Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference

**Job title: International Consultant on Terminal Evaluation of the Project**

**Project title:** **Mainstreaming Sustainable Land and Forest Management in Mountain Landscapes of North-eastern Armenia**

**Project: 00091048/00081940**

**Contract modality: Individual Contract (IC)**

**Duration: 25 July – 25 October 2020 (estimated 20 consultancy days)**

**Duty station: Home based and one mission to Armenia (alternatively distant support**

**(depending on COVID-19 restrictions))**

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**Mainstreaming Sustainable Land and Forest Management in Mountain Landscapes of North-eastern Armenia**(PIMS # 4416.)

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

Project Summary Table

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Title: | **Mainstreaming Sustainable Land and Forest Management in Mountain Landscapes of North-eastern Armenia** | | | | |
| GEF Project ID: | | GEF ID #5353 |  | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | *at completion (Million US$)* |
| UNDP Project ID: | | UNDP PIMS #54416  UNDP Atlas Project ID: 00091048  UNDP Atlas Output ID: 00081940 | GEF financing: | $2,977,169 |  |
| Country: | | Armenia | IA/EA own (UNDP): | $180,000 |  |
|  | |  | UNDP in-kind: | $720,000 |  |
| Region: | | CIS | Government cash: | 5,095,000 |  |
|  | |  | Government in-kind: | 7,332,235 |  |
|  | |  | Other cash: | $662,700 |  |
| Focal Area: | | Multi-focal: BD/LD/CCM/ SFM | Other-local communities (Berd, Gugarq, Margahovit, Yenoqavan) | 17,520.14 |  |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): | | GEF-6:  **SFM:**  *Good management practices applied in existing forests*  **LD 2**:  *Sustained flow of services in forest ecosystems in drylands*  **LD 3**:  *Enhanced, cross-sectoral enabling environment for integrated landscape scale management*  **CCM-5**:  *Promote conservation and enhancement**of carbon stocks through sustainable management of land use, land use change and forestry*  **BD-2**:  *Increase in sustainably managed landscapes and seascapes that integrate biodiversity conservation* | Total co-financing: | $14,007,455.14 |  |
| Executing Agency: | | UNDP | Total Project Cost: | $16,984,624.14 |  |
| Other Partners involved: | | Ministry of Environment | ProDoc Signature (date project began): | | December 24, 2015 |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | Proposed:  December 24, 2019 | Actual:  December 24, 2020 |

Objective and Scope

The project was designed to achieve the shift from current unsustainable to sustainable forest and land use practice.

The **project objective** is to ensure sustainable land and forest management to secure continued flow of multiple ecosystem services. The main cause of land and forest degradation in North-Eastern Armenia, where 64% of the forests of the country are located is the deforestation and overexploitation of forest resources. sustainable land and forest management approaches as being postulated under the project.

The sustainable land and forest management would be achieved through two main components, namely:

1. Integration of sustainable forest and land management objectives into planning and management of forest ecosystems to reduce degradation and enhance ecosystem services in two marzes covering 0.65 million hectares; and
2. (ii) Sustainable Forest Management practices effectively demonstrating reduced pressure on high conservation forests and maintaining flow of ecosystem services.

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[[1]](#footnote-1) for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact,** as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR ([*Annex C*](#_TOR_Annex_C:)) The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence‐based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Lori and Tavush regions of Republic of Armenia (alternatively distant support (depending on COVID-19 restrictions)) including the following project sites: Tavush region- Ijevan, Berd and Noyemberyan consolidated communities; Lori region-Mets Parni, Margahovit, Gugarq, Vahagni and Odzun consolidated communities*.* Alternatively, the evaluator would have opportunity of on-line video-interviews with project stakeholders, experts and beneficiaries, if field mission wouldn’t be possible due to COVID-19*.* Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

* Project Coordination Unit staff;
* UNDP Country Office in Armenia;
* Members of Project Board;
* National government stakeholders, including: Ministry of Environment, State forest committee and “Hayantar” SNCO;
* National Contractors and partners of the Project;
* National consultants involved in the project (at least two);
* International organization, implementing similar projects.

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 | $180,000 | $180,000 | $5,095,000 | $5,095,000 | $662,700 | $668,220.14 | $5,925,700 | $5,943,220.11 |
| Loans/Concessions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * In-kind support | $720,000 | $720,000 | $7,332,235 | $7,332,235 |  |  | $8,052,235 | $8,052,235 |

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 equality.

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 Armenia. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluator. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluator to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government or organize any distance support for desk reviews, online interviews etc.

Evaluation timeframe

The total duration of the evaluation will be *20* days according to the following plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Timing | Completion Date |
| **Preparation** | *3* days | *5 August* |
| **Evaluation Mission** (alternatively distant support (depending on COVID-19 restrictions)) | 5 days | *15 September* |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | 9 days | *05 October* |
| **Final Report** | 3 days | *25 October* |

Evaluation deliverables

The evaluator 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, interviews, desk-reviews. | 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 performed by one international evaluator. 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.

Key qualifications:

* Education: advanced degree in environmental management and policy, public administration.

Minimum 10 years of relevant professional experience (natural resources management, public administration), including minimum 5 years of experience in monitoring and evaluation of similar projects;

* Proven experience and knowledge in UNDP-GEF projects evaluation, UNDP and GEF procedures and requirements;
* Previous experience with results‐based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
* Technical knowledge in the targeted focal areas: Multi-focal areas – Good management practices applied in existing forests(SFM),Sustained flow of services in forest ecosystems in drylands (LD2), Enhanced, cross-sectoral enabling environment for integrated landscape scale management (LD3), Promote conservation and enhancementof carbon stocks through sustainable management of land use, land use change and forestry (CCM-5) and Increase in sustainably managed landscapes and seascapes that integrate biodiversity conservation (BD-2);
* Fluency in English is required (written and oral), knowledge of Russian is an asset.

Evaluator Ethics

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

Payment modalities and specifications

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| % | Milestone |
| *60%* | Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report |
| *40%* | Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report |

Application process

Interested individual consultants must submit the following documents/information to

demonstrate their qualifications.

1. Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability using the template provided by UNDP;
2. CV and a Personal History Form (P11); indicating all past experience from similar projects; as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the candidate and at least three (3) professional references;
3. Brief description of approach to work/technical proposal of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology to complete the assignment; (max 1 page)
4. Financial Proposal that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc), supported by a breakdown of costs.

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**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Indicator | Baseline | Targets  End of Project | Data source | Status of Implementation |
| Project Objective  Sustainable land and  forest management in the Northeastern Armenia secures continued flow of ecosystem services  (equivalent to output in ATLAS) | Number of forest management plans integrating considerations of biodiversity, ecosystem services, climate mitigation and community resource use (integrating sustainable forest management principles) | 0 | 11 (2 Forest Enterprises (FEs) in target regions were merged by the end of 2020, thus target FEs shifted from 11 to 10)  5 Community development plans updated | Drafted FMPs of Ijevan, Noyemberyan and Vanadzor (Gugarq and Yeghegnut FEs were merged by the end of 2019)  Updated community development plans | 3 FMPs are in the process of approval  Drafting of 3 FMPs is in progress    8 Community Development plans: Mets Parni, Noyemberyan, Ardvi ,Gugarq, Margahovit, Lusadzor, Yenoqavan and Berd |
| Total avoided and/or sequestrated carbon benefits over ten-year period due to improved sustainable management of forests | N/A | 681,990 metric t CO2 | Updates on forest cover, carbon monitoring reports | Total avoided (472,054 metric t CO2) and/or sequestrated (44,700 metric t CO2) carbon benefits over a 10-year period for 3 FEs (Ijevan, Noyemberyan, Vanadzor) according to amended FMPs and Dilijan NP MP amount to 516,754 metric t CO2.  The calculations for 3 new forest enterprises (Tashir, Stepanavan and Jiliza) will be done in 2020. |
| Extent in hectares of forest area managed for multiple sustainable forest management and ecosystem benefits | 0 | 250,000 | Drafted FMPs of Ijevan, Noyemberyan and Vanadzor (merged Gugarq and Yeghegnut FEs) forest enterprises | Total for 2017-2020  80,461 ha  Drafting of 3 FMPs is in progress (area 28.817 ha) |
| Outcome 1  Integration of sustainable forest and land management objectives into planning and management of forest ecosystems in NE Armenia to reduce degradation and enhance ecosystem services in two marzes covering 0.65 million hectares  (equivalent to activity in ATLAS) | Number of forest management plan protocols/guidelines for mainstreaming ecosystem, climate risk mitigation and biodiversity considerations into forest management in NE Armenia | 0 | One set approved by Ministry of Agriculture | Revised forest management guidelines/protocols | In progress |
| Number of sets of forest inventory and maps in support of sustainable forest management for forest enterprise branches | 0 | 11 (10 in fact) | Forest inventory and maps | Total for 2017-2020 - 3  Drafting for 3 FEs is in progress |
| Number of forest enterprise branches effectively applying consideration of the needs for biodiversity, climate mitigation, forest ecosystem services and community sustainable use | 0 (partial application in FMPs) | 11 (10 in fact) | Forest management plans | In progress -3  Drafting for 3 FEs are is progress |
| Number of forest monitoring protocols to assess effectiveness of adoption for SFM in forestlands | 0 (Existing practice, monitoring protocols used for recording forest violations and fires, not for consideration of ecosystem values and functions) | One set of protocols approved and adopted by Ministry of Agriculture | Forest management plan monitoring reports | In progress |
| Number of marz and enterprise branch forest staff trained in the use of ecosystem-based planning tools | 0 | 60 | Training records and training evaluation reports | Completed  (60 persons are trained within drafting of 6 FEs FMPs ) |
| Number of pasture stakeholders undergone technical and skills training and development in sustainable pasture management | 0 | 100 (of which at least 30 are women) | Training records and training evaluation reports | Completed |
| Number of forest dependents trained in technical skills for sustainable forest resource use | 0 | 500 (of which at least 150 are women) | Training records and training evaluation reports | Completed  (Trainings of 500 persons (of which 150 women were conducted within drafting of 3 FEs FMPs) |
| Number of recommendations on accounting for ecosystem services valuation and community resource use | 0 | One set of recommendations | Policy notes | In progress |
| Outcome 2  Sustainable Forest Management practices effectively demonstrating reduced pressure on high conservation forests and maintaining flow of ecosystem services  (equivalent to activity in ATLAS) | Hectares of high biodiversity conservation value forests designated identified and effectively managed for biodiversity and climate mitigation | 0 | At least 85,000 | Protected Area management plans  Forest management plans include conservation management prescriptions | -In total, 71,765 ha (HCVF) delineated: Ijevan state sanctuary-13,912 ha; Ijevan FE-2,660 ha; Noyemberyan FE-8,506 ha; Vanadzor FE (integrates former Gugarq FE- 5,256, Margahovit state sanctuary-3,126 ha; Yeghegnut FE-4,540 ha) and Dilijan NP with Yew Grove sanctuary-33,765 ha.  The delineation of the remaining 13,235 ha HCVF will be done within 3 new FEs: Tashir, Stepanavan and Jiliza |
| Change in population trends for five indicator bird species | The coefficient of *x* value in the ten-year linear trend equation (which refers to *y=ax+b*) is --0.0965; -0.0455; --0.0338; -0.1156 and -0.0346 for Coal Tit, Eurasian Nuthatch, Semi-collared flycatcher, Green Warbler and Song Thrush respectively. | Population of indicator bird species stable or increase over baseline values | Annual Forest surveys and inventory at 25 selected sites | Monitoring will be completed in 2020 |
| Change in population trends for five indicator butterfly species | Average number of individuals per 1km transect for the 4 species are 10.3-16.5; 8.6-12.9; 15.3-21.7 and 18.9-27.2 for *Argynnis paphia, Brintesia circe, Coenonympha arcania and Leptidea sinapis* respectively. | Population changes of indicator butterfly species stable and/or do not decrease | Bi-annual count at 25 selected transects in forest | Monitoring will be completed in 2020 |
| Number of hectares of degraded forests regenerated through assisted natural regeneration | 0 | 4,932 | Hayantar records of forest cover and regeneration | Completed |
| Number of hectares degraded pasture and hay fields rehabilitated under sustainable management practices to reduce pressure on forest lands | 0 | 1,000 | Hayantar records of pasture development and grazing incidents | Completed  (Ca 600 ha is completed and the remaining 400 ha will be completed by April-May, 2020). |
| Number of hectares of forest land under multiple use regimes (sustainable NTFP production and agro-forestry) with participation of forest dependent communities | 0 | 3,000 | Community surveys and records of forest improvement and increased incomes and production of NTFP  Independent evaluations | -2,000 ha of forest land has been identified and mapped for the purpose of multiple use regimes (NTFP, agro-forestry system, bee-keeping, etc.).  -The identification and mapping of the remaining 1000 ha is in progress for 3 new FEs |
| Percentage decrease in number of livestock using natural forests for unsustainable grazing practices in targeted forest branches | Baseline to be developed after forest inventory and mapping completed and locations identified for grazing management | 15% | Marz and Forest enterprise records of livestock numbers and grazing patterns | In progress |
| Percentage reduction in forest firewood collection areas in targeted forest branches Reduced areas of felling in target state forests | Baseline to be developed after forest inventory and mapping completed | 15% | Hayantar records of firewood extraction volumes and areas of harvest | In progress |
| Number of recommendations for management of dependencies in firewood use from forests | No integrated strategy exists to deal with the complex nature of firewood dependencies | One set of recommendation developed by Ministry of Agriculture | Report and recommendations  Number of consultations meetings regarding topic | In progress |
| Percentage of households reporting increased incomes from forest and non-forest resources in target communities, including percentage of beneficiaries among women | Baseline incomes would be assessed once forest inventory and mapping completed and locations for community forest use identified | 20%, of which at least 30% of beneficiaries are women | Social surveys and reports at village level | In progress |
| Number of carbon stock assessment completed for key forest types in NE Armenia | 0 | One set of baseline assessment completed and monitoring | Forest (biomass) carbon inventory/baseline (emission data) and deforestation rate (activity data) | Completed |
| Emissions of metric tCO2 avoided from conservation set-asides over a10-year period | 0 | 559,110 metric t CO2 | Forest (biomass) carbon inventory/baseline (emission data) and deforestation rate (activity data) | In progress |
| Improvement in carbon sequestration capacity in metric tCO2 of restored forests over a 10-year period | 0 | 122,880 metric t CO2 | Forest (biomass) carbon inventory/baseline (emission data) and deforestation rate (activity data) | In progress |

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

*Project Document*

*Reports (Quarterly, Semi-annual, Annual Standard Progress Reports)*

*Project Implementation reports (PIRs)*

*Mid Term Review (MTR) Report*

*List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Boards, and other partners to be consulted*

*Minutes of Project Board Meetings*

*Project budget and financial data*

*UNDP Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF)*

*UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD)*

*UNDP Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP)*

Annex C: Evaluation Questions

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

| **Evaluative Criteria Questions** | | **Indicators** | **Sources** | **Methodology** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels? | | | | | |
|  | * How well does the project align with evolving GEF CCCD focal area priorities through GEF 5 and GEF 6? | * Extent to which CCCD and related GEF priorities and areas of work incorporated | Project documents  National policies and strategies  Project partners |  |
|  | * Are project outcomes contributing to national development priorities and plans? | * Degree to which the project supports objectives of Government. |  |
|  | * Have implementation strategies been appropriate (is the logframe logical and complete)? | * Adequacy of project design and implementation to national realities and existing capacities |  |
|  | * Did the project address the needs of target beneficiaries and other stakeholders? Are beneficiaries and other stakeholders effectively engaged in implementation? | * Degree to which the project meets stakeholder expectations |  |
| Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? | | | | | | |
|  | * How well has the project performed against its expected objectives and outcomes, and its indicators and targets? | * Extent to which milestones and targets are achieved at mid-term, as laid out in the logframe and monitoring plan | Project mid-term evaluation report, Management response  Project reports, Minutes of project Management and Advisory boards |  | |
|  | * Which have been key factors contributing to project success/underachievement? | * Evidence of adaptive management and/or early application of lessons learned | Project work plans and reports  Interviews with local partners  Tracking tools |  | |
|  | * How has the project contributed to raising capacity of local stakeholders to address aims of the project or of Government? | * Extent of support from local stakeholders |  | |
|  | * What are the views of stakeholders on the implementation and activities of the project? | * Extent to which stakeholders are actively participating in the implementation and monitoring of the project |  | |
| Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards? | | | | | | |
|  | Implementation efficiency (including monitoring):   * Was the project management effective? * Were there any particular challenges with the management process? * Has project implementation been responsive to issues arising (e.g. from monitoring or from interactions with stakeholders)? * Were progress reports produced accurately and timely, and did they respond to reporting requirements including adaptive management changes? * Did the project management Board provide the anticipated input and support to project management? * Has internal and external communication been effective and efficient? * How efficiently have resources and back-up been provided by donors, including quality assurance by UNDP? | Extent to which project activities were conducted on time  Extent to which project delivery matched the expectation of the ProDoc and the expectations of partners  Level of satisfaction expressed by partners in the responsiveness (adaptive management) of the project | Project work plans and reports  Local partners |  | |
|  |  | |
|  |  | |
|  | Financial efficiency:   * Are the accounting and financial systems in place adequate for project management and producing accurate and timely financial information? * Have funds been available and transferred efficiently (from donor to project to contractors) to address the project purpose, outputs and planned activities? * Are funds being used correctly? * Are financial resources being utilized efficiently (converted into outcomes)? Could financial resources be used more efficiently? * Was project implementation as cost effective as originally proposed (planned vs. actual)? | Extent to which funds have been converted into outcomes as per the expectations of the ProDoc  Level of transparency in the use of funds  Level of satisfaction of partners and beneficiaries in the use of funds  Timely delivery of funds, mitigation of bottlenecks | Project financial records |  | |
|  | Efficiency of partnership arrangements for the project  To what extent were partnerships/linkages between institutions/organizations realized as planned?  Which partnerships/linkages were facilitated? Which ones can be considered sustainable?  What was the level of efficiency of cooperation and collaboration arrangements? | Extent to which project partners committed time and resources to the project  Extent of commitment of partners to take over project activities | Project work plans and reports  Interviews with local partners |  | |
|  | Is the project responsive to threats and opportunities emerging during the course of the project? | Level of adaptive management related to emerging trends | Project work plans and reports |  | |
|  | How well were risks, assumptions and impact drivers managed? What was the quality of risk mitigation strategies developed? Were these sufficient? Are there clear strategies for risk mitigation related to long-term sustainability of the project? | Extent to which project has responded to identified and emerging risks  Level of attention paid to up-dating risks log | Risks log |  | |
|  | Is a communications strategy in place? How well is it implemented and how successful has it been in reaching intended audiences? | Extent to which project information has been disseminated  Level of awareness of beneficiaries and the general public | Communications documents  Press articles |  | |
| Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? | | | | | | |
|  | Is the social, legal and political environment conducive to sustainability? | Extent of supportive policies | Policy documents  Project board and Advisory Committee minutes  Local partners and beneficiaries |  | |
|  | Are there early signs of activities being taken up by project partners, and plans being developed to sustain them? | Extent to which partners are considering post-project actions | Interviews with local partners |  | |
|  | Have partners and stakeholders successfully enhanced their capacities and do they have the required resources to make use of these capacities? | Extent to which partners and stakeholders are applying new ideas outside of the immediate project context | Interviews with local partners |  | |
| **Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?** | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | |
|  | * Has the project demonstrated progress towards innovative approaches in forest management practices? |  |  |  | |
|  | * Has the project contributed to the degraded forest rehabilitation techniques and capacities? |  |  |  | |
|  | * Has the project contributed to the degraded forest pastures rehabilitation practices and further development of Land Degradation Neutrality concept in forested regions and in the country? |  |  |  | |
|  | * Has the project demonstrated the potential of alternative-livelihood programs to decrease the forest adjacent communities impact on surrounding forest ecosystems? |  |  |  | |
|  | * Has project succeeded to demonstrate the alternatives to fuel-wood and energy-efficient solutions to decrease impact on forests as a source of firewood? |  |  |  | |
|  | * Has project succeeded to develop certain capacities in forest sector? |  |  |  | |
|  | * Has project succeed to set up a national forest carbon inventory and monitoring system (at least for target regions) to contribute to the National Greenhouse Gas Inventory? |  |  |  | |

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 * Name and bio of Evaluator * 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: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

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)