DocuSign Envelope ID: 1EEC3E9B-233B-443F-8B44-DCDDCD82F2BD

Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference (ToR) for UNDP-supported GEF-financed projects

1. INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full- and medium-sized UNDP-supported GEF-financed projects are required to undergo a Terminal Evaluation (TE) at the end of the project. This Terms of Reference (ToR) sets out the expectations for the TE of the full size project titled **"Securing Watershed Services through Sustainable Land Management in the Ruvu and Zigi catchments (Eastern Arc Region), Tanzania"** (PIMS 5077) (referred to hereafter as 'the watershed project') implemented through the Ministry of Water (MOW). The project started on the 30th March 2016 and is in its 5th year of implementation. The TE process must follow the guidance outlined in the document 'Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects' (http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/UNDP-GEF-TE-Guide.pdf)

2. PROJECT BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

The project was designed to ensure sustainable land management alleviates land degradation, maintains ecosystem services and improves livelihoods in the Ruvu and Zigi Catchments of the Eastern Arc Mountains in Tanzania. The specific ecosystems services that were targeted included regulation of hydrological flows (reducing or buffering runoff, improving soil infiltration and maintaining base flows), securing fresh water supply (quantity and quality of water); soil protection and control of erosion and sedimentation; natural hazard mitigation (flood prevention, peak flow regulation and reduction of landslides) and crop and livestock production. The Project activities have been designed to implement an optimal mix of land and water management measures and practices with potential to secure the targeted watershed services, thus strengthening water security and facilitating more sustainable planning and allocation of water use.

The project's intervention was organized under two components:

Component 1: Establishing a collaborative framework for water basin authorities to effectively plan, monitor and adapt land management and leverage national and regional investments for integrating SLM into watershed management. Work under this component is focused on building enabling institutional capacity and leveraging funding for integrating SLM into watershed management, as well as strengthening co-ordination and collaborative planning, monitoring and enforcement amongst basin management authorities.

Under this component there are two key outcomes. The first: Enabling institutional arrangements are in place to support mainstreaming of SLM into Integrated Water Resources Management in the Ruvu and Zigi catchments, and the second: Finances available for SLM investment are increased by accessing new streams of public finance and more effective alignment of existing sectoral contributions.

Component 2: Reducing the effects of land degradation on watershed services and improving livelihoods through landscape-level uptake of SLM measures. Work under this component of the project is focused on implementing practical Sustainable Land Management (SLM) interventions that address land degradation and degradation of watershed services in forests, rangelands and on arable

DocuSign Envelope ID: 1EEC3E9B-233B-443F-8B44-DCDDCD82F2BD

land, whilst improving livelihoods through the uptake of sustainable land use management practices and alternative sustainable livelihoods.

Under this component there are two Outcomes, one on developing institutional capacity for promoting sustainable land/forest management in support of IWRM, and the second focusing on increasing the uptake of sustainable land management practices to secure watershed services and improve livelihoods. A more detailed summary of the project Components, Outcomes and Outputs is included as in annex B to this TOR.

The main Project Implementing partner is the Ministry of Water (MOW), supported by key stakeholders' including the Vice President's Office (VPO DOE), National Land Use Planning Commission (NLUPC), Tanga-UWASA, DAWASA, MORUWASA, PBWB & WRBWB, MOA, MOE, MNRT, MLHHS and respective local authorities in the two water catchments..

The project supported the coordinated development and management of water, land and related resources whilst improving livelihoods and reducing poverty in a sustainable and equitable way. It also capacitated water basin authorities and water users to overcome the barriers that prevented them from addressing the causes of land degradation and generating solutions that effectively integrate SLM into watershed management., building incrementally on the existing baseline of interventions and the institutional capacities that exist in the two river basins.

Total project financing from GEF is US$ 3.649M while UNDP country office planned to provide cash co-finance of US$2.0M. The Government co-financing is in the order of US$22.00M constituting both cash and in-kind co-financing.

3. TE PURPOSE

The TE team will assess the achievement of project results against what was expected to be achieved, and draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming. The TE report promotes accountability and transparency and assesses the extent of project accomplishments. The TE report will form a baseline to which future programmes and project of similar nature will build upon. Hence the results of the evaluation will be to inform stakeholders from an independent team the lessons that can both improve the sustainability and aid in the overall enhancement of Government and UNDP programming.

4. TE APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

The TE report must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful.
The TE team will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure/SESP) the Project Document, project reports including annual PIRs, project budget revisions, lesson learned reports, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based evaluation. The TE team will review the baseline and midterm GEF focal area Core Indicators/Tracking Tools submitted to the GEF at the CEO endorsement and midterm stages and the terminal Core Indicators/Tracking Tools that must be completed before the TE field mission begins.

DocuSign Envelope ID: 1EEC3E9B-233B-443F-8B44-DCDDCD82F2BD

The TE team is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), Implementing Partners, the UNDP Country Office(s), the Regional Technical Advisor, direct beneficiaries and other stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful TE exercise. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to the Ministry of Water (in Dodoma) the TE team will meet the PS as the main IP and chair of the PSC, the Director of Water Resources and other staff responsible for the project in the two water basins including project focal points in key institutions. The team will also consult or pay courtesy to District Council authorities in the two basins where the key project sites are located. In addition, the TE team shall make consultations with selected members of the Project Steering Committee including Vice President's Office (VPO) – Division of Environment, National Land Use Planning Commission (NLUPC), Tanga Urban Water and Sanitation Authority (Tanga-UWASA), Dar es Salaam Water and Sanitation Authority (DAWASA), Morogoro Urban Water and Sanitation Authority (MORUWASA), Pangani and Wami-Ruvu Basin Water Boards (PBWB and WRBWB), Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries (MALF), Ministry of Energy and Minerals (MEM), TFS in the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism (MNRT). Additionally, the TE team is expected to conduct field missions to Dar es Salaam, Morogoro and Tanga, including the following project sites:

Ruvu Catchment:
Kinyenze cattle trough at Mvomero DC, 2. Strawberry Demo plot at Tulo in Morogoro Municipal 3. Mbarangwe fishpond in Morogoro DC

Zigi Catchment:
1. UWAMAKIZI farming practices and the 3 villages of expansion namely Potwe Mpirani, Potwe Ndondondo and Kwemwewe; 2. ZIMIKA AMCOS in Muheza DC 3. Ubiri village in Korogwe DC where land use plans were done up to stage six. In addition, visit could include Kihara (source of Zigi river in Amani Forest and Nature Reserve or Zirai village (storage and spice processing machine) in Muheza DC or Kihuhwi River flow station and NIMRI weather station in Zigi catchment to be firmed up during inception. Interviews will be held with selected organizations and individuals at a minimum of 2 sites in each catchment depending on weather and accessibility as well as COVID-19 situation in that area. Caution will be taken to organize meetings of smaller groups to observe social distancing to avoid transmission of COVID 19, as per current government guidance.

Please note that in case the selected Team Leader (international consultant) is unable to travel to Tanzania and to the project sites due to the restrictions posed by the COVID-19 pandemic, discussions with the successful national consultant will be held during the inception to agree on modalities of obtaining the field information including virtual discussions via zoom/skype meetings

The specific design and methodology for the TE should emerge from consultations between the TE team and the above-mentioned parties regarding what is appropriate and feasible for meeting the TE purpose and objectives and answering the evaluation questions, given limitations of budget, time and data. The TE team must use gender-responsive methodologies and tools and ensure that gender

DocuSign Envelope ID: 1EEC3E9B-233B-443F-8B44-DCDDCD82F2BD

equality and women's empowerment, as well as other cross-cutting issues and SDGs are incorporated into the TE report.

The final methodological approach including interview schedule, field visits and data to be used in the evaluation must be clearly outlined in the TE Inception Report and be fully discussed and agreed between UNDP, stakeholders and the TE team. The evaluation team may revise the approach in consultation with UNDP and the Project manager and key stakeholders as it deemed necessary and these changes in approach should be agreed and reflected clearly in the TE Inception Report.

The final report must describe the full TE approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the evaluation.

5. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE TE

The TE will assess project performance against expectations set out in the project's Logical Framework/Results Framework (see ToR Annex A). The TE will assess results according to the criteria outlined in the Guidance for TEs of UNDP-supported GEF-financed Projects available at (http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/UNDP-GEF-TE-Guide.pdf).

The Findings section of the TE report will cover the topics listed below. A full outline of the TE report's content is provided in ToR Annex D.

The asterisk "(*)" indicates criteria for which a rating is required.

Findings

i. Project Design/Formulation

- National priorities and country driven-ness
- Theory of Change
- Gender equality and women's empowerment
- Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)
- Analysis of Results Framework: project logic and strategy, indicators
- Assumptions and Risks
- Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g. same focal area) incorporated into project design
- Planned stakeholder participation
- Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
- Management arrangements

ii. Project Implementation

- Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
- Actual stakeholder participation and partnership arrangements
- Project Finance and Co-finance

DocuSign Envelope ID: 1EEC3E9B-233B-443F-8B44-DCDDCD82F2BD

- Monitoring & Evaluation: design at entry (*), implementation (*), and overall assessment of M&E (*)
- Implementing Agency (UNDP) (*) and Executing Agency (*), overall project oversight/implementation and execution (*)
- Risk Management, including Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)

iii. Project Results

- Assess the achievement of outcomes against indicators by reporting on the level of progress for each objective and outcome indicator at the time of the TE and noting final achievements
- Relevance (*), Effectiveness (*), Efficiency (*) and overall project outcome (*)
- Sustainability: financial (*) , socio-political (*), institutional framework and governance (*), environmental (*), overall likelihood of sustainability (*)
- Country ownership
- Gender equality and women's empowerment
- Cross-cutting issues (poverty alleviation, improved governance, climate change mitigation and adaptation, disaster prevention and recovery, human rights, capacity development, South-South cooperation, knowledge management, volunteerism, etc., as relevant)
- GEF Additionality
- Catalytic Role / Replication Effect
- Progress to impact

Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons Learned

- The TE team will include a summary of the main findings of the TE report. Findings should be presented as statements of fact that are based on analysis of the data.
- The section on conclusions will be written in light of the findings. Conclusions should be comprehensive and balanced statements that are well substantiated by evidence and logically connected to the TE findings. They should highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project, respond to key evaluation questions and provide insights into the identification of and/or solutions to important problems or issues pertinent to project beneficiaries, UNDP and the GEF, including issues in relation to gender equality and women's empowerment.
- Recommendations should provide concrete, practical, feasible and targeted recommendations directed to the intended users of the evaluation about what actions to take and decisions to make. The recommendations should be specifically supported by the evidence and linked to the findings and conclusions around key questions addressed by the evaluation.
- The TE report should also include lessons that can be taken from the evaluation, including best practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success that can provide knowledge gained from the particular circumstance (programmatic and evaluation methods used, partnerships, financial leveraging, etc.) that are applicable to other GEF and UNDP interventions. When possible, the TE team should include examples of good practices in project design and implementation.

DocuSign Envelope ID: 1EEC3E9B-233B-443F-8B44-DCDDCD82F2BD

- It is important for the conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned of the TE report to incorporate gender equality and empowerment of women.

The TE report will include an Evaluation Ratings Table, as shown below:

DocuSign Envelope ID: 1EEC3E9B-233B-443F-8B44-DCDDCD82F2BD

ToR Table 2: Evaluation Ratings Table for ('the watershed project')

Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E)	Rating[1]
M&E design at entry	
M&E Plan Implementation	
Overall Quality of M&E	
Implementation & Execution	Rating
Quality of UNDP Implementation/Oversight	
Quality of Implementing Partner Execution	
Overall quality of Implementation/Execution	
Assessment of Outcomes	Rating
Relevance	
Effectiveness	
Efficiency	
Overall Project Outcome Rating	
Sustainability	Rating
Financial resources	
Socio-political/economic	
Institutional framework and governance	
Environmental	
Overall Likelihood of Sustainability	

6. TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the TE will be approximately **25 working days** spread over a period of 10 weeks starting from **September to early December 2020.** The tentative TE timeframe is as follows:

Timeframe	Activity
22nd September	Application closes
30th September	Selection of TE team
12th October	Preparation period for TE team (handover of documentation)
(13-15 October) 3 days	Document review and preparation of TE Inception Report
(19 October) 2 days	Finalization and Validation of TE Inception Report; latest start of TE mission
(20th Oct to 4th November) 12 days	TE mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits, etc.
5th November	Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings; earliest end of TE mission

[1] Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, Implementation/Oversight & Execution, Relevance are rated on a 6-point scale: 6=Highly Satisfactory (HS), 5=Satisfactory (S), 4=Moderately Satisfactory (MS), 3=Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), 2=Unsatisfactory (U), 1=Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). Sustainability is rated on a 4-point scale: 4=Likely (L), 3=Moderately Likely (ML), 2=Moderately Unlikely (MU), 1=Unlikely (U)

DocuSign Envelope ID: 1EEC3E9B-233B-443F-8B44-DCDDCD82F2BD

(5 to 11 November) 5 days	Preparation of draft TE report
12 to 24 November	Circulation of draft TE report for comments
25 – 26 November	Incorporation of comments on draft TE report into Audit Trail & finalization of TE report
(27Nov – 1st December)	Preparation and Issuance of Management Response
(TBD)	Concluding Stakeholder Workshop (optional)
(3rd December 2020)	Expected date of full TE completion

In summary:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Document review and preparation of TE Inception Report	*3* days	*13-15 October 2020*
Evaluation Mission: to be agreed at the inception whether the team Leader will undertake this mission or only the NC	*14*days	*20th Oct to 3rd November 2020*
Draft Evaluation Report	5 days	*5th to 11th November 2020*
Incorporation of comments + Audit Trail & finalization of **Final Report**	*3* day	*by 5th December 2020*

Options for site visits should be agreed and provided in the TE Inception Report.

7. TE DELIVERABLES

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	TE Inception Report	TE team clarifies objectives, methodology and timing of the TE	No later than 2 weeks before the TE mission: *19th October 2020*	TE team submits Inception Report to UNDP Country office in Dar es Salaam
2	Presentation	Initial Findings	End of TE mission: *4th November 2020*	TE team presents to UNDP Country Office and project management team
3	Draft TE Report	Full draft report *(using guidelines on report content in ToR Annex D)* with annexes	Within 3 weeks of end of TE mission: *10 November 2020*	TE team submits to Commissioning Unit; reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP
5	Final TE Report* + Audit Trail	Revised final report and TE Audit trail in which the TE details how all received comments have (and have not) been	Within 1 week of receiving comments on draft report: *5th December 2020*	TE team submits both documents to the Commissioning Unit

DocuSign Envelope ID: 1EEC3E9B-233B-443F-8B44-DCDDCD82F2BD

		addressed in the final TE report *(See template in ToR Annex I)*		

*All final TE reports will be quality assessed by the UNDP Independent Evaluation Office (IEO). Details of the IEO's quality assessment of decentralized evaluations can be found in Section 6 of the UNDP Evaluation Guidelines.[2]

8. TE ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing the TE resides with the UNDP CO in Tanzania. 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 implementation Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government partners. The Project coordinator will designate a focal point at each catchment to assist in facilitating the process (e.g., providing relevant documentation, arranging visits/interviews with key informants in the respective sites, etc.). The PSC and CO Management will take responsibility for the approval of the final evaluation report, with involvement of the relevant UNDP Regional Technical Advisor. The CO management will liaise with the project implementation team to develop a management response to the evaluation within two weeks of report finalization.

9. TE TEAM COMPOSITION

A team of two independent evaluators will conduct the TE - one team leader (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions and one team expert, a national consultant with technical/policy skills on the project focus area. The international consultant will be designated a team leader and shall be responsible for the overall design and writing of the TE report and ensure quality of the final report submitted to UNDP. The two evaluators will be recruited separately; however, the two shall form a team making the assessment of emerging trends with respect to regulatory frameworks, budget allocations, capacity building, work with the Project Team in developing the TE itinerary and make a joint presentation to the Project Management team including the Project Steering Committee members (PSC) as appropriate. Situation allowing, PSC meeting shall be planned to take place towards the end of the field missions. The evaluator(s) cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation and/or implementation (including the writing of the project document), must not have conducted this project's Mid-Term Review and should not have a conflict of interest with the project's related activities

[2] Access at: http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/section-6.shtml

DocuSign Envelope ID: 1EEC3E9B-233B-443F-8B44-DCDDCD82F2BD

These TOR is for the International consultant who is required to have the following qualifications and experience

Education

- Master's degree or higher in the relevant areas such as Natural Resources Management, Sustainable Land/Forest Management, or Environmental sciences (**5%**).

Experience

- Minimum of 10 years of professional experience, with demonstrated understanding of policies and practices relevant to the GEF project, including those guiding sustainable land management, environment, protected area management, and sustainable financing (**20%**)
- Relevant experience with results-based management evaluation methodologies; demonstrated in recent experience with evaluating projects with result-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies and in applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios (**20%**)
- Proposed methodology and evaluation approach, showing understanding of issues related to gender and natural resources management, sustainable land/forest management; experience in gender responsive evaluation and analysis (**20%**)
- Specific experience in evaluating UNDP and GEF projects (**5%**)

Functional Competencies

- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to Natural Resources Management, Sustainable Land/Forest Management
- Demonstrated ability to plan, organize logically, effectively implement and meet set deadlines
- Good interpersonal and communication skills, including ability to set out a coherent argument in presentations and group interactions
- Conceptual and strategic analytical capacity coupled with good writing skills

Language

- Fluency in written and spoken English.

10. EVALUATOR ETHICS

The TE team will be held to the highest ethical standards and is required to sign a code of conduct upon acceptance of the assignment. This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'. The evaluator must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data. The evaluator must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be

DocuSign Envelope ID: 1EEC3E9B-233B-443F-8B44-DCDDCD82F2BD

solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses without the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

11. PAYMENT SCHEDULE

- 20% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final TE Inception Report and approval by the UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA
- 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the draft TE report to the UNDP-CO
- 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final TE report and approval by the UNDP-CO and RTA (via signatures on the TE Report Clearance Form) and delivery of completed TE Audit Trail

Criteria for issuing the final payment of 40%[3]:

- The final TE report includes all requirements outlined in the TE TOR and is in accordance with the TE guidance.
- The final TE report is clearly written, logically organized, and is specific for this project (i.e. text has not been cut & pasted from other TE reports).
- The Audit Trail includes responses to and justification for each comment listed.

12. APPLICATION PROCESS[4]

(Adjust this section if a vetted roster will be used)

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

a) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the template[5] provided by UNDP;
b) **CV** and a **Personal History Form** (P11 form[6]);
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 1 page)
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

[3] The Commissioning Unit is obligated to issue payments to the TE team as soon as the terms under the ToR are fulfilled. If there is an ongoing discussion regarding the quality and completeness of the final deliverables that cannot be resolved between the Commissioning Unit and the TE team, the Regional M&E Advisor and Vertical Fund Directorate will be consulted. If needed, the Commissioning Unit's senior management, Procurement Services Unit and Legal Support Office will be notified as well so that a decision can be made about whether or not to withhold payment of any amounts that may be due to the evaluator(s), suspend or terminate the contract and/or remove the individual contractor from any applicable rosters. See the UNDP Individual Contract Policy for further details:
https://popp.undp.org/_layouts/15/WopiFrame.aspx?sourcedoc=/UNDP_POPP_DOCUMENT_LIBRARY/Public/PSU_Individual%20Contract_Individual%20Contract%20Policy.docx&action=default

[4] Engagement of evaluators should be done in line with guidelines for hiring consultants in the POPP https://popp.undp.org/SitePages/POPPRoot.aspx

[5] https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx

[6] http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc

DocuSign Envelope ID: 1EEC3E9B-233B-443F-8B44-DCDDCD82F2BD

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.

All application materials should be submitted to the address (To be inserted by procurement) in a sealed envelope indicating the following reference "Consultant for Terminal Evaluation of Securing watershed through SLM in Zigi and Ruvu catchment " or by email at the following address ONLY: *(To be provided by procurement)* by *(Time to be provided by procurement unit)*. Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

Criteria for Evaluation of Proposal: Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated. Offers will be evaluated according to the Combined Scoring method – where the educational background and experience on similar assignments will be weighted at 70% and the price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring. The applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score that has also accepted UNDP's General Terms and Conditions will be awarded the contract.

13. TOR ANNEXES

(Add the following annexes to the final ToR)

- ToR Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework
- ToR Annex B: Summary of the Project Components Outcomes and Outputs
- Annex C: Project Information Package to be reviewed by TE team
- ToR Annex D: Content of the TE report
- ToR Annex E: Evaluation Criteria Matrix template
- ToR Annex F: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators
- ToR Annex G: TE Rating Scales
- ToR Annex H: TE Report Clearance Form
- ToR Annex I: TE Audit Trail

DocuSign Envelope ID: 1EEC3E9B-233B-443F-8B44-DCDDCD82F2BD

ToR Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework

SECURING WATERSHED SERVICES THROUGH SUSTAINABLE LAND MANAGEMENT IN THE RUVU AND ZIGI CATCHMENTS (EASTERN ARC REGION), TANZANIA

MONITORING AND EVALUATION MATRIX –Amendments approved at the 3 PSC meeting

Hierarchy of Objectives	**Indicator (Original)**	**Indicator (amended)**	**Baseline level (2014/2015)**	**Baseline (Amended / determined at inception)**	**Target at End of Project (Dec. 2020) - Original**	**Target at End of Project (amended)**
Project Objective: Sustainable land and natural resource management alleviates land degradation, maintains ecosystem services and improves livelihoods in the Ruvu and Zigi sub-catchments of the Eastern Arc Mountains in Tanzania.	Reduction in land degradation in the Ruvu and Zigi catchments as measured by at least a 25% increase in land cover in forests and rangelands	Unchanged	See GEF LD Tracking Tool (land degradation within the project area is significant and the current land use practices and management approaches lack integration and targeted financing to promote INRM and SLM)	Unchanged	• A 10% reduction in soil erosion, improved soil organic matter as reflected in the GEF LD Tracking Tool. 20,000 ha under direct SLM practices • A 10% improvement in water quality and quantity in rivers at intervention sites as measured by water flows, annual rainfall, sediment load, using methods to be established at project inception • At least 10,000 ha of degraded forest restored (5,000 in protected forest and 5,000 ha outside of protected areas) • At least 25 % improvement in household welfare and 10% increase in annual food production for at least 40% of the households in pilot villages, measured as a percentage increase in household incomes,	• A 10% reduction in soil erosion, improved soil organic matter as reflected in the GEF LD Tracking Tool. 20,000 ha under direct SLM practices • A 10% improvement in water quality and quantity in rivers at intervention sites as measured by water flows, annual rainfall, sediment load, using methods including analysis of flow, rainfall and sediment loads measured during low, mid and high flows at selected. • At least 10,000 ha of degraded forest restored (5,000 in protected forest and 5,000 ha outside of protected areas) • At least 25 % improvement in household welfare and 10% increase in annual

DocuSign Envelope ID: 1EEC3E9B-233B-443F-8B44-DCDDCD82F2BD

Hierarchy of Objectives	Indicator (Original)	Indicator (amended)	Baseline level (2014/2015)	Baseline (Amended / determined at inception)	Target at End of Project (Dec. 2020) - Original	Target at End of Project (amended)
					percentage reduction in the number of food insecure days per year, and other indicators to be determined at project inception. • At least 30% of livestock keepers adopt sustainable rangeland management practices, with a 25% improvement in land cover over 2,000 ha of rangeland	food production for at least 40% of the households in pilot villages, measured as a percentage increase in household incomes, percentage reduction in the number of food insecure days per year, and production level of main crops (tons/ha) • At least 30% of livestock keepers adopt sustainable rangeland management practices, with a 25% improvement in land cover over 2,000 ha of rangeland
Outcome 1: Enabling institutional arrangements are in place to support mainstreaming of SLM into Integrated Water Resource Management in the Ruvu and Zigi catchments	Number of land use management plans integrating SLM	Number of land use management plans integrating SLM Planning/budgeting guidelines for integrating SLM into water resource	Formal integration of SLM is currently limited or non-existent	Unchanged	• SLM integrated into 7 District Land Use Plans in the Ruvu and Zigi catchments • Develop planning guideline for mainstreaming SLM into IWRM in Ruvu and Zigi	Unchanged

DocuSign Envelope ID: 1EEC3E9B-233B-443F-8B44-DCDDCD82F2BD

Hierarchy of Objectives	**Indicator (Original)**	**Indicator (amended)**	**Baseline level (2014/2015)**	**Baseline (Amended / determined at inception)**	**Target at End of Project (Dec. 2020) - Original**	**Target at End of Project (amended)**
		management developed and adapted				
Output 1.1 Integrated Land Use Management Plans and Village Land Use Management Plans are developed and implemented in 7 districts (Morogoro, and Mvomero (in Morogoro Region) and Muheza, Mkinga, Korogwe and Tanga (in Tanga Region), ensuring optimal allocation of land to generate critical environmental and development benefits.	Number of District Land Use Plans developed and operationalised	Unchanged	3 District Plans (Morogoro DC, Muheza and Mkinga) developed but not implemented, 1 (Mvomero) initiated but need resources to continue and complete planning and implementation process 9 Village Land Use Plans developed but not operational in Zigi Basin 5 Village Land Use Plans developed but not operational in Ruvu Catchment	Unchanged	• District Land Use Plans developed and operationalised in at 7 Districts 20 villages (10 from each catchment of Zigi and Ruvu) • GIS-based LD/SLM database and land-use decision support-tool/system is in place and at least 50% of land use planning officers, front line extension workers and community associations are trained in the use of the decision-support tool to strengthen land use planning and develop land use maps	Unchanged

DocuSign Envelope ID: 1EEC3E9B-233B-443F-8B44-DCDDCD82F2BD

Hierarchy of Objectives	**Indicator (Original)**	**Indicator (amended)**	**Baseline level (2014/2015)**	**Baseline (Amended / determined at inception)**	**Target at End of Project (Dec. 2020) - Original**	**Target at End of Project (amended)**
Output 1.2 Multi-stakeholder committees are established (or strengthened) and are active in promoting co-ordination and dialogue in support of mainstreaming SLM into other sectors, programmes and policies	Number of multi-sectoral stakeholder landscape co-ordination committees (Catchment Forums) formed and operational in each Basin with committee members segregated by gender	Unchanged. Indicator made gender sensitive	Interagency co-operation is currently very weak or non-existent, no joint vision for SLM in place 2 Environmental Committees – Mabayani Dam 1 Community Association - Uwamakizi 1 Community Association - Wakuakuvyama	Unchanged	• At least one multi-stakeholder committee established and operating effectively in each basin as a result of the project • At least 75% of District Officers (Participatory Land Use Management teams) and Village land use committees trained in participatory land-use planning, monitoring and implementation of land use plans	Unchanged

DocuSign Envelope ID: 1EEC3E9B-233B-443F-8B44-DCDDCD82F2BD

Hierarchy of Objectives	**Indicator (Original)**	**Indicator (amended)**	**Baseline level (2014/2015)**	**Baseline (Amended / determined at inception)**	**Target at End of Project (Dec. 2020) - Original**	**Target at End of Project (amended)**
Output 1.3 Water User Associations (WUAs) and River Committees are established and capacitated to perform their roles effectively in all key sub-catchments within the two river basins	Number of registered, operational Water User Associations and Sub-Catchment Committees in each catchment	Number of registered, operational Water User Associations and Sub-Catchment Committees in each catchment with members segregated by gender	Zigi: 1 WUA- Zigi-Mkulumuzi (functional, but requires strengthening) Ruvu: 4 WUAs– Mfizigo Sub-catchment; Lower Ngerengere and Upper Ngerengere A & B (all are non-functional)	Uncahnged	••At least 5 new Water User Associations and 2 new sub-catchment committees established, registered and operational and with a plan for upscaling in place • All Water User Associations and Sub-Catchment Committees trained in the principles of SLM and the role of SLM in protection of water resources, provisions of all relevant land and water-use legislation; financial management and the development of funding proposals; entrepreneurship skills; the costs and benefits of alternative sustainable livelihoods • Up-to-date database of stakeholders and projects established for each Basin Water Office	Unchanged

DocuSign Envelope ID: 1EEC3E9B-233B-443F-8B44-DCDDCD82F2BD

Hierarchy of Objectives	**Indicator (Original)**	**Indicator (amended)**	**Baseline level (2014/2015)**	**Baseline (Amended / determined at inception)**	**Target at End of Project (Dec. 2020) - Original**	**Target at End of Project (amended)**
Output 1.4 Wami-Ruvu and Pangani River Water Basin Authorities and water users understand water basin regulations and are capacitated to identify and prosecute water and land-use infringements and harness greater compliance.	% increase in rates of compliance with water basin regulations Number of staff and members of community associations (segregated by gender) trained in provisions of land and water-use legislation	Unchanged. Indicator made gender sensitive	Currently not known, although rates are generally low. To be determined at project inception. 226 (Ruvu) and 162 (Zigi) people trained in basic provisions of water-use legislation No people trained in provisions of relevant land-use legislation	In Ruvu Catchment 301 out of 1500 identified water users are complying. In Zigi only 11 users out of 350 are complying 226 (Ruvu) and 162 (Zigi) people trained in basic provisions of water-use legislation No people trained in provisions of relevant land-use legislation	• 50 - 75% of all staff in target institutions, all WUAs and VNRCs trained in provisions of water and land-use legislation • At least 50% of water users issued with water use permits and 60% of industries and commercial farming operators complying with water discharge permits • Gender-sensitive communications strategy developed and operationalized	Unchanged
Outcome 2: Finances available for SLM investments are increased by accessing new streams of public finance and more effective alignment of existing sectoral contributions	% increase in public funds allocated to SLM interventions in the Ruvu and Zigi catchments	Unchanged	No SLM funds currently allocated to water resources management agencies.	Some sectoral funds available for SLM but not coordinated to finance SLM strategy for Integrated Natural Resources Management	15% increase in fund earmarked for SLM interventions in the Ruvu and Zigi catchments	Unchanged

DocuSign Envelope ID: 1EEC3E9B-233B-443F-8B44-DCDDCD82F2BD

Hierarchy of Objectives	**Indicator (Original)**	**Indicator (amended)**	**Baseline level (2014/2015)**	**Baseline (Amended / determined at inception)**	**Target at End of Project (Dec. 2020) - Original**	**Target at End of Project (amended)**
Output 2.1 New streams of public finance are identified and accessed	Amount of funding accessed for SLM through new streams of public finance and other financing mechanisms	Unchanged	0 -The key organisations do not have adequate resources for integrating SLM into watershed management and the financing requirements have not been comprehensively assessed As per UNDP Capacity Scorecard	Unchanged	At least 2 new streams of funding for SLM accessed via sources such as Incentive and Market Based Mechanisms (IMBMs), Public Private Partnerships (PPP)s	Unchanged
Output 2.2 Sectoral (forestry, agriculture, land, livestock, environment and water) allocations to SLM are re-aligned	Amount of sectoral allocations aligned to SLM strategies	Unchanged	1 - The resource requirements for integrating SLM into watershed management are known but are not being addressed As per UNDP Capacity Scorecard	Unchanged	Resource allocation criteria and to inform allocation of resources to SLM	Unchanged
Output 2.3 The effectiveness of SLM investments is improved	Increase in the targeted SLM investments	Unchanged	No effective SLM investment strategy in place	Unchanged	Integrated SLM investment strategy and M&E system in place to track the effectiveness and impact of SLM investments	Unchanged

DocuSign Envelope ID: 1EEC3E9B-233B-443F-8B44-DCDDCD82F2BD

Hierarchy of Objectives	**Indicator (Original)**	**Indicator (amended)**	**Baseline level (2014/2015)**	**Baseline (Amended / determined at inception)**	**Target at End of Project (Dec. 2020) - Original**	**Target at End of Project (amended)**
Outcome 3: Institutional capacity is built for promoting sustainable land and forest management in support of IWRM in the Ruvu and Zigi Catchments	Increase in awareness and capacity of local communities and institutions (e.g. extensions services, district authorities, Basin Water Offices) for integration of SLM into resource use and management practices (measured as per UNDP Capacity Scorecard).	Unchanged	1 – The required skills and technologies are identified, as well as their sources but are only partially developed As per UNDP Capacity Scorecard	Unchanged	3 -The required skills and technologies are available and there is a nationally-based mechanism for updating the required skills and upgrading technology As per UNDP Capacity Scorecard	Unchanged
Output 3.1 The institutional capacity (staff and resource requirements for promoting SLM) is strengthened in the Wami-Ruvu and Pangani Water Basin Offices and regional offices of line ministries and local government institutions	Staffing and resources development plans developed and implemented for Basin Water Office, District Authorities and WUAs	Unchanged	1 – The required skills and technologies are identified, as well as their sources but are only partially developed As per UNDP Capacity Scorecard	Unchanged	Staff and resource deficits for integrating SLM into watershed management decreased by at least 75% in water basin management agencies and other targeted institutions	Unchanged
Output 3.2 The technical knowledge and skills for	Number of technical staff in Water Basin Offices, District and local government	Unchanged. Indicator made gender sensitive	1 – The required skills and technologies are identified, as well as	Unchanged	At least 50% of technical officers in Water Basin Management Agencies, extension services and other targeted institutions have	Unchanged

DocuSign Envelope ID: 1EEC3E9B-233B-443F-8B44-DCDDCD82F2BD

Hierarchy of Objectives	Indicator (Original)	Indicator (amended)	Baseline level (2014/2015)	Baseline (Amended / determined at inception)	Target at End of Project (Dec. 2020) - Original	Target at End of Project (amended)
integrating SLM into IWRM are increased amongst relevant staff of Water Basin Offices, relevant line ministries, and local government institutions	institutions, WUAs and Village structures completing skills and knowledge improvement training programmes (segregated by gender)		their sources but are only partially developed As per UNDP Capacity Scorecard		received training to enhance their knowledge and skills for integrating SLM into watershed management	
Output 3.3 Extension services are capacitated to promote adoption of SLM and promote alternative sustainable livelihoods	% of population in targeted villages aware of SLM and SLM-related activities in their area (as a result of the project) and satisfied with extension services (segregated by gender) Number of trained extension officers available to provide SLM messages in agricultural and livestock extension services (segregated by gender)	Unchanged. The two indicators were made gender sensitive	Ruvu Basin: 36 extension officers with fair levels of technical skill, but not enough officers in each ward and lack knowledge of modern SLM and current water and land-use legislation Zigi (Muheza): 12 extension officers; Technical capacity and knowledge is outdated and there are not enough officers in each ward	Unchanged	• At least 50 % of land users in the target areas report an improvement in the extension services provided and number of trained extension personnel increased by 50% • Increase of 25% in number of community members trained to serve as 'para professional' extension officers, with equal focus on men and women • At least 75% of land-users in targeted areas aware of the benefits of SLM as a result of improved extensions services	Unchanged

DocuSign Envelope ID: 1EEC3E9B-233B-443F-8B44-DCDDCD82F2BD

Hierarchy of Objectives	**Indicator (Original)**	**Indicator (amended)**	**Baseline level (2014/2015)**	**Baseline (Amended / determined at inception)**	**Target at End of Project (Dec. 2020) - Original**	**Target at End of Project (amended)**
Outcome 4: Landscape-level adoption of SLM measures in the Ruvu and Zigi catchments promoted to reduce the effects of land degradation on watershed services and to improve livelihoods	Reduction in extent of degradation in the Ruvu and Zigi catchments and improvement in the livelihoods of basin communities due to increased benefits from adoption of SLM practices	Unchanged	To be determined at project inception	Over 80% of land area under forest, rangeland and agricultural production is being degraded through unsustainable land use practices Limited viable businesses as an avenue for emerging local economic development complementing SLM	• Over 15,000 - 20,000 ha under direct SLM as a result of this project in the target areas in the Ruvu and Zigi catchments • Household incomes increased by at least 25% in at least 40% of the households in participating villages, as a result of uptake of SLM practices introduced through the project, with special focus on most vulnerable households	Unchanged
Output 4.1 Sustainable land management practices promoted and natural rehabilitation facilitated in 10,000 ha of forest	% decline in illegal harvesting from protected forests % improvement in land cover in rangelands	Unchanged	To be determined at project inception	Total of 50,754 ha of protected forest is degraded (including 49,066 ha of 60 m river line, 438 ha Uluguru Nature Forest Reserve and 1250 Amani Nature Forest Reserve)	• Forest cover restored over at least 5,000 ha of riverine habitat in protected forests and 5 000 ha outside of protected areas ••Land Cover improved by 25% over 2,000 ha of rangelands At least a 25% decline in the rate of illegal harvesting from protected forests	Unchanged

DocuSign Envelope ID: 1EEC3E9B-233B-443F-8B44-DCDDCD82F2BD

Hierarchy of Objectives	**Indicator (Original)**	**Indicator (amended)**	**Baseline level (2014/2015)**	**Baseline (Amended / determined at inception)**	**Target at End of Project (Dec. 2020) - Original**	**Target at End of Project (amended)**
Output 4.2 Household food production and incomes increased by 30% (for actively participating villages) through promotion of sustainable income generating activities in participating villages	% increase in household incomes and % increase in production rates as a result of SLM practices	Unchanged	To be determined at project inception	Average household income ranges from TZS 480,000 – 550,000 per year	• At least 2 new sustainable livelihood practices taken up in each of the target areas and contributing 10% to production and overall incomes • At least a 15 % increase in annual agricultural produce for key crops as a result of SLM practices introduced by the project in the target villages • At least 25% of households in target villages using clean energy cooking technology and 75% of households aware of alternative energy solutions through capacity building of men, women and youth • At least 25% of farmers in the target villages benefitting from accessing micro-finance and the development of new markets for agricultural products	Unchanged

DocuSign Envelope ID: 1EEC3E9B-233B-443F-8B44-DCDDCD82F2BD

Hierarchy of Objectives	**Indicator (Original)**	**Indicator (amended)**	**Baseline level (2014/2015)**	**Baseline (Amended / determined at inception)**	**Target at End of Project (Dec. 2020) - Original**	**Target at End of Project (amended)**
Output 4.3 Sustainable livestock management technologies developed and tested and infrastructure developed to operationalise SLM in rangelands	% increase in number of farmers using SLM techniques	% increase in number of farmers using SLM techniques % decrease in undesired movements of livestock in search for pasture and water	To be determined at project inception	Most livestock keepers do not practice SLM No livestock/rangeland management structures in place	• At least 50% of farmers trained in the use of sustainable land management techniques • At least 30% of livestock keepers adopt alternative livestock management technologies • At least 20% increase in number of farmers in target villages consistently applying 2 to 5 SLM techniques introduced by the project	Unchanged

SLM Practices include:

1. Demarcation of protected areas and enforcement of bylaws related to use of the land
2. Tree planting for restoration of degraded areas + promoting natural regeneration
3. Agroforestry technologies: Tree planting in farmlands, management of apiaries, woodlots, soil and water management structures (contours, tie ridges, terraces - fanyajuu/fanyachini, bench terraces etc), integrated soil fertility management, establishment of fruit orchards
4. Rangeland Management - fire control, pasture/fodder improvement, production and management, provision of water points
5. Integrated soil fertility management (use of compost, other organic manure**)**

DocuSign Envelope ID: 1EEC3E9B-233B-443F-8B44-DCDDCD82F2BD

ToR Annex B: Summary of the Project Components Outcomes and Outputs

Objective: Sustainable land management alleviates land degradation, maintains ecosystem services and improves livelihoods in the Ruvu and Zigi Catchments of the Eastern Arc Mountains in Tanzania.

Project components

In order to achieve the project objective, the project's intervention has been organized in two components as follows:

Component 1: Establishing a collaborative framework for water basin authorities to effectively plan, monitor and adapt land management and leverage national and regional investments for integrating SLM into watershed management. Work under this component is focused on building enabling institutional capacity and leveraging funding for integrating SLM into watershed management, as well as strengthening co-ordination and collaborative planning, monitoring and enforcement amongst basin management authorities.

Component 2: Reducing the effects of land degradation on watershed services and improving livelihoods through landscape-level uptake of SLM measures. Work under this component of the project is focused on implementing practical Sustainable Land Management (SLM) interventions that address land degradation and degradation of watershed services in forests, rangelands and on arable land, whilst improving livelihoods through the uptake of sustainable land use management practices and alternative sustainable livelihoods.

The project components are delivered through four (4) outcomes to be pursued through thirteen (13) outputs

Outcome 1: Enabling institutional arrangements are in place to support mainstreaming of SLM into Integrated Water Resources Management in the Ruvu and Zigi catchments,

Outputs:

Output 1.1: Integrated Land Use Management Plans and Village Land Use Management Plans are developed and implemented in 7 districts (Morogoro Urban, Morogoro Rural and Mvomero (in Morogoro Region) and Muheza, Mkinga, Korogwe and Tanga City (in Tanga Region).
Output 1.2: Multi-stakeholder committees are established (or strengthened) and active in promoting co-ordination and dialogue in support of mainstreaming of SLM into other sectors, programmes and policies.
Output 1.3: Water User Associations (WUAs) and River Committees are established and capacitated to perform their roles effectively in all key sub-catchments within the Wami-Ruvu and Pangani river basins
Output 1.4: Wami-Ruvu and Pangani River Water Basin Authorities and water users understand water basin regulations and are capacitated to identify and prosecute water and land-use infringements and harness greater compliance

Outcome 2: Finances available for SLM investment are increased by accessing new streams of public finance and more effective alignment of existing sectoral contributions.

Outputs

DocuSign Envelope ID: 1EEC3E9B-233B-443F-8B44-DCDDCD82F2BD

Output 2.1: New streams of public finance are identified and accessed
Output 2.2: Sectoral (forestry, agriculture and water) allocations to SLM are re-aligned
Output 2.3: The effectiveness of SLM investments is improved

Component 2: Reducing the effects of land degradation on watershed services and improving livelihoods through increased landscape level adoption of SLM measures in the Ruvu and Zigi catchment

Outcome 3: Institutional capacity is built for promoting sustainable land and forest management in support of IWRM in the Ruvu and Zigi Catchments

Outputs

Output 3.1: The institutional capacity (staff and resource requirements for promoting SLM) is strengthened in the Wami-Ruvu and Pangani Water Basin Offices, regional offices of line ministries and local government institutions
Output 3.2: The technical knowledge and skills for integrating SLM into IWRM are increased amongst relevant staff of Water Basin Offices, relevant line ministries, and local government institutions
Output 3.3: Extension services are capacitated to promote uptake of SLM and promote sustainable livelihoods

Outcome 4: Landscape-level adoption of SLM measures in the Ruvu and Zigi catchments promoted to reduce the effects of land degradation on watershed services and to improve livelihoods

Outputs

Output 4.1: Sustainable land management practices promoted, and natural rehabilitation facilitated in 10,000 ha of forest
Output 4.2: Household food production and incomes increased by 30% (for actively participating villages) through promotion of sustainable income generating activities in participating villages

Output 4.3. Sustainable livestock management technologies developed and tested and infrastructure developed to operationalize SLM in rangelands

DocuSign Envelope ID: 1EEC3E9B-233B-443F-8B44-DCDDCD82F2BD

ToR Annex C: Project Information Package to be reviewed by TE team

#	Item (electronic versions preferred if available)
1	Project Identification Form (PIF)
2	UNDP Initiation Plan – Not Applicable
3	Final UNDP-GEF Project Document with all annexes
4	CEO Endorsement Request
5	UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) and associated management plans (if any)
6	Inception Workshop Report
7	Mid-Term Review report and management response to MTR recommendations
8	All Project Implementation Reports (PIRs)
9	Progress reports (quarterly, semi-annual or annual, with associated workplans and financial reports)
10	Oversight mission reports
11	Minutes of Project Board Meetings and of other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
12	GEF Tracking Tools (from CEO Endorsement, midterm and terminal stages)
13	GEF/LDCF/SCCF Core Indicators (from PIF, CEO Endorsement, midterm and terminal stages); for GEF-6 and GEF-7 projects only
14	Financial data, including actual expenditures by project outcome, including management costs, and including documentation of any significant budget revisions
15	Co-financing data with expected and actual contributions broken down by type of co-financing, source, and whether the contribution is considered as investment mobilized or recurring expenditures
16	Audit reports
17	Electronic copies of project outputs (booklets, manuals, technical reports, articles, etc.)
18	Sample of project communications materials
19	Summary list of formal meetings, workshops, etc. held, with date, location, topic, and number of participants
20	Any relevant socio-economic monitoring data, such as average incomes / employment levels of stakeholders in the target area, change in revenue related to project activities
21	List of contracts and procurement items over ~US$5,000 (i.e. organizations or companies contracted for project outputs, etc., except in cases of confidential information)
22	List of related projects/initiatives contributing to project objectives approved/started after GEF project approval (i.e. any leveraged or "catalytic" results)
23	Data on relevant project website activity – e.g. number of unique visitors per month, number of page views, etc. over relevant time period, if available
24	UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD)
25	List/map of project sites, highlighting suggested visits
26	List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Board members, RTA, Project Team members, and other partners to be consulted

DocuSign Envelope ID: 1EEC3E9B-233B-443F-8B44-DCDDCD82F2BD

27	Project deliverables that provide documentary evidence of achievement towards project outcomes
	Additional documents, as required

DocuSign Envelope ID: 1EEC3E9B-233B-443F-8B44-DCDDCD82F2BD

ToR Annex D: Content of the TE report

i. Title page
    - Title of UNDP-supported GEF-financed project
    - UNDP PIMS ID and GEF ID
    - TE timeframe and date of final TE report
    - Region and countries included in the project
    - GEF Focal Area/Strategic Program
    - Executing Agency, Implementing partner and other project partners
    - TE Team members

ii. Acknowledgements

iii. Table of Contents

iv. Acronyms and Abbreviations

1. Executive Summary (3-4 pages)
    - Project Information Table
    - Project Description (brief)
    - Evaluation Ratings Table
    - Concise summary of findings, conclusions and lessons learned
    - Recommendations summary table
2. Introduction (2-3 pages)
    - Purpose and objective of the TE
    - Scope
    - Methodology
    - Data Collection & Analysis
    - Ethics
    - Limitations to the evaluation
    - Structure of the TE report
3. Project Description (3-5 pages)
    - Project start and duration, including milestones
    - Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope
    - Problems that the project sought to address, threats and barriers targeted
    - Immediate and development objectives of the project
    - Expected results
    - Main stakeholders: summary list
    - Theory of Change
4. Findings
   (in addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (*) must be given a rating7)
   4.1 Project Design/Formulation
    - Analysis of Results Framework: project logic and strategy, indicators

[7] See ToR Annex G for rating scales.

DocuSign Envelope ID: 1EEC3E9B-233B-443F-8B44-DCDDCD82F2BD

- Assumptions and Risks
- Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g. same focal area) incorporated into project design
- Planned stakeholder participation
- Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector

4.1 Project Implementation

- Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
- Actual stakeholder participation and partnership arrangements
- Project Finance and Co-finance
- Monitoring & Evaluation: design at entry (*), implementation (*), and overall assessment of M&E (*)
- UNDP implementation/oversight (*) and Implementing Partner execution (*), overall project implementation/execution (*), coordination, and operational issues
- Risk Management, including Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)

4.2 Project Results and Impacts

- Progress towards objective and expected outcomes (*)
- Relevance (*)
- Effectiveness (*)
- Efficiency (*)
- Overall Outcome (*)
- Sustainability: financial (*), socio-economic (*), institutional framework and governance (*), environmental (*), and overall likelihood (*)
- Country ownership
- Gender equality and women's empowerment
- Cross-cutting Issues
- GEF Additionality
- Catalytic/Replication Effect
- Progress to Impact

5. Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons
    - Main Findings
    - Conclusions
    - Recommendations
    - Lessons Learned
6. Annexes
    - TE ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
    - TE Mission itinerary, including summary of field visits
    - List of persons interviewed
    - List of documents reviewed
    - Evaluation Question Matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology)
    - Questionnaire used and summary of results
    - Co-financing tables (if not include in body of report)

DocuSign Envelope ID: 1EEC3E9B-233B-443F-8B44-DCDDCD82F2BD

- TE Rating scales
- Signed Evaluation Consultant Agreement form
- Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form
- Signed TE Report Clearance form
- *Annexed in a separate file*: TE Audit Trail
- *Annexed in a separate file:* relevant terminal GEF/LDCF/SCCF Core Indicators or Tracking Tools, as applicable

ToR Annex E: Evaluation Criteria Matrix template

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 a the local, regional and national level?			
(include evaluative questions)	*(i.e. relationships established, level of coherence between project design and implementation approach, specific activities conducted, quality of risk mitigation strategies, etc.)*	*(i.e. project documentation, national policies or strategies, websites, project staff, project partners, data collected throughout the TE mission, etc.)*	*(i.e. document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc.)*
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, socio-political, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
Gender equality and women's empowerment: How did the project contribute to gender equality and women's empowerment?			
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			

DocuSign Envelope ID: 1EEC3E9B-233B-443F-8B44-DCDDCD82F2BD

(Expand the table to include questions for all criteria being assessed: Monitoring & Evaluation, UNDP oversight/implementation, Implementing Partner Execution, cross-cutting issues, etc.)

ToR Annex F: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators

DocuSign Envelope ID: 1EEC3E9B-233B-443F-8B44-DCDDCD82F2BD

Independence entails the ability to evaluate without undue influence or pressure by any party (including the hiring unit) and providing evaluators with free access to information on the evaluation subject. Independence provides legitimacy to and ensures an objective perspective on evaluations. An independent evaluation reduces the potential for conflicts of interest which might arise with self-reported ratings by those involved in the management of the project being evaluated. Independence is one of ten general principles for evaluations (together with internationally agreed principles, goals and targets: utility, credibility, impartiality, ethics, transparency, human rights and gender equality, national evaluation capacities, and professionalism).

Evaluators/Consultants:

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.
8. Must ensure that independence of judgement is maintained, and that evaluation findings and recommendations are independently presented.
9. Must confirm that they have not been involved in designing, executing or advising on the project being evaluated and did not carry out the project's Mid-Term Review.

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

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

Name of Evaluator: _____

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: _____

DocuSign Envelope ID: 1EEC3E9B-233B-443F-8B44-DCDDCD82F2BD

ToR Annex G: TE Rating Scales

Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, Implementation/Oversight, Execution, Relevance	Sustainability ratings:
6 = Highly Satisfactory (HS): exceeds expectations and/or no shortcomings 5 = Satisfactory (S): meets expectations and/or no or minor shortcomings 4 = Moderately Satisfactory (MS): more or less meets expectations and/or some shortcomings 3 = Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): somewhat below expectations and/or significant shortcomings 2 = Unsatisfactory (U): substantially below expectations and/or major shortcomings 1 = Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe shortcomings Unable to Assess (U/A): available information does not allow an assessment	4 = Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3 = Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks to sustainability 2 = Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks to sustainability 1 = Unlikely (U): severe risks to sustainability Unable to Assess (U/A): Unable to assess the expected incidence and magnitude of risks to sustainability

ToR Annex H: TE Report Clearance Form

Terminal Evaluation Report for Securing Watershed Services through Sustainable Land Management in the Ruvu and Zigi catchments (Eastern Arc Region), Tanzania (PIMS 5077)

Reviewed and Cleared By:

Commissioning Unit (M&E Focal Point)

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Regional Technical Advisor (Nature, Climate and Energy)

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

DocuSign Envelope ID: 1EEC3E9B-233B-443F-8B44-DCDDCD82F2BD

DocuSign Envelope ID: 1EEC3E9B-233B-443F-8B44-DCDDCD82F2BD

ToR Annex I: TE Audit Trail

The following is a template for the TE Team to show how the received comments on the draft TE report have (or have not) been incorporated into the final TE report. This Audit Trail should be listed as an annex in the final TE report but not attached to the report file.

To the comments received on *(date)* **from the Terminal Evaluation of Securing Watershed Services through Sustainable Land Management in the Ruvu and Zigi catchments (Eastern Arc Region), Tanzania" (PIMS 5077**) The following comments were provided to the draft TE report; they are referenced by institution/organization (do not include the commentator's name) and track change comment number ("#" column):

Institution/ Organization	#	Para No./ comment location	Comment/Feedback on the draft TE report	TE team response and actions taken

This TOR is approved by Mandy Cadman

Mandy Cadman
.....

Regional Technical Adviser - Ecosystems & Biodiversity

UNDP Regional Service Centre for Africa

31-Aug-2020
Date ..... August 2020