**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:** National

**Type of Contract:** Individual Consultant

**Post Type:** National 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:** 1st July 2020

1. **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).*

1. **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 |  | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | *at completion (Million US$)* |
| UNDP Project ID: | 00095404 | GEF financing: | 1,620,320 | 1,620,320 |
| Country: | Uganda | UNDP | 2,670,750 | 2,670,750 |
| Region: | Africa | Government: | 6,160634 | 6,160634 |
| 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 Bulambuli District Local Governments, NGOs, CBOs and Local communities and Private sector | ProDoc Signature (date project began): | | 29 Feb 2016 |
| (Operational closing date) | Proposed: 30 Feb 2018 | Actual: 30 August 2020 |

1. **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

1. **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 National 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.

1. **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](#_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: |  |

1. **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 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1. **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.

1. **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.

1. **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.

1. **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.

1. **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 |

1. **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.

1. **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%)

1. **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.

1. **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)

1. **Payment modalities and specifications**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| % | Milestone |
| *25%* | Upon submission and approval of inception report and work plan |
| *35%* | 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 |

1. **Application process**

Applicants are requested to apply online at http://jobs.undp.org by Friday 3rd 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 3rd April 2020must submit the following documents/information to demonstrate their qualifications:

1. Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability using the template 3 provided by UNDP;
2. 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;
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 on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 3 pages);
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, 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 Friday 12 June 2020. Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

ANNAEX 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  Land conflicts remain localized and do not endanger the overall project implementation  The occurrence of extreme climate events does not compromise the implementation of project activities |
| 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  Number of people with increased awareness on SLM technologies and approaches | SLM, SFM and CCM clauses are available in the three districts of intervention but not implemented  Lack of awareness on SLM technologies and approaches | 50% of the relevant clauses identified are implemented  30 district staff  60 local community representatives with increased awareness in SLM technologies and approaches | 1 gap analysis study on SLM legislation  Clauses in existing legislation  Workshop attendance sheets |
| 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 into district policy plans | Existence or absence of guidelines to integrate SLM, SFM and CCM into District Development Plans  Existence or absence of District Environment Action Plans | The Districts Development Plans do not significantly consider SLM, SFM and CCM  No District Environment Action Plans are in place in the districts | 3 Districts have guidelines to integrate SLM, SFM and CCM into their Development Plans  1 Local Environmental Committee is effective on each district and has developed guidelines for a District Environment Action Plan | Guidelines for Districts Development Plans  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 approaches in their farming practices  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 |
| 2.2 Existing public-private collaboration is strengthened to improve farmer’s access to inputs, technical support and advice and markets | Existence or absence of an action plan to improve and strengthen existing collaboration to improve farmers’ access to inputs (such as micro-finance and climate resilient seedlings), technical support and advice, and markets | 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), technical support and advice, and markets | Action plan |
| 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 |
| 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 |
| **Objective level indicators** | 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) and GEF focal area strategic program objectives

**Annex C: Evaluation Questions**

| **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**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***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 | | |