

TERMINAL EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the Sustainable Management of Namibia's Forested Lands (NAFOLA) PIMS: 4626.

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

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

| | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| Project Title: | Sustainable Management of Namibia's Forested Lands (NAFOLA) | | | |
| GEF Project ID: | 4832 PIMS ID 4626 | | <i>at endorsement</i> <i>(Million US\$)</i> | <i>at completion</i> <i>(Million US\$)</i> |
| UNDP Project ID: | 00091179 00091179 | GEF financing: | 4,446,000.00 | 4,446,000.00 |
| Country: | Namibia | IA/EA own: | 500,000.00 | 500,000.00 |
| Region: | Southern Africa | Government: | 17,500,000.00 | 21,000,000.00 |
| Focal Area: | Land degradation | Other: | 4,500,000.00 | 4,500,000.00 |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): | To reduce pressure on forest resources by facilitating the gazettement of Community Forests, and increasing the capacity for the uptake of improved agriculture, livestock and forestry management practices in the community forest areas | Total co-financing: | 22,500,000.00 | 26,000,000 |
| Executing Agency: | Directorate of Forestry under the Ministry of Agriculture, Water & Forest | Total Project Cost: | 26,946,000 | 30,446,000 |
| Other Partners involved: | Directorate of Research Development, Directorate of Agricultural Production, Engineering, Extension Services | ProDoc Signature (date project began): | | August 2014 |
| | | (Operational) Closing Date: | Proposed: 31 December 2019 | Actual: 31 December 2019 |

OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The project was designed to reduce pressure on forest resources from competing land uses. Its objective is to reduce pressure on forest resources by facilitating the gazettement of CFs and increasing the capacity

for the uptake of improved agriculture, livestock and forestry management practices in the community forest areas. The project objective will be achieved through two outcomes (components) that have several outputs. Outcome 1. aims to create knowledge, which would support land use planning, and policy change. This will result in gazetting of 11 community forests and mainstreaming of forest issues into productive policies. Outcome 2. Aims to demonstrate sustainable land use and forest management practices in selected community forests.

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects.

The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

An overall approach and method¹ for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects have 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 (**in Annex C**). The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct field missions to all project sites where substantive investment has been made to date. These include but not limited to: Omusati Region, Oshana Region, Ohangwena Region, Oshikoto Region, Kunene Region, Otjozondjupa Region, Omaheke Region and surround areas/neighbours.

Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

- Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry
 - Directorate of Forestry
 - Directorate of Research Development
 - Directorate of Agricultural Production, Extension and Engineering Services
- Local level stakeholders (e.g. Forest Management Bodies)
- Civil Society (Namibia Development Trust, NACSO, IRDNC)
- Ministry of Environment and Tourism
- GIZ – Debushing Programme
- UNDP staff

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

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](#) 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 ([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](#).

| 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 | | | | | | | | |
| 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. In addition, the evaluation will be included in the country office evaluation plan.

IMPACT

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.²

CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions, recommendations** and **lessons**. Conclusions should build on findings and be based in evidence. Recommendations should be prioritized, specific, relevant and targeted, with suggested implementers of the recommendations. Lessons should have wider applicability to other initiatives across the region, the area of intervention, and for the future.

IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Namibia. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the evaluation will be 30 days according to the following plan:

| Activity | Timing | Completion Date |
|-------------------------|---------|----------------------------------------------------|
| Preparation | 3 days | 21/10/19 (<i>Submission of Inception report</i>) |
| Evaluation Mission | 15 days | 28/10/19 – 15/11/19 |
| Draft Evaluation Report | 7 days | 27/11/19 |
| Final Report | 5 days | 05/12/19 |

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](#)

EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

| Deliverable | Content | Timing | Responsibilities |
|---------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|
| Inception Report | Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method | No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission. | Evaluator submits to UNDP CO |
| Presentation | Initial Findings | End of evaluation mission | To project management, UNDP CO |
| Draft Final Report | Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes | Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission | Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs |
| Final Report* | Revised report | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft | Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC. |

*When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluator is required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report.

TEAM COMPOSITION

The evaluation will be carried out by 1 independent international consultant. The consultant shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The evaluator selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities. The consultant must present the following qualifications/ credentials: The overall assessment rating is out of 100.

- At least a Master's degree in environmental management, development studies, evaluation theory or a related field (10 points);
- Minimum of five (5) years of relevant professional experience (e.g. conducting project/ programme evaluations) in the environment/ development sector (12 points);
- Knowledge of doing evaluations for the UNDP and GEF is an advantage (8 points);
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies (15 points);
- Competencies in management, applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios, including adaptive management are essential (15 points);
- Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s) (5 points);
- Demonstrable analytical skills (5 points);
- Excellent English communication skills (5 points).
- Possessing excellent interpersonal skills and the ability to engage and motivate a wide range of stakeholders (10 points); and
- Experience working in the sub-Saharan African Region (15 points).

EVALUATOR ETHICS

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex E) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the [UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'](#)

PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

| % | Milestone |
|-----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 10% | Upon the approval of the 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

Applicants are requested to apply online (<http://jobs.undp.org>) by (10 October 2019). Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions. The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in English with indication of the e-mail and phone contact. Shortlisted candidates will be requested to submit a price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs).

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

ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

| Objective/Outcome | Indicator | Baseline | End of Project target | Source of Information | Risks and assumptions |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Objective – To reduce pressure on forest resources by facilitating the policy and capacity enabling environment for the uptake of improved practices within agriculture, livestock and forestry management in the community forest areas. | Increased area of gazetted community forests within the CF hotspots in northern Namibia with legal management structures. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3 out of 13 CFs gazetted. Some identified/established communal forests but without any systematic management regime or formalised authority. | 10 CFs successfully gazetted and under a systematic and integrated land-use management framework. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government registration/formalisation documents Independent mid-term and final evaluations Project reports Government Gazettes | <p><u>Risk:</u> - Incomplete submissions in the preparatory milestone for gazettement</p> <p>- Reducing pressure on the forest resources will depend on: i) successful intensification of crop yields to prevent further agriculture expansion into forest lands; ii) successful reduction of overstocking and overgrazing; and iii) bush and fire control.</p> <p><u>Assumption:</u> - Continued interest and support of government and staff in the implementation of policies and programs to mainstream forestry issues, land degradation and economic</p> |
| | Increase in area under effective land use management with vegetative cover maintained or increased as measured by % area being managed under approved land use plans; % change in woody cover for degraded areas, reduction in plant density in bush encroached areas and increase in desirable grass species | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only 162,815ha out of 2,840,153 ha (5.7%) being managed in line with approved land use plans; X hectares Woody cover average 30%; Bush densities range from 2,500-8,000/ha, | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2,840,153ha under approved land use plans; 500,000ha with woody cover in process of regeneration at an average >50%; Reduction in bush densities by at least 20% and reduction in area covered by bush | CF reports, project reports, DoF reports, agricultural and livestock production surveys and reports MAWF reports | |

| Objective/Outcome | Indicator | Baseline | End of Project target | Source of Information | Risks and assumptions |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | in overgrazed areas | decreaser grasses dominate over 100,000ha of rangelands (all 3 will be fine-tuned for each community forest as part of participatory monitoring) | by at least 10%. Desirable perennial grasses dominant in at least 50% of degraded rangelands | | development in national planning. |
| Component 1 : Knowledge based land use planning and policy change hasten gazettement of eleven community forests (CFs) and mainstreaming of forest resources in productive policies | Outputs Output 1.1 Eleven communities assisted to legalise their CFs: Output 1.2 Three CFs supported to formulate & implement integrated forest resources management plans: Output 1.3 Strengthening Organisational Capacity for effective Community Forest Management Output 1.4 Policies harmonised, support local governance and reflect value of forests in national development programs | | | | |
| | Increase in compliance with land use plans as measured by % of area complying with approved uses | Only 5.7% of area under land use plans and compliance with land use plans currently <40 % | By year 5, 10 comprehensive land use plans developed and by end of project compliance in all > 60% | CF reports, project reports, DoF reports, Agricultural and Livestock production surveys and reports MAWF reports | Risks: -Slow process of policy and legislation enactment may cause delays in mainstreaming of forest and woodlands consideration into productive sector |
| | Forest sector issues reflected in regional land use plans and regional programs of sectors such as agriculture, water, local development, environment and tourism. | No regional and national level production sector frameworks incorporating forestry issues | At least 2 (Agriculture and energy sectors incorporate forestry considerations) | Sectoral Framework Reports Management plans, MAWF reports, and Government Policy Reports | - Complexity in sectoral coordination due to differing interests |

| Objective/Outcome | Indicator | Baseline | End of Project target | Source of Information | Risks and assumptions |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | Number of national, local and regional dialogue forums actively supporting implementation of policy recommendations of the CPP in local SFM and SLM processes. | 1 (Ministerial Forum) | At least 2 (One at Local and one at National level) | MAWF reports; Government registration/formalisation documents | and wide range of stakeholders. Assumptions: - Landscape based, integrated land use management will gradually become a national priority for the prevention of land degradation. |
| | Change in capacity score cards of technical staff of ministries, CF management committees/ Boards and community members | Technical institutions scored an average of 64.9; CF institutions an average of 30.9 ³ ; community members capacity assessment during inception | Capacity score card increases to average of 80% for technical institutions, >50% for CF institutions and community members | CF reports, project reports, DoF reports, Agricultural and Livestock production surveys and reports MAWF reports | |
| Component 2: Implementation of SFM technologies in selected CF hotspots | <u>Outputs:</u> Output 2.1 Conservation agriculture piloted Output 2.2 Improved livestock practices piloted in Omaheke, Oshikoto and Otjozondjupa hotspots Output 2.3 Improved marketing of sustainably harvested forest and livestock products piloted Output 2.4 Fire management strategy is piloted in Omaheke, Oshikoto, Kunene and Otjozondjupa hotspots Output 2.5 Bush control program is piloted in Omundaungilo, Okongo, Ongandjera, Otjituuu and Otjku-Tjithilonde and provides financial incentives for controlled bush clearance Output 2.6 Energy saving and alternative energy program implemented Output 2.7 System for monitoring of forest and range condition and land productivity is in place | | | | |
| | Increase in agricultural productivity of main crops (pearl millet and sorghum) in Kavango, Omusati, | Current production of 200-600kg/ha | Production increase to 400-800kg/ha | Agricultural production surveys and reports MAWF reports Farmer Surveys | <u>Risks:</u> - Effects of climate change and capacity erosion through HIV/AIDS |

³ In table 13 of Prodoc

| Objective/Outcome | Indicator | Baseline | End of Project target | Source of Information | Risks and assumptions |
|-------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | Otjozondjupa, Kunene, Ohangwena and Omaheke regions covering 300,000ha | | | | and other illnesses may derail the project effort, by reducing the effectiveness of the measures introduced by the project |
| | Increased health, quality and type of livestock kept in Omaheke, Oshikoto and Otjozondjupa regions covering 150,000ha | 70% of cattle at Grade C, 60% with fatness grade 0 and 1 and 70% oxen. | At least 20% of cattle upgrade to Grade B, fatness Grade 2 or 3 and decrease in oxen and increase in number of heifers. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> MAWF reports MeatCo reports Farmer Surveys | - Threat of continued degradation of the Community forests accompanied by fencing, deforestation, overgrazing, extension of agriculture and unplanned human development. |
| | Increased off-take of livestock in Omaheke, Oshikoto and Otjozondjupa | Current livestock off-take at 5-8%. | Off-take increased to 20%. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> MAWF reports Livestock production and marketing reports Farmer Surveys | - Climate change affects ecosystem resilience. |
| | Increased utilisation of fire management practices reduces total areas burned and severity of fires in Omaheke, Oshikoto, Kunene and Otjozondjupa regions (200,000ha) | 15,405.3ha burned with 4 CFs suffering severe fires. | Reduction in area burned by at least 30% and at least 2CFs reduced to mild fire severity. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fire Management Reports Community forest reports MAWF reports Satellite imagery data | - |
| | Reduction in bush encroachment in Omundaungilo, Okongo, Ongandjera, Otjituu and Otjiku-Tjithilonde | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bush densities range from 2,500-8,000/ha. Baseline surveys to determine | Reduction in bush densities by at least 20% and reduction in area covered by bush by at least 10%. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> MAWF reports Satellite imagery data Approved management guidelines | Participation by women in the project is limited by lack of awareness and cultural norms Assumptions: - Local communities welcome the |

| Objective/Outcome | Indicator | Baseline | End of Project target | Source of Information | Risks and assumptions |
|-------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | | area covered by bush conducted at Inception. | | | improved technologies and there is sufficient uptake of the |
| | Increase in utilisation of alternative energy sources and reduction in CF wood consumption for energy in the households in the CFs | Current number of households: wood fuel (89.2%), electricity (7%), Gas (1.3%), Animal dung (0.8%), Paraffin (0.4%), Solar (0.3%) | Reduction in use of wood fuel by at least 20% and increase in use of alternative energy sources by 10% | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community forest reports MAWF reports Satellite imagery data Approved energy development guidelines | technologies resulting in reduced pressure on forest resources. - Increased awareness and capacity will lead to a change in behaviour with respect to the |
| | Increase in financial returns from sustainable economic exploitation of forest resources in all hotspots, in line with land use plans | Data is incomplete but PPG assessment reported an annual total of N\$ 487,500 (average of N\$ 37,500 for 13 CFs) | Increased ability to capture data on incomes per CF; at least 25% increase in total incomes earned. | Community Forest reports, project and DoF/ MAWF reports | incorporation of SLM and SFM technologies and community participation in natural resource management and sustainable economic development. |

ANNEX B: LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE EVALUATORS

1. PIF
2. UNDP Initiation Plan
3. UNDP Project Document
4. UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results
5. Project Inception Report
6. All Project Implementation Reports (PIR's)
7. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
8. Audit reports
9. Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools at CEO endorsement and midterm (GEF PMAT Assessment)
10. Capacity Scorecard Assessment for Community Forest and Technical Institutions (DoF) for 2019
11. Oversight mission reports
12. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
13. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team

The following documents will also be available:

14. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
15. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
16. Minutes of the NAFOLA Project Steering Committee Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
17. Project site location maps

ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

This Evaluation Criteria Matrix must be fully completed/amended by the consultant and included in the TE inception report and as an Annex to the TE report.

| 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? | | | |
| a. How does the project support the GEF focal area and strategic priorities? | • | • | • |
| b. How does the project support sustainable land management and sustainable development objectives of the Government of the Republic of Namibia? | • | • | • |
| c. What was the level of stakeholder participation and ownership in project design and implementation? | • | • | • |
| d. How does the project support the needs of relevant stakeholders, and has the implementation of the project been inclusive of all relevant stakeholders? | • | • | • |
| e. Were local beneficiaries and stakeholders adequately involved in project design and implementation? | • | • | • |
| f. Are there logical linkages between expected results of the project (log frame) and the project design (in terms of project components, choice of partners, structure, delivery mechanism, scope, budget, use of resources etc.)? | • | • | • |
| g. Was the length of the project sufficient to achieve project outcomes? | • | • | • |
| h. Are the GEF funded activities and objectives supported by other donors? How do GEF-funds help to fill gaps (or give additional stimulus) that are necessary but are not covered by other donors? | • | • | • |
| i. Is there coordination and complementarity between donors? | • | • | • |

Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?

| | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|---|
| a. Has the project been effective in achieving its expected outcomes? ➤ Outcome 1: Knowledge based land use planning and policy change hasten gazettement of eleven community forests (CFs) and mainstreaming of forest resources in productive policies ➤ Outcome 2: Implementation of SFM technologies in selected CF hotspots | • | • | • |
| b. What lessons have been learned from the project regarding achievement of outcomes? | | • | • |
| c. What changes could have been made (if any) to the design of the project in order to improve the achievement of the project's expected results? | | • | • |

Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?

| | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|---|
| a. Were the project logical framework and work plans (and any changes made to them) used as management tools during implementation? | • | • | • |
| b. Were the accounting and financial systems in place adequate for project management and producing accurate and timely financial information? | • | • | • |
| c. Were progress reports produced accurately, timely and did they respond to the reporting requirements? | • | • | • |
| d. Was project implementation as cost effective as originally proposed (planned vs. actual)? | • | • | • |
| e. Did the leveraging of funds (co-financing) happen as planned? Were financial resources utilized efficiently? Could financial resources have been used more efficiently? | • | • | • |
| f. Was procurement carried out in a manner making efficient use of project resources? | • | • | • |
| g. To what extent were partnerships/linkages between institutions/organizations encouraged and supported? | • | • | • |

| | | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|---|
| h. What was the level of efficiency of cooperation and collaboration arrangements? | • | • | • |
| i. Was an appropriate balance struck between utilization of international expertise as well as local capacity? | • | • | • |
| j. Did the project take into account local capacity in design and implementation of the project? | • | • | • |
| Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? | | | |
| a. How well are the risks, assumptions and impact drivers for financial, institutional, social and economic being managed? | • | • | • |
| b. What was the quality of the risk mitigation strategies developed? Were they sufficient? | • | • | • |
| c. Are there clear strategies for risk mitigation related with the long-term sustainability of the project? | • | • | • |
| d. Has the experience of the project provided relevant lessons for other future projects targeted at similar objectives? | • | • | • |
| e. What lessons can be learnt from the project regarding forested lands? | • | • | • |
| f. How could the project have more efficiently carried out implementation (in terms of management structures and procedures, partnerships arrangements etc)? | • | • | • |
| g. What changes could have been made (if any) to the project in order to improve its efficiency? | • | • | • |
| Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved sustainable land management? | | | |
| a. Does the project adequately take into account the national realities, both in terms of institutional and policy framework towards reduces environmental stress and improved sustainable management of forested lands in Namibia in its design and its implementation? | • | • | • |
| b. Are there any indicators that the project have contributed towards improved agricultural practices? | • | • | • |

c. Are there any indicators that the project has contributed towards livestock management practices?

•

•

•

ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

| | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution</i> 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 | <i>Sustainability ratings:</i> 4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks | <i>Relevance ratings</i> 2. Relevant (R) 1. Not relevant (NR) <i>Impact Ratings:</i> 3. Significant (S) 2. Minimal (M) 1. Negligible (N) |
| <i>Additional ratings where relevant:</i> 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 Form⁴

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: _____

⁴www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE⁵

- 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 Manual⁶)
- 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 rated⁷)
- 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

⁵The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

⁶ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

⁷ Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations.

- Project Finance:
 - Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (*)
 - UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (*) coordination, and operational issues
- 3.3** Project Results
- Overall results (attainment of objectives) (*)
 - Relevance(*)
 - Effectiveness & Efficiency (*)
 - Country ownership
 - Mainstreaming
 - Sustainability (*)
 - Impact
- 4.** Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons
- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
 - Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
 - Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
 - Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success
- 5.** Annexes
- ToR
 - Itinerary
 - List of persons interviewed
 - Summary of field visits
 - List of documents reviewed
 - Evaluation Question Matrix
 - Questionnaire used and summary of results
 - Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

ANNEX G: EVALUATION REPORT CLEARANCE FORM

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

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

UNDP GEF RTA

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

ANNEX H: TE REPORT AUDIT TRAIL TEMPLATE

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

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

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

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