Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference – NATIONAL CONSULTANT

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP-supported, GEF-financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) set out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the Project: Conservation and Sustainable Use of the Threatened Savanna Woodland in the Kidepo Critical Landscape in North Eastern Uganda (PIMS 4592).

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

Project Summary Table

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Title | Conservation and Sustainable Use of the Threatened Savanna Woodland in the Kidepo Critical Landscape in North Eastern Uganda | | | |
| GEF Project ID: | 4592 | GEF Financing | At endorsement (Million USD) | At completion (Million USD) |
| UNDP Project ID: | 00085611 | IA/EA own | 2.525 |  |
| Country | Uganda | Government | 5.6597 |  |
| Region | Africa | Other: | 0.350 |  |
| Focal Area | Biodiversity Conservation | Total co-financing | 10.6847 |  |
| Operational Program: | GEF 5 | Total Project Cost | 3.08 |  |
| Executing Agency | UNDP | Prodoc Signature (date project began) | 24 July 2013 |  |
| Other Partners Involved | The National Environment Management Agency (NEMA)  Uganda Wildlife Authority  National Forestry Authority  District Local Governments of Kaabong, Kotido, Abim, Otuke, Agago and Kitgum | Operational Closing Date | 31st May 2019 |  |
|  |  |  | Proposed: 31st July 2017 | Actual: 31st May 2019 |

1. **Background**

The Government of Uganda through the National Environment Management Authority (NEMA), with support from United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and Global Environmental Facility (GEF), is implementing the project “Conservation and Sustainable Use of the Threatened Savannah Woodland in the Kidepo Critical Landscape in North Eastern Uganda”.

This UNDP/GEF-GOU initiative is a partnership programme implemented as a joint venture of national government partners. The partners include:-

* The National Environment Management Agency (NEMA)
* Uganda Wildlife Authority
* National Forestry Authority
* District Local Governments of Kaabong, Kotido, Abim, Otuke, Agago and Kitgum.

The Project Document covering the period 2013-2017 was signed by Government and UNDP in July 2013 and full project implementation began in 2014. The planned operational closure date for the project was 31-Jul-2017, but the project was extended for another 22 months up to end of May 2019.

The Government of Uganda has made significant investments in most protected areas (PAs) in the country. However, the Kidepo Critical Landscape (KCL) of North-Eastern Uganda, encompassing eight protected areas under a range of management authorities, received limited investment over the past 20 years due to protracted conflict, and proportionately suffers from lower management-effectiveness compared to other sites.

The project was designed to strengthen the national system of protected areas in Uganda by improving the management effectiveness of protected areas in the Kidepo Critical Landscape in the North-Eastern part of the country, thus affording biodiversity sufficient protection from emerging and future threats. This can be achieved through providing planned, targeted and effective support to the operational capacity of core PAs within the landscape, and by creating a coordinated landscape-management approach in the KCL to serve as a shield against human-induced pressures on Uganda’s threatened biodiversity.

This project in the Kidepo Critical Landscape of PAs and buffer zones satisfies the requirements for GEF financing under GEF Biodiversity Focal Area, Strategic Objective one: Improve sustainability of Protected Area systems. The project aimed to bring 416,485 ha of land directly under strengthened PA management arrangements, involving three categories of PA (National Park, entral Forestry Reserve and Community Wildlife Area) as well as public lands, with a wider positive influence on an additional 239,215 ha of dispersal areas. In total, the project thus aimed to enhance biodiversity protection to over 655,700 ha of targeted PAs and linked dispersal areas. The project comprises two complementary components, which will be cost-shared by the GEF and co-financing. Each addresses a different barrier and has discrete outcomes.

Component 1. Strengthening Management Effectiveness of the Kidepo Critical Landscape PA Cluster.

Component 2. Integrating PA Management in the Wider Landscape.

By addressing management deficits in these sites, the project was expected to strengthen the national PA system in Uganda as a whole as well as improve livelihoods for communities within the landscape. The project worked to diversify and strengthen biodiversity-based livelihoods through improved management of biodiversity assets both within and beyond the boundaries of protected area – for example, through management and sustainable utilization of species such as the shea tree, which provides significant economic benefits to communities, thus demonstrating the importance of biodiversity to livelihoods of rural people.

1. **Objective and scope of the TE**

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Guidance document for Evaluation of GEF Financed projects, and the updated (2017) guidance document prepared by the GEF.

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 TE is to cover the entire Project including GEF, UNDP and GoU of Uganda funded activities*.

Evaluation approach and method

An overall approach and method[[1]](#footnote-1) for conducting terminal evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed projects has 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, and the associated guidance document released by GEF in 2017. 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 (both the former and current) and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to the Kidepo project site including the following project sites (Annex I)*.* Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: (See Annex J).

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**.

Implementation arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Uganda. 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 *28* days according to the following plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Indicative time allocation | Completion Date |
| **Meeting and sharing relevant documentation to the team** | *At the time of contract signing* | *Signature date* |
| **Preparation and submission of the inception report** | *5* days | *date* |
| **Evaluation Mission** | *15*days | *date* |
| **Draft Evaluation Report (maximum 50 pages excluding annexes)** | *5* days | *date* |
| **Final Report** | *3* days | *date* |

Evaluation deliverables

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Deliverable | Content | Timing | Responsibilities |
| **Inception Report (10 – 15 pages)** | Evaluator clarifies timing and method of review, proposes the timeline of the review process, including the proposed field mission, itinerary developed in consultation with the Project management Unit | Two weeks after the contract signature. No later than 1 week before the review mission. | Evaluator submits to UNDP CO and Regional Technical Advisor) with PMU in copy.  PMU is expected to provide support to the consultants to develop the mission itinerary and schedule interview to ensure the maximum exposure of the consultant to the project. |
| **Evaluation debriefings (Presentation)** | Initial Findings | Immediately following evaluation (during in-country mission) | To project management, UNDP CO and RTA |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes | Within 2 weeks of the evaluation mission | Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs |
| **Evaluation report audit trail** | Comments and changes by the evaluator in response to the draft report | Within 2 days of receiving UNDP comments on draft | Evaluator |
| **Final Report\*** | Revised report | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft | Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC, after final review by RTA. |

\*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 Consultant Evaluator/ Team Leaderwho will be responsible for finalizing the report, and 1 National Consultant. The National Consultant shall report to the Team Leader. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

**Duties of the National Consultant**

The National Consultant will support and provide inputs to the Team Leader / Lead Consultant provide support for e production of the agreed products. S/he will deliver on the following:-

1. Identify strengths and weaknesses in the Programme design and implementation, in particular implementation arrangements and its impacts on efficiency and effectiveness of converting resources (money, time) into results and impacts;
2. Ascertain achievements and impacts to date; to what extent the Programme has moved towards achievement of the objectives and outputs under the three outcomes in the results framework and the need for continued focus (in particular achieving global environment benefits and improvement in livelihoods);
3. Assess likelihood of sustainability of results and determine the key elements of the exit strategy that would increase the likelihood of sustaining critical results;
4. Examine the significance of un-expected effects, whether beneficial or detrimental in character
5. Assess to what extent the Programme has contributed to building capacity at national, district and community levels to formulate, implement and monitor actions/activities for biodiversity conservation
6. Assess the validity of assumptions used in the development of the Kidepo Critical Landscape programme, and this Kidepo Critical Landscape project;
7. Identify and assess lessons learnt and best practices in relation to achievement of the programme objectives and outputs
8. Assess how the Kidepo Critical Landscape Project has adapted to emerging issues and trends such as climate change, energy and other emerging issues, etc.
9. Mobilise stakeholders for consultations and provision of information regarding the evaluation.

**Required Skills and Experience of the National Consultant**

* At lease an MSc degree and at least 7 years’ experience in natural resources management, Agriculture, climate change adaptation/ mitigation, socio-economic development or related fields.
* Familiarity with Biodiversity conservation related projects in Uganda and particularly the national parks and community wildlife management areas, either through managing or evaluating donor-funded projects.
* Substantive knowledge of participatory M&E processes is essential, and experience with CBOs/community development processes; design, implementation and/or management of community and local level sustainable livelihoods initiatives and country experience in Uganda are advantages.
* A good wealth of experience in the evaluation of technical assistance projects, if possible with UNDP or other UN development agencies and major donors, is required. A demonstrated understanding of UNDP principles and expected impacts in terms of poverty reduction and sustainable development is essential.
* Familiarity and knowledge of the UN Convention to Conserve Biodiversity, and knowledge of integrated approaches to drylands development and capacity development for management of Biodiversity loss would be an asset
* Excellent English writing and communication skills. Demonstrated ability to assess complex situations in order to analyse critical issues succinctly and clearly and draw forward-looking conclusions.
* Experience in supporting small multi-disciplinary, multi-national teams to deliver quality products in high stress, short deadline situations.
* Experience of working with Local Governments and Community Based Organisations in the areas of Natural Resource Management is an advantage.

**Competencies**

* Excellent Analytical Skills;
* Positive, constructive attitude towards work;
* Ability to act professionally and flexibly to engage with government officials, donor representatives, and local communities.

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 |
| *10%* | At submission and approval of inception report |
| *40%* | Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report |
| *50%* | Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report |

Application process

All applications including CV, technical and financial proposals should be submitted by e-mail address ONLY:

(indicate the site, such as http://jobs.undp.org, etc.) by (date.

**Recommended Presentation of Proposal** : Introduction about the consultant/CV; Proposed methodology and work plan (max 1 page); Financial Proposal, including proposed fee and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc.)

**Criteria for Evaluation of Proposal:** the selection will be made based on the educational background and experience on similar assignments. The price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total score and the technical score (from CV and proposed methodology will weigh 70% of the total score).

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

***Results Framework for Kidepo Critical Landscape Project: Outcomes and Indicators***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPAP:** | Natural and Energy resources are used and managed in a manner that is sustainable and contributing to growth and poverty reduction |
| **Country Programme Outcome Indicators:** | (i) Number of institutions integrating environment, Climate Change and energy access in development plans; (Disaggregated by level i.e. National/ Local government); (ii) % of targeted Environment, natural resources management and Climate change adaptation/ mitigation pilot initiatives (innovative practices) implemented; (iii) Number of policies and strategies reviewed/ developed to draft stage. |
| **Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Programme:** | BD1: Improve Sustainability of Protected Area Systems |
| **Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes:** | Improved management effectiveness of existing and new protected areas |
| **Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators:** | Increased coverage of threatened ecosystems and threatened species  New protected areas (1) and coverage (95,600 ha) of unprotected ecosystems |
| **Project Goal:** | ***The biodiversity and ecosystem values of the Kidepo Critical Landscape, Uganda, are conserved and provide sustainable benefit flows at local, national and global levels through enhanced operational capacity and functional landscape planning approaches.*** |
|  | **Objectively Verifiable Indicators** |

| **Project Strategy** | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Target by EOP** | **Sources of verification** | **Assumptions** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Objective:** The Biodiversity of the Kidepo Critical Landscape in North Eastern Uganda is protected from existing and emerging threats | Ecological stability of entire landscapes is increased, biodiversity is less threatened, and habitats are secured; | Landscape level approaches will not be taken up to the extent that the opportunity allows; risks from climate change will impact the buffer zones but also PAs themselves, with net loss to biodiversity and to incomes | Effective Terrestrial protected area coverage increased from a baseline of Increased coverage of PA by 95,600 ha over a baseline of 240,075 ha. and designation of buffer zones to conserve dry season refugia for wildlife (227,389 hectares) | GIS and ground truthing, elephant monitoring, zebra monitoring, forest canopy cover monitoring, shea distribution and density | Collaborative approaches on a landscape level resulting in increased role of local communities in managing natural resource use and access as well as state and private sector actors. |
|  | Karenga CWA will have the necessary operational and governance capacity built by EoP to be gazetted to full NP status | The existing baseline is centred on KVNP as the core area where wildlife are able to peacefully habitat; refugia are limited and insecure, corridors, like Karenga, are under threat | Increased coverage of PA by 95,600 ha over a baseline of 240,075 ha. and strengthened integrity of buffer zones to conserve dry season refugia for wildlife (227,389 hectares) | Gazettement notice; greater numbers of wildlife - measured by indicator species such as elephant, buffalo and zebra; enhanced operational capacity in KVNP, CFAs and Karenga | The management and operational capacity process that would enable Karenga to be brought to NP status will have proven the requirement for gazettement, and support will be enabled |
|  | Poaching levels will have decreased | Enforcement in the Kidepo Critical Landscape is currently too weak to deal with armed poachers from politically unstable South Sudan, and poaching is a growing problem | Reduced poaching pressures over an area of 428,311 ha comprising seven PAs (one NP, six CFRs) and a community wildlife management area, verified by 25% greater wildlife abundance over the course of the year by EoP | Enhanced and installed security operations in KVNP and six CFA as well as defined management regime in Karenga; reduced poaching, measured by reduction in carcass incidents | Strong support will be made available within UWA, NEMA and partners to improved operational interventions in KVNP, 6 CFA and Karenga community area |
|  | METT scores are improved in the target PAs: Kidepo Valley NP, Nyangea, Morungole, Zulia, Timu, Lwala and Rom CFR. | Baseline METT scores as follows: Kidepo Valley – 65%; Nyangea- 58%; Lwala - 45%, Timu 53%, Morungole – 42%; Zulia – 53% and Rom – 40%. Average score: 52% | Management Effectiveness Score for Kidepo Critical Landscape PA cluster (KVNP), Nyangea-Napore, Morungole, Zulia, Timu, Lwala and Rom CFRs); increased over the baseline score by at least 40%. | Fauna and Flora Monitoring procedures, Biodiversity resources assessments, Ministry and landscape level Reports, and Project Docs, PA and Landscape plans, maps and GIS files, MTE and Terminal Evaluation (TE) | Government and their community, civil society and private sector partners in the Kidepo Cluster PAs are effectively supported in training and management to ensure ongoing support and engagement in the process |
| Key indicator species in the Kidepo Critical Landscape PA cluster show measurable increase in numbers | Elephant population in 2012 was 502; zebra: 75; buffalo: 3,990; these are relatively depleted numbers relative to the carrying capacity of the landscape | Key indicator species (elephants, zebra, buffalo) in the Kidepo Critical Landscape PA cluster show measurable increase in numbers of >25% by EoP | Annual Report on indicator species counts; Wildlife census reports, Project Annual and Quarterly work plans and progress reports, Data base | Census and indicator species counts will be carried out by EoP |
| Deforestation, community wildlife agreements | Cooperation between UWA and NFA is relatively limited; cooperation between different districts is minimal, especially in terms of managing wildlife and forest resources | A working model for integrating management of PAs and wider production landscapes is piloted and adopted in six districts in North Eastern Uganda (Kitgum, Kaabong, Agago, Otuke, Abim and Kotido) and secures wildlife corridors and dispersal areas covering approximately 227,389 ha - resulting in reduced deforestation of shea by 25 % | Partnership agreements and constitutions of coordination mechanisms, monitoring and evaluation of related activities; creation of secure wildlife corridors in the Kidepo landscape and documented support to establishment of the model. | All stakeholders remain interested in the concept of landscape level conservation during the lifespan of the project and support the formalisation of coordination initiatives and the promotion of wildlife corridors to enhance ecological sustainability. |
| Wildlife numbers are stable in the buffer zones | Wildlife and habitats are not sufficiently monitored nor effectively managed in buffer zones outside PAs; poaching is showing signs of an increase in dispersal areas | No net loss of natural habitat in the critical landscape and at least 40% reduction in hunting pressures in wildlife corridors and dispersal areas | Remote sensing and GIS, backed up by ground truthing and ecological monitoring work, ongoing through to EoP | The savannah habitats of the Kidepo Critical Landscape as their wildlife numbers remain well monitored and characteristics understood |
| Common management approaches to habitat conservation. | There are no management plans for PA buffer zones, as a result there lacks a coordinated response to wildlife and habitat conservation in the Kidepo Critical Landscape | PA buffer zone under approved district management plans in six districts (Kitgum, Kaabong, Agago, Otuke, Abim and Kotido) incorporating BD considerations | Management plans, district coordination policies and collective management planning processes in place | There is widespread support and capacity amongst the key stakeholders - district governments, UWA, NEMA, NFA and others in a coordinated approach to landscape management |
| Six district governments (Kitgum, Kaabong, Agago, Otuke, Abim and Kotido) are collaborating on shared management issues | No mechanism is presently in place for joint management planning for natural resource use by local governments in the critical landscape | District governments in six districts cooperate effectively to regulate and plan natural resource use over 227,389 ha of the critical landscape, resulting in a landscape level coordination mechanism that enshrines biodiversity conservation by mandate | Proof of district level commitment to habitat conservation and wildlife management | District governments are able to see the value in a coordinated approach to joint management of natural resources in the Kidepo Critical Landscape |
| **Component 1: Strengthening management effectiveness of the Kidepo Critical Landscape PA cluster** | Karenga is qualified for upgrading to higher PA status through consultative process | Karenga is managed on a meagre budget, there is almost no management nor operational capacity; the area is at high risk from poaching and the loss of the wildlife corridor | Management and integrity of the 95,600 ha Karenga community wildlife management area strengthened, leading to its potential gazettement by end of project to safeguard a crucial wildlife corridor and dispersal area | Survey report, boundary marks, physical inspection, resolutions, minutes of meetings, annual and quarterly reports, workshop reports | Political intervention does not interfere with the process of both management improvements and ultimately gazettement, and communities are willing to cooperate |
|  | Existence of a functional and operational security system in 8 PAs. | The Kidepo Cluster PAs, particularly the CFRs and Karenga lack operational capacity to manage secure PA operations in an effective manner, gaps exist in HR across park operations, lack of equipment means difficulty to manage fires, poaching and monitoring the ecosystem. | Introduction of a security and enforcement system with a platform for information sharing and intelligence gathering among parks and other institutions; with databases that will be continuously updated. Includes provision of surveillance equipment, ranger uniforms, fire management tools | Security System. Surveillance equipment – radios, repeaters, GPS, cameras, night vision and firefighting equipment purchased, trained on, logged and in use. | Business and security plans will set cost coefficients for all prescribed PA functions and rolling operations plans will define site management priorities. |
|  | A business plan for the PA clusters | Business planning in northern Uganda's Kidepo PA cluster lacks local context and full understanding of the international dimension of financial and business planning requirements; business planning is limited as a result. Financial scorecards show scores of 72% for UWA and 39.5% for NFA | A sustainable financing plan for the PA cluster providing accurate revenue forecasts (from gate fees, concessions, film rights and other permissible uses to private sector investments), is developed approved and implemented, and matches revenue to priority management needs, measured by improvement in financial scorecard results by >25% and the creation of community trusts. | PA Management plan; Business plan; Project Annual and Quarterly work plans and progress reports; NFA Data bank; Project Annual and Quarterly work plans and progress reports; Number of beneficiaries | UWA, NEMA, NFA and other government and community partners willing to support the development of an objective planning process for the sustainable financing of PAs in the Kidepo Cluster and support implementation. |
|  | Field, quarterly and annual reports; field visits; field inspection reports of pilot sites |
| Ranger and staff training programme in existence and functioning in KVNP, Karenga and 6 CFR | Rangers have insufficient capacity in KVNP, Karenga and 6 CFR to gather intelligence on poaching and fires; relations with tour operators and tourists often strained because of lack of customer care capacity; lack of value-add services. | Staff training programme in place covering all aspects of PA cluster operations ensuring 120 rangers and other field staff meet necessary competencies for planning, administration, conflict resolution, policing and enforcement). | Staff training programmes are in place across spectrum of operations in KVNP, Karenga and 6 CFR, covering necessary competencies for planning, administration, marketing, customer care, conflict resolution, policing and enforcement. | UWA, NEMA, NFA and partners are willing to take lessons learned from other countries and from NGOs, tour operators and other private sector partners on best practices for PA staff in core and new competencies. |
| **Component 2: Integrating PA Management in the Wider Landscape** | Sustainable use options (a) Shea and (b) wildlife species that are regulated for sport hunting are implemented and the data is available for operational use | No data available for sustainable use options for Shea tree harvesting and wildlife hunting: as a result there is unsustainable use of key species | Sustainable use options for Shea tree resources and wildlife established and implemented - resulting in reduction of pressure on savannah habitat in the landscape, particularly shea and elephant populations- | District resource centres, minutes of meetings, reports | National and district level stakeholders will support the process of identifying sustainable offtakes for Shea and selected wildlife |
|  | Biodiversity management is factored into decision-making governing land use management in District Development Plans | Management activities are carried out on NP, CFR district and community levels but with a lack of a landscape level coordination mechanism | Mechanisms (landscape level coordinated management plans and institutional governance systems) for enhancing sustainable management of Kidepo critical landscape promoted, with landscape management plan in place and enforced | Existence of landscape level management plans and institutional mechanisms, minutes of meetings and subsequent actions. Central and district government consent and ratification of plans | NEMA, UWA, NFA and other related government institutions support a landscape approach to biodiversity management, ratified at national and district government level. |
|  | District governments in six districts (Kitgum, Kaabong, Agago, Otuke, Abim and Kotido) have proven capacity for managing natural resources sustainably | District Governments lack the competence and staff skills to monitor and enforce laws - as a result ther is a lack of understanding of the situation vis-à-vis sustainable hunting and Shea utilisation, leading to habitat degradation. | Local Governments have the competence and staff skills to monitor and enforce laws on sustainable hunting and sustainable use of Shea tree in target districts, measured by a 40% increase in scores in capacity development scorecard | Training manual, strategic plan, number of people trained and equipped, inter-district committee in existence, enforcement guidelines and by-laws, regulation, ordinances in place | NEMA is able to effectively support District Governments in the process of capacity building and developing functioning systems to sustainably utilise key natural resources |
| National export strategy for shea products in place; 25% increase in sales; an operational market information centre for shea products; Certified products in marketplace | The Shea nut / butter market is currently not yielding sufficient returns to producers to justify the conservation of Shea: average yields are 122.5 kg/household/year and average prices for oil 2,500/+ UGX per litre | Measures to improve market access for Shea products in place, and employment and income generation among rural women in the pilot area increased through access to markets, leading to a 30% rise in the value of shea products and a 25% increase in sales from start of project | Record from UNBS and Uganda Export Promotion Board; Copies of Shea products export strategy; Sales values of Shea products at household level | There is widespread support amongst key stakeholders-especially the private sector-in bringing value and structure to the latent Shea nut / butter market |
| Existence of inter-district coordination body in place and functioning, with an M & E Plan | Presently there is no District coordination mechanism in place, leading to a lack of coordination over the management of crucial savannah woodland habitats, Shea trees and wildlife | A District coordination mechanism in place in the project target area (six districts) to ensure that biodiversity management in National Parks, CFA and wildlife migration corridors and dispersal areas is factored into integrated decision-making governing land use management | Records at the coordination offices and districts, UWA and NEMA records, M& E reports | Strong support will be sought and maintained until at least EoP for a coordinated approach to biodiversity management in the Kidepo Critical Landscape |
| Management plan, including zonation plan and regulations in place | Management plans and regulations critical for wildlife dispersal are presently non-existent in the wider landscape | Management plans and regulations on BD-friendly management in blocks identified as critical for wildlife dispersal developed and applied by local governments-resulting in security of buffer zones and wildlife corridors | Project records and District Government documentation, management plans | District governments and related stakeholders support and ratify the management planning processes effectively |
| Ordinances and by-laws and being enforced by EoP- | District ordinances and community by-laws are non-existent for Shea tree harvesting and wildlife hunting | District ordinances and community by-laws on the harvest of Shea trees and wildlife hunting reinstated or developed - resulting in 25% reduction in Shea tree deforestation and a 50% drop in the use of Shea for charcoal | Records at the coordination offices and districts, UWA and NEMA records, M& E reports | Districts have the capacity and the will to support the process |

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

* Kidepo Critical Landscape Conservation Project Document (contribution Agreement)
* Theory of change and result framework
* GEF Focal Area Tracking Tool
* Programme and project quality assurance reports
* Quarterly and Annual Project performance Reports
* Project Implementation Review (PIR) Reports
* Annual work plans, Project budgets and files
* Highlights of project board meetings
* UN Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness;
* UNCBD Global Strategic Plan;
* GEF Biodiversity Conservation Focal Area Objectives (for GEF 5);
* Project Monitoring & Evaluation Framework
* UNDP GEF [Evaluation Report Format](http://www.undp.org/eo/documents/erc/Evaluation_Report.doc)
* [UNDP Quality Criteria for Evaluation Report](http://www.undp.org/eo/documents/erc/Evaluation_Report.doc)
* [Ethical Code of Conduct for Evaluation in UNDP](http://www.undp.org/eo/documents/erc/Code_of_Conduct.doc)

Annex C: Evaluation Questions

The TE will assess the overall relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of the Kidepo programme and will be guided by the following key questions (but not limited to these) relating to the above highlighted issues:

**Relevance:**

* How does the project relate to the main objectives of the UNCBD, to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?
* Is the project likely to deliver the global environment benefits expected by the GEF CBD Focal Area objectives and are the indicators selected by the project relevant to measure the expected global environment benefits?
* To what extent is it contributing to dry lands development and to UNDP's CPAP and Uganda’s overall development goals?
* How have project activities changed in response to new environment conditions, particularly the changing political agendas for land use and ownership? Have the changes been appropriate in line project objectives?
* Is the project still relevant to the problems it was intended to address?

**2. Efficiency:**

* Assess the project implementation efficiency in line with international and national norms and standards?
* Assess the impact of the location of the PMU on the timely implementation of project activities and delivery; how has this affected efficiency of conversion of resources (money, time) to project results?
* Assess the impact of implementation arrangement through the government structures on the efficiency of delivery of project results; how has this arrangement affected the efficiency of converting project resources (money, time) into project results, in the context Paris Aid Effectiveness concept?
* How does this project compare with similar projects on efficiency of converting resources to results? Are there standards for such a comparison?
* To what extent is the programme delivered in a timely and cost-effective manner (use the above sub-questions to answer this question)?

**3. Effectiveness:**

* To what extent have the expected outcomes/results and objectives of the project been achieved?
* To what extent is M&E being used to monitor and guide project implementation? Is it effective? How can it be improved?
* What progress has been made towards achieving project national and lower level results? What has affected achievement of the results?

**4. Impact:**

* Assess the indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status in the project area.
* To what extent is the programme contributing to longer term outcomes in the country? How relevant, appropriate and strategic are the project results to national goals and the UNDP mandate?
* Quantify the changes in the baseline values for the indicators of global environment benefits and assess the likelihood of the project reaching the current targets;
* Quantify the changes in the indicators of strengthening Biodiversity conservation and protected area management and assess the likelihood of the project achieving the targets under the current implementation arrangement;
* What are the unexpected positive and negative results that the project has registered to date?

**5. Sustainability:**

* What project initiatives can realistically be expected to be sustained?
* Can those initiatives/outcomes be sustained beyond this funding given the current project set up?
* To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?
* Is there an enabling environment that supports ongoing positive impacts?
* What project sustainability measures exist and what factors are likely to negatively affect project sustainability? Which key factors require attention in order to improve prospects for sustainability of project results?
* How appropriate is the project knowledge transfer strategy? What lessons have been learnt from project implementation?
* What should be the main elements of the project exit strategy in order to sustain the key initiatives/outcomes identified under bullet 1?

**6. Role of UNDP**

* To what extent has UNDP fulfilled its roles during implementation of the project?
* To what extent has the project developed human and institutional capacity?

| **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[[3]](#footnote-3)**

**Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System**

**Name of Consultant:** \_\_     \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Name of Consultancy Organization** (where relevant)**:** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.**

Signed at *place* on *date*

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Annex F: Evaluation Report Outline[[4]](#footnote-4)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **i.** | Opening page:   * Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project * UNDP and GEF project ID#s. * Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report * Region and countries included in the project * GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program * Implementing Partner and other project partners * Evaluation team members * Acknowledgements |
| **ii.** | Executive Summary   * Project Summary Table * Project Description (brief) * Evaluation Rating Table * Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons |
| **iii.** | Acronyms and Abbreviations  (See: UNDP Editorial Manual[[5]](#footnote-5)) |
| **1.** | Introduction   * Purpose of the evaluation * Scope & Methodology * Structure of the evaluation report |
| **2.** | Project description and development context   * Project start and duration * Problems that the project sought to address * Immediate and development objectives of the project * Baseline Indicators established * Main stakeholders * Expected Results |
| **3.** | Findings  (In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) must be rated[[6]](#footnote-6)) |
| **3.1** | Project Design / Formulation   * Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators) * Assumptions and Risks * Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design * Planned stakeholder participation * Replication approach * UNDP comparative advantage * Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector * Management arrangements |
| **3.2** | Project Implementation   * Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation) * Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region) * Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management * Project Finance: * Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (\*) * UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (\*) coordination, and operational issues |
| **3.3** | Project Results   * Overall results (attainment of objectives) (\*) * Relevance(\*) * Effectiveness & Efficiency (\*) * Country ownership * Mainstreaming * Sustainability (\*) * Impact |
| **4.** | Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons   * Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project * Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project * Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives * Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success |
| **5.** | Annexes   * ToR * Itinerary * List of persons interviewed * Summary of field visits * List of documents reviewed * Evaluation Question Matrix * Questionnaire used and summary of results * Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form |

Annex G: Evaluation Report Clearance Form

*(to be completed by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and included in the final document)*

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

UNDP GEF RTA

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

ANNEX H: TE Report Audit Trial

The following is a template for the evaluator to show how he/she received comments on the draft TE report have (or have not) been incorporated into the final TE report.

ANNEX I: FIELD VISIT SITES

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Institution Site | Location | Contact Official | Phone Number | Email Address |
|  | UNDP Country Office | Kampala |  |  |  |
|  | Ministry of Finance Planning and Economic Development (GEF Operational Focal Point) | Kampala |  |  |  |
|  | National Environment Management Authority | Kampala |  |  |  |
|  | Uganda Wildlife Authority | Kampala |  |  |  |
|  |  | Kidepo Valley National Park |  |  |  |
|  | National Forestry Authority | Kampala |  |  |  |
|  |  | Gulu – Aswa Range |  |  |  |
|  | Uganda Export Promotion Board |  |  |  |  |
|  | Abim District | District Local Government HQ |  |  |  |
|  |  | 2 Selected Sub counties |  |  |  |
|  | Agago District | DLG HQ |  |  |  |
|  |  | 2 Selected Sub Counties |  |  |  |
|  | Kaabong District Local Government | DLG HQ |  |  |  |
|  |  | 2 Selected Sub Counties |  |  |  |
|  | Kitgum District Local Government | DLG HQ |  |  |  |
|  |  | 2 Selected Sub Counties |  |  |  |
|  | Kotido District Local Government | DLG HQ |  |  |  |
|  |  | 2 Selected Sub Counties |  |  |  |
|  | Otuke District Local Government | DLG HQ |  |  |  |
|  |  | 2 Selected Sub Counties |  |  |  |
|  | At least 50% of Community Based Organization beneficiaries |  |  |  |  |
|  | At least 25% of Private Sector Involved in Project implementation |  |  |  |  |

ANNEX J: LIST OF STAKEHOLDERS TO BE CONSULTED

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Name/Title** | **Designation** | **Institution** | **Telephone** | **Email** |
|  | **Project Board Members** |  |  |  |  |
| 1. | Dr. Tom .O. Okurut | Chairman | National Environment Management Authority |  | [tokurut@nemaug.org](mailto:tokurut@nemaug.org) |
| 2. | Mr. Sam Mwandha | Co-Chair | Uganda Wildlife Authority |  |  |
| 3. | Mr. Tom Okello Ebong | Member | National Forestry Authority |  |  |
| 4. | Mr. Edgar Mugisha | Member | National Forestry Resources Research Institute |  |  |
| 5. | Mr. Paul Mafabi | Member | Ministry of Water and Environment |  |  |
| 6. | Ms. Maris Wanyera | Member | Ministry of Finance Planning and Economic Development |  |  |
| 7. | Mr. Wilson Kwamya | Member | United Nations Development Programme |  | [wilson.kwamya@undp.org](mailto:wilson.kwamya@undp.org) |
| 8. | Mr. Sam Karuhanga | Member | Uganda Export Promotion Board |  |  |
| 9. | Ms. Lomonyang Margaret | Member | Representative of Local Community CBOs (based in Moroto) |  |  |
| 10 | Ms. Dennis Mugagga | Member | Ministry of Finance Planning and Economic Development |  | [Denis.Mugagga@finance.go.ug](mailto:Denis.Mugagga@finance.go.ug) |
|  | **National Steering Committee Members** |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | Professor Joseph Obua, | Chairperson | Makerere University School of Forestry |  | [jobua09@gmail.com](mailto:jobua09@gmail.com) |
| 12 | Dr. Gerald Eilu | Member | Makerere University School of Forestry |  | [gerald.eilu@gmail.com](mailto:gerald.eilu@gmail.com) |
| 13 | Mr. Francis Ogwal | Project Coordinator | National Environment Management Authority |  | sabinofrancis@gmail.com |
| 14 | Mr. Aggrey Rwetsiba | Project Coordinator | Uganda Wildlife Authority |  | [aggrey.rwetsiba@ugandawildlife.org](mailto:aggrey.rwetsiba@ugandawildlife.org) |
| 15 | Mr. Obed Tugumisirize | Member | National Forestry Authority National Tree Nursery Namanve |  | [obetug@yahoo.com](mailto:obetug@yahoo.com) |
| 16 | Dr. Mary Namaganda, | Member | Makerere University Herbarium |  | [mnamaganda@yahoo.com](mailto:mnamaganda@yahoo.com) |
| 17 | Mr. Innocent Akampurira, | Member | Uganda National Council of Science and Technology, Ntinda |  | [iakampurira@yahoo.com](mailto:iakampurira@yahoo.com) |
| 18 | Mr. Fred Onyai | Member | National Environment Management Authority |  | [fonyai@nemaug.org](mailto:fonyai@nemaug.org) |
| 19 | Mr. Aventino Bakunda, | Member | Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries, Fisheries Department - Entebbe |  | [aventino\_b@yahoo.com](mailto:aventino_b@yahoo.com) |
| 20 | Dr. William Olupot, | Member | Nature Livelihoods Uganda, Bung Kampala |  |  |
| 21 | Mr. Daniel Omodo McMondo | Programme Analyst | United Nations Development Programme |  | [daniel.omodo@undp.org](mailto:daniel.omodo@undp.org) |
|  | **Project Management Unit** |  |  |  |  |
| 22 | Mr. Okiria-Ateker James | Project Manager | National Environment Management Authority |  | [jateker@nemaug.org](mailto:jateker@nemaug.org) |
| 23 | Ms. Agnes Atwongo | Project Field Officer | National Environment Management Authority |  | [ddatwongo@gmail.com](mailto:ddatwongo@gmail.com) |
| 24 | Mr. Emmanuel Mbirontono | Project Administration and Finance Assistant | National Environment Management Authority |  | [emmanuel.mbirontono@yahoo.com](mailto:emmanuel.mbirontono@yahoo.com) |
|  | **Other NEMA and UWA Staff** |  |  |  |  |
| 25 | Mr. Allan Kasaaga | Ag. Director Finance | National Environment Management Authority |  |  |
| 26 | Mr. Fred Onyai | Manager Internal Monitoring and Evaluation | National Environment Management Authority |  |  |
| 27 | Ms. Agnes Nekesa | Sector Manager Kitgum | National Forestry Authority |  |  |
| 28 | Mr. Okot Paul | Range Manager Karamoja | National Forestry Authority |  |  |
|  | **Other UNDP Staff** |  |  |  |  |
| 29 | Mr. Polly Mugisha Akankwatsa | M&E Specialist/ Team Leader Management Support Unit | United Nations Development Programme |  |  |
| 30 | Ms. Harriet Karusigarira | Programme and Finance Analyst | United Nations Development Programme |  |  |
| 31 |  | Team Leader / International Consultant Kidepo Project TE | United Nations Development Programme |  |  |
| 32 |  | National Consultant Kidepo Project TE | United Nations Development Programme |  |  |
|  | **District Officials** |  |  |  |  |
| 33 |  | Chief Administrative Officer | Kaabong District Local Government |  |  |
| 34 |  | District Natural Resources Officer | Kaabong District Local Government |  |  |
| 35 |  | Chief Administrative Officer | Kotido District Local Government |  |  |
| 36 | Oming | District Natural Resources Officer | Kotido District Local Government |  |  |
| 37 |  | Chief Administrative Officer | Abim District Local Government |  |  |
| 38 |  | District Natural Resources Officer | Abim District Local Government |  |  |
| 39 |  | Chief Administrative Officer | Otuke District Local Government |  |  |
| 40 | Boniface Ebong | District Natural Resources Officer | Otuke District Local Government |  |  |
| 41 |  | Chief Administrative Officer | Agago District Local Government |  |  |
| 42 | David Olal | District Natural Resources Officer | Agago District Local Government |  |  |
| 43 |  | Chief Administrative Officer | Kitgum District Local Government |  |  |
| 44 |  | District Natural Resources Officer | Kitgum District Local Government |  |  |
|  | **Community Based Organisations** |  |  |  |  |
| 45 |  | Chairperson | Fountain of Life Uganda |  |  |
| 46 |  | Chairperson | Karenga Drama Group Association |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

1. For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](http://www.undp.org/evaluation/handbook), Chapter 7, pg. 163 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office:  [ROTI Handbook 2009](http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/M2_ROtI%20Handbook.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)