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**GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY**

**UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME**

**Terms of Reference**

**for TERMINAL Evaluation:**

**Project Title**: “Land degradation offset and Mitigation in Western Mongolia”

**Functional Title:** International Consultant for Terminal Evaluation

**Duration:** Estimated 20 working days during February-May 2019, including field mission to Mongolia: Zavkhan and nearby.

**Terms of Payment:** Lump sum payable upon satisfactory completion and approval by UNDP of all deliverables, including the Evaluation Report

**Duty station:** Home based with a week mission to Zavkhan( 5 days)

**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 Land degradation offset and Mitigation in Western Mongolia (PIMS#5287).

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

Project Summary Table

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Title: | “Land degradation offset and Mitigation in Western Mongolia” | | | | |
| GEF Project ID:  UNDP GEF Project ID (PIMS): | | #5287 |  | at endorsement (Million US$) | at completion (Million US$) |
| Atlas award ID:  Atlas project ID: | | 00087440 | GEF financing: | 1,289,863 | 1,289,863 |
| Country: | | Mongolia | IA/EA own: |  |  |
| Region: | |  | Government: | 4,150.000 | 4,150.000 |
| Focal Area: | | Zavkhan, Uvs and Khovd provinces | Other: | 280.000 | 280.000 |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): | | Objective  Objective  Objective | Total co-financing: | 4,430.000 | 4,430.000 |
| Executing Agency: | | UNDP | Total Project Cost: | 6,569.863 | 6,569.863 |
| Other Partners involved: | | MOM  TNC  WWF  MNMA | ProDoc Signature (date project began): | | 12 June 2015 |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | Proposed:   July 2019 | Actual:   May 2019 |

Objective and Scope

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](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/UNDP-GEF-TE-Guide.pdf).

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.

The objective of the project is to implement and adopt Best Environmental Practices (BEP) and Best Available Technologies (BAT) in assisting the Government of Mongolia to reduce negative impacts of mining on rangelands in the western mountain and steppe region by incorporating mitigation hierarchy and offset for land degradation into the landscape level planning and management.

The project will strengthen the policy, legal and planning framework governing the environmental impacts of mining, demonstrate best practice approaches, build capacity and facilitate a cross-sectoral collaboration for land management and planning at the landscape level. By completing the Western Region eco- regional assessment, the project will assist the Government of Mongolia to develop and implement the national mitigation hierarchy and offsetting framework to address direct and indirect mining threats to pasture and water resources, ecosystems and local livelihood.

The project will support the incorporation of the principles and the results of eco-regional assessment into land use planning across 41.5 million hectares of mountain and steppe landscapes in the Western Aimags. The selected pilot landscapes are 1. Bukhmuren Soum of Uvs Aimag, with “Khotgor”, “Erchim-Nuurst Khotgor” and “Khotgor Shanaga” open-cast coal mines, 2. Durvuljin and Erdenekhairan Soums of Zavkhan Aimag with “Bayan Airag” open pit gold mine, and 3. Darvi Soum of Khovd Aimag with “Khushuut” open-cast coal mines .

Feasibility study for the potential pilot sites, was conducted over a period from September, 2014 to January 2015 through extensive consultation with key stakeholders in Western provinces and Government. The feasibility study has identified the potential sites based on consolidated recommendations on specific landscapes, eco regional zones, water catchment areas, protected areas, and mining activities

The project consists of 2 main components:

The first component will support further development of the mitigation hierarchy and offsetting framework for land degradation in the planning and management system of mining concessions at the national level, in order to reduce threats to land and water resources and ecosystem integrity. It will emplace participatory and eco-regional assessments as the basis for integrated land use planning by the Government across 41.5 million ha of production system and natural habitat in western Mongolia. This will be achieved by incorporating science-based mitigation hierarchy into mining concession planning and provincial land use planning and management of competing land use types, and setting aside ecologically sensitive areas from mining related development. Institutional and personnel capacity for mitigating and offsetting the impacts of mining will be developed for local level.

The second project component will demonstrate application of the mitigation hierarchy and offsets to mining impacts through integrated SLM practices within selected pilot landscapes in the western provinces. Local herders and farmers, as primary resource users, and local Government will implement landscape-level land use plans to address land degradation challenges from competing uses. Specifically, the project will pilot best practice operationalization of the mitigation hierarchy and land degradation offset mechanisms in the selected landscapes by the mining companies. Integrated landscape management and offset mechanisms will be demonstrated covering at lea t I00,000 ha with prominent mining concessions and other competing land uses. Increased investments in SLM actions in the landscape will help to rehabilitate lands, and reduce the projected rate of land degradation and biodiversity loss.

The Project has primary results summarized below:

* Ecoregional assessment (ERA) results have been integrated into long term land management plans and policy documents in target aimags and soums.
* The training program for integrated planning and management with incorporation of eco-regional assessment into land use plans and the mining offset principle was implemented for all related stakeholders of Western Mongolia. As a result, 4 mining companies have developed offset plans and 9 soum development plans based on ERA results in close collaboration with local residents and authorities.
* Since 2016, the project implementation unit's local technical committee was established and started its initiative towards designing and expanding protected areas (PA) network based on eco-regional assessments which resulted in approval by the Government and Parliament of Mongolia on establishment of number of protected areas in western aimags. As of 2018, 51.8% **/21,516,605 ha/** of the total area of Western region have been established as Local PAs and registered in the cadastre database of the Mineral Resources and Petroleum Authority of Mongolia.
* The PIU has completed drafting and developing the law amendments and regulations and guidelines and submitted at Ministerial level. The approval of these legal documents is of significant importance to the sustainability of project outcomes in the future.
* Capacity score on land degradation mitigation and offset is **50.2 /56.4%/** in 2017. This indicates **13.8%** increase from the baseline level.
* Biodiversity and land offsetting plans were developed by 4 mining companies in western Mongolia taking into account the importance of involving local communities for effective conservation. With close collaboration with different partners and active lobbying, the offset plans are covering 59,061 ha areas by 4 Mining companies.
* 2018 budget for Environmental management plan of the target mining sites shows increase of **76%** compared to that of 2014.
* Total 985 ha of land is rehabilitated by small innovation projects in pilot areas.

Evaluation approach and method

An overall approach and method[[1]](#footnote-1) for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects have been 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 (*see* [*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. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

Key stakeholders:

* Target provinces and soums
* The Ministry of Urban planning and Construction
* The State Agency on Land Geodesy and Cadastr
* The Ministry of Heavy Industry and Mining
* The Nature Conservancy
* Green Gold NGO
* WWF
* Mongolian Academy of Science
* Mining companies in target areas

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 | Planned | Actual |
| Grants | 850.000 | 850.000 | 4,150.000 | 4,150.000 | 280. 000 | 280. 000 | 5,280.000 | 5,280.000 |
| Loans/Concessions |  |  |  |  | 280. 000 | 280. 000 |  |  |
| * In-kind support | 850.000 | 850.000 | 4,150.000 | 4,150.000 | 280. 000 | 280. 000 |  |  |
| * Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals | 850.000 | 850.000 | 4,150.000 | 4,150.000 | 280. 000 | 280. 000 | 5,280.000 | 5,280.000 |

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 Mongolia*.* 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 20days according to the following indicative plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Timing (indicative) | Completion Date (indicative) |
| **Preparation (desk review)** | 7 days (February, 2019) | 15 March, 2019 |
| **Evaluation Mission (in-country field visits, interviews and presentation of preliminary findings)** | Up to 10 days (20 March, 2019) | 10 April, 2019 |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | 6 days (April , 2019) | 25 April, 2019 |
| **Final Report** | 4 days (April, 2019) | 31 May, 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 1 week before the evaluation mission. (by 15 March, 2019) | Evaluator submits to UNDP CO and Project |
| **Presentation** | Initial Findings | Last day of the field mission (Friday, by 18 April) | Project Team, UNDP CO and key stakeholders, members of Project Board |
| **Draft Final Report** | Draft evaluation report, (per annexed template) with annexes | Within two weeks time after the field mission (by 14 May 2019) | Project team, CO, reviewed by RTA, GEF OFP |
| **Final Report\*** | Final report addressing and integrating feedback and comments | Within a week time after receiving comments on the draft (by 31 May 2019) | Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP Region. |

\*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. See Annex H for an audit trail template.

Team Composition

The evaluation team will be composed of *1 international consultant. The consultant shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects.* The international Consultant has responsibility over submission of a final report. 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 project will provide an interpreter to accompany the international consultant during the mission to Mongolia.

The International Consultant must present the following qualifications:

* A Master’s degree in natural science;
* Minimum 7 years of professional experience in the fields of land or environmental management;
* Proven track record of evaluation of projects focusing on environmental assessment performance with at least two project evaluations;
* At least one project evaluation with GEF M&E policies and procedures;
* Experience in working in Central Asian or CIS countries will be an asset;
* Fluency in English. Knowledge in Mongolian is an asset.

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

The service provider will be responsible for all personal administrative and travel expenses associated with undertaking this assignment including office accommodation, printing, stationary, telephone and electronic communications, and report copies incurred in this assignment. For this reason, the contract is prepared as a lump sum contract.

The remuneration of work performed will be conducted as follows: lump sum payable in 1 installment, upon satisfactory completion and approval by UNDP of all deliverables, including the Final Evaluation Report.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| % | Milestone |
| *100%* | Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report |

Application process

|  |
| --- |
|  |
| **Recommended Presentation of Proposal:**   1. **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx)[[3]](#footnote-3) provided by UNDP; 2. **CV** and a **Personal History Form** ([P11 form](http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc)[[4]](#footnote-4)); 3. **Brief description of approach to work/technical proposal** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page) 4. **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc), supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the Letter of Confirmation of Interest template. If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.   All application materials should be submitted to the e-mail address (bids.mn@undp.org) with reference “ International Consultant for UNDP-GEF Project ,“ Land Degradation Offset and Mitigation in Western Mongolia Terminal Review” This email address is being protected from spam bots, you need Javascript enabled to view it by ***\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_).*** Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.  SCOPE OF PRICE PROPOSAL   * Financial proposals must be “all inclusive” and expressed in a lump-sum for the total duration of the contract. The term “all inclusive” implies all cost (professional fees, travel costs, living allowances etc.); * For duty travels, the UN’s Daily Subsistence Allowance (DSA) rates are Durvuljin soum, Zavkhan province and include DSA rate for Ulaanbaatar (fill for all travel destinations), which should provide indication of the cost of living in a duty station/destination *(Note: Individuals on this contract are not UN staff and are therefore not entitled to DSAs. All living allowances required to perform the demands of the ToR must be incorporated in the financial proposal, whether the fees are expressed as daily fees or lump sum amount.)*   ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR THE RECOMMENDED CONTRACTOR  **Statement of Medical Fitness for Work**  Individual Consultants/Contractors whose assignments require travel and who are over 60 years of age are required, at their own costs, to undergo a full medical examination including x-rays and obtaining medical clearance from UN –approved doctor, prior to taking up their assignment.  Where there is no UN office nor a UN Medical Doctor present in the location of the Individual Contractor prior to commencing the travel, either for repatriation or duty travel, the Individual Contractor may choose his/her own preferred physician to obtain the required medical clearance.  **Inoculations/Vaccinations**  Individual Contractors are required to have vaccinations/inoculations when travelling to certain countries, as designated by the UN Medical Director. The cost of required vaccinations/inoculations, when foreseeable, must be included in the financial proposal. Any unforeseeable vaccination/inoculation cost will be reimbursed by UNDP.  TRAVELS   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Date | Place | No. of days | | | February, 2019 | Mongolia | Up to 10 working days trip | 10 overnights |   Field missions to (location), including the following project sites (list):   1. Ulaanbaatar (Country office, Project Management Unit UNDP, Project National Partners); 2. Zavkhan province Durvuljin soum   SECURITY CLEARANCE  The Consultant will be requested to undertake the Basic Security in the Field (BSIF) training and Advanced Security in the Field (ASIF). These requirements apply for all Consultants, attracted individually or through the Employer.  UNDP CONTRIBUTION  The security charges are applicable. UNDP project will provide the Consultant with following:   * Project documents (see list of documents on page 16); * Organize meetings with Project partners; * Working place; * Interpreter if needed.   The ToR is approved by:  Khishigjargal Kharkhuu, Programme Analyst UNDP CO |

Annex A: Project Logical Framework[[5]](#footnote-5)

**Project Title: Land Degradation Offset and Mitigation in Western Mongolia**

**Project’s Development Goal: Conservation of ecosystem integrity and resilience, biodiversity and livelihoods in Western Mongolia’s productive landscapes**

| **Objective/ Outcome** | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **End of Project target** | **Source of Information** | **Risks and assumptions** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Objective:**  **To reduce negative impacts of mining on rangelands in the western mountain and steppe region by incorporating mitigation hierarchy and offset for land degradation into the landscape level planning and management** | Area of pastoral production system and natural habitats in western Mongolia under integrated planning and management as shown by incorporation of eco-regional assessment into land use plans | 0 | 41.5 million ha | * Mid-term Review and Final Evaluation reports * Project progress reports * Provincial land use plans | Risks:  Political instability and 2016 elections delay project progress  Further economic downturn hinders cooperation with mining companies through investment in SLM  Lack of consensus among stakeholders on detailed rules and regulations for offsets  Assumptions:  The Government of Mongolia is fully committed to the conservation and sustainable use of the country’s ecosystems and the operationalisation of a national framework for mitigation and offsetting of mining impacts.  Co-financing is mobilised from Government allocations and other donors |
| Area set aside from mining related development, for ecological sensitivity including pasture values (through local and national PA designations) derived from Eco-regional assessment) | 11.35M ha national PAs and 2.08 M ha Local PAs  Total = 13.43 M ha | 10% increase | * Project progress reports * MEGDT website (PAAD) |
| Level of institutional capacity for implementation of mitigation and offsetting framework as indicated by Capacity scorecard | 41 out of a possible 96 = 42.7% | Improved capacity indicated by an increase of at least 25% over baseline (ie. a score of 51.25 = 53.4%) | * Project progress reports * Capacity Scorecard assessments in Mid-term Review and Final Evaluation reports * Training reports |
| **Outcome 1:**  **Land degradation mitigation and offset framework operationalised, through eco-regional land use planning and capacity development** | **Outputs:**   * Output 1.1: Land degradation mitigation and offset procedures and guidelines developed, integrated in the mining concession planning and licensing system and operationalized. * Output 1.2: Participatory and science-based eco-regional assessment conducted in western Mongolia and applied to provincial (landscape-level) land use planning. * Output 1.3: Capacity of key stakeholders developed to apply mitigation and offsetting at the national, aimag and soum levels, and public awareness raised. | | | | |
| Resolution of legal contradictions and adoption of new guidelines / regulations / mechanisms to strengthen the mitigation /offsetting framework | - | * amended law to incorporate offsetting in land use plans at national. aimag and soum levels; * guideline for the implementation of offsetting and mitigation hierarchy through SLM | * Minutes of meetings of inter-ministerial committee | Risks:  Economic downturn takes government focus off achieving the 30% PA target, in favour of a more relaxed approach to mining licences  Assumptions:  Cooperation is forthcoming from the aimag authorities and production sectors such as Livestock and Agriculture, for introducing mitigation and offsetting through SLM practices.  Stakeholder institutions are willing to share information that is required for reducing land degradation through SLM  Institutions are willing to commit the expected number of personnel for training and capacity building |
| Area of priority conservation (potential offset) areas identified for protection and integrated in mining concession planning process | 13.43 million hectares | 30% of 41.5 million ha (= 12.45 million ha) | * Eco-regional assessment * Mining concession plans |
| Public awareness of the role of mitigation and offsetting in addressing impacts of mining | Extremely low: 0 | 10% increase in Aimag centres and 30% increase in pastoral communities at pilot landscapes | * Results of questionnaire surveys conducted at beginning and end of project |
| **Outcome 2.**  **Land degradation mitigation and offsets applied through SLM within selected landscapes** | **Outputs:**  Output 2.1: Integrated land management plans operationalised in selected landscapes with full participation of key stakeholders.  Output 2.2: Land degradation mitigation and offsets piloted in selected landscapes.  Output 2.3: Capacity of local stakeholders developed through demonstration and application of innovative SLM approaches. | | | | |
| Integrated landscape management and offset mechanisms demonstrated with prominent mining concessions and other competing land uses | 0ha | at least 100,000 ha, with at least one offset agreement signed per pilot landscape | * Pilot landscape reports * Project Progress reports | Risks:  Local communities are unwilling to engage constructively with mining companies due to lack of trust  Mining companies unwilling to commit additional finds for offsets  Assumptions:  Aimag and Soum authorities are collaborating and receptive for introducing SLM initiatives for mitigation and offsetting  Opportunities through offsetting would stimulate the poor natural resource dependent pastoral communities to organize and perform better. |
| Increased investments in SLM actions in the landscape | Khotgor mines $29,323  Bayan Airag mine $19,600  Khushuut mine $118,000 | A 50% increase on the 2014 EMP budgets of partner mining companies in the pilot landscapes | * Project reports * Mid-term and terminal evaluation reports |
| % pilot site herder/farmer families applying innovative SLM technologies (as defined in Output 2.3) | low: 0 | 50% by end of project of 200 households in Khushuut Bagh of Darvi soum (Khovd),  190 households of khar altat Bagh of Bukhmurun soum, (Uvs), 149 households of Tsogt Bagh of Durvuljin soum, (Zavkhan) | * Project reports * Mid-term and terminal evaluation reports |
| Area of grazing/forested land (ha) and # springs/wells in pilot landscapes subject to innovative SLM interventions | Grazing rotation: Integrated Land Management Data 2013 | 30% of the total grazing/forested area or degraded springs/wells in the pilot landscapes by end of project | * Project reports * Mid-term and terminal evaluation reports |

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

**General documentation**

* UNDP Programme and Operations Policies and Procedures (POPP);
* UNDP Handbook for Monitoring and Evaluating for Results;
* UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects;
* GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy;
* GEF Guidelines for conducting Terminal Evaluations.

**Project documentation**

* GEF Project Information Form (PIF) and Log Frame Analysis
* List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Boards, and other partners to be consulted;
* Project sites, highlighting suggested visits;
* Project document;
* Annual Work Plans;
* Annual Project Reports;
* Project Implementation Review;
* GEF Operational Quarterly Reports;
* Midterm Review Report (MTR);
* Management response to MTE;
* Annual Project Implementation Reports (PIRs);
* Project budget and financial data;
* Inception report;
* Project Board Meeting minutes;
* Knowledge and legislation related drafts and products.
* Reports of training, workshop and knowledge assessment
* Scorecard report
* TNC report and other technical experts’ reports
* Green Gold reports
* Others

Annex C: Evaluation Questions

*This is a generic list, to be further detailed with more specific questions by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on the particulars of the project.*

| **Evaluative Criteria Questions** | | **Indicators** | **Sources** | **Methodology** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels? | | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? | | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards? | | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? | | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?** | | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Annex D: Rating Scales

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution*** | ***Sustainability ratings:*** | ***Relevance ratings*** |
| 6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings  5: Satisfactory (S): minor 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 * Co-financing table * Report Clearance Form * *Annexed in a separate file:* TE Audit Trail * *Annexed in a separate file:* Terminal GEF Tracking Tool, if applicable |

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 the project “Land degradation offset and Mitigation in Western Mongolia  *“* UNDP *PIMS # 5287)***

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

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author** | **#** | **Para No./ comment location** | **Comment/Feedback on the draft TE report** | **Evaluator 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. <https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx> [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. <http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc> [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Project logical framework has taken from Inception Report [↑](#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: Moderately Satisfactory, 3: Moderately Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see Guidelines for conducting Terminal evaluations: http://www.thegef.org/gef/node/1905. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)