**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**Using SLM to improve the integrity of the Makgadikgadi ecosystem and to secure the livelihoods of rangeland-dependent communities (PIMS #5359.)**

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

Project Summary Table

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Title: | Using SLM to improve the integrity of the Makgadikgadi ecosystem and to secure the livelihoods of rangeland-dependent communities | | | | |
| **GEF Project ID:** | | 5789 |  | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | *at completion (Million US$)* |
| **UNDP Project ID:** | | 00081415  00090691 | **GEF financing:** | 792,832.00 |  |
| **Country:** | | BOTSWANA | **IA/EA own:** |  |  |
| **Region:** | | Africa | **Government:** | 6,570,000.00 |  |
| **Focal Area:** | | Land Degradation | **Other:** | 225,000 |  |
| **FA Objectives, (OP/SP):** | | Reduce pressures on natural resources by managing competing land uses in wider landscape | **Total co-financing:** | 6,795,000.00 |  |
| **Executing Agency:** | | BirdLife Botswana | **Total Project Cost:** | 7,587,832.00 |  |
| **Other Partners involved:** | | Department of Forestry and Range Resources and the Department of Environmental Affairs under the Ministry of Environment, Wildlife and Tourism | **ProDoc Signature (date project began):** | | 22 Sept. 2014 |
| **(Operational) Closing Date:** | **Proposed:**  31st December 2017 | Actual: |

Objective and Scope

**A. Project Summary**

Prevalent land and livestock management processes in Botswana’s Makgadikgadi ecosystem are likely to compromise the continued flow of ecosystem goods and services from the savannah ecosystem that are necessary to sustain the national economy, livelihoods and the rich fauna and flora diversity. Local communities need to participate meaningfully in mainstreaming SLM principles into rangeland management and governance in order to secure the ecosystems goods and services necessary for current and future development and maintenance of biodiversity. However, the effectiveness of their participation is currently hindered by critical barriers, chief among them, inadequate knowledge and skills for adoption of SLM in arable farming, livestock management and livelihood support systems (primarily for the hitherto under-utilised veld products); lack of integrated localized land-use plans and inadequate user-right privileges for resident natural resource users. These barriers are preventing the government and the local communities to achieve the long-term solutions desired for the rangelands.

**B. Project Goal**

The project aims to remove these barriers by supporting communities to mainstream SLM principles into the Sub-district-wide land-use planning, and at a few pilot sites into both livestock production (through strengthening Farmer’s Associations and providing through them technical backstopping to enable farmers to improve livestock productivity whilst enhancing rangeland conditions) and arable farming (through conservation agriculture). This will be achieved through two components.

**C. Project Components**

**Component 1** will put in place systems and capacities for applying improved range management principles over 1,900,000 hectares of rangelands. Activities will be targeted at the entire Makgadikgadi Framework Management Planning (MFMP) area, but with other more detailed support for land use planning focusing on the Boteti sub-district. Replication of the successful pilots could have an impact on an additional 1,440,000 hectares (notably in the adjoining Tutume sub-district planning area). **Component 2** will facilitate the conditions necessary for development and successful implementation of local integrated land use plans in pilot villages. Component 2 will empower local institutions to improve resource governance and stakeholder participation in regional dialogues on the importance of mainstreaming SLM into rangeland management for local development. Overall, the project will improve capacity for local resource management and governance, removing barriers to small-scale, non-beef enterprises (including veld product processing, development and marketing, and community-based tourism that utilizes threatened trees of conservation and cultural significance), and conservation agriculture to enhance arable production catalyzed through GEF resources.

**D. Project Resources**

The total budget for the project is USD 7,587,832, out of which GEF contributes USD792, 832, and a co-finance of 6,795,000, out of which UNDP contributes USD 225,000, and national partners contribute the balance of USD 6,570,000. The three-year project will be implemented by BirdLife Botswana, supported by the Department of Forestry and Range Resources and the Department of Environmental Affairs under the Ministry of Environment, Wildlife and Tourism.

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 Lethakane village **including the following project sites*:*** Mmea, Mokubilo, Mosu, Makgaba, and Mmatshumo. **Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum**: BirdLife Botswana, UNDP (Botswana), Department of Forestry and Range Resources (DFRR) and Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA), as well as Mr Keletshwaretse Phetsogang (Mmatshumo Village Chief), Paulson Keithaganetse (Mmea Village Chief), Mr Khulekani Mpofu (DEA, Gaborone), Ms Tuelo Nkwane (DEA, Serowe), Ms Namasiku Mufwanzala (DFRR), Ms Kefilwe Tsetse (DFRR, Gaborone), Ms Babatshani Mathapa (Manager, Gaing- O Conservation Trust), Mr George Ntalabgwe (Chairperson, Gumakutshaa Conservation Trust), Mr Gopolang Sitale (Chairperson, Tikologo Small Stock Famers Association), Mr keikemetse Shaka (Vice Chairperson, Boteti Beef Farmers Association), Mr Joseph Modo (Department of Animal Production, Letlhakane), Mr Chemelani Mokgosi (Department of Crop Production), Mrs Ntebalang Thapelo (Land Board, Letlhakane), Mr Rorisang Chubele (Physical Planning Unit, Letlhakane), Mrs Mpho Marope (Department of Wildlife and National Parks, Serowe).

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 Jan 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 consultant~~s~~ shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The evaluator~~s~~ selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The evaluator 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 land degradation; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis | 20 |
| Competence in adaptive management, as applied to the GEF focal area of biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into production landscapes. | 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

1. PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

|  |
| --- |
| This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in the CPAP: Strengthened national capacity and improved policy and institutional framework for environmental management and sustainable development; and Enhanced capacity of communities for natural resources and ecosystem, management and benefit distribution |
| **Country Programme Outcome Indicators:** No. of community-based organizations with capacity to develop and implement plans in natural resources and ecosystem management and benefit distribution |
| Primary applicable Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area: Mainstreaming Environment and Energy |
| **Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program:** **LD-3:** Reduce pressures on natural resources from competing land uses in the wider landscape |
| **Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes: Outcome 3.1** (Enhanced cross-sector enabling environment for integrated landscape management) and **Outcome 3.2** (Integrated landscape management practices adopted by local communities)*.* |
| **Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators: Indicator 3.1** (Policies support integration of agriculture, rangeland, forest, and other land uses) and **Indicator 3.2** (Application of integrated natural resource management (INRM) practices in wider landscapes). |

| **Project Strategy** | **Objectively Verifiable Indicators** | **Baseline** | **Target** | **Sources of verification** | **Risks** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Objective[[3]](#footnote-3): To mainstream SLM in rangeland areas of the Makgadikgadi for improved livelihoods | Hectares of rangeland that are under improved management | Zero | 1,900,000 hectares by project end. (In addition, it is expected that project lessons can be replicated to an additional 1,440,000 hectares post-project, notably in the Tutume sub-district planning area) | Project PIR, Independent Evaluation, periodic field surveys/field visits | * Slugging of the current buy-in from planning institutions and Government. There is a possibility of conflicts arising from perceptions of interference and differences on approaches to how the issues could be addressed, especially between government institutions and civil society organizations. * The benefits generated by the project may be offset by the impacts of climate change, which might exacerbate the usual droughts. |
| Outcome 1[[4]](#footnote-4): Effective resource governance frameworks for SLM and equitable resource access | No. of functional farmer’s associations | Zero | 2 by the end of the project, covering all of Boteti-sub-district and all of the southern Sua Plan planning area (2,160,000 ha) | Data from district office of Ministry of Agriculture |
| No. of farmers practicing improved and effective herd management | Zero | 100 farmers enrolled for participation in the project, through the farmers associations | Data from district office of Ministry of Agriculture |
| No of integrated district-wide plans with spatially-explicit (GIS-based) maps of where particular sectors (tourism, settlements, agriculture ) could best be allocated land parcels in a manner that minimises conflicts amongst these sectors | Zero | An integrated plan covering all of the Boteti sub-district planning area developed and approved with involvement of all stakeholders | Plan available owned, and implemented by Letlhakane sub-land board and other stakeholders |
| Capacity of key land management institutions for SLM | 50% (see Annex 4) | Raise to 75% and improving by the end of the project | Capacity Development Scorecard (see Annex 4) ; project M&E data |
| No. of annual status reports with needed information on the condition of rangelands in the Boteti sub-district | Zero | Three annual status reports on the condition of rangelands, largely based on MOMS dataset and used for tracking yearly change in rangeland conditions | Annual reports published |
| Multi-stakeholder forum for mainstreaming SLM issues in national and regional policies, plans and strategies | Existing multi-sectoral institution is limited to multiple government sectors only | Active participation from government, NGOs, water and land user groups, community trusts, community leaders, private sector by project end | Meeting minutes on both the MFMP Implementation Committee (for national-level targets) and Makgadikgadi Wetlands Management Committee (site-level targets) |
| No. of annual status reports on the status of ‘common birds’ in rangelands of the Boteti sub-district, as a proxy for the Biodiversity Intactness Index | Zero | Three annual status reports on population trends of ‘common birds’ and the habitats on which they depend, largely based on MOMS dataset | Annual reports published |
| Outcome 2: Effective range management to improve range condition and flow of ecosystem services to support livelihoods of local communities in Southern Sua Pan Region | No. of integrated community Participatory Land Use and Management Plans | Zero | Four produced for southern Sua Pan villages, one for each of the villages of Mosu, Mmatshumo, Mokubilo and Mmea; and an overarching summary document covering all of southern Sua Pan. Plans would be approved and with ongoing implementation by End of Project | Participatory Land Use and Management Plans available | * Reluctant participation by local communities due to fear that the project will compromise their livelihoods by introducing strict management systems. * To insert more, refer to Risk analysis (Annex |
| No. of farmers[[5]](#footnote-5) with improved livelihoods | Tbd during range assessments which will cover farmer livelihoods as well, but national average is around US$850 | Increase by 50% farm generated income of farmers involved in improved herd management and CA, to at least $1,275 by project end | Baseline and monitoring data collected by project |
| Off-take rate for cattle | Tbd during range assessments under the economic section. However, baseline assumes calving rate (the proportion of cows bearing a live calf (% per yr), estimated at 92%, based on average rainfall of 450 mm/yr, and using formulae in table 2 of Abel, 1997, Ecological Economics 23: 113-133 | Tbd after range assessments. However, using estimate from Abel (1997), used for the baseline, project will endeavour to increase this target by 3% to almost 95% | Data from district office of Ministry of Agriculture |
|  | Area of southern Sua Pan rangeland with improved grass and herbaceous species cover | Tbd during range assessments but because an estimated 40% is degraded, it suggests 60% is probably in reasonable condition (i.e. 150,000 ha, being 60% of 250,000 ha of rangelands in southern Sua Pan) | At least 25% across southern Sua Pan rangelands (i.e. an additional 37, 500 ha to the baseline) rehabilitated by project end, for End of Project of at least 187,500 ha in Southern Sua to have good quality grass and herbaceous vegetation cover | Field and remotely sensed data collected during the project |  |
|  | No. of farmers practicing conservation agriculture | Zero | At least 40 every year (10 in each of the villages: Mosu, Mmatshumo, Mokubilo and Mmea), trained and given extension support i.e. 120 at EOP. | Department of Crops data |
|  | Increased arable production as a consequence of adopting conservation agriculture | 0.33 tonnes/ha (current yields) | 0.66 tonnes/ha (i.e. project will double the yield for those farmers that adopt conservation agriculture) | Department of Crops data |
|  | No. of farmers practicing improved and effective herd management | Zero | 120 farmers enrolled for participation in the project (10 from each village initially and 10 more added per each of the 4 villages by project end) | Department of Animal Production data |
|  | Revenue from non-timber forest products, including soils and salt | Tbd; however across all of MFMP this is approximately $444/household/annum. | End of Project targets is to increase revenue by 33% to $591/household/annum within the project site. Independent and project/site-specific estimates to be determined during exercise to map the resources and develop feasibility studies for setting up processing and marketing plant | Project reports on pilot activity |
|  | Extent of uncontrolled fires | An estimated 16,392 ha affected by uncontrolled fire. ~9% of central district burnt in 2012, and assuming this burn rate in Southern Sua Pan’s Mopane/sandveld (180,000 ha), approximately 16,393 ha is used as a baseline | Fire-affected area reduced by 50% in year two and three (i.e. at worst only 8,196 ha burnt) | DFRR data |
|  | Incidence of fires | Baseline is 32 fires for the period 2001–2010, an average 3 fires/year | Fire incidences cut by 50% to less than 1.6 fires/yr at End of project | DFRR data |

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, Gumakutshaa Conservation Trust NEF Project proposal, Boteti Beef Famers Association Project Proposal to Karowe, SEA report, Remote Sensing for Fire and Range Assessment Report, Bird Population Monitoring Report, Southern Sua Pan Management Plan.

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[[6]](#footnote-6)**

**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[[7]](#footnote-7)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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[[8]](#footnote-8)) |
| **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[[9]](#footnote-9)) |
| **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: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Annex H: TE Report audit trail

The following is a template for the evaluator to show how the received comments on the draft TE report have (or have not) been incorporated into the final TE report. This audit trail should be included as an annex in the final TE report.

**To the comments received on (*date*) from the Terminal Evaluation of (*project name*) (UNDP *PIMS #)***

*The following comments were provided to the draft Terminal Evaluation report during (time period); they are referenced by institution (“Author” column) and comment number (“#” column):*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author** | **#** | **Para No./ comment location** | **Comment/Feedback on the draft TE report** | **TE team response and actions taken** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

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. Objective (Atlas output) monitored quarterly ERBM and annually in APR/PIR [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. All outcomes monitored annually in the APR/PIR. It is highly recommended not to have more than 4 outcomes. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. *Farmers to be disaggregated according to gender, age group and small stock keeping*  [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. 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-9)