

## 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 *Implementation of Sustainable Land Management (SLM) Practices to Address Land Degradation and Mitigate Effects of Drought* (otherwise known as the SLM Project) (PIMS #5365).

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

## PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

<b>Table 1. Project Summary Table</b>				
<b>Project Title: Implementation of Sustainable Land Management (SLM) Practices to Address Land Degradation and Mitigate Effects of Drought (otherwise known as the SLM Project) (PIMS #5365)</b>				
<b>GEF Project ID (PIMS #)</b>	5365		<b>At Endorsement (US \$ M)</b>	<b>By end June 2019 (US \$ M)</b>
<b>UNDP Project ID:</b>	00095966	<b>GEF Financing:</b>	870,900.00	
<b>Country:</b>	Philippines	<b>UNDP</b>	500,000.00	
<b>Region:</b>	Asia	<b>Government:</b>	3,733,815.00	
<b>Focal Area:</b>	Sustainable Land Management	<b>Other (NGOs, LGUs, communities)</b>	1,569,337.00	
<b>Operational Program:</b>	GEF-5 Strategic Program	<b>Total Co-financing:</b>	5,803,152.00	
<b>Executing Agency:</b>	DA-BSWM	<b>Total Project Cost:</b>	6,674,052.00	
<b>Other Partners Involved:</b>	DENR, DAR, DILG, HLURB, LGUs of the Provinces of Bukidnon and Leyte through their Provincial Agriculture Offices	<b>ProDoc Signature:</b> July 2015		<b>Proposed (Approved):</b>
		<b>Date Project began:</b> July 2015		
		<b>(Operational) Closing Date:</b> June 30, 2019		

	and City of Malaybalay, Bukidnon and Municipality of Abuyog, Leyte, through the City and Municipal Agriculture Offices, and respective Farmers' Associations in Malaybalay, and Abuyog			
--	--	--	--	--

---

## OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The project was designed to strengthen the SLM frameworks to address land degradation process and mitigate the effects of drought in the Philippines through the following outcomes: Outcome 1: effective national enabling environment to promote integrated landscape management; and Outcome 2: long-term capacities and incentives in place for local communities and LGUs to uptake of SLM practices in two targeted municipality in the Philippines.

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

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

## EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

An overall approach and method<sup>1</sup> for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluation should include a mixed methodology of document review, interviews, and observations from project site visits, at minimum, and the evaluators should make an effort to triangulate information. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact**, as defined and

---

<sup>1</sup> For additional information on methods, see the [UNDP Evaluation Guidelines](#), Section 4, Annex 2, pg. 45

explained in [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 ([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, DA Bureau of Soils and Water Management Office, SLM Project Team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser and key stakeholders.

The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to select project sites in the aforementioned two priority sites of the Programme. The complete list of these projects, their corresponding project sites, grantees and their contact details is included in [Annex B](#). Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

- Members of the Project Board
- Officials of the DENR Foreign-Assisted and Special Projects Service (DENR-FASPS)
- Officials of the Department of Agriculture Bureau of Soils and Water Management (BSWM)
- GEF Operational Focal Point
- Staff/Consultants of SLM Project
- Officials and Staff of the Local Responsible Partners
- Officials and Staff of the UNDP Country Office
- Officers and Staff of Local Government Units
- Members of the Inter-Agency Technical Committee (IATC)
- Members of the Local Technical Working Group (LTWG)

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in [Annex B](#) of this Terms of Reference.

## EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS

---

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see [Annex A](#)), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact**. Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in [Annex D](#).

Evaluation Ratings	
<b>1. Monitoring and Evaluation:</b>	<b>Rating</b>

M&E design at entry	
M&E Plan implementation	
<i>Overall quality of M&amp;E</i>	
<b>2. IA&amp; EA Execution:</b>	
Implementing Agency execution (UNDP)	
Executing Agency execution (DENR-BMB)	
<i>Overall quality of project implementation / execution</i>	
<b>3. Assessment of Outcomes:</b>	
Relevance	
Effectiveness	
Efficiency	
<i>Overall quality of project outcomes</i>	
<b>4. Sustainability:</b>	
Financial resources	
Socio-economic	
Institutional framework and governance	
Environmental	
<i>Overall likelihood of risks to Sustainability</i>	
<b>5. Impact:</b>	
Environmental status improvement	
Environmental stress reduction	
Progress towards stress/status change	
<b>OVERALL PROJECT RESULTS</b>	

## 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.

## 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.<sup>2</sup>

## 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 the Philippines. 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.

---

<sup>2</sup> 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 TIMEFRAME

---

The total duration of the evaluation will be 37 days spread over 3 months according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation of Inception Report to include accomplished Annex C and E	2 days	26 April 2019
Evaluation Mission	20 Days - 10 days review of reports and documents - 10 days field visit in the Philippines including the presentation of key initial findings to UNDP and IP	31 May 2019
Draft Evaluation Report	10 days	19 June 2019
Final Report including the audit trail of comments	5 days	10 July 2019

---

## EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

---

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
<b>Inception Report*</b>	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
<b>Presentation</b>	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission	To project management, UNDP CO
<b>Draft Final Report</b>	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within <b>3</b> weeks of the evaluation mission	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, Project Manager, GEF OFPs

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
Final Report**	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC.

\* An [evaluation matrix](#) will also be submitted as an annex to the Inception Report (Annex C). The matrix will outline the data sources and data collection tools and methods required to answer each evaluation question. The Inception Report should also include submission of accomplished Annex E.

\*\*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.

## EVALUATOR

---

There will be an international consultant who will conduct the terminal evaluation. 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 **International Evaluator** must present the following qualifications:

- Master's Degree on agriculture, development studies/ management, environmental science, environment & natural resources management, or any related course (20%)
- Minimum ten (10) years of relevant professional experience especially on results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies (20%)
- Knowledge of UNDP and GEF, and experience of working on GEF evaluations (20%)
- Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area and familiarity with land degradation issues globally, and if possible, in the Philippines or in Southeast Asian countries (20%)
- Knowledge of sustainable land management approaches and practices in production landscapes (20%)
- Fluency in the English language and excellent oral and written communication skills both required for consultant

## CRITERIA FOR THE SELECTION PROCESS

A combined scoring method will be used in selecting the qualified candidate.

- Qualifications - 50%
- Methodology - 20%
- Financial Proposal - 30%;

### **SCOPE OF FINANCIAL PROPOSAL**

The financial proposals from possible candidates should be expressed in lump sum amount inclusive of all financial costs related to this engagement (i.e. professional fees, transportation/travel to and from country of origin if residing outside the Philippines, subsistence allowance during the entire stay in Manila not exceeding the UN prescribed DSA daily rate, reproduction, communications including internet).

Domestic airfare, food and accommodation of the team outside Manila will be shouldered by UNDP separately and only 20% of the DSA following the NIM rates will be provided.

### **ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR THE RECOMMENDED CONTRACTOR**

#### **Statement of Medical Fitness for Work**

Individual Consultants/Contractors whose assignments require travel and who are over 65 years of age are required to submit a Medical Clearance.

#### **SECURITY CLEARANCE**

The Consultant will be requested to undertake the BSAFE online mandatory course. These requirements apply for all Consultants, attracted individually or through the Employer.

### **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**

---

<b>Milestone</b>	<b>Due dates</b>
10% Upon submission and acceptance of the Inception Report	26 April 2019
40% Upon submission and acceptance of the draft Terminal Evaluation Report	19 June 2019
50% Upon submission and acceptance of the (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final Terminal Evaluation Report	10 July 2019



## APPLICATION PROCESS

### ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

PIMS 5365: Implementation of Sustainable Land Management (SLM) Practices to Address Land Degradation and Mitigate Effects of Drought

	INDICATOR	BASELINE	END OF PROJECT TARGETS	SOURCE OF INFORMATION	RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS
<p><b>Project Objective</b><sup>1</sup> Strengthening SLM frameworks to address land degradation processes and mitigate the effects of drought in the Philippines</p>	<p>Area of LD-intense municipalities where the causes of land degradation are addressed through the implementation of land use plans</p>	<p>0 ha</p>	<p>177,083 hectares</p>	<p>Approved Comprehensive Land Use Plans for City of Malaybalay and Abuyog municipalities</p>	<p><b>Risk:</b> Assuming that the CLUP with provisions on SLM is in place, changes in political landscape may lead to changes in leadership who may not prioritize the implementation of CLUP with provisions on SLM mainstreaming.</p> <p><b>Assumption:</b> Changes in political leadership will not have an effect on the implementation of the revised and approved CLUPs with provisions on SLM.</p>
	<p>Enhanced cross-sector enabling environment for integrated landscape management as per PMAT score: (i) Framework strengthening INRM (ii) Capacity strengthening to enhance cross-sector enabling environment</p>	<p>(i) Score 1 – No INRM framework in place (ii) Score 2 – Initial awareness raised (e.g. workshops, seminars)</p>	<p>(i) Score 4 – INRM framework has been formally adopted by stakeholders but weak (ii) Score 4 – Knowledge effectively transferred (e.g. working groups tackle cross-sectoral issues)</p>	<p>Completion of PMAT at mid-term and terminal phase</p>	<p><b>Risk:</b> Within the 3-year project duration, INRM at the techno demo sites might have been done, however, due to changes in political landscape, the INRM applied at the demo sites might not be replicated to nearby barangays. The implementation/replication of INRM at the demo sites to expansion areas might not be a priority of the new leaders.</p> <p><b>Assumption:</b> Changes in political leadership will not have</p>

					an effect on the replication of the INRM at the demo sites to the expansion areas.
<b>Outcome 1</b> Effective cross-sectoral enabling environment at the national and local level in place to promote integrated landscape management	<b>Outputs:</b> 1.1 Approved guidelines on SLM mainstreaming into national and local land use plans and investment programs (to be field tested under Outcome 2; 1.2 Multi-sectoral stakeholder committee established at national level to oversee and give technical advice on the integration of SLM into LGU's development; 1.3 Information management system to support SLM integration into LGUs development plans and improving informed land use allocation decisions (set up as a national system but only populated with the targeted municipality data to be selected under Outcome 2; 1.4 Training-of-trainers from BSWM, DA Regional Offices, DENR, DAR and the PAOs and MAOs/CAOs capacitated in training extension officers from the LGUs in promotion of SLM practices;				
	An integrated land management framework incorporating SLM practices and technologies	Presence of guidelines in mainstreaming CCA-DRR and biodiversity conservation in CLUP	A national integrated land management framework mainstreaming SLM practices and technologies developed and adopted by HLURB	Crop yield during harvest season  Terminal project report	<b>Risk:</b> Projected crop yield might not be realized due to uncontrolled pest infestation and occurrence of strong typhoons. <b>Assumption:</b> There will be no pest infestation and drastic climate variability within the three (3) years of project implementation.
	Enhanced CLUP guidelines to mainstream SLM	No existing procedural guidelines on mainstreaming SLM in land use, agricultural and forestry development plans	Guidelines on mainstreaming have been applied in to pilot municipalities and further enhanced based on experience and findings of the testing exercise.	Report on guidelines for the mainstreaming process	<b>Risk:</b> Some LGUs may not be able to operationalize the guidelines due to lack of data or poor data base. <b>Assumption:</b> The guidelines are simplified and designed as user-friendly for the adoption of less trained planners of LGUs

	Relevant policy issuance for the mainstreaming of SLM in local land-use including forest land-use and development planning processes	Pledge of commitment signed by DA, DAR and DENR in support to the implementation of the National Action Plan to Combat Desertification, Land Degradation and Drought (NAP-DLDD 2010-2020)	Issuance of Joint Memorandum Circular or special order on SLM mainstreaming by DA, DENR and DAR.  Issuance of memorandum order or administrative order on SLM mainstreaming by DILG to priority LGUs	Signed MO or SO on SLM Mainstreaming  Signed DILG MO or AO	<b>Risk:</b> Delayed issuance due to poor coordination among NGAs <b>Assumptions:</b> Key NGAs are supportive of the mainstreaming policy; they are properly briefed on the objectives and essential contents of the policy order
	Data base and decision support information system operational and accessible to LGUs	Existing LADA web portal with maps at national and regional scales	Developed a GIS-based LADA maps incorporating SLM practices and technologies with information/maps accessible and relevant to CLUP preparation of LGUs	Project monitoring and inspection report on BSWM data base upgrading	<b>Risk:</b> Major equipment upgrading will be needed and will entail expense to BSWM.  <b>Assumption:</b> Partner institutions such as DENR and DAR have the facility to link with the system; BSWM has the funds to maintain the information system.
	Competency development programme for LGUs on SLM technology application and mainstreaming developed and implemented	New and young scientists from BSWM, DA Regional Offices, DENR and DAR lacked hands-on training on SLM.	List of training modules on SLM technology application and mainstreaming for LGUs developed  Potential trainers from DA-BSWM, DENR and HLURB are identified and trained on various SLM management and physical technologies on SLM.	Project Reports  List of attendance and copy of certificates of training awarded.	<b>Risk:</b> Concerned NGAs may send trainees who are not qualified for the technical training.  No allocated budget for the implementation of the competency programme for LGUs  <b>Assumption:</b> Identified trainees from DA-BSWM, DENR and DAR are assigned and performing function on SLM and their heads of offices are making them

					available for the entire duration of the training.
	<p>Increased scores of the indicators of the following capacity results in the Capacity Development Monitoring Scorecards of DA-BSWM, DENR-FMB and HLURB from the start-up of Project up to end of Project:</p> <p>a. Capacity for engagement (CR1);</p> <p>b. Capacity to generate access, and use information and knowledge (CR2);</p> <p>c. Capacity for strategy, policy, and legislation development (CR3);</p> <p>d. Capacity for management and implementation (CR4); and</p>	<p>Average capacity scores for (See Annex F for the Capacity Development Monitoring Scorecard)</p> <p><u>DA-BSWM</u></p> <p>CR1 – 2 (Inds. 1-3)  CR2 – 2 (Inds. 4-8)  CR3 – 2 (Inds. 9-11)  CR4 – 2 (Inds. 12-13)  CR5 – 2 (Inds. 14-15)</p> <p><u>DENR-FMB</u></p> <p>CR1 – 1.67 (Inds. 1-3)  CR2 – 2 (Inds. 4-8)  CR3 – 2 (Inds. 9-11)  CR4 – 2.5 (Inds. 12-13)  CR5 – 1 (Inds. 14-15)</p> <p><u>HLURB</u></p> <p>CR1 – 1 (Inds. 1-3)  CR2 – 2 (Inds. 4-8)  CR3 – 2 (Inds. 9-11)</p>	<p>At least an average increase in 5 capacity results (CR1 to CR5) by 0.33 to 1 for BSWM with a high score of 3 in the following indicators: Indicator 3, 4, 5, 7 and 13 (see Annex F for the Capacity Development Monitoring Scorecard)</p> <p>At least an average increase in 5 capacity results by 0.5 to 0.8 for DENR-FMB with a high score of 2 to 3 in the following indicators: Indicator 3,4,5,8,10,and 12 (see Annex F for the Capacity Development Monitoring Scorecard)</p> <p>At least an average increase in 5 capacity results by 0.2 to 1.33 for HLURB with a high score</p>	Capacity Development Monitoring Scorecard	<p><b>Risk:</b> Changes in political landscape that may lead to changes in personnel assignment</p> <p>At national level, the qualification of the participants who will be sent for training might not have the appropriate educational background. The trained personnel might be assigned later to other tasks.</p> <p><b>Assumption:</b> Changes in political leadership will not affect personnel assignment.</p>

	e. Capacity to monitor and evaluate (CR5)	CR4 – 2.5 (Inds. 12-13) CR5 – 1 (Inds. 14-15)	of 2 to 3 in the following indicators: Indicator 1, 10, 11, 12 and 14 (see Annex F for the Capacity Development Monitoring Scorecard)		
<b>Outcome 2</b> Long term capacities and incentives in place for local communities and LGUs to uptake SLM practices in two (2) targeted municipalities in the Philippines	<b>Outputs</b> 2.1 Comprehensive Land Use Plans (CLUPs) updated/revised for targeted City and Municipality with serious LD issues; 2.2 SLM best practices implemented in targeted City and Municipality; 2.3 National and LGU extension services capacitated to incorporate SLM to LD and drought risk areas and deliver targeted support to targeted City and Municipality and farmers with similar agricultural threats; 2.4. Secure additional finances for SLM investments and align existing financial contributions in the forestry and agricultural sectors to support SLM practices in at least two selected municipalities				
	Plant/soil cover in the agricultural land area covering 2,887 ha and forest cover in Barangay Silae	Plant/soil cover to be established during project implementation in the first year  721.65 ha of forest land area	Increase in plant/soil cover ratio  No net loss of forest cover in Barangay Silae	Year 1 and end of project vegetative cover estimates for Barangay Silae  Terminal project report	<b>Risk:</b> Projected vegetative cover might not be realized due to natural occurrences like typhoons and forest fires, etc. and other activities like slash and burn and land use conversions.  <b>Assumption:</b> There will be no drastic climate change variability and no forest fires. Occurrences of slash and burn activities are being monitored and executers being apprehended by the concerned government agencies.
	Dry Matter (DM) and Organic Matter (OM) Content from 5 sample sites randomly selected from the agricultural land area (151 ha) and forest land area of Barangay Tadoc	Sample sites and baseline Dry Matter and Organic Matter to be determined during Year 1 of implementation  12.61 ha of forest land area	Average increase in DM and OM Content of Soils in 5 sample sites representing the soil fertility of the 151 agricultural land area  No net loss of forest cover in the Barangay Tadoc	OM content analysis in year 1 and end of project  Periodic geo-tagging of the sites	

	Composite Land Degradation Index (LDI) <sup>1</sup> monitoring system for monitoring LD is developed and in place for City of Malaybalay and Abuyog Municipality	No LDI monitoring system in use	Stable or improved composite LDI monitoring system across 20,000 ha <sup>3</sup> in two municipalities  Agriculture: 3,038 ha Forestry: 734.26 ha Mixed System – 16,227.74 ha	Completion of composite LDI monitoring system at project inception, mid-term and terminal periods	<b>Risk:</b> Changes in the soil erosion rate might not be realized due to natural occurrences like typhoons and forest fires, etc. and other activities like slash and burn and land use conversions.  <b>Assumption:</b> There will be no drastic climate change variability and no forest fires. Occurrences of slash and burn activities are being monitored and executers being apprehended by the concerned government agencies.
	Increased in % of SLM guidance delivered by extension services	Lack of SLM modules on the existing Farmers Field School (FFS)	100% SLM guidance delivered by extension services through integration of complete SLM modules in the season-long FFS	List of modules of FFS  Document on two SLM project sites	<b>Risk:</b> LGU heads of offices may send unqualified staff for the SLM training.  <b>Assumption:</b> The project has a clear set of criteria and qualification requirements for the trainees from LGUs.
	Farming households adopt sustainable agricultural practices and integrated SFM/SLM practices.	There are total 2,924 farming households in the 2 target sites (3 Brgys. out of 46 Brgys. in Malaybalay City and 13 Brgys. out of 63 Brgys. in Abuyog)	At least 585 of the farming households in 2 targeted municipalities (3 Brgys. out of 46 Brgys. in Malaybalay City and 13 Brgys. out of 63 Brgys. in Abuyog) adopt sustainable agriculture	Project evaluation report	<b>Risk:</b> Difficulty in influencing the farmers in nearby farms to adopt the SLM technology showcased at the two (2) demonstration sites; this may result to possibility of not attaining the project objectives

<sup>3</sup> 8,100 ha Agricultural land and 11,900 forestry lands covering Barangays Silae, Mapulo and Can-ayan in Malaybalay City and Barangays Tiadoc, Tinalian, Burubud-an, Lawaan, Libertad, New Taligue, Old Taligue, San Rogue, Kikilo, Bahau, Tib-o, Buaya, and Anbongan.

			practices and integrated SFM/SLM practices		<b>Assumption:</b> BSWM and LGU have successfully showcased the SLM technology package and enhanced extension services have been carried out.
--	--	--	--	--	---

## **ANNEX B: LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE EVALUATORS AND PROJECTS FUNDED UNDER GEF-PHILIPPINE ICCA PROJECT**

---

### **LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE EVALUATORS<sup>4</sup>**

The evaluation consultant should be guided by the following documents when conducting the evaluation activities:General documentation

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

The evaluation will include the review of the following documents:

- Project Document
- Annual Work Plans (AWPs) (2016,2017 and 2018)
- APRs and PIRs (2016, 2017 and 2018)
- Consolidated Quarterly Progress Reports
- Site-level Quarterly Progress Reports
- Mid- and Year-end Assessment Reports

### **PROJECT BRIEF**

Land degradation in the Philippines is largely caused by the susceptibility of its soils to erosion due to the hilly and mountainous landforms in many parts of the country. The widespread clearing of forest lands in steeply sloping and rolling topography leaves the bare soil highly vulnerable to accelerated erosion of topsoil caused by heavy rainfall and consequential erosive force of water run-off. The practice of kaingin (or shifting cultivation) and other forms of unsuitable upland farming in cleared forest areas further worsens the erosion problem and loss of fertile and productive top soils. Land degradation in the Philippines is manifested by (i) the loss of productive topsoil through water erosion, (ii) loss of soil fertility due to over-cultivation, (iii) loss of vegetation cover due to illegal logging and widespread forest tree cutting, and (iv) expansion of slash and burn agriculture in critical slopes. Other kinds of degradation which cover a relatively smaller part of the landscape include (i) water logging due to poor drainage and water management; (ii) soil salinization due to over-harvesting of ground water near coastal areas; and (iii) soil pollution from excessive pesticide application and contamination by industrial and household wastes.

The proposed project would focus principally at the systemic and institutional levels, and hence strengthen the enabling regulatory, institutional and financial framework that would govern efforts to address land degradation in the Philippines. It will mainstream Sustainable Land Management (SLM) policies and programs into the development plans of LGUs through the guidance of government agencies such as Department of Agriculture, Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Department of Agrarian Reform, Department of Interior and Local Development and Housing and Land Use Regulatory Board to strengthen complementation among these government institutions concerned with land degradation and ensure that the incidence and spread of land degradation in vulnerable ecosystems will be avoided and/or reduced. The project is expected to improve the land productivity and socioeconomic well-being of small farmers. To achieve this, the project will follow a participatory cross-sectoral approach involving all the key stakeholders in project design and implementation. The promotion of SLM measures and technologies for the adoption of vulnerable farming communities will be the focus of the field investments of the project. Through the establishment of SLM demonstration sites, farmers will be able to learn

---

<sup>4</sup> This list will be updated before TE as more documents become available.



and adopt various methods of soil conservation farming and water resources conservation that will improve their crop production and income.

Therefore, the project aims to strengthen the SLM frameworks to address land degradation process and mitigate the effects of drought in the Philippines through the following outcomes:

**Outcome 1:** Effective cross-sectoral national and local enabling environment to promote integrated landscape management

**Target Outcome Indicators:**

1. Area of LD-intense municipalities where the causes of land degradation are addressed through the implementation of land use plans
2. Enhanced cross-sector enabling environment for integrated landscape management as per PMAT score:
  - (i) Framework strengthening INRM
  - (ii) Capacity strengthening to enhance cross-sector enabling environment

**Target Output Indicators:**

1. An Integrated Land Management Framework incorporating SLM practices and technologies
2. Enhanced CLUP guidelines to mainstream SLM
3. Relevant policy issuance for the mainstreaming of SLM in local land use including forest land use and development planning processes
4. Data base and decision support information system operational and accessible to LGUs
5. Competency development program for LGUs on SLM technology application and mainstreaming developed and implemented
6. Increase scores of indicators of the following capacity results in the Capacity Development Scorecards of DA-BSWM, DENR-FMB and HLURB from the start-up of Project up to end of Project
  - a. Capacity for engagement (CR1);
  - b. Capacity to generate access, and use information and knowledge (CR2);
  - c. Capacity for strategy, policy, and legislation development (CR3);
  - d. Capacity for management and implementation (CR4);
  - e. Capacity to monitor and evaluate (CR5)

**Outcome 2:** Long term capacities and incentives in place for local communities and LGUs to uptake SLM practices in two (2) targeted municipalities in the Philippines

**Target Output Indicators:**

1. Plant/soil cover in the agricultural land area covering 2,866 ha and forest cover in Barangay Silae
2. Dry Matter (DM) and Organic Matter (OM) Content from 5 sample sites randomly selected from the agricultural land area (151 ha) and forest (12.61 ha) land area of Barangay Tadoc
3. Composite Land Degradation Index (LDI) monitoring system for monitoring LD is developed and in place for City of Malaybalay and Abuyog Municipality

4. Increased in % of SLM guidance delivered by extension services
5. Farming households adopt sustainable agricultural practices and integrated SFM/SLM

## ANNEX C: EVALUATION MATRIX

---

The evaluation matrix is a tool that evaluators create as map and reference in planning and conducting an evaluation. It also serves as a useful tool for summarizing and visually presenting the evaluation design and methodology for discussions with stakeholders. It details evaluation questions that the evaluation will answer, data sources, data collection, analysis tools or methods appropriate for each data source, and the standard or measure by which each question will be evaluated.

<b>Relevant evaluation criteria</b>	<b>Key questions</b>	<b>Specific sub questions</b>	<b>Data sources</b>	<b>Data-collection methods/tools</b>	<b>Indicators / success standards</b>	<b>Methods for data analysis</b>

**ANNEX D: RATING SCALES**

<b><i>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&amp;E, I&amp;E Execution</i></b>	<b><i>Sustainability ratings:</i></b>	<b><i>Relevance ratings</i></b>	<b><i>Impact Ratings:</i></b>
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 3: Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks 2: Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1: Unlikely (U): severe risks	2: Relevant (R) 1: Not relevant (NR)	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<sup>5</sup>

#### 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: \_\_\_\_\_

---

<sup>5</sup>[www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct](http://www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct)

## ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE<sup>6</sup>

---

- 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<sup>7</sup>)
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<sup>8</sup>)
- 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:

---

<sup>6</sup>The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

<sup>7</sup> UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

<sup>8</sup> 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.

- 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
  - *Annexed in a separate file: TE Audit Trail*

**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: EVALUATION MATRIX

---

The evaluation matrix is a tool that evaluators create as map and reference in planning and conducting an evaluation. It also serves as a useful tool for summarizing and visually presenting the evaluation design and methodology for discussions with stakeholders. It details evaluation questions that the evaluation will answer, data sources, data collection, analysis tools or methods appropriate for each data source, and the standard or measure by which each question will be evaluated.

<b>Relevant evaluation criteria</b>	<b>Key questions</b>	<b>Specific sub questions</b>	<b>Data sources</b>	<b>Data-collection methods/tools</b>	<b>Indicators / success standards</b>	<b>Methods for data analysis</b>

---

## ANNEX I: TE REPORT AUDIT TRAIL

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

**To the comments received on (date) from the Terminal Evaluation of the Philippine SLM Project (UNDP PIMS # 5365).**

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

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