

## Terms of Reference

### Consultancy to support the Terminal Evaluation of the *Integrated Landscape Management for Improved Livelihoods and Ecosystem Resilience in Mount Elgon*

Programme /Project Title:	Integrated Landscape Management for Improved Livelihoods and Ecosystem Resilience in Mount Elgon
Scope of Advertisement:	International
Type of Contract:	Individual Consultant
Post Type:	International Consultant
Duty Station:	Kampala
Expected Areas of Travel:	Kampala, Mbale, Bulambuli, Manafwa
Languages:	English
Duration of Contract:	30 working days spread over a period of two calendar months
Start Date:	1 <sup>st</sup> July 2020

#### I. Introduction

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full-size UNDP supported 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 *Integrated Landscape Management for Improved Livelihoods and Ecosystem Resilience in Mount Elgon (PIMS #4634)*.

#### II. Background

The Government of Uganda through the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF) with support from United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the Global Environmental Facility (GEF) is implementing the project “Integrated Landscape Management for Ecosystem Resilience and Improved Livelihoods in the Mt. Elgon Region” in the districts of Mbale, Bulambuli and Manafwa.

Mt Elgon landscape presents a variety of ecosystems providing services upon which local population heavily depends. A large portion of the landscape is now degraded, considering current changes in land use due to expansion of agriculture fields and human settlements, largely driven by high population growth. There is also increasing pressure on the land to accommodate a population that is still rising in the Mt Elgon region and the inherent danger is that this increasing pressure for land will impact negatively on land use, such as a) causing trees to be cut for fuel wood before maturing and b) increase encroachment into the upper protected watersheds c) increased land fragmentation d) increased soil erosion. The project will facilitate a transformative shift from unsustainable to integrated sustainable land management in Mount Elgon landscape, an area identified by the Government of Uganda as a high priority for interventions to prevent land degradation and reduce risks of natural disasters. The project will address the underlying issues behind the drivers of degradation of ecosystems in Mt Elgon such as land use planning or lack thereof, and the insecure land tenure. Proper mapping of community resources and developing land use plans based on those resources will ensure users takes into account the ecosystem values and ecosystem carrying capacity. Addressing land tenure insecurity will incentivise communities to invest in Sustainable Land Management (SLM) activities that ensure

the long-term resilience of the resource base on which they rely. Soil erosion and forest cover will also be addressed in the process.

To increase sustainability and ownership of the interventions, it is imperative that entire communities' capacities are built to work together to restore and to sustainably use the available resources.

The overall goal of the project is to empower communities in Mt Elgon to manage their production landscapes in an integrated manner for improved livelihoods and ecosystem resilience. The project implementation commenced since August 2017 without any significant change and with almost all project outcomes met. As a requirement to complete project implementation, this final evaluation will focus on: a) the cost-effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation and performance; b) highlight issues requiring decisions and actions; and c) present initial lessons learned about project design, implementation and management. Findings of this evaluation will be incorporated as lessons learned, and recommendations for improvement addressed to ensure the institutional sustainability of project outputs, particular for the replication of project activities. The final evaluation will also look at project outcomes and their sustainability. The final evaluation should also provide recommendations for follow-up activities, as appropriate.

#### PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title	Integrated Landscape Management for Improved Livelihoods and Ecosystem Resilience in Mount Elgon			
GEF Project ID:	4634		<u>at endorsement</u> <u>(Million US\$)</u>	<u>at completion</u> <u>(Million US\$)</u>
UNDP Project ID:	00095404	GEF financing:	1,620,320	1,620,320
Country:	Uganda	UNDP	2,670,750	2,670,750
Region:	Africa	Government:	6,160,634	6,160,634
Focal Area:	SLM, CCM & SFM	Other:		
FA Objectives, (OP/SP)		Total co-financing:	8,831,384	8,831,384
Executing Agency:	Ministry of Agriculture Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF)	Total Project Cost:	10,451,704	10,451,704
Other Partners involved:	MWE, MLHUD, NARO, Mbale, Manafwa and	ProDoc Signature (date project began):	29 Feb 2016	
		(Operational closing date)	Proposed: 30 Feb 2018	Actual: 30 August 2020

	Bulambuli District Local Governments, NGOs, CBOs and Local communities and Private sector			
--	---	--	--	--

### III. Objective and Scope

The project was designed to empower communities in Mt Elgon to manage their production landscapes in an integrated manner for improved livelihoods and ecosystem resilience.

It was designed to contribute to this goal through 2 outcomes including:

Outcome 1: The landscape planning and management processes in the district of Manafwa, Bulambuli and Mbale are done in an integrated manner to reduce land degradation and increase carbon sequestration and

Outcome 2: Local communities are empowered and applying technologies and approaches to reverse land degradation and reduce GHG emissions.

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 draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming

### IV. Evaluation Approach and Method

An overall approach and method 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 (fill in Annex C) A set of questions covering each of these criteria must be drafted into an evaluative matrix , which the evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit as part of an inception report, and must include as an annex to the final terminal evaluation.

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 Uganda, including the following project sites (Mbale, Bulambuli and Manafwa). Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

- 1) Leadership of the Ministry of Agriculture Animal Industry and Fisheries
- 2) Select officials of the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries
- 3) Select officials from the Ministry of Water and Environment
- 4) Select officials of the National Agricultural Research Organisation (NARO)
- 5) Select officials of the Busitema University
- 6) Select officials of the National Forestry Authority
- 7) Leadership and selected officials of Mbale District Local Government
- 8) Leadership and selected officials of Bulambuli District Local Government
- 9) Leadership and selected officials of Manafwa District Local Government
- 10) Select officials of NGOs that have worked on project implementation
- 11) Select officials of CBOs (that have contributed to project delivery
- 12) Select officials of Local communities including project participants
- 13) Select officials of the Private sector(specify)
- 14) Officials of UNDP Uganda

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual PIR, Mid-term review, 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.

#### Responsibilities of the International Consultant in this assignment

The consultant is expected to use a mixed method design that will incorporate and integrate qualitative and quantitative methods in order to optimally meet objectives.

The study design to permit:

- Development of a detailed profile of the farmers in the study (including poverty profile and starting asset level, and baseline status of outcomes of interest).
- Measurement of change at the farm and household, from the baseline to a period 3 years later.
- Comparison of changes over time between households and communities with and without interventions using both statistical and econometric techniques.
- Attribution of that observed change in outcomes to intervention.
- Assessment of whether, how, and why starting farm and household outcome levels and observed change in these outcomes over time differ across different types of farmers (e.g. farmers with different levels of initial assets, different poverty profiles, and of different genders), and

- Assessment of the contribution of other variables to explain variations in outcomes, including but not limited to the livelihood zone, accessibility, nature and quantity of training and support services received, and farmer organization, if applicable.
- The quantitative work is expected to be complemented with qualitative research, which will inform the models used for the impact evaluations (result chain), explain and validate the results of the quantitative studies.
- The qualitative analysis should be based on, among others; community level focus group discussions and interviews with key informants (e.g. target group, project implementers and funders).
- The evaluation questions on problems, context and description of the project should be addressed through reviewing available documentation and interviewing key informants at the relevant national, district and household levels.
- The questions on sustainability are expected to be addressed by including questions about institutional performance and factors that determine sustainability in the field surveys and focus group discussions.
- Field visits to investigate in more depth the institutional aspects of the project at the local level.

#### Responsibilities and tasks

- Before starting, be thoroughly familiar with the Project (objectives, outputs and undertaken activities, etc.) from the key background documentation provided by ILM Project Management team (project appraisal report, supervision mission reports, progress reports, M&E reports and special studies, background information on the project area, etc.);
- Agree with project management on the methodology of the review, in terms of: (i) the level of participation vis-à-vis management on the process of data collection, data analysis, etc. (ii) the sampling methodology to be adopted (interviews, questionnaires, participatory techniques, etc.);
- Per component, assess physical progress, efficiency and adequacy, in terms of delivery of project inputs, outputs and outcomes;
- Assess the relevance and effectiveness of all implemented Project activities, including technical assistance and training given to Project beneficiaries/stakeholders in relation to design objectives;
- Analyze which factors and constraints have influenced Project implementation, including technical, managerial, organizational, institutional and socio-economic policy issues, in addition to other external factors unforeseen during design;
- Produce a clear set of lessons learned that can be beneficial in design and implementation of other similar projects.

## V. Evaluation Criteria and 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.

<b>Evaluation Ratings:</b>			
<b>1. Monitoring and Evaluation</b>	<i>rating</i>	<b>2. IA&amp; EA Execution</b>	<i>rating</i>
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	
<b>3. Assessment of Outcomes</b>	<i>rating</i>	<b>4. Sustainability</b>	<i>rating</i>
Relevance		Financial resources:	
Effectiveness		Socio-political:	
Efficiency		Institutional framework and governance:	
Overall Project Outcome Rating		Environmental :	
		Overall likelihood of sustainability:	

## VI. 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, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

Co-financing (type/source)	UNDP own financing (mill. US\$)		Government (mill. US\$)		Partner Agency (mill. US\$)		Total (mill. US\$)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Actual	Actual
Grants								
Loans/Concessions								
• In-kind support								
• Other (e.g parallel investments)								
Totals								

## VII. 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.

## VIII. 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.

## IX. 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, and should indicate which agencies or individuals will be responsible for implementation, and relevant timeframes. The lessons learned from the project should have wider applicability to other initiatives across the region, the area of intervention, and for the future.

## X. Implementation arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Uganda. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc. This component of the work will require careful advance planning to accommodate possible constraints imposed by COVID-19-related restrictions on travel and gatherings, should these still be in effect at the time the TE is conducted.

## XI. Evaluation timeframe

The total duration of the evaluation will be 25 days (spread over two calendar months) according to the following plan:

Activity	Duration	Completion Date
Preparation	03 days	3 July 2020
Evaluation Mission	20 days	31 July 2020
Draft Evaluation Report	05 days	7 August 2020
Final Report	02 days	12 August 2020

## XII. Evaluation deliverables

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
-------------	---------	--------	------------------

Inception Report	Evaluators provide clarifications on timing and method	No later than 1 weeks before the evaluation mission.	Team leader 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 2 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.

### XIII. Team Composition

The evaluation team will be composed of 1 international evaluator and 1 national evaluator. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage.

The international evaluator will be designated as the team leader and will be responsible for guiding the entire evaluation process and finalizing the report. He/she will work remotely. The local consultant will be responsible for collection of all in-country data that cannot be collected remotely, including field work, where this is possible. 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.

The international evaluator will be designated as the team leader and will be responsible for 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.

The Team members must present the following qualifications:

#### Requirements for Experience and Qualifications:

##### Academic Qualifications:

- Advanced University Degree (Masters or equivalent) in natural sciences; with a specialization in environment, biodiversity, climate change or any other closely related field

##### Experience:

- Minimum 8 years of relevant professional experience in relevant technical areas;
- Minimum of 4 years proven track record of application of results-based approaches to evaluation of projects focusing on Sustainable Land Management, sustainable Forest Management and Climate Change mitigation;
- Highly knowledgeable of participatory monitoring and evaluation processes;



- Familiarity with Uganda's development, environment, land, forest and other relevant policy frameworks;
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and Sustainable Land Management;
- Excellent English writing and communication skills.

#### Competences:

- Excellent analytical skills;
- Demonstrates integrity and ethical standards;
- Ability to act professionally and flexibility to engage with Government Officials, Development Partner Representatives and the Private Sector.

The National Consultant shall have these qualifications:

- Advanced University Degree (Masters or equivalent) in natural sciences; with a specialization in environment, biodiversity, climate change or any other closely related field (15%);
- Minimum 8 years of relevant professional experience in relevant technical areas (15%);
- Minimum of 4 years proven track record of application of results-based approaches to evaluation of projects focusing on Sustainable Land Management, sustainable Forest Management and Climate Change mitigation (20%);
- Highly knowledgeable of participatory monitoring and evaluation processes (5%);
- Familiarity with Uganda's development, environment, land, forest and other relevant policy frameworks (5%);
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender mainstreaming and Sustainable Land Management (5%);
- Excellent English writing and communication skills (5%)

#### XIV. Selection Criteria

Qualified Individual Consultant is expected to submit both the Technical and Financial Proposals. Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated. The Consultant will be evaluated based on qualifications and the years of experience, as outlined in the qualifications/requirements section of the Terms of Reference. In addition, the consultant will also be evaluated on the following methodology:

Technical Criteria weight: 70%  
Financial criteria weight: 30%

The award of the contract shall be made to the Consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as: Responsive/compliant/acceptable; and having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the Terms of Reference.

#### XV. 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'

## XVI. Payment modalities and specifications

%	Milestone
25%	Upon submission and approval of inception report and work plan
35%	Following submission and approval of the 1 <sup>st</sup> draft terminal evaluation report
40%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report

## XVII. Application process

Applicants are requested to apply online at <http://jobs.undp.org> by Friday 3<sup>rd</sup> April 2020. Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions. The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in English with indication of the e-mail and phone contact. Shortlisted candidates will be requested to submit a price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs).

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

Interested individual consultants are requested to apply online at <http://jobs.undp.org> by Friday 30<sup>th</sup> June 2020 and must submit the following documents/information to demonstrate their qualifications:

- a) Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability using the template 3 provided by UNDP;
- b) Curriculum Vitae (CV) 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;
- c) 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 on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 3 pages);
- d) 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, as per template attached to the Letter of Confirmation of Interest template.

If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

Applicants are requested to group the requested documents into one (1) single PDF document as the application only allows to upload maximum one document: All application materials should be submitted to UNDP by 30<sup>th</sup> June 2020. Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

## ANNEX A: THE PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Outcomes	Output	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Means of verification	Assumption
1. The landscape planning and management processes in the district of Manafwa, Bulambuli and Mbale are done in an integrated manner to reduce land degradation and increase carbon sequestration	1.1 Community resource maps developed in 6 sub-counties in 3 districts	Percentage of parishes with community resource maps developed and disseminated in the 6 sub-counties in the 3 districts	No resource maps are available in the parishes of the 6 sub-counties of intervention	Community resources maps are developed and disseminated in the 33 parishes of the 6 sub-counties	Community resource maps  Workshop attendance sheets	Communities provide valuable inputs for the development of resource maps  Land use plans, existing legislation and district development plans are taken seriously and effectively enforced
	1.2 Land use plans developed, in line with the resource maps, in 6 highly degraded sub-counties	Percentage of parishes with land use plans developed and disseminated in 6 highly degraded sub-counties	No land use plans are available in the 6 sub-counties of intervention	Land use plans are developed and disseminated in the 33 parishes of the 6 highly degraded sub-counties	Land use plans  Workshop attendance sheets	
	1.3 District local governments supported to implement clauses regarding SLM, SFM and CCM	Number of clauses implemented	SLM, SFM and CCM clauses are available in the three districts of intervention but not implemented	50% of the relevant clauses identified are implemented	1 gap analysis study on SLM legislation  Clauses in existing legislation	Land conflicts remain localized and do not endanger the overall project implementation
		Number of people with increased awareness on SLM technologies and approaches	Lack of awareness on SLM technologies and approaches	30 district staff  60 local community representatives with increased awareness in SLM technologies and approaches	Workshop attendance sheets	The occurrence of extreme climate events does not compromise the implementation of project activities
	1.4 A system for effective monitoring and enforcement of the land use plans and related legislation is put in place	Existence or absence of a monitoring and enforcement framework	No monitoring and enforcement systems are effectively implemented	1 monitoring and enforcement framework designed per district	Monitoring and enforcement framework	
	1.5 SLM, SFM and CCM mainstreamed	Existence or absence of guidelines to	The Districts Development Plans do not	3 Districts have guidelines to integrate SLM,	Guidelines for Districts	

	into district policy plans	integrate SLM, SFM and CCM into District Development Plans	significantly consider SLM, SFM and CCM	SFM and CCM into their Development Plans	Development Plans	
		Existence or absence of District Environment Action Plans	No District Environment Action Plans are in place in the districts	1 Local Environmental Committee is effective on each district and has developed guidelines for a District Environment Action Plan	Local Environmental Committees Meeting reports  Guidelines for District Environment Action Plan	
2. Local communities are empowered and applying technologies and approaches to reverse land degradation and reduce GHG emissions.	2.1 Enhanced local capacities for the adoption of sustainable forest and land management and climate change mitigation through the FFS approach	Number of master trainers trained in SLM, SFM and CCM  Number of FFS facilitators trained and equipped  Number of farmers trained	Limited capacities in SLM, SFM and CCM and equipment among the extension staff and farmers of the districts of intervention	6 extension staff (50% women) per district trained and equipped to be FFS facilitators  1500 farmers trained	Training attendance sheets  FFS attendance sheets  Declaration of improved equipment from master trainers and FFS facilitators	Extension staff and farmers participate actively in the FFS trainings  The public and private sectors recognize an opportunity in participating  Land conflicts remain localized and do not compromise pilots implementation  Farmers are willing to adopt new technologies and
	2.2 Existing public-private collaboration is strengthened to improve farmer's access to inputs, technical support and	Existence or absence of an action plan to improve and strengthen existing collaboration to improve farmers' access to inputs (such as micro-	Limited farmers' access to inputs (such as micro-finance and climate resilient seedlings), technical support and advice and markets	1 Action Plan for a better public-private collaboration to improve farmers' access to inputs (such as micro-finance and climate resilient seedlings),	Action plan	

	advice and markets	finance and climate resilient seedlings), technical support and advice, and markets		technical support and advice, and markets		approaches in their farming practices
	2.3 Pilots demonstrating SLM and SFM are implemented in the 3 districts of intervention	Surface area of land under conservation agriculture  Surface area of land reforested  Surface area of farmland with tree farming systems	Conservation agriculture and tree farming systems are rare in the three districts of intervention and deforestation is significant	20,500 ha under conservation agriculture (indicative: depending on land use plans)  1,000 ha reforested (indicative: depending on land use plans)  4,000 ha of farmland with tree farming systems (indicative: depending on land use plans)	Project Progress Reports	The occurrence of extreme climate events does not compromise the implementation of project activities  Best practices and lessons learned can be extracted from the implementation of the project
	2.4 Monitoring frameworks for carbon emission/sequestration and soil erosion are developed and implemented	Existence or absence of monitoring frameworks for carbon emission/sequestration	Lack of monitoring for carbon emission/sequestration and soil erosion	1 monitoring framework for carbon emission/sequestration developed and implemented  1 monitoring framework for soil erosion developed and implemented	Monitoring frameworks and progress reports	

	2.5 Best practices developed and disseminated	Existence or absence of a strategic plan to scale up best practices and lessons from the project	Not applicable	1 plan published and disseminated	Strategic plan to scale up best practices and lessons learned	
<b>Objective level indicators</b>	Number of hectares degraded: approximately 25,500 ha Scores on the LD Tracking Tool Scorecard: 15-20% increases Score on the Capacity Development Scorecard: 25% increase Hectares under forest cover: 5,000 ha Tons of Carbon sequestered: 24,142 tC/y					

#### **Annex B: LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE EVALUATORS**

- GEF Project Information Form (PIF)
- UNDP Project Document
- UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results
- Project Inception Report
- All Project Implementation Reports (PIR's)
- Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
- Project budgets and financial data
- Project Audit reports
- Oversight mission reports
- All monitoring reports prepared by the project
- Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team
- Project Board Meeting minutes
- Project Tracking Tool, at baseline, at mid-term, and at terminal points
- UNDP Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF)
- UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD)
- GEF focal area strategic program objectives

## ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

This Evaluation Criteria Matrix must be fully completed/amended by the consultant and included in the TE inception report and as an Annex to the TE report. For the sample evaluation criteria matrix, please refer to Annex 4 of the TE Guidance <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/UNDP-GEF-TE- Guide.pdf>

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
•	•	•	•
•		•	•
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•

## ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

<i>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&amp;E, I&amp;E Execution</i> 6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings 5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings 4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS) 3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings 2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems 1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems	<i>Sustainability ratings:</i> 4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks	<i>Relevance ratings</i> 2. Relevant (R) 1.. Not relevant (NR)  <i>Impact Ratings:</i> 3. Significant (S) 2. Minimal (M) 1. Negligible (N)
<i>Additional ratings where relevant:</i> Not Applicable (N/A) Unable to Assess (U/A)		



### 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>1</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>1</sup>[www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct](http://www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct)

## ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE<sup>2</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>3</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>4</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

---

<sup>2</sup>The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

<sup>3</sup> UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

<sup>4</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.

- 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