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**1. Introduction**

This inception report outlines the proposed scope, methodology, issues, work tasks and schedule for the Terminal Evaluation (TE) of *Mainstreaming Incentives for Biodiversity Conservation in the Climate Resilient Green Economy Strategy (CRGE)* funded by Government of Ethiopia, Global Environment Facility and United Nations Development Programme. The Implementing Partner (IP)is Environment Forest and Climate Change Commission and the Environmental Protection Bureaus of the Oromia, Amhara, Somali, Southern Nations, Nationalities and Peoples Regional States; aa.

The project was designed to put in place safeguards to ensure that the current high level of economic growth and planned investments do not impact negatively on biodiversity. Overall, the project is expected to raise awareness on the importance of biodiversity and ecosystem services and build capacity at all levels to ensure that the Payment for Ecosystem Services (PES) programme can be scaled-up in the post-project period.

**Outcome 1** supports the development of a framework for recognizing the value ofbiodiversity to the economy. This included review of government spending on biodiversity (coding and public expenditure review) to catalyse further conservation investments, and ensuring that decision makers have the requisite information for decision making through the provision of improved data, decision support tools and training. **Outcome 2** has piloted Payments for Ecosystem Services (PES) in four sitesrecognized globally for their high biodiversity value and high risk of degradation. It has established a system at these sites for compensating land users who engage in biodiversity friendly practices.

The project has been supporting communities and local governments in their effort to protect and intensively rehabilitate highly threatened ecosystems in four pilot areas of Ethiopia:

(1) Choke mountain ecosystem in Amhara regional state where significant number of tributary rivers to the Blue Nile starts, It is also part of one of the Eastern Afromontane ‘Biodiversity Hot Spots’

(2) Diga-Arjo forest in Oromia regional state which has also high importance for Dedesa sub-basin in the west, The site is also dominated by moist evergreen Afromontane forest - part of one of the Eastern Afromontane ‘Biodiversity Hot Spots’

(3) Kulfo forest in South Nations, Nationalities and Peoples’ regional state which is also a critical catchment for Omo watershed to the south and part of one of the Eastern Afromontane ‘Biodiversity Hot Spots’,

(4) Hadew (Karamara) range area in Ethio-Somali regional state where promising & significant number of medicinal trees & shrubs exist. Part of one of the Eastern Afromontane Biodiversity Hot Spots bordering the Horn of Africa Biodiversity Hot Spot.

The Terminal Evaluation is an independent review, prepared in accordance with UNDP-GEF guidelines, of the progress made in achieving expected project outcomes; the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation; the issues requiring decisions and actions; and the lessons learned about project design, implementation and management. The objective of this evaluation is to providea comprehensive and systematic accounting of performance, and to assess project design, implementation, likelihood of sustainability and possible impacts*.* The Terms of Reference specify that the evaluation is to conform to the *Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported GEF-Financed Projects*, (UNDP Evaluation Office, 2012) and to address five main evaluation criteria: Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Sustainability and Impact.

The key evaluation criteria and questions are presented in **Annex 1 Evaluation Matrix** based on amended version that was provided in the Terms of Reference. A Draft Outline is presented in **Annex 2**. The MTR comments on project achievements are provided in **Annex 3** – to be updated. **Annex 4** lists data to be compiled on project activities, including a Survey of CBO Activities. **Annex 5** tables will summarize financing and co-financing.

**2. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION**

The UNDP/GEF evaluation guidelines specify that the Terminal Evaluation is to address the following aspects of project design, delivery, results and lessons:

|  |
| --- |
| **Project Formulation*** Analysis of LFA (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)
* Assumptions and Risks
* Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project implementation
* Stakeholder participation (\*)
* Replication approach
* Cost-effectiveness
* UNDP comparative advantage
* Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector, including management arrangements
 |
| **Project Implementation** * The logical framework used during implementation as a management and M&E tool
* Effective partnerships arrangements established for implementation of the project with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region
* Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management
	+ Financial Planning
	+ Monitoring and evaluation (\*)
	+ Execution and implementation modalities
	+ Management by the UNDP country office
	+ Coordination and operational issues
 |
| **Project Results*** Attainment of objectives (\*)
* Country ownership
* Mainstreaming
* Sustainability (\*)
* Catalytic Role+
* Impact
 |
| **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
 |

(\*) These evaluation criteria are to be rated

+ Catalytic Role will be addressed within the discussion on Impact

The GEF and UNDP terminal evaluation guidelines specify five evaluative criteria[[1]](#footnote-1):

1. **Relevance.** Were the project’s outcomes consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies and country priorities?
	* The extent to which the activity is aligned with local and national development priorities and organizational policies, including changes over time.
	* The extent to which the project is in line with the GEF Operational Programs or the strategic priorities under which the project was funded.
2. **Effectiveness.** Are the actual project outcomes commensurate with the original or modified project objectives? If the original or modified expected results are merely outputs/inputs, the evaluators should assess if there were any real outcomes of the project and, if there were, determine whether these are commensurate with realistic expectations from such projects.
	* The extent to which the expected outcomes and objectives have been achieved or how likely they will be achieved or not achieved.
3. **Efficiency.** Was the project cost effective? Was the project the least cost option? Was project implementation delayed, and, if it was, did that affect cost effectiveness? Wherever possible, the evaluator should also compare the costs incurred and the time taken to achieve outcomes with that for similar projects.
	* The extent to which results have been delivered with the least costly resources possible; also called cost effectiveness or efficacy.

**4. Sustainability.** Can the beneficial project results be sustained?

* + The likely ability of an intervention to continue to deliver benefits for an extended period of time after completion.
	+ Projects need to be environmentally, as well as financially and socially sustainable.

**5. Impact.** What are the positive and negative, foreseen and unforeseen changes to and effects produced by a development intervention?

* + In GEF terms, impact results include direct and indirect, longer term effects and replication or scale-up evidence.

The pilot implementation sites for improving community stewardship and reducing development pressure on biodiversity are located in four regional states, shown on Figure 1.



**Figure 1: Project Sites**

**3. KEY ISSUES FOR EVALUATION**

Discussions during the start-up of the TE mission will identify some of the key issues that have affected project implementation and that need to be considered during the Terminal Evaluation. These may include some of the following challenges that have been identified in the preliminary review of available reports:

* *Legal framework*: extent to which the proposed PES framework has been adopted and enacted and agreements currently in place; other policy actions initiated.
* *Institutional change*: capacity development measurement via the tracking tools – e.g., METT and others, provide an approximate gauge of the level of protection and management activity as a result of the project assistance; consider institutional change that is needed to ensure ongoing management effectiveness.
* *Level of mainstreaming of conservation into development policy, plans and plan implementation*: commitments to conservation need to be reflected in land use and development decision making that recognize and facilitate the specific conservation objectives in some measurable way in the local area.
* *Capacity development*: Results of the extensive training activities and other activities for enhanced capacity and PES brokering need further clarification. Have systemic and sustainable changes occurred in institutional capacities? The MTR noted CBO creation and strengthening, but limited alternative livelihoods development.
* *Mechanisms for sustainability and scale up*: the basis for ensuring that positive results are sustained and that they provide models for expanding protected area conservation at local, provincial and national levels need to be considered in the project withdrawal strategy.
* *Financial support for PES schemes:* the potential access to PES co-financing and other biodiversity conservation financing noted in the MTR, from government and financial institutions, can be a constraint.
* *Biodiversity conservation expenditure tagging and budgeting:* effects of the budget analyses on the processes and allocations for conservation and ecosystem services protectionneed to be determined (“inform fiscal decision making”).
* *Accounting of government co-financing*: the in-kind co-financing contributions from government agencies can be difficult to verify.

**4. eVALUATION Methodology**

The evaluation will be principally guided by the Terms of Reference and the Evaluation Matrix (Annex 1). The methodology is based on

(a) Review of documents, reports that describe progress on project outputs, outcomes and objectives as per indicators in the project design,

(b) Compilation of data on project deliverables and status of outputs, and the biodiversity conservation trends at the project sites,

(c) Email Survey of CBO activities and status sent to the local project officers,

(d) Discussion of key issues and lines of inquiry with project executive and management team regarding strengths and weaknesses of project design and execution,

(e) Self-assessment of achievements by project staff and participants,

(f) Interviews with project participants and stakeholders to verify achievements and to identify issues related to project design and implementation,

(g) Where feasible, group discussions to review project experiences and lessons learned,

(h) Site visits to compile evidence of achievements and to consult with beneficiaries and stakeholders, and in the final analyses,

(j) Triangulation and corroboration of comments by participants regarding project results, implementation and lessons.

The evaluation will include quantitative and qualitative analyses of project achievements in relation to baseline conditions. It will draw upon the conclusions and recommendations of the MTR report to provide advice on follow-up action needed to assist the project results. The first phase of the evaluation will involve compiling detailed information on the indicators outlined in the Evaluation Matrix (Annex 1). Survey questionnaire will be used to collect data on the status of the CBOs assisted by the project.

The evaluation tasks will include:

* Data collection and compilation undertaken in cooperation with the management teams by completing background tables on project activities, outputs and finances (**Annex 4 and 5**)
* Interviews with project beneficiaries and participants and project management and partners, for the field level, assisted by an Interview Guide (see **Annex 6**), to assess results, implementation challenges and lessons learned;
* Analyses of the project design and assumptions, implementation performance and measurable results in comparison to the project management plans and results indicators and targets, and identification of any gaps between design and delivery.
* Field review of selected representative project sites and comparative before and after information, as available, to verify reported results on the key project interventions at selected sites.

In all of the discussions, an emphasis will be placed on collegial and constructive dialogue and compiling reliable observations project performance and lessons. The interviews will be assisted by an Interview Guide which will provide lead questions that facilitate consistency and triangulation of responses from those interviewed. The evaluation will involve an objective and independent review of the *weight of evidence* compiled from reports, interviews/group discussions and site visits. Reasons for conclusions, ratings and recommendations will be provided based on the evidence. The evaluation will also draw out key lessons from the project that have implications for the exit strategy and/or for future climate change adaptation projects.

In accordance with UNDP/GEF evaluation requirements, project Relevance will be rated as:

**Relevant (R) or**

**Not relevant (NR)**

The project Effectiveness, Efficiency and M&E systems will be rated in terms of:

**Highly satisfactory (HS).** The project had no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency.

**Satisfactory (S).** The project had minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency.

**Moderately satisfactory (MS).** The project had moderate shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency.

**Moderately unsatisfactory (MU).** The project had significant shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency.

**Unsatisfactory (U).** The project had major shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency.

**Highly unsatisfactory (HU).**The project had severe shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency.

Sustainability will be rated according to the following scale:

**Likely (L)** negligible risks to sustainability, with key outcomes expected to continue into the foreseeable future.

**Moderately Likely (ML)** moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained

**Moderately Unlikely (MU)** substantial risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on.

**Unlikely (UL)** severe risk that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained

Impact will be rated according the following scale:

**Significant (S)**

**Minimal (M)**

**Negligible (N)**

**5. EVALUATION MILESTONES**

There are four milestones that the evaluation process will aim to meet:

1. Inception Report finalized (Wed. July 17, 2019)
2. Debriefing Note and presentation (Friday, August 2, 2019)
3. Draft Report (August 19, 2019)
4. Final Report (August 31, 2019 est.)
5. **WORK PLAN AND SCHEDULE**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Dates** | **Tasks** | **Outputs** | **Responsibilities** |
| July 10-16 | Prepare and submit draft Inception Report; clarification of key issues for evaluation; elaboration of itinerary | Draft and Final Inception Report | Alan |
| July 16-17 | Collect available data on project outputs and financing (Annexes). Biodiversity scorecard discussions. Responses to MTR recommendations | Data tables for the report | Abera |
| July 16 | Finalize schedule and itinerary; make appointments. Compile List of Contacts. Finalize Inception Report. | Final Itinerary | Project team/ Abera |
| July 16-17 | Design data collection methods for assessing status of the 4 pilot sites and related CBOs. Capacity scorecard and CBO Survey. | Profiles of the project sites and CBOs status | Alan/Abera |
| July 17-18 | Selected interviews in Addis with key informants (EFCCO, EBI, GiZ, etc) linkages to other projects; PES commitments | Draft itineraryInterview Notes | Alan/Abera |
| July 19-22 | Travel to Arjo-DigaArjo-Dign stakeholder meetings | Interview Notes; Project site report | Alan/Abera |
| July 22-23 | Travel to Addis/work in Addis |  |  |
| July 24-26 | Travel to KulfoKulfo stakeholder meetings | Interview Notes; Project site report | Alan/Abera |
| July 27-28 | Travel to Addis/work on report | Interview Notes; Project site report | Alan/Abera |
| July 29-30 | Travel to BahirdarStakeholder mtgs | Interview Notes | Alan/Abera |
| July 31 | Travel to Addis |  | Alan/Abera |
| Aug 1 | Meetings national stakeholders |  | Alan/Abera |
| Aug 2 | Debriefing with UNDP | Debriefing note |  |
| Aug 3-18 | Draft Report preparation | Draft Report | Alan/Abera |
| Aug 19-31 | Review of Draft Report and preparation of Final Report | Final Report | Alan/Abera |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |

**ANNEX 1: EVALUATION MATRIX (DRAFT)**

| **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 the project has contributed to GEF-5 strategic objective, which is conservation and sustainable utilization of biodiversity and ecosystems
 | * Consistency with national and UNDP/GEF priorities
* Amendments to Ethiopia’s CRGE strategy to address contribution of biodiversity
* Changes in priorities or commitments that may have affected relevance of the project
 | * Revised, modified or new national strategy due to the project
* Interview data on the quality of the project design
 | * Interview and Focal Group Discussions
* Review of alignment with GEF and government programmes and institutions
 |
|  | * How far the project designing process has considered participation of counter parts from national and local government as well as project beneficiaries at the community level
 | * Number of agencies and people (M/F) that participated
* Extent of partners’ involvement and ownership including integration into ongoing programmes
 | * Minutes kept during LPAC meeting and inception reports
* Interview notes
 | * Meetings, FGDs, personal interviews
 |
|  | * How do you weigh the project strategies and objectives? Are these sufficient to reverse degradation of ecosystem conditions and loss of biodiversity in the selected project areas, do you think sites selected by the project are fairly representative?
 | * Stakeholder views of the project concept and approach
* Project design level of representative targeting of GEF focal area objectives and national objectives
* Achievability of ProDoc targets
 | * Prodoc, Project MTR report, Success stories, annual reports
* Interview notes
 | * Desk review
* FGDs, interviews
 |
| Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? |
|  | * **Objective: Mainstreaming biodiversity**

1) To what extent has biodiversity conservation been integrated into national/local development systems?2) What is the status of the targeted PAs and use of PES agreements and funding in Ethiopia? | * National system that appreciate values of biodiversity
* Number of institutions strengthened
* Number of biodiversity PER study
* % of pressure reduction on the land resource
* Area of land put under community stewardship via PES system
 | * Annual report
* National PER study document for the biodiversity sector
* Physical observation of selected project sites
 | * Desk review
 |
|  | * **Outcome 1: Enabling framework**

1) What decision support tools and plans have been established at each pilot site?2) What processes have been established and utilized to assess biodiversity values?3) What policy measures, technical support and organizational development have occurred to support conservation?4) What training has been completed and how have new skills been applied? | * Number of newly created institutions
* Number of strengthened institutions
* Application of tools and knowledge products for biodiversity conservation
* Policy changes instigated by the project
* Number of trainings, persons trained and results of trainings
 | * Quarter and Annual reports
* Project MTR
* Project outputs
* Post-training surveys
 | * Desk review
* Interview
* Observation
* FGDS
 |
|  | **Outcome 2: PES pilots**1) How successful have the PES pilots been in establishing agreements for ecosystem services?2) What is the current capacity of the 34 CBOs to facilitate biodiversity conservation and PES?3) What capacity gaps remain within government and communities?4) What are the main lessons and challenges that have emerged from the PES pilots? | * PES agreements produced by the project
* CBO survey and field observation on status of PAs
* Capacity scorecard ratings, organizational changes and post-training assessments
* Rating of CBO’s capacity to implement enhanced biodiversity conservation and PES agreements
* Funding commitments for PES agreements
 | * Quarter and Annual reports
* Project MTR
* Interviews with project participants
 | * Desk review
* Interview
* Meetings
* FGDs
* Surveys of CBOs
 |
| Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards? |
|  | * Has the project timely launched and completed all the deliverables as originally planned?
 | * Timeliness
 | * Project annual reports and MTR
 | * Desk review
 |
|  | * Have the project personnel and finance been utilized in line with the intended international and national standards?
 | * In Conformity with GEF priorities and national plan
* Participant satisfaction
 | * GEF-5 strategic objective
* Ethiopia’s national plan 2016-2019
 | * Desk review
* Interviews
* Financial audit review
 |
|  | * Has the project resource efficiently utilized to address the needs/problems identified during the project design?
 | * Time disaggregated (quarter, year) fund utilization track
 | * PIR report
* Finance data compilation/analyses
 | * Desk review
 |
|  | * Project efficiency/cost effectiveness: Has the project been generally efficient and cost effective in relation to results?
 | * Outputs achieved relative to costs; value for money
* Proportion of costs for project management
 | * PIR report
* Finance data compilation/analyses
 | * Desk review
 |
|  | * Finance/cofinancing: Has project financing and budgeting occurred as planned?
 | * Co-financing and in-kind contributions
* Efficiency of disbursements and financial management and reporting
 | * Finance data compilation/analyses
 | * Desk review
 |
|  Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? |
|  | * Has the project sufficiently forecast institutional, socio-economic and environmental risks to sustain the project gains? What about risk mitigation strategies?
 | * Number of Risk analysis and mitigation plans
* Responses to anticipated risks
 | * Project document
* Interview notes
 | * Desk Review of risk management
 |
|  | * Has the project sufficiently linked its results to existing government systems?
 | * Number and level of arrangements
* Policy developments that have enhanced sustainability
 | * Government Commitment letters
* Project reports
 | * Desk Review
* Interviews
 |
|  | * Is the project strategy been sufficiently owned and sustained by national and local government?
 | * Level of Government ownership
* Institutional development measures to enhance sustainability
 | * Government Commitment letters
 | * Desk Review
* Interviews
 |
| **Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?**  |
|  | * What are the project effects across the project regions in reducing environmental stress and biodiversity loss
 | * % reduction in biodiversity loss in the project conservation areas
* % of ecological restoration in the project sites
 | * Project reports
* Project MTR
* Data on PA status
 | * Desk review
* Interview
* Physical observation
 |
|  | * What is the overall progress rate of the project to its original targets /to improve ecological status?
 | * Overall environmental trend of the project conservation sites (inclining, declining or no change)
* Trends in ecosystem status, wildlife species and habitats of concern
 | * Project tracking tools
* Project Digital maps
* Data on PA and ecosystem and species status
 | * Desk review
* Physical observation in selected project sites
 |
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**Annex 3 Project achievements - July 2019**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Components** | **Indicator** | **Baseline**  | **Target for end of project** | **Current status of Achievements** |
| **Project objective:** **To ensure that the biodiversity of Ethiopia is better protected from current and future threats by ensuring development and investment decisions do not impact negatively on biodiversity**  | (i) A comprehensive CRGE that recognizes conservation and sustainable use of BD as a major contributor to its goal of increasing GDP; and delivers a coherent response to BD loss, and CC; (ii) At least 20,000ha of the highlythreatened afro-montane forests are underimproved stewardshipby community landmanagers, as a resultof a PES schemepiloted, indicated byno loss of habitatin BD sensitive areas(from clearance foragriculture). | The importance of biodiversity conservation not adequately appreciated across sectors – or the budget process in Ethiopia  | 1. The importance of biodiversity conservation is better recognised at all levels in Ethiopia – including in the federal budget process –, investment in the environment is increased and decision makers in the planning system are better able to make decisions to protect biodiversity and ecosystem services. 2. Pilot PES operational in four sites. 3. At least 20,000 ha of the highly threatened Afromontane ecoregion are under improved stewardship by community land managers, as a result of the PES scheme piloted, indicated by no loss of habitat in BD sensitive areas (from clearance for agriculture, deforestation for fuel / building wood or grazing).  | ***To be completed*** |
| **Outcome 1: The enabling framework for mainstreaming incentives for biodiversity conservation into the CRGE at national level strengthened**   | (i) Improved recognition of conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity as a major contributor to the CGRE strategy of increasing GDP; and delivers a coherent response to biodiversity loss, and climate change.  | GoE budget not coded for environment No BDER Importance of biodiversity conservation is in planning and EIA systems but staff have limited capacity to implement systems  | 1. Biodiversity Expenditure review completed.2. GoE budget coded for biodiversity expenditure.3. Decision makers more aware of the importance of Biodiversity to national and local economies and willing to redirect greater financial support to the Biodiversity sector. |  |
| (ii) Requisite staff capacitated and well positioned to use decision support tools and the results from BPER, and other relevant studies regularly in their decision-making  | 4. 6 regional level large scale digital maps of critical biodiversity areas developed; 5. Biodiversity score cards in place to determine a) no go areas (b) areas where developments may be allowed but with certain minimum conditions - target 6 (by end PY 2).6. Spatial data, decision support tools and training provided to staff in all regions to better equip them to implement systems to support protection of biodiversity and ecosystem services in sustainable development.7. Key staff trained in all relevant sectors at all levels on how to use the maps and scorecards for better land use planning and investments - – target 24 (by end PY2), 16 more (by end PY3), 24 more (by end PY4). |  |
| (iii) Better cooperation and interaction of institutions involved in managing the response to biodiversity loss and climate change  |  |  |
| **Outcome 2: Payments for biodiversity conservation and wider ecosystem services is piloted at selected sites**  | (i) Enhanced conservation security for the following threatened species (ii) Land use changes under PES, result in increased forest cover, reduced habitat loss and habitat degradation by 35%  | No land under PES in selected pilot sites  | 1. At least 20,000ha under PES agreements in pilot sites. 2. At least 25% of land users in pilot areas benefiting from PES.3. 50 % of land users increasingly aware of importance of BD and ESs.4. At least 25% of land users using SLM technologies to enhance production in non-PES pilot areas.5. Key local staff of MEFCC and other local institutions (including universities) trained in negotiation, contracting, transaction, monitoring and verification to effectively manage the PES schemes [60 overall (10 per pilot area and 20 additional for scaling-up)].6. *Metrics for determining the* *payments designed:* Ecosystem services in the selected sites are defined, measured and assessed; amount of payment is determined. |  |
|  | (iii) Institutional capacity of national and provincial governments (*woredas*) is emplaced to coordinate PES programmes, allowing for the systematic scale up of PES across the Afromontane forests (covering at least 20,000 hectares)  | 7. Prospective sellers to supply ecosystem services identified; and their capacity to modify land use practices is enhanced through technical assistance / extension on biodiversity friendly land use practices.8. PES agreements are brokered between sellers and Government specifying conditions for payments (Value of service; mode of payment; delivery of service) agreed upon by Government and sellers and operationalised through contracts.9. Institutions in place to manage the PES scheme – such as negotiation, contracting, transaction and verification. |  |
| (iv) Increased government investment in pro-conservation PES in the Afromontane forests by EOP (MTR recommended revising indicator: ‘Guidelines for ecosystem services valuation developed, including indicators to evaluate biodiversity restoration status’. | 10. Monitoring and verification system measures the impact of intervention (PES) on land use changes (actual delivery of ecosystem services), biodiversity and livelihoods in the target sites using standards and indicators derived from baseline information.  |  |

**Responses to issues identified in the MTR Report**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Area** | **Weaknesses/challenges noted in MTR** | **Actions taken/proposed to strengthen results** |
| **Project strategy** | - The project does not provide enough support to build sustainable, climate-resilient livelihoods for the communities in the project sites.- PES is a completely new approach in Ethiopia. Therefore, the design and implementation of the PES system should happen as early as possible to ensure demonstration of the economic and environmental benefits, and to provide local communities with alternative source of income |  |
| **Project objective:** To ensure that the biodiversity ofEthiopia is betterprotected fromcurrent and futurethreats by ensuringdevelopment andinvestment decisionsdo not impact negatively on biodiversity | - PES is not fully implemented as no legal framework was adopted yet. As a result, only volunteer – not mandatory – PES agreements have been signed between CBOs and public/private buyers.Several of these buyers have requested the adoption by the GoE of an operational framework to support legal PES transactions.- The GoE’s commitment to provide USD 1.6 million towards PES scheme has not been concretised yet. |  |
| **Outcome 1:**The enabling framework for mainstreamingincentives for biodiversityconservation intothe CRGE strengthened | - The review team noted that the regional digital maps produced by the project do not include relevant data allowing to demonstrate the project’s impacts on biodiversity conservation areas (because of the time series used to produce the maps); the reviewers have advised to add relevant data, and the project team is acting upon this recommendation.- Access to the project’s knowledge products and decision support tools can be improved, as there is currently communication outlets (e.g. website) for compiling and sharing them. |  |
| **Outcome 2:**Payments for Ecosystem services (including biodiversityconservation) is piloted at selected sites | - The GoE’s commitment to provide USD 1.6 million as co-finance to the PES scheme has not been concretised yet; this co-finance is critical to enable the implementation of PES. |  |
| **Project****implementation****and adaptive****management** | - The national legal framework which development was supported by the project has not been adopted yet, by the GOE, therefore, site specific PES systems are not yet operational.  |  |
| **Sustainability** | - The project’s livelihood component is weak. There is limited support available for the promotion of alternative, sustainable livelihoods. Yet, a siloed approach to BD conservation is not sustainable, it needs to be combined with support to sustainable livelihood options to deliver satisfactory long-term results |  |

**ANNEX 4 Project Activities Data and CBO Survey**

**Project Sites Status**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Protected Area for PES piloting** | **Legal Designation** | **Ha start****Ha current** | **# active CBOs** | **Annual budget**  |
| Choke mountain ecosystem in Amhara regional state |  |  |  |  |
| Diga-Arjo forest in Oromia regional state |  |  |  |  |
| Kulfo forest in South Nations, Nationalities and Peoples’ regional state |  |  |  |  |
| Hadew (Karamara) range area in Ethio-Somali regional state |  |  |  |  |

**List of Trainings and Workshops**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Date** | **Location** | **Events** | **Participants****(M/F)** | **Documents & post-training activity** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

**CBO Survey data – to be prepared**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Project site/CBOs (42)** | **Capacity building activities** | **Conservation initiatives** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**CBO Survey: Mainstreaming Incentives for Biodiversity Conservation**

**Name of CBO: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Protected/management area: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Legal status of the CBO: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**No. of CBO members (M/F): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Main activities of the CBO: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

1. **What are the primary ecosystem services or biodiversity values of concern to your organization?**
2. **What are the main threats to these ecosystems services/biodiversity values in your area? Have ‘biodiversity scorecards’ been completed for your area?**
3. **What are the key issues and challenges that your CBO faces in protecting these ecosystems and biodiversity values?**
4. **Do you have a management plan or conservation agreement for your area? If so, is it useful and adequate to guide your activities?**
5. **Do you have a monitoring program or system for inspection and reporting on the protected area? Are you satisfied with this monitoring process?**
6. **What is the status of information and knowledge about the ecosystems and biodiversity in your area – High/Moderate/Low? Are there specific gaps?**
7. **What is your current annual budget and sources of funding?**
8. **Have alternative livelihoods been introduced to assist conservation? If so, please describe these livelihoods and the main beneficiaries.**
9. **Does your organization have the capacity to sustain the protection of ecosystem services and biodiversity values after the Project is completed? (Sufficient Capacity /Partial Capacity/Inadequate Capacity). If not, what are the main gaps in capacity?**
10. **Has there been any progress toward *Payment of Ecosystem* services in your area? If so, please describe. If not, what are the main constraints or barriers?**

This survey is being distributed to 42 CBOs involved with the *Mainstreaming Incentives for Biodiversity Conservation Project* in Ethiopia. Your assistance in completing this survey is greatly appreciated.

**List of Project PES Agreements/Negotiations**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Title** | **Current Status** | **Summary** |
|  |  |  |
| 2. |  |  |
| 3. |  |  |
| 4. |  |  |
| 5. |  |  |
| 6. |  |  |
| 7. |  |  |
| 8. |  |  |
| 9. |  |  |
| 10. |  |  |
| 11. |  |  |
| 12. |  |  |
| 13. |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ANNEX 5** **PROJECT FINANCING****Project Budget and Expenditures ($‘000) 2015 – 2019**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **June 2019** | **Total to June 2019** |
|  | **Budget** | **Expend** | **Budget** | **Expend** | **Budget** | **Expend** | **Budget** | **Expend** |  |
| **Outcome 1** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 2** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Project Mgt** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Total** |  |  **(x%)** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

 |  |  |

**Project Financing and co-financing status**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project financing** | **Project Document****2015** | **At Midterm Review****June 2018**  | **Terminal Evaluation****August 2019** | **%** |
| ***Cash grant*** |  |  |  |  |
| GEF: | 3,316,453 | 2,124,550 |  |  |
| UNDP: | 200,000  | 82,000 |  |  |
| Govt:  | 1,600,000 | 0 |  |  |
| Sub-Total | 5,116,453 | 2,206,550 |  |  |
| ***In-kind*** |  |  |  |  |
| Govt:  | 14,200,000 | 7,000,000 |  |  |
| UNDP in-kind | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Sub-Total |  |  |  |  |
| TOTAL | 19,316,453 | 9,206,550 |  |  |

 Sources: Project Document, MTR Report

**ANNEX 6: Draft Interview Guide**

This is a reference guide only, intended to assist interviews as needed and in conjunction with the evaluation criteria/matrix. It is not a questionnaire. It serves as an informal aid in prompting discussion during the interviews and will be supplemented with additional questions.

**Project Formulation**

1. Did you observe any problems or gaps in the project design or approach that affected project implementation?
2. Was there adequate participation of stakeholders and beneficiaries in the project formulation? (How were you involved?)
3. Has the project strategy – technical support/training and PES development and piloting, been effective? How could it have been improved?

**Project Implementation**

1. How effective and efficient was the Project Structure in facilitating project coordination, communications and implementation at national, provincial and local levels? Would you have changed anything in hindsight?
2. Has annual work planning and budgeting been effective? Have actual disbursements been in line with annual budgets, work plans and schedules (discuss Fin. Tables)? Were there any delays in administrative processes?
3. Have the project management bodies and partners been sufficiently active in guiding and responding to issues? (examples?) Are any MTR responses incomplete?
4. Have the project monitoring Indicators been effective and feasible for reporting on progress? Have they provided reliable measures of change?
5. What have been the major challenges or issues in implementing the project? Are there lessons for design of future projects?
6. What are the characteristics of PES sellers and buyers in the project pilot sites? What features have affected agreement or non-agreement?

**Project Results**

1. What aspects of the project have been most successful, and which least successful? Are there specific measures that have affected the potential for replication?
2. Can you identify *the Key Factors* that have affected the project results – either positive or negative?
3. What has been the most apparent change in biodiversity conservation that you have seen from the project? What gaps remain in capacity development?
4. What is the most important learning or skill, if any, that you have acquired from the project trainings or demonstrations? Any post-training data?
5. How have the decision support tools been used in decision making? Is there a long term vision for these tools?
6. Are there any expected results that have not been completely achieved or are not fully satisfactory?

**Sustainability**

1. Do you think that the use of decision support tools and PES processes will be continued after the project closes? Why? Why not?
2. Are there any exit strategies for the project? What actions could be considered to enhance sustainability? How will lessons be shared within Ethiopia and with other countries?

**Impact**

1. Should any further changes in government policy or regulations be considered to assist mainstreaming incentives into the CRGE strategy?
2. Are there any specific examples of alternative livelihoods that have succeeded in conjunction with conservation that could provide models for replication?
3. Is there any empirical evidence of project impact on government biodiversity conservation budgets allocations?

**ANNEX 8: EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT 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**30

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

**Name of Consultant:** Alan Ferguson

**Name of Consultancy Organization** (where relevant): Regional Consulting Limited

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

**Conduct for Evaluation.**

Signed at *(place) Vancouver* on July 10, 2019

****

Signature:

**Annex - Draft Detailed Schedule (to be completed)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Date** | **Time** | **Key person**  | **Organisation** | **Venue** | **Phone/contact** | **Status** |
| **Mon July 15** |  | Alan arrival Addis |  |  |  |  |
| **Tues July 16** | 9:00-10:00am |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2:30-3:30pm | Wubua Mekonnen and Abdeta Debella | UNDP | Congo Building | 0911561417 and 0915700200 respectively |  |
| **Wed July 17** | 9.00am 3:00pm | Work within UNDP |  |  |  |  |
| **Thu July 18** | 9:30-10:30 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2:30-3:30pm |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Fri July 19** | 9:00-10:00am | **In the morning:** Prof. Fikadu Beyene( Commissioner for EFCC) | Environment, Forest and CC  | Arat Kilo Area |  |  |
|  | 1.30 pm | Getu Geleta, project officer in Arjo-Diga | Local EFCC authority | Diga town | 0910-130414 |  |
|  | etc | Project Steering committee  | Diga district Administrator office |  | c/o Getu0910130414 |  |
| **Sat July 20** |  | Diga-Arjo forest in Oromia regional state which has also high importance for Dedhesa sub-basin in the west, **Visit to the project sites** |  |  | c/o Getu0910130414 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Sun July 21** |  | **Discussion with CBO representatives** |  |  | c/o Getu0910130414 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Mon July 22** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Tues July 23** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **etc** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **July 24**  |  | Contact Project officer( Molalign Kesese) |  |  | 0931-410752 |  |
| **July 25** |  | Meeting with project steering committee |  |  | c/o Molalign0931-410752 |  |
|  |  | Meeting with project Steering Committee | Zonal Administrator office |  | C/0 Ato Mazie head enviornmnet office 090502151 |  |
| **July 26** |  | Kulfo forest in South Nations, Nationalities and Peoples’ regional state which is also a critical catchment for Omo watershed to the south | Visit to the project sites and discuss with CBO members |  | C/o Molalign0931-410752 |  |
| **July 27** |  | Return to Addis |  |  |  |  |
| **July 28** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **July 29** |  | **Discussion with Amhara regional Environment and Forest Authority** | Amhara EFWLC Authority  |  | Dr. Belayneh or Ato BelstyC/o Solomon Berhanu, Project officer0913-106503 |  |
| **July 30** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **July 31** |  | **Return to Addis** |  |  |  |  |
| **Aug 1** |  | **Prepare notes and presentation** |  |  |  |  |
| **Aug 2** |  | **Final meetings and debriefing** |  |  |  |  |
| **Aug 3** |  | **Alan to depart Addis** |  |  |  |  |

1. UNDP, *Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*, 2012. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)