



INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANT PROCUREMENT NOTICE

Date: 22nd January 2019

Country: Botswana

Description of the assignment: The purpose of the assignment is for the Consultant to conduct a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the **Mainstreaming SLM in Rangeland Areas of Ngamiland District Landscapes for Improved Livelihoods (PIMS 4629)** as 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.

Project name: Mainstreaming SLM in Rangeland Areas of Ngamiland District Landscapes for Improved Livelihoods (PIMS 4629)

Period of assignment/services: The total duration of the Consultancy will be approximately **thirty (30) days over a time period of 8 weeks starting in February 2019.**

Submission Requirements: Proposals with reference should be submitted in a sealed envelope clearly labelled, "Individual Consultant - Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the Mainstreaming SLM in Rangeland Areas of Ngamiland District Landscapes for Improved Livelihoods (PIMS 4629)"

Should be submitted at the following address no later than **04th February 2019 at 12:00pm (Botswana Time)**

to: The Resident Representative
United Nations Development Programme
P.O. Box 54
Gaborone

or by email to: procurement.bw@undp.org

Any request for clarification must be sent in writing, or by standard electronic communication to the address or e-mailed to enquiries.bw@undp.org UNDP Botswana will respond in writing or by standard electronic mail and will send written copies of the response, including an explanation of the query without identifying the source of the inquiry to all prospective facilitators.

NOTE: Consultancy firms/companies interested in applying for this assignment are free to do so provided they submit a CV of only one qualified consultant and present its bid in a manner that would allow for evaluation of the bid in accordance with the evaluation criteria specified in these solicitation documents.

That is, the experience required is that of the individual whose CV would have been submitted by the company rather than that of the company. Further, if the submitted bid wins, the ensuing contract will be between the UNDP and the company/firm, not the individual.

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

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:		Mainstreaming SLM in Rangeland Areas of Ngamiland District Landscapes for Improved Livelihoods		
GEF Project ID:	4751 PIMS 4629		at endorsement (Million US\$)	at completion (Million US\$)
UNDP Project ID:	00077645 00088298	GEF financing:	3,081,800	
Country:	Botswana	UNDP:	1,000,000	
Region:	Africa	Government:	(10,475,000)	
		Department of Environmental Affairs	1,300,000	24,711
		North West District Council	3,500,000	0
		Department of Forestry and Range Resources	2,675,000	418,587
		Department of Animal Production	3,000,000	246,152
Focal Area:	Land Degradation	NGOs	(17,174,000)	
		Southern African Regional Program (SAREP)	50,000	0
		Tlharesegolo Foundation	250,000	0
		NCONGO	630,000	173,000
				0

		Kalahari Conservation Society		
		Other University of Botswana	2,061,000	140,000
		Botswana Meat Commission	14,183,000	472,000
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	To: a) improve range land condition and flow of ecosystem services to support livelihoods of local communities in Ngamiland; b) mainstream sustainable land management in rangeland areas of Ngamiland c) improve resource governance frameworks and markets for livestock off-take and compliance with SLM.	Total co-financing:	27,649,000	
Executing Agency:	UNDP	Total Project Cost:	31,730,800	3,671,870
Other Partners involved:	Department Forestry and Range Resources, Department of Animal Production, Department of Environmental Affairs, Department of Wildlife and National Parks, University of Botswana, Ministry of Agriculture/ Botswana Meat Commission	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		12th March 2014
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: 31st March 2019	Actual:

OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

A. Project Summary

Prevalent land and livestock management processes in Ngamiland are compromising 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. The long-term solution pursued by the project was to mainstream sustainable land management (SLM) principles into the livestock production sector, specifically in areas adjacent to the Okavango Delta where rangeland degradation is most intense.

Critically, local communities need to participate meaningfully in rangeland governance. However, inadequate knowledge and skills for adoption of SLM in livestock management and livelihood support systems, and policy and market distortions that provide disincentives for adopting SLM (particularly sustainable range management principles) in the livestock production sector were significant barriers. The project adopted an outcome-based process to realize objectives as follows:

Outcome 1: Effective range management improves range condition and flow of ecosystem services to support livelihoods of local communities in Ngamiland – The project put in place systems and capacities for applying improved range management principles over one million hectares of rangelands. Activities were piloted in three different areas within Ngamiland.

Outcome 2: Effective resource governance frameworks and markets provide incentives for livestock off-take and compliance with SLM – The project facilitated the conditions necessary for development and successful implementation of the local integrated land use plans and replication of the pilot activities developed under Outcome 1. These conditions related to improved capacity for local resource governance catalysed through GEF resources, removing barriers to small-scale, non-beef, livestock product-based enterprises catalysed through GEF resources and improved access to markets for Ngamiland meat catalysed through co-financing.

B. Project Goal

To mainstream SLM in rangeland areas of Ngamiland District

C. Project Objective

To mainstream SLM in rangeland areas of Ngamiland District productive landscapes for improved livelihoods

D. Project Components

Component 1: Effective range management in over 1 million hectares improves range condition and flow of ecosystem services to support livelihoods of local communities in Ngamiland

Output 1.1: Local level land use plans developed for each pilot area to support sustainable utilization of range resources;

Output 1.2: Improved range management and mixed livelihood systems are piloted in line with the land use plans

Output 1.3: Bush-control program is piloted and provides financial incentives for controlled bush clearance

Output 1.4: Fire management strategy is piloted in Tsodilo line with the provisions of the land use plans

Output 1.5: System for monitoring of range condition and productivity is in place.

Outcome 2: Effective resource governance frameworks and markets provide incentives for livestock off-take and compliance with SLM

Output 2.1: A regional multi-stakeholder forum for facilitating a dialogue on SLM and mainstreaming SLM into regional and national policy programs and processes is created and empowered

Output 2.2: Improved access of farmers to markets for livestock products

Output 2.3: Processing plant in Ngamiland increases quantity and variety of locally processed beef products, allowing higher sales of livestock products and off-take (supported through BMC co-financing)

Output 2.4: Product placement secured in local and regional markets (supported through BMC co-financing)

Project Management Unit

Project office is headed by Project Manager, assisted by the Project Officer and Finance and Administration Officer and two Interns. The three officers hold UNDP Service Contracts. They provide technical support to the 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, DAP) 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 method¹ 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](#)). 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: Ngamiland District including the following project sites: Hainaveld farms, Lake Ngami villages, Tsodilo enclave villages including Tsodilo, Etsha 1-13 and Shakawe. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: Office of the District Commissioner, Tawana Land Board, North West District Council, Department of Wildlife and National Parks, Department of Forestry and Range Resources, Department, of Animal Production, Department of Veterinary Services,, Department of Tourism, Department of National Museum and Monuments, NCONGO, University of Botswana, Hainaveld Farmers Association, Lake Ngami Conservation Trust, Tsodilo Conservation Trust, Matute-A-Mongongo, Tribal leadership/Dikgosi, 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 budgets, 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 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), 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](#).

¹ For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](#), Chapter 7, pg. 163

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

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 working days over a period of 3 months according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation <ul style="list-style-type: none">handover of documents, desk reviewinception report	7 days	<ul style="list-style-type: none">28 - 30 January 2019 (3 days)4 – 7 February 2019 (4 days)
Evaluation Mission <ul style="list-style-type: none">Stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits, debriefing meeting with UNDP	8 days	<ul style="list-style-type: none">18 - 25 February 2019 (8 days)

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](#)

Draft Evaluation Report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Preparing draft report ▪ Circulation for comments feedback 	10 days	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 26 February – 1 March 2019 (5 days) ▪ 4 – 8 March 2019 (5 days)
Final Report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Incorporate comments, finalize and submit report (accommodate time delay in dates for circulation and review of the draft report) 	5 days (after receiving UNDP's comment on draft report)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 18 – 29 March 2019

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 TE will be conducted by an International evaluator. The consultant shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The evaluator selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The Consultant 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'

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 Applicant should apply on line and 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 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 Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area: Mainstreaming Environment and Energy
Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program: LD 1: Maintain or improve flow of agro-ecosystem services sustaining the livelihoods of local communities; LD-3: Reduce pressures on natural resources from competing land uses in the wider landscape
Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes: Outcome 1.2: Improved rangelands/ livestock management; Outcome 3.1: Enhanced cross-sector enabling environment for integrated landscape management
Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators: Indicator 1.2 Increased land area with sustained productivity and reduced vulnerability of communities to climate variability; Indicator 3.1 Policies support integration of agriculture, rangeland, forest, and other land uses

Project Strategy	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Risks
Objective3: To mainstream SLM in rangeland areas of Ngamiland District productive landscapes for improved livelihoods	Hectares of rangeland that are under improved management	Zero	1 million hectares by project end (In addition, it is expected that project lessons can be replicated to an additional 4.5 million hectares post-project)	Project PIR, Independent Evaluation, periodic field surveys/field visits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.

3 Objective (Atlas output) monitored quarterly ERBM and annually in APR/PIR

Outcome 14: Effective range management improves range condition and flow of ecosystem services to support livelihoods of local communities	Area of rangeland with improved grass and herbaceous species cover	64,000 ha denuded in ranches	Approx. 40% (25,600 ha) in 4 ranches rehabilitated by project end	Field and remotely sensed data collected during the project	Weak enforcement of the TGLP has in the past encouraged overstocking in the communal lands since commercial farmers have retained the right to offload excess livestock to the communal areas. Increased access to livestock markets might become a perverse incentive and fuel higher
	Area of riparian woodland preserved	10,000 ha of riparian woodland lost around Lake Ngami	200 meter buffer zone reclaimed by project end	Field and remotely sensed data collected under the project	
	Incidence of late dry season fires	Fires burn annually at Tsodilo	Frequency reduced to every three years	DFRR data	
	Extent of uncontrolled fires	10,000 ha affected by uncontrolled fire	Fire-affected area reduced by 50% most of the years and by	DFRR data	
Project Strategy	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Risks
			100% in two out of the five years of the project		stocking rates, if governance is not improved simultaneously.
	Area affected by bush encroachment	100,000 ha affected by overgrazing and bush encroachment	Decrease by 25% by the end of the project	Field and remotely sensed data collected under the project	Reluctant participation by local communities due to fear that the project will

4 All outcomes monitored annually in the APR/PIR. It is highly recommended not to have more than 4 outcomes.

No. of farmers practicing conservation agriculture	Zero	30 every other year, trained and given extension support	Department of Crops data	compromise their livelihoods by introducing strict management systems.
No. of farmers practicing in improved and effective herd management	Zero	30 farmers enrolled for participation in the project (20 initially and 10 more added by project end)	DAP and ORI data	
Stocking rates in line with the prevailing condition of the rangeland	16Ha/Livestock Unit	8Ha/Livestock Unit	DAP and ORI data	
No. of farmers ⁵ with improved livelihoods	Zero livestock sales	Double farm generated income of farmers involved in improved herd management and CA by project end	Baseline and monitoring data collected by project	
Economic returns per land unit	P4800/Ha	Increase returns by a quarter of the baseline every year after the 2nd year	Baseline and monitoring data collected by project	
Capacity of key land management institutions for	Summary baseline capacity score 28%	Raise to 50% and improving by the end of the project	Capacity Development Scorecard (see	

⁵ Farmers are disaggregated according to gender, age group and small stock keeping

	SLM			Annex 4) ; project M&E data	
Outcome 2: Effective governance framework and markets provide incentives for livestock off-take and compliance with SLM	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	Active participation from government, NGOs, water and land user groups, community trusts, community leaders, private sector by project end	Meeting minutes	☒ Difficulties in matching new markets to new products, or farmers fail to meet the quality specifications for new products and new markets.
	Revenue from non-beef livestock products	Zero	10% of beef value	Project reports on pilot activity	
	Off-take rate for cattle	Zero	10% offtake	Data from district office of Ministry of Agriculture	

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), Project Tracking tools (at Baseline, MTR & TE), 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 Plans already mentioned.

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

<p>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution</p> <p>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</p>	<p>Sustainability ratings:</p> <p>4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks</p>	<p>Relevance ratings</p> <p>2. Relevant (R) 1.. Not relevant (NR)</p> <p>Impact Ratings:</p> <p>3. Significant (S) 2. Minimal (M) 1. Negligible (N)</p>
<p><i>Additional ratings where relevant:</i> Not Applicable (N/A) Unable to Assess (U/A)</p>		

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 Form⁶

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: _____

⁶www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE⁷

- 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 Manual⁸)
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 rated⁹)
- 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

⁷The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

⁸ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

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.

- 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 TEMPLATE

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 in track changes to the draft Terminal Evaluation report; they are referenced by institution (“Author” column) and track change comment number (“#” column):

Author	#	Para No./ comment location	Comment/Feedback on the draft TE report	TE response and action taken

1.