**Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference**

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the *Sustainable Land Management in the Qaraoun Catchment Project* (PIMS # 4642).

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

Project Summary Table

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Project Title:  |  |
| **GEF Project ID:** | 5229 |   | ***at endorsement (Million US$)*** | ***at completion (Million US$)*** |
| **UNDP Project ID:** | 4642 | **GEF financing:** | 3.18 |       |
| **Country:** | Lebanon | **IA/EA own:** |  |       |
| **Region:** | Arab States | **Government:** | 17.6 |       |
| **Focal Area:** | Biodiversity | **Other (UNDP)** | 0.3 |       |
| **FA Objectives, (OP/SP):** | Land Degradation | Total co-financing: | 18.05 |       |
| **Executing Agency:** | Lebanese Ministry of the Environment | **Total Project Cost:** | 21.23 |       |
| **Other Partners involved:** | Ministry of Agriculture, Center for Development and Reconstruction | **ProDoc Signature (date project began):**  | January 2016 |
| **(Operational) Closing Date:** | Proposed:27 July 2021 | Actual:27 July 2021 |

Objective and Scope

The project titled “Sustainable Land Management in the Qaraoun Catchment” or “SLM Qaraoun” is financed by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and is nationally executed by the Ministry of Environment (MoE) of the Government of Lebanon (GoL) and is implemented by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) using the Support to National Implementation Modality (NIM).

The project was designed to: achieve sustainable land management in the Qaraoun Catchment. More specifically, it is aiming to obtain alleviation of land degradation, maintenance of ecosystem services and an improvement in livelihoods as targeted by the Objective. The Qaraoun catchment is characterized by its important role in providing ecosystem services in the area in addition to being a source of water for urban use and food production. Despite its crucial functions, the catchment suffers from accelerating land degradation attributable to historic deforestation, expansion of urban settlements, and inappropriate infrastructure placement. National momentum has shed the light on the increasingly important pollution levels in the area creating an enabling environment for the Sustainable Land Management in the Qaraoun Catchment project, and specifically for introducing improved land management practices at the local level.

To achieve the intended outcomes, project worked at 3 levels. Firstly at the local level through interventions under Outcome 1 where specific SLM practices were implemented in 3 districts in specific farms, forests and rangeland areas within selected landscapes. Secondly, at the district level through the formulation of land use plans under Outcome 2. Thirdly, a set of activities were implemented preparing for higher level replication under Outcome 3 including the development of legal and regulatory texts, training curricula, communication material and more.

The project is hosted by the Ministry of Environment in close coordination with the Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Public Works & Transport & DGUP, Ministry of Energy & Water, Council of Development and Reconstruction (CDR), Litani River Authority (LRA), Lebanese Agriculture Research Institute (LARI), Municipalities and Unions of Municipalities, NGOs, Investment Development Authority of Lebanon, Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), and other international organizations.

Evaluation approach and method

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

The evaluation must provide evidence‐based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders.

The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Beirut, Lebanon, and site visits will be organized to one or more of the project beneficiaries’ sites that are located in different districts/areas in the Bekaa Governorate. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: UNDP Lebanon Energy and Environment Programme team, Project Managers of other donor-funded projects that are relevant, including but not limited to land degradation, natural resources management and biodiversity, the Ministry of Environment and Ministry of Agriculture (various individuals), etc.. The evaluator may be requested to undertake these meetings online depending on the COVID-19 context in observance to precautionary measures. The Project Team will be responsible for organizing these interviews and will support the consultant in the logistics of these meeting. Approximately 5 – 10 meetings/interviews will be undertaken.

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in [Annex B](#_TOR_Annex_B:) of this Terms of Reference.

Evaluation Criteria & Ratings

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see  [Annex A](#_TOR_Annex_A:)), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact.** Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in  [Annex D](#_TOR_Annex_D:).

|  |
| --- |
| **Evaluation Ratings:** |
| **1. Monitoring and Evaluation** | ***Rating*** | **2. IA& EA Execution** | ***Rating*** |
| M&E design at entry |       | Quality of UNDP Implementation |       |
| M&E Plan Implementation |       | Quality of Execution - Executing Agency  |       |
| Overall quality of M&E |       | Overall quality of Implementation / Execution |       |
| **3. Assessment of Outcomes**  | **Rating** | **4. Sustainability** | **Rating** |
| Relevance  |       | Financial resources: |       |
| Effectiveness |       | Socio-political: |       |
| Efficiency  |       | Institutional framework and governance: |       |
| Overall Project Outcome Rating |       | Environmental : |       |
|  |  | Overall likelihood of sustainability: |       |

Project finance / cofinance

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Co-financing(type/source) | UNDP own financing (mill. US$) | Government(mill. US$) | Partner Agency(mill. US$) | Total(mill. US$) |
| Planned | Actual  | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Actual | Actual |
| Grants  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Loans/Concessions  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * In-kind support
 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * Other
 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

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. The evaluators can use the following tools, inter alia: (i) Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation - Towards UNEG Guidance[[2]](#footnote-2).

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.[[3]](#footnote-3)

Conclusions, recommendations & lessons

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions**, **recommendations** and **lessons**.

Implementation arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in *Lebanon.* 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.

Evaluation timeframe

The total duration of the evaluation will be *20* days according to the following plan spread over a period of 11 calendar weeks (but no later than 10 June 2021):

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Timing | Completion Date |
| **Preparation** | *5* days  | *16 April 2021* |
| **Evaluation Mission** | *5* days  | *31 April 2021* |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | *8* days  | *21 May 2021* |
| **Final Report** | *2* days  | *10 June 2021* |

The evaluation mission is tentatively scheduled to end of April 2021. Should travel not be feasible during this time and a mission not possible, the meetings will be undertaken virtually and the estimated mission costs deducted.

Evaluation deliverables

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Deliverable | Content  | Timing | Responsibilities |
| **Inception Report** | Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method  | No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission.  | Evaluator submits to UNDP CO  |
| **Presentation** | Initial Findings  | End of evaluation mission | To project management, UNDP CO |
| **Draft Final Report**  | Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes | Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission | Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs |
| **Final Report\*** | Revised report  | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft  | Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC.  |

\*When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluator is required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report.

Team Composition

The evaluation team will be composed of 1 international evaluator*.* The consultant shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The evaluator selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The consultant must present the following qualifications:

* Higher degree in natural resources management, biodiversity, agricultural sciences, land management, environmental sciences, or closely related field
* Minimum 10 years of relevant professional experience
* Knowledge of the Sustainable Land Management sector
* At least 3 relevant GEF results‐based monitoring and evaluation assignments undertaken;
* Experience working in Arab States is preferable;
* Previous experience with UN agency or international donor funded projects.

Evaluator Ethics

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

Payment modalities and specifications

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| % | Milestone |
| *10%* | Upon approval of the final TE Inception Report |
| *30%* | Upon submission of the draft TE report |
| *60%* | Upon finalization of the TE report |

Application process

Applicants are requested to apply online at

http://www.lb.undp.org/content/lebanon/en/home/procurement.html by (date). 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 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.

The award of the contract should be made to the Individual Consultant whose offer has received the highest score out of the following criteria:

Technical Criteria weight: 70%

Financial Criteria weight: 30%

Only candidates obtaining a minimum technical score of 70 points would be considered for the financial evaluation.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Weight** | **Max. Point** |
| Technical Competence | 70% | 100 |
| Academic Qualifications (relevant)Master’s degree: (13 points)PhD: (20 points)Relevant trainings/certificates: +5 Points |  | 25 |
| Years of Relevant Experience* Less than 10 = 0
* 10 to 12 years of relevant experience: (21 points)

More than 12 years: (30 points) |  | 30 |
| Experience in SLM interventions (15 points)More than 3 GEF results‐based monitoring and evaluation assignments (15 points)Experience in working in Arab States; (5 points)Experience with UN or international donor project(s) (10 points) |  | 45 |
| Financial (Lower Offer/Offer\*100) | 30% | 100 |
| **Total Score**  | **Technical Score \* 0.7 + Financial Score \* 0.3** |

Annex A: Project Logical Framework

|  |
| --- |
| **This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPD:** Environmental considerations are mainstreamed in sector/local-level strategies/plans  |
| **Country Programme Outcome Indicators:**Indicator 1.1 Ministerial plans/strategies include environmental considerations such as the Land Use Master Plan; Indicator 2.1 Technical units with the Ministry operational and having a higher level of technical expertise related to each concerned environmental convention. |
| **Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area (same as that on the cover page, circle one):** 1. Mainstreaming environment and energy. |
| **Applicable GEF Strategic Objectives:**LD 1: Maintain or improve flow of agroecosystem services to sustaining the livelihoods of local communities; LD-2: Generate sustainable flows of forest ecosystem services in drylands, including sustaining livelihoodsof forest dependent people; LD-3: Reduce pressures on natural resources from competing land uses in the wider landscape |
| **Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes:**Outcome 1.2: Improved agricultural management; Outcome 1.3: Sustained flow of services in agro-ecosystems; Outcome 2.3: Sustained flow of services in forest ecosystems in drylands; Outcome 3.1: Cross- sectoral enabling environment for integrated landscape management (in support of SLM); Outcome 3.2: Integrated landscape management practice adopted by local communities; Outcome 3.3: Increased investments in integrated landscape management |
| **Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators:**Indicator 1.3 Maintained/increased flow of services in agro-ecosystems; Indicator 2.2 Increased land area under sustainable forest management practices; Indicator 2.3 Increased quantity and quality of forests in dryland ecosystems; Indicator 3.1 Policies support integration of agriculture, rangeland, forest, and other land uses; Indicator 3.2 Application of integrated natural resource management (INRM) practices in wider landscapes |
| **The** **Objective seeks three results, namely: Alleviation of land degradation; Maintenance of ecosystem services; and, Improvement in livelihoods** |
| **Description of Indicator** | **Baseline Level** | **Midterm target level** | **End of project target level** | **Source of verification[[4]](#footnote-4)** | **Assumptions and Risks** |
| 0.1 Alleviation of land degradation – Area in target districts managed according to SLM principles | No explicit SLM practices in the Qaraoun Catchment | THERE ARE NO MID TERM TARGETS IN THE PRODOC | 24,300 ha of land in the target districts managed according to SLM principles. | Baseline to be established by survey during the Inception Phase; subsequent surveys to measure the uptake of SLM Measures | **Assumptions:** Awareness and sensitivity to the value and vulnerability of land and ecological resources will reach an effective critical level among government officials, land owners and others in the private sector, communities and individuals, leading to an alleviation of land degradation, protection of ecosystem services and improvement in livelihoods.**Risks:** The risk is that the project timescale is somewhat short for some of the project benefits to manifest themselves, resulting in a lack of appreciation. The project will mitigate against this by putting in place a robust information and participatory strategy whereby stakeholders will share the project challenges as well as its benefits.The selected Indicators will serve to discover any beneficial results from project activities or confirm whether a good enough foundation has been laid for such results. |
| 0.2 Improvement in livelihoods: Improved quality of life among target communities, measured as: Number of new economic opportunities created within targeted communities | Baseline will be established by surveying representative selected communities, as an early activity of project inception (see Output 2.2) | *(not set or not applicable)* | Five new economic opportunities created in target communities | Survey to establish baseline, and subsequent monitoring system to be established by the project |
| **Description of Indicator** | **Baseline Level** | **Midterm target level** | **End of project target level** | **Source of verification** | **Assumptions and Risk** |
| **Outcome 1 - Landscape level uptake of SLM measures avoids and reduces land degradation, delivering ecosystem and development benefits in the Qaraoun Catchment**  |
| 1.1 Rehabilitation of degraded forest to improve forest patch connectivity, measured by:  For areas with direct assisted restoration activities (on 300 ha): # of seedlings planted with >50% survival rate;  For areas left to natural regeneration (on 10,000 ha): # of emerging seedlings/ha in sample plots  | In target districts, up to 500 ha of forests are badly degraded | *(not set or not applicable)* | 300 ha of degraded forest – in targeted areas that improve overall forest patch connectivity – restored by the end of the project For areas with direct assisted restoration activities: Assuming planting density of 500 / ha \* 300 ha @ 50%: 75,000 surviving seedlings, to be extrapolated from sampling plots  For areas left to natural regeneration: # of emerging seedlings/ha at least double, to be extrapolated from sampling plots  | Forest biodiversity indicators measurable in recovered areas, through ground surveys aided by remote sensing or other:* Remotely-sensed and GIS based indicators:
* Fragmentation/intactness and road density
* Ecosystem Productivity and Biomass
* Ground surveying/Species-based indicators:
* Community composition: Plant species richness via diversity indices[[5]](#footnote-5), Forest structure & composition[[6]](#footnote-6) and Natural Regeneration Rate NRR

Reforestation/afforestation success indicators:* Survival Rate

Total surface area planted/planting density  | **Assumptions:** The Outcome assumes that the uptake of SLM measures will lead to very specific beneficial results in the catchment; and that these results will be evident soon enough to ensure the sustainability of project benefits.**Risks:** If the planned outputs are indeed obtained through the project and if awareness is raised to an effective level, there is very little or no risk that the outcome will not be achieved. |
| 1.2 Area of degraded rangelands recovered in targeted areas through SLM techniques, measured by XX samples across the targeted area, on: Soil/Site Stability Hydrologic function Total soil organic carbon Cover with native vegetation Alpha species diversity  | In target districts, up to 51,400 ha of rangelands are badly degraded – estimate to be refined through the first survey under Output 2.2 | *(not set or not applicable)* | Overall increase, or at least no net loss | * Remotely-sensed and GIS based indicators:
	+ Ecosystem Productivity through NPP and Biomass
* Ground surveys :
	+ Plant Functional/structural groups (percent composition by functional or structural group and group richness)

Rangeland management evaluation indicators:* Stoking rate[[7]](#footnote-7), and/or

Carrying Capacity (CC)/Grazing Capacity (GC)[[8]](#footnote-8) |  |
| 1.3 Area of agricultural lands in targeted areas where SLM measures are being applied. | Few if any farmers and other land users apply SLM measures knowingly | *(not set or not applicable)* | SLM measures are being applied, either directly or through replication, in 4,000 ha of agricultural land in targeted areas.  | Measurements/observations of Land quality indicators LQI at baseline, mid and closure.Observations and measurements to be conducted by remote sensing tools where possible and ground surveys:* + Yield and yield gap and/or Soil nutrient balance and depletion
	+ Agricultural land use intensity and diversity

Land (soil) cover |
| 1.4 Percentage of land users (gender-disaggregated) in project localities in each of the three Districts that are applying SLM approaches in upland forests, rangelands, and valley arable lands | Current level in project target areas is very low (see Output 2.2) | THERE ARE NO MID TERM TARGETS IN THE PRODOC | >15% of land users (of which at least 30% are women) in project localities in each of the three Districts that are applying SLM approaches in upland forests, rangelands, and valley arable lands. | Land use practice survey |
| **Outcome 2 - Pressures on natural resources from competing land uses in the West Bekaa and Rachaya Districts are reduced** |
| 2.1 Number of local or district level land use plans in the targeted areas that integrate SLM approaches and thereby reduce pressure on natural resources. | Existing Land Use Plans do not reflect natural resource limitations and sustainability considerations | *(not set or not applicable)* | At least 10 newly developed local or district level land use plans in the targeted areas that integrate SLM approaches. | Availability of appropriate planning documents | **Assumptions:** The Outcome assumes that pressures on natural resources can be reduced and that this can be obtained through the elimination of competing land uses through effective land use planning and management. **Risks:** The risk is that the capacity at local levels will not be adequate to carry on with the benefits of the project. However, if capacity development by the project is well-targeted and effective there is no risk that this will not be the case. |
| 2.2 Existence of a Land Use Management System (LUIMS) and Land Use Monitoring System to inform the integration of SLM into land use plans. | *(not set or not applicable)* | *(not set or not applicable)* | A Land Use Management System (LUIMS) and a Land Use Monitoring System developed to inform the integration of SLM into land use plans | Deployment of the IMS and informed users |
| **Outcome 3 - Institutional strengthening and Capacity enhancement for Promoting sustainable forest and land management in the Qaraoun Catchment through an INRM approach across the landscape** |
| 3.1 Capacity development indicator score for Land Use Planning and Management in West Bekaa and Rachaya Districts | Current score for West Bekaa and Rachaya Districts in 33.3% | *(not set or not applicable)* | > 50% overall capacity development indicator score for Land Use Planning and Management in West Bekaa and Rachaya Districts at districts and municipalities level. | UNDP-GEF CapacityDevelopment Scorecard record repeated at mid-term and at project closure | **Assumptions:** The Outcome seeks ultimate results – sustainable forests and land management, and it is assumed that stronger institutions and enhanced capacity will achieve this. **Risks:** The risk that stronger institutions and enhanced capacity may not lead to the desired results is low and the likelihood is reduced further through the economic incentives and disincentives that will be developed by the project and the fact that the framework will be developed with the full participation of the private sector. |
| 3.2 Percentage change in the knowledge level of SLM as a rational approach for land use. Target group: Key stakeholders (district and municipality officials, selected households of farmers, shepherds, etc. in Zahle, West Bekaa, and Rachaya) | Current level in project target areas is very low (see Output 2.2) | *(not set or not applicable)* | 20% increase in the knowledge level of SLM as a rational approach for land use. | Survey to set the baseline, repeated at mid-term and terminal phases possibly combined with the socio-economic and land-use assessments. |
| 3.3 Extent of mainstreaming of SLM: Existence of targets for SLM in national and/or local: policies, regulatory frameworks, strategies, and land use plans. Existence of extension services to support the implementation of SLM.  | Baseline to be established under Output 3.1. | *(not set or not applicable)* | Targets for SLM are included in national and/or local: policies, regulatory frameworks, strategies, and land use plans There are extension services available to communities in Zahle, West Bekaa, and Rachaya to support the implementation of SLM.  | Number of regulatory tools integrating SLM considerations |
| 3.4 Existence of SLM tools and techniques for the improved management of degraded rangelands in targeted areas to achieve the main three attributes of ecosystem status: • Soil/Site Stability • Hydrologic function • Integrity of the Biotic Community  | None exist at present | *(not set or not applicable)* | SLM tools and techniques exist for the improved management of degraded rangelands in targeted areas. | Existence of SLM tools and techniques. |

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

1. PIF
2. UNDP Project Document
3. Project Inception Report
4. Midterm Review Report
5. All Project Implementation Reports (PIRs)
6. All Annual work plans
7. Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools at CEO endorsement and midterm
8. All Combined Delivery Report (CDRs)
9. ATLAS Risk Management
10. Co-financing Table

The following documents will also be available:

1. Project operational guidelines, reports, manuals and systems
2. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
3. Minutes of the *SLMQ* Board Meetings
4. Project interventions maps
5. Main deliverables

Annex C: Evaluation Questions

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

| **Evaluative Criteria Questions** | **Indicators** | **Sources** | **Methodology** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 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 shortcomings4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS)3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems1. 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 risks1. Unlikely (U): severe risks | ***Impact Ratings:***3. Significant (S)2. Minimal (M)1. Negligible (N) |
| *Additional ratings where relevant:*Not Applicable (N/A) Unable to Assess (U/A |

Annex E: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form

**Evaluators:**

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people’s right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people’s right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders’ dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form[[9]](#footnote-9)**

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

**Name of Consultant:** \_\_     \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Name of Consultancy Organization** (where relevant)**:** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

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

Signed at *place* on *date*

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Annex F: Evaluation Report Outline[[10]](#footnote-10)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **i.** | Opening page:* Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
* UNDP and GEF project ID#s.
* Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report
* Region and countries included in the project
* GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program
* Implementing Partner and other project partners
* Evaluation team members
* Acknowledgements
 |
| **ii.** | Executive Summary* Project Summary Table
* Project Description (brief)
* Evaluation Rating Table
* Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons
 |
| **iii.** | Acronyms and Abbreviations(See: UNDP Editorial Manual[[11]](#footnote-11)) |
| **1.** | Introduction* Purpose of the evaluation
* Scope & Methodology
* Structure of the evaluation report
 |
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Annex G: Evaluation Report Clearance Form

*(to be completed by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and included in the final document)*

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

UNDP GEF RTA

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](http://www.undp.org/evaluation/handbook), Chapter 7, pg. 163 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. <http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/980> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office:  [ROTI Handbook 2009](http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/M2_ROtI%20Handbook.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Comprehensive surveys, ranging from ecosystem to household level, will be carried out under Outputs 2.1 and 2.2 at the Project Inception Phase and will serve to provide the baseline for a number of Indicators against which to gauge the progress of the project towards its targets. In addition, specific localities at farm level will be identified during the Inception Phase and only when this is done can the project determine specific baseline data. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Alpha and/or beta and/or gamma diversity indices (as relevant) [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Dominance of tree species, the mean basal area, mean DBH and mean height [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Stocking rate is defined as the number of animals on a given amount of land over a certain period of time. Stocking rate is generally expressed as animal units per unit of land area.

The stocking rate is the balance between the livestock's monthly forage utilization requirements, the plant production and the ecology of the site. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. The carrying capacity is the stocking rate that is sustainable over time per unit of land area while the Grazing Capacity is the adjusted Carrying Capacity for access and management factors. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)