



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

Annex I
Terms of Reference (TOR)

"Providing International Consultancy Services for
Terminal Evaluation of MENARID Project"

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 *MENARID- Institutional Strengthening and Coherence for Integrated Natural Resources Management* (PIMS 3232).

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

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:		MENARID - Institutional Strengthening and Coherence for Integrated Natural Resources Management		
GEF Project ID:	3232		<i>at endorsement (US\$)</i>	<i>at completion (US\$)</i>
UNDP Project ID:	00074811	GEF financing:	US \$ 4,320,000	US\$ 4,320,000
Country:	Islamic Republic of Iran	IA/EA own:		
Region:	Asia Pacific	Government:	Cash US \$ 9,000,000 In kind US\$5,600,000	Cash US \$ 10,000,000 In kind US \$ 6,725,387
Focal Area:	Multi-Focal	Other:	UNDP TRAC: US\$200,000 UNDP TRAC (Through Parallel Funding to SMLWR II) US\$ 937,000	UNDP: US \$ 311,069 UNDP TRAC (Through Parallel Funding to SMLWR II) US\$ 937,000
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	Ld-Sp1; Iw-Sp3; Cc-Sp6; Bd-Sp4	Total co-financing:	US \$ 15,737,000	US \$ 17,973,456
Executing Agency:	Forests, Rangeland and Watershed Management Organization, FRWO	Total Project Cost:	US\$ 20,057,000	US \$ 22,293,456
Other Partners involved:	MOI (Ministry of Interior) MPO (Management and Planning Organization)	Pro Doc Signature (date project began):		July 22, 2010 by GEF September 28, 2010 by FRWO
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: August 2015	Actual: 31 December 2017



Project Expected Results:

Outcomes and Outputs: The project's results are summarized in three major outcomes and several key activities (Pro Doc):

Outcome 1: Enhanced, engendered knowledge and understanding of the drivers of land-use change, causing land, ecosystem and water degradation with consequent impacts on ecosystem services and local livelihoods

Outcome 2: An enabling environment for the INRM and the use of the enhanced knowledge from Component 1

Outcome 3: Community-driven, climate-resilient approaches and techniques for sustainable land and water management demonstrated through INRM practices.

Thus, an "at a glance" overview of the project is provided in the table below.

Project Title	Institutional Strengthening and Coherence for Integrated Natural Resources Management
Project Duration	7 years in total: 5 Years, 2 year extension by MTE
Project Budget	US \$ 22,293,456
Executing Entity	Forests, Rangeland and Watershed Management Organization (FRWO) of the Ministry of Jihad Agriculture (MoJA)
Cooperating National Agencies	Ministry of Interior (MoI)
	Management and Planning Organization (MPO)
	Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA)
	Department of Environment (DOE)
Implementing Agency	United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)

Thus the goal, objectives and intended outcomes of the Project were developed. They are summarized in Table below:

Project Goal	Institutional Strengthening and Coherence for Integrated Natural Resources Management
Project Objective	To remove barriers to Integrated Natural Resources Management (INRM) by developing and strengthening institutional knowledge,



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), 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.

Evaluation Ratings:			
1. Monitoring and Evaluation	<i>rating</i>	2. IA & EA Execution	<i>rating</i>
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	<i>rating</i>	4. Sustainability	<i>rating</i>
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								



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 3 weeks before the evaluation mission.	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO and Project 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 project and CO, reviewed by RTA, PMU, GEF OFPs
Final Report*	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP and project 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 /1 national evaluators). The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. (International consultant will be the team leader and 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.

International Evaluator (team leader) must present the following qualifications:

- Minimum 15 years of relevant professional experience at the international level,
- Knowledge of UNDP and GEF,
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies,
- Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s),
- Academic and/or professional background in institutional/governance aspects of natural resource management
- Experience in the review of technical assistance projects at the international level, preferably with UNDP or GEF or other United Nations development agencies and major donors.
- Experience in project design, project cycle management, and project monitoring and evaluation at the international level outside Iran.
- Have a broad-based knowledge and international experience related to capacity building, community development and natural resource management.
- Excellent English writing and communication skills.
- Demonstrated ability to assess complex situations in order to succinctly and clearly distill critical issues and draw practical conclusions.
- An ability to assess institutional capacity and incentives.



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

- The project will provide air ticket for each local travel - therefore the cost is excluded from this contract. As for living allowances, the cost is included in and covered by this contract for two 3-days and two 2-days trips to the mentioned project pilot sites and the remaining 10 days in Tehran. However, the reimbursement of local travel costs (including living allowances) will be made upon receipt of travel claim form and based on the actual rate on travel dates but not exceeding the rates of financial proposal.
- Each payment will be made in Euro upon satisfactory completion of the tasks and respective deliverables as per submission of deliverables/claims by the consultant and the project/UNDP approvals.
- Each payment will be transferred by UNDP through Electronic Fund Transfer to the Euro account number of the contractor introduced through an official letter indicating full banking information.
- Any payment under this contract will be made using UN Operational Rate of Exchange. For updated rates please see: <http://treasury.un.org/operationalrates/OperationalRates.aspx>
- Payments will be made according to UNDP regulations as explained in the contract documents.
- The International Consultant shall not do any work, provide any equipment, materials and supplies or perform any other services which may result in any cost in excess of the above-mentioned amount.

TRAVEL

If travel is required under the contract, the individual consultant shall:

1. Obtain the security clearance from UNDP office (the details of travel including date of departure and arrival, accommodation and purpose of travel shall be submitted to UNDP office 2 working days before date of travel)
2. Undertake the training courses on Basic Security in the Field and Advanced Security in the Field (only applicable for certain destination; to be checked with UNDP) and provide UNDP with both certificates; the related CD ROMs are available at UNDP office.
3. Undertake a full medical examination including x-rays and obtain medical clearance from an UN-approved physician. This is only applicable for the contractors on the age of 62 years or more.
4. All envisaged travel costs was included in the Offeror's financial proposal and this contract. This includes all duty travels, travels to join duty station and repatriation. The anticipated mission travel has been included in the TOR; however, in the event of unforeseeable travel, UNDP and the Individual Contractor will agree upon the manner in which travel costs including tickets, lodging and terminal expenses are to be reimbursed to the traveler.

United Nations Development Programme



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

Particular	Indicator	Baseline			Targets end of project		Justification for change in Log-frame	Current status	Source of verification
		Before baseline study	Reported in the baseline study	Original	suggested				
	Enhanced carbon sequestration in soil and vegetation across landscape in project demonstration sites	Baseline to be measured in Y1	Kermanshah: 3614 tons/year Yazd: 1678 tons/year Sistan-Baluchistan: 1000 tons/year	10% increase of total system carbon at project demonstration sites	60,000 tons increase of total system carbon at 4 demonstration sites	Target revised based on potential for carbon sequestration at demonstration site, as mentioned in baseline study report	Total increase in CS: 12000 tons Kermanshah: 10000 tons Yazd: 1000 tons Sistan-Baluchistan: 1000 tons	Field surveys of changed practices (e.g. no-till, not burning residues; range-land rehabilitation); GEF Carbon tracking tool	
	Enhanced resilience to climate change at demonstration site due to adaptation and mitigation measures (e.g. resistant varieties, vegetative buffers, and wind erosion control)*		0 hec		At least four types of resilience-enhancing measures employed in 10,000 hec at 4 demonstration sites	New indicator included to make explicit focus on GEF focal area on CC	Wind erosion control Sistan: 30 ha Flood control Kermanshah & SMLWR: 1000 ha Soil erosion control: Kermanshah & SMLWR: 500 ha Resistance varieties (Medical plant cultivation, wild almond cultivation, pistachio and saffron cultivation to use less water); 100 ha Demonstrating		

No. 8, Shahrzad Blvd, Darrous, 1948773911 Tehran, I.R. Iran (P.O. Box 15875-4557)

Tel: (98 21) 2286 0691-4, 286 0925-8, Fax: (98 21) 22869547, Email: registry@undp.org, website: www.ir.undp.org

United Nations Development Programme



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

Particular	Indicator	Baseline		Targets end of project		Justification for change in Log-frame	Current status	Source of verification
		Before baseline study	Reported in the baseline study	Original	suggested			
<p><i>Outcome 1:</i></p> <p>Enhanced engendered knowledge and understanding of the drivers of land-use change causing land, ecosystem and water degradation with</p>	<p>The project includes gender analysis of drivers of land-use change causing land, ecosystem and water degradation, and measures to identify and address women's specific needs and contributions in INRM.</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>Integration of gender analysis in the project analytical reports.</p>	<p>Gender analysis report in demonstration sites</p>		<p>Gender analysis reports prepared by NGOs at pilot sites</p>	<p>The project analytical reports</p>

United Nations Development Programme



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

Particular	Indicator	Baseline			Targets end of project		Justification for change in Log-frame	Current status	Source of verification
		Before baseline study	Reported in the baseline study	Original	suggested				
	Gender-sensitive monitoring and information system on dry land agriculture, and drought early warning system for land-use change, and land and water degradation assessment	None	None	System developed and verified; RS/GIS techniques applied on gender sensitive monitoring and information system.	System developed and verified on drought early warning system; PGIS/GIS techniques applied on gender sensitive monitoring and information system.	Indicator on dry land agriculture, and drought early warning included in earlier indicator	2 PGIS projects in Yazd and Sistan-Baluchestan	Reports on MIS system, Provincial technical committee MOM APR & PIR Midterm & final evaluation	
	Number of engendered INRM and water management best practices characterized in 4 provinces	Limited and dispersed		At least 3 practices per province with capability for up scaling; most derived from demonstration or adjacent sites.			IPCM: 4 cases PES: 2 cases Watershed management and rangeland management: 4 cases		
	Number of market-based (financial), non-monetary and trade-off assessments of the loss of ecosystems services (provisioning, regulating, cultural) in 4 provinces	None	None	Four comprehensive, integrated assessments of market based, non-monetary and trade-off in ecosystem services.	Four comprehensive, integrated assessments of market based, non-monetary and trade-off in ecosystem services.	No change	Four Land degradation trend assessment reports and its effects on ecosystem services (one for each site)	Market Based methodology assessment reports	

United Nations Development Programme



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

Particular	Indicator	Baseline		Targets end of project		Justification for change in Log-frame	Current status	Source of verification
		Before baseline study	Reported in the baseline study	Original	suggested			
	Government agencies and representatives of community organizations are systematically engaged in dialogue on INRM	None	None	One consultation mechanism is established	One institutional mechanism is established at each province including representative from communities, government and other stakeholders	More neutral sentence used	Women have been systematically included in dialogues related to INRM at local, provincial and national levels, namely: a-Process of preparing 2 Strategy Documents (Yazd and Kermanshah) b-Watershed management committees established in each site. c- Regular government meetings at committee levels (80 meetings) d-Training, capacity building and consultation meetings re project formulation related to INRM (eg. cultivation of medicinal plants, biodiversity conservation, vermi-composting)	Project mid-term and final evaluation
	Community organizations, including those	None	None	One consultation mechanism is established	37 active groups of women and men are established	More gender neutral sentence used	In total 805 people, in 37 community	Project mid-term and final evaluation

No. 8, Shahrzad Blvd, Darrous, 1948773911 Tehran, I.R. Iran (P.O. Box 15875-4557)
Tel: (98 21) 2286 0691-4, 286 0925-8, Fax: (98 21) 22869547, Email: registry@undp.org, website: www.ir.undp.org

United Nations Development Programme



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

Particular	Indicator	Baseline			Targets end of project		Justification for change in Log-frame	Current status	Source of verification
		Before baseline study	Reported in the baseline study	Original	suggested				
								Land Use plan prepared for Hablich-Rud Watershed One report prepared on INRM policies to determine conflicting policies	
	Number of requests and/or database access events for information on INRM originating from national and provincial stakeholders and other relevant parties, including the private sector and other projects	Originating from: National: 0 Local/prov: 0 Others: 0	Originating from: National: 0 Local/prov: 0 Others: 20	Originating from: National: 100 Local/prov: 50 Others: 20	Originating from: National: 100 Local/prov: 50 each Others: 20	No change	Bilingual website established and 7200 visits to the MENARID project website recorded Also, information requested by MENARID-ICARDA regional project Private sector: Barij Essence Co. (Herbal Essence), Carpet companies Universities: Yazd Univ., Zahedan Univ. and Research Centre in Kermanshah NGOs (through SGP and others)	Information system on website ; compilation of written requests; Survey conducted as input to final evaluation	

United Nations Development Programme



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

Particular	Indicator	Baseline		Targets end of project		Justification for change in Log-frame	Current status	Source of verification
		Before baseline study	Reported in the baseline study	Original	suggested			
	Increase in best-practice, organic and traditional/local innovations in land and water management, biodiversity conservation and climate change resilience.	Current use measured in Y1	3 best practices maintenance of the Qanats, Pistachio cultivation to use less water, and participatory cleaning the canals called Hashar	Increased by at least 100%	8 innovations at demonstration sites	More realistic target used	IPCM: 4 cases PES: 2 cases Watershed management and rangeland management: 4 cases Incubating and extension center for INRM	Field Survey, photo and video documentation, Survey with local communities ; inputs to information system
	Increase in best-practice management of water resources (surface and groundwater) to mitigate floods and drought, increase groundwater recharge and reduce sedimentation and pollution.	Current use measured in Y1	It is removed				Already included in earlier indicator	

United Nations Development Programme



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

Particular	Indicator	Baseline			Targets end of project		Justification for change in Log-frame	Current status	Source of verification
		Before baseline study	Reported in the baseline study	Original	suggested				
	Climate change adaptation and mitigation programs are developed that reflect women's concerns and interests, and are monitored for their impact on women's lives so that equality of outcome is achieved.	None	None	Four	Four	More specific indicator	Same as above	Project final evaluation	
	Gender-responsive policies are in place, linking women's use of natural resources and environment services with their roles and interests in sustainable livelihoods and small business promotion.	Totally removed (in Iran, women and men have equal rights regarding natural resources and environmental services, Article 50 Constitution)							

Note:

- Those rows with double line borders are add by MTE
- Those rows that have diagonal line removed by MTE



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 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.



ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE⁴

- 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 Manual⁵)
 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 rated⁶)
 - 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

⁴The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

⁵ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

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.



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

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: _____