Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the **Improved Management Effectiveness of the Chobe-Kwando Linyanti Matrix of Protected Areas (PIMS 4624)**

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

Project Summary Table

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Title: |  | | | | | |
| **GEF Project ID:** | | 4544 |  | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | | *at completion (Million US$)* |
| **UNDP Project ID:** | | 00076326  00087781 | **GEF financing:** | 1,818,182 | |  |
| **Country:** | | Botswana | **IA/EA own:** |  | |  |
| **Region:** | | Africa | **Government:** | 6,711,806 | |  |
| **Focal Area:** | | Biodiversity | **Other:** | 2,229,239 | |  |
| **FA Objectives, (OP/SP):** | | To:  a) improve the sustainability of protected area systems;  b) mainstream biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into production  landscapes/seascapes and sectors;  c) build capacity to implement the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety; and  d) build capacity on access to genetic resources and benefit-sharing. | **Total co-financing:** | 8,761,045 | |  |
| **Executing Agency:** | | UNDP | **Total Project Cost:** | 10,829,227 | |  |
| **Other Partners involved:** | | Department of Wildlife and National Parks, University of Botswana, Department of Environmental Affairs Ministry of Agriculture/  Botswana College of Agriculture | **ProDoc Signature (date project began):** | | | 20 December 2013 |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | | **Proposed:**  31ST December 2017 | Actual: |

Objective and Scope

**A. Project Summary**

The project was designed to: improve the Management Effectiveness of the Chobe-Kwando-Linyanti Matrix of Protected Areas (Bio-Chobe Project), Strengthen Management Effectiveness of the National PA system, conserve globally significant biodiversity and maintain healthy and resilient ecosystems with strategic emphasis on the Chobe-Kwando-Linyanti matrix of Protected Areas. The project intends to achieve that through addressing the challenges and threats to Chobe-Kwando-Linyanti area biodiversity and ecosystems, which include; illegal harvesting: subsistence and commercial poaching of wildlife and use of forest products, bush fires, land-use conflicts (e.g. agriculture in wildlife corridors, human wildlife conflict and inadequate investments in Protected Area management. In an effort to reduce the threats and challenges to biodiversity and to enhance economic empowerment, Bio-Chobe Project planned to put in place a collaborative governance for Protected Areas and buffer zones and put in place systems for natural resources protection, monitoring and management.

**B. Project Goal**

To Strengthen Management Effectiveness of the National PA system to conserve globally significant biodiversity and to maintain healthy and resilient ecosystems with strategic emphasis on the Chobe-Kwando-Linyanti matrix of Protected Areas.

**C. Project Objective**

To strengthen management effectiveness of the Chobe-Kwando-Linyanti Matrix of Protected Areas to respond to the existing and emerging threats

**D. Project Components**

**Component 1:** Collaborative governance framework in place in PAs and buffer zones resulting in reduced threats to biodiversity and enhanced economic growth

Outputs:

1.1. Co-management framework involving PAs, private sector, communities, NGOs and government established and capacitated

1.2. Integrated land use planning processes supported

1.3. Tourism revenue exploited and diversified in priority areas including Forest Reserves and revenue used to leverage community benefits

Component 2: Management Effectiveness and Financial Sustainability in Core Protected Areas strengthened to address existing and emerging threats to biodiversity

Outputs:

2.1. Management Effectiveness and financial efficiency of PAs increased

2.2. Effective Resource Protection and Monitoring in place

The project is implemented in the Chobe District, Botswana, and covers the total area 25, 925 Square Kilometers, Chobe – Kwando – Linyanti area, which includes the Chobe National Park – 10, 600 SQ KM, Chobe Forest Reserves – 4, 176 SQ KM, State land / CHA – 8, 998 SQ KM, CBNRM areas – 2, 151 SQ KM (9 Wildlife Management Areas) and Chobe District 8 villages, localities (Logothwane, Muchenje etc) and Kasane township. This project and it is a four year project. Its actual implementation started in 2014, July and will end in July, 2018. It has a total budget of USD 10, 829,227.00, out of this amount the only GEF support of USD 1, 818,182.00 is in monetary value, the other resources are planned to be in kind. This include USD 6, 711,806.00 of Government of Botswana and USD 2, 229,239.00 from other partners (University of Botswana, Botswana College of Agriculture and Kwando Safaris).

The implementing partners for the project are, Department of Wildlife and National Parks, Department of Forestry and Range Resources and Department of Environmental affairs. The other key stakeholders are the Chobe land Board and the District Land Use Planning Unit, Department of Crops Production as they help in implementing key activities of the project. Communities and the tribal leadership in the district are also key partners in the project, not only as beneficiaries but also as participants in implementing project activities on the ground.

Project office is headed by Project Manager, assisted by Finance and Administration Officer. The two hold UNDP Service Contracts. They source technical supported from implementing partners as and when needed. At the District level the Technical Reference Group (TRG) assist in guiding the project implementation. The TRG is made up of representatives from both central and local government. Overall oversight of project performance is the responsibility of the Project Steering Committee. Project Steering Committee established by the PS of MEWT, and includes key project partners (DWNP, DFRR, DEA) and UNDP. PSC makes strategic decisions bringing project achievements and requirements (e.g. barrier removal) to central level attention. GEF Focal Point in Department of Environmental Affairs is responsible for overseeing the project in partnership with the Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Environment, Wildlife and Tourism (MEWT).

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:** Kasane township in Chobe District **including the following project sites:** *Chobe Enclave villages; Mabele, Parakarungu, Satau, Kavimba and Kachikau as well as the Chobe East villages; Lesoma and Pandamatenga.* **Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:** Chobe Land Board, Chobe District Council, District Land Use Planning Unit, Department of Wildlife and National Parks, Department of Forestry and Range Resources, Department, District Commissioner’s office, Department of Tourism, Chobe Enclave Conservation Trust, tribal leadership/chiefs, Community Based Fire Management Committees.

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**. Conclusions should build on findings and be based in evidence. Recommendations should be prioritized, specific, relevant, and targeted, with suggested implementers of the recommendations. Lessons should have wider applicability to other initiatives across the region, the area of intervention, and for the future.

Implementation arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Botswana. 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 period of 3 months according to the following plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Timing | Completion Date |
| **Preparation**   * handover of documents, desk review * inception report | *7* days | * *17 - 19 January (3 days)* * *23 – 26 January 2018 (4 days)* |
| **Evaluation Mission**   * *Stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits, debriefing meeting with UNDP* | 8 days | * 5 - 12 February 2018 (8 days) |
| **Draft Evaluation Report**   * Preparing draft report * Circulation for comments feedback | *10* days | * *13 – 17 February 2018 (5 days)* * *19 - 23 February2018 (5 days)* |
| **Final Report**   * Incorporate comments, finalize and submit report (accommodate time delay in dates for circulation and review of the draft report) | *5* days | * *26 February – 2 March 2018* |

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 evaluator*.* 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:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | weight |
| A Master’s Degree in Natural Science, Social Sciences, Project Management, Monitoring and Evaluation, Protected area management or other closely related field | 10 |
| Minimum 7 years’ experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations | 10 |
| Demonstrated understanding of Terminal Evaluation requirements such as project strategies including evaluation systems, tracking project performance and clarity of analytical methodologies | 20 |
| Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and biodiversity conservation; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis | 20 |
| Demonstrated understanding of the assignment; and response to the terms of reference. | 20 |
| Working in Botswana and other SADC countries, and knowledge of Botswana landscape, including the range of national policies, laws and regulations | 10 |
| Project evaluation/review experiences within the United Nations system will be considered as asset | 10 |
| Total score | 100 |

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

(*this payment schedule is indicative, to be filled in by the CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on their standard procurement procedures)*

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

Application process

The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in English with indication of the e‐mail and phone contact. Shortlisted candidates will be requested to submit a price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs).

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

Annex A: Project Logical Framework

PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

|  |
| --- |
| **This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPAP or CPD:** By 2016, the poor, especially women, youth and disadvantaged communities will derive greater benefits from the environment and natural ecosystems |
| **Country Programme Outcome Indicators:**   * National Policies and institutions promote and support the participation and beneficiation of communities in natural resources management; * The capacities of communities (especially women and youth) enhanced for ecosystem management and benefit acquisition. |
| **Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program:**  **BD-1: Improve Sustainability of Protected Areas** |
| **Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes:**  Outcome 1.1 Improved management effectiveness of existing and new protected areas.  Outcome 1.2: Increased revenue for protected area systems to meet total expenditures required for management |
| **Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators:**  Protected area management effectiveness score as recorded by Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool Sustainable financing as recorded by Financial Scorecard |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Objective/ Outcome** | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **End of Project target** | **Source of Information** | **Risks and assumptions** |
| **Objective**: To strengthen management  effectiveness of the ChobeKwando-Linyanti Matrix of PAs to respond to existing  and emerging threats | PA budgets secure    PA management  indicators including status of LE, habitats and wildlife  populations    Community benefits and participation HH income, especially in poor areas    Reduced land use and wildlife  conflicts    Wildlife corridors    Tourism expansion and diversification in  FR, CBNRM  areas and CNP | P8m    Nil              P6m to committee  P750,000 to villages  0 HH benefit        5-10 lions HWC  10 elephants HWC          1,200 beds | PA budgets of P15m cover operational costs for 14,000km2 and used effectively according to activity-based budgets and stakeholder review    14,776km2 PA (CNP10,600 km, FRs 4,176 km2) and 11,149km2 buffer zones (8,998km2 CHAs, 2,151 km2 occupied State Lands) have measurable resource protection, habitat and wildlife monitoring and PA management indicators (detailed below) are monitored and improving (i.e. habitats and wildlife, poaching, fire, problem animals, tourism, stakeholder and tourist satisfaction)    15% increase in HH income in CBNRM areas    Wildlife corridors (to Hwange, Nxai  Pan/Maghadghadi, Okavango, Caprivi) and key wildlife habitats (e.g. Seloko) formally identified and secured and land use conflicts reduced to 50% of current level    PAC in CBNRM areas reduced to 30% of current levels (through benefit sharing and management plans)    Tourism activities diversified with  250-300 beds in new areas | Annual reports and accounts    Annual performance review    Surveys of HH  livelihoods    Aerial surveys and  expert opinion    HWC records    Tourism contracts | Supportive  Government policies in place emphasizing decentralized responsibilities and  revenue retention by  PAs    Stakeholders are able to work together and agree roles, targets and land use zonation, streamline tourism site allocation agree, and follow strategic Vision and zoning plan    GoB supports  strengthen of  CBNRM approaches  with participation and  80% benefit sharing |
|  | Increase in  Financial  Sustainability  Scorecard scores | CNP = 25%  FR = 21% | CNP = 60%  FR = 50% |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Management  Effectiveness  Tracking Tool | CNP = 54%  FR = 45 | CNP=75%  FR = 60% |  |  |
| Component 1: Collaborative Governance in PA and Buffer Zones Increasing Economic Growth and Removing Threats | | | | | |
| 1.1 Co-management framework involving PAs, private sector, communities, NGO and GoZ  established and capacitated | * Stakeholder committee * Role   clarification   * Procedures | Plans for CNP, CECT, CH5?? and draft plans for “Kasane as the Tourism Capital of the  North” | * Stakeholder forum meeting regularly, tracking progress against project indicators and ensuring timely decision making and corrective action * Roles of stakeholders agreed in strategic plan * Procedures streamlined and decision made within 90 days (e.g. approval of LUP, tourism sites, adherence to ILUP, etc.) * At least 3 staff trained with degrees, 15 with certificates and diplomas, and 170 through professional short course training. | * Annual workplans and budget * Report of strategic planning workshop/s * Reports on LUPs, tourism plans * Training reports | Conflicts between arms of Government and different stakeholder groups do not undermine project  implementation  activities    Suitable research/ training institutions are available in the region |
| 1.2 Integrated land use plans reducing threats and expanding economy | * Integrated plans /processes and sub-plans * Wildlife populations at landscape level * Wildlife corridors * Compatibility of land uses * Containment of threats from infrastructure placement and tourism impact |  | * PA Buffer and Wildlife Dispersal Areas zoned with clear boundaries, specific regulations, standards and code of practices and ensures compatibility of   land uses with overall biodiversity management goals   * Wildlife populations maintained at landscape level * Wildlife corridors identified and secured and preserving wildlife movements and access to water |  | Government agencies able to work together to integrate plans |
| 1.3 Tourism revenue exploited and diversified in priority areas | * Tourism investment sites and procedures * Tourism beds, |  | • Integrated tourism development plan agreed by stakeholders to increase investment in FRs (6 camp / 120+beds), CBNRM-linked areas (8 camps/200+ | Monitoring of site contracts Gate statistics  Lodge/hotel | BTO, Land Board,  DWNP, FD,  Communities able to agree on and |

7 Note that this scorecard was completed by the ProDoc consultant. The METT values provided in the preparatory documents exaggerates the management effectiveness of CNP and FRs, mainly because they have no budgets and/or trained staff to implement. Alternative scores were 72% and 54% for CNP and FRs respectively

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| including FRs and  CBNRM/CHA  areas | income, economic impact, employment   * Number of new activities introduced • Park fees * Tourism   satisfaction |  | beds) by Y4   * Tourism turnover increases by P65-100m with new 250-300 beds and 500 new jobs * Tourism activities diversified to include walking, night drives, horse trails, bush dinners, remote camp sites, etc introduced * Park fees increase by P2.5m * At least 80% of tourists recommend Chobe to friends | statistics Tourist  satisfaction surveys | implement new  tourism sites    Sufficient tourism investors available to take up sites |
| 1.4 Tourism expansion used to leverage  community  benefits (through PPPs and HH revenue sharing) and wildlife  management  . | * Amount and % of tourism fees reaching community * Employment * Uptake of wildlife   management and land use zoning by communities | * CECT P4m   (P150,000 to each village)   * KALEPA P1,5m   (nil to each village)     * 8 lions, 10 elephant   / year | * 8 Villages receiving at least P400,000 annually with 80% benefiting HH and providing at least 250 jobs * Communities employing game guards and providing MOMS and HWC reports * HWC reduced to 4 lions, 5 elephants * LU zoning, protection and business plans implemented and monitored * Livelihoods improve 15% especially for marginal people and women (surveys) * Governance tracking shows 65%+ performance and at least 30% women representation | Bi-annual surveys of livelihoods, gender effects, governance in communities | * Ban on hunting can be replaced by tourism revenues * Policy /practices agreeing to Village benefits and 80% HH revenue sharing agreed * Villagers empowered to manage wildlife and wildlife businesses * Private sector is not capable and willing to invest in biodiversity conservation |
| Component 2.Core protected areas strengthened (financial sustainability and management effectiveness) to address existing and emerging threats to biodiversity | | | | | |
| 2.1 Increase management  effectiveness and financial  efficiency of PA  Complex | Sustainable financing plan | P8m (requirement is P20m) | CNP/FR legally established as business centers by Y3 and retaining P20m to manage CNP and FRs effectively |  | Policy makers in Gaborone agree to modernize PA financial and management  structures, and agree to revenue retention    High staff turnover affects capacity retention, institutional memory and |
| PA revenues |  | PA revenues increased by 25% from new sites in FRs and streamlined PA gate and concession fees |  |
| Reduction in funding gap of the targeted PAs | CNP income: P19,200,000  CNP Budget:  P5,000,000  FR income: P0 FR Budget: | CNP Income: P25m  CNP Budget: P15m  FR Income: P4m  FR budget: P 10m  Strategic surplus: P4m. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | P3,700,000 |  |  | relationship building |
| Effective management |  | Activity based budgets and performance indicators in place by Y2 | Annual reports, financial accounts |
| Management information system | Much unused data | Visualized data presented to stakeholders to support evidence-based decision making, e.g. fires, LE, habitats, wildlife, CBNRM, tourism, etc. | Annual and half annual stakeholder review |
| Tourism crowding and satisfaction | No data | 80% of tourists satisfied with game viewing along Chobe River frontage |  |
| Human resource  capacity (relative to KPAs) | 0 | In Y1, review staff numbers and capacity relative to KPAs, including job  descriptions and performance criteria, and initiate a staff development plan    At least 3 staff trained with degrees, 15 with certificates and diplomas, and 170 through professional short course training. |  |  |
| Housing and equipment | Housing condition poor 5 vehicles | At least 50 staff houses rehabilitated with water, electricity  10 vehicles |  |
| 2.2: Effective resource protection and monitoring in place | Wildlife protection • Patrol days   * Area coverage * Poaching catch/effort data | 19 elephants poached in 2009 and 18 in  2010 | LE Management information system in place by Y2  At least 25,000 patrol days annually Less than 1 poaching incident / 100 patrol days  Less than 10 elephant poached annually | MOMS anti-  poaching monitoring  (Control room) | BDF works with  DWNP to introduce LE management  information systems    KAZA provides outlet  for excess elephants    Chobe has had a series of above average rainfall years. This is unlikely to continue |
| Status of key habitats | 0 | Habitats stable or improving | 300 permanent vegetation transects established by Y5 (Walker 1976 method)  Fixed point photos Tree recovery initiated in experimental enclosures |
| Reduced area  burned annually | Average burnt area of 7 714 ± 1 574 km2 | Burned area reduced to 4,000km2 Integrated Fire Management Strategy in place | Remote sensing |
| Wildlife | CNP=100% of | Stable or increasing populations of | Bi-annual Aerial |
|  | populations | c*arrying* capacity (as per aerial survey  2010)  Elephants = 91% large mammal biomass Mammal counts  (1960s; 2012) | indicator / at risk species e.g. puku, red lechwe, tsessebe, sable, roan, bushbuck, slaty egret, wattled crane | survey  Monthly road counts on floodplain |  |
| Aquatic environment | 0 | Baseline survey and threat assessment conducted by Y3 |  |

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

Project Document and Log Frame Analysis (LFA), Project Monitoring and Implementation Plan, Implementing/executing partner arrangements, List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Boards, and other partners to be consulted, Project sites, highlighting suggested visits, Midterm evaluation (MTE), Annual Project Implementation Reports (PIR), Project budget - broken out by outcomes and outputs, Sample of project communications materials, i.e. press releases, brochures, documentaries, etc. Project Document, TRG Minutes, PSC minutes, Draft Land Use Plan, LUCIS report, Face Forms, MTR Report.

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?** | | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
| **Country Ownership: Has government approved policies or regulatory frameworks in line with the Project Objective** | | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
| **Synergy with Other Projects/Programmes: Explain how synergies with other projects/programmes have been incorporated in the implementation of the project** | | | | | |

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)