footnote-4)**

**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[[5]](#footnote-5)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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[[6]](#footnote-6)) |
| **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[[7]](#footnote-7))  |
| **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. *The term “All inclusive” implies that all costs (professional fees, travel costs, living allowances, communications, consummables, etc.) that could possibly be incurred by the Contractor are already factored into the final amounts submitted in the proposal* [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. 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-7)