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**GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY**

**UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME**

**Terms of Reference**

**for TERMINAL Evaluation:**

**Project Title**: “Demonstrating Sustainable Mountain Pasture Management in the Suusamyr Valley, Kyrgyzstan”

**Functional Title:** International Consultant for Terminal Evaluation

**Duration:** Estimated 15 working days during the period of: November 2012

**Terms of Payment:** Lump sum payable upon satisfactory completion and approval by UNDP of all deliverables, including the Evaluation Report

**Duty station:** Travel to Bishkek and Suusamyr valley

**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 ”Demonstrating Sustainable Mountain Pasture Management in the Suusamyr Valley, Kyrgyzstan” Project (PIMS #3220.)

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

Project Summary Table

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Project Title:  | ”Demonstrating Sustainable Mountain Pasture Management in the Suusamyr Valley, Kyrgyzstan” |
| GEF Project ID:UNDP GEF Project ID (PIMS): | ## 3220  |   | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | *at completion (Million US$)* |
| Atlas award ID:Atlas project ID: | 00046221 00054913  | GEF financing:  |  0.950     |       |
| Country: |  Kyrgyzstan  | IA/EA own: |  0.310     |       |
| Region: |  ECIS  | Government: |  0.631     |       |
| Focal Area: |  LD  | Other: |  0.048     |       |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): |  OP15  | Total co-financing: |  0.989     |       |
| Executing Agency: |  UNDP  | Total Project Cost: |  1.939     |       |
| Other Partners involved: |  Ministry of Agriculture  | ProDoc Signature (date project began):  |  20 Dec. 2007  |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | Proposed: 19 Dec. 2012  | Actual: 31 Dec. 2012  |

Objective and Scope

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects, in the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation policy: http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/ME\_Policy\_2010.pdf and guidelines for conducting evaluations: www.thegef.org/gef/node/1905; as well as the UNDP Monitoring and Evaluation Policy: http://web.undp.org/evaluation/policy.htm.

The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

The goal of this project is functional integrity of mountain rangelands in the highlands of Kyrgyzstan as a contribution to greater ecosystem stability reduced soil erosion and enhanced food security. The project will attempt to achieve this goal by the specific Project objective of “to develop in the Suusamyr Valley a cost-effective and replicable pasture management mechanism which reduces the negative effects of livestock grazing on land and which improves rural livelihoods”.

The project is designed to produce four outcomes:

*Outcome 1.* A set of innovative pilot measures which have been designed and validated for demonstrating the feasibility and profitability of sustainable rangeland management.

This outcome will be achieved through a number of pilot measures, which will lead to enhanced management of village and roadside pastures and will promote the return to transhumance. To this end, the project will support local communities in setting-up a grazing plan for using pastures in a more efficient and hence in a sustainable way. Main Outputs in support of this Outcome include:

1.1: Knowledge of the potential of the rangeland for livestock grazing in different parts of Suusamyr Valley;

1.2: Grazing plan for village pastures that has been developed and introduced in a participatory manner;

1.3: Basic infrastructure necessary for grazing at distant places;

1.4: Feed production (cultivation of fodder plants) introduced and promoted.

1.5: Storage of hay and other feed for supplementary feeding in winter promoted.

1.6: Improved shelters/stables which allow livestock to stay there longer during the cold season (avoidance of early grazing).

1.7: Village and roadside pastures improved with forage plants and fertilizer.

1.8: Enhanced marketing channels for livestock and livestock products.

*Outcome 2.* Capacity and awareness of rural communities and local governments for monitoring, planning and regulating the use of pastures in a sustainable way.

Considering the fact that most of the present-day stock farming is carried out by people with no history in the farming sector the project will pay special attention to build both local government and local community capacity through a series of training and experience sharing among farmers. The project will also promote establishment of a local institutions and its capacity building for a sustainable grazing management. The key outputs will include:

2.1: Pasture User Association (PUA) founded to advocate for the interests of herders and livestock owners;

2.2: Farmers and livestock owners trained in professional livestock and rangeland management;

2.3: Decision-makers fully aware of the negative environmental impacts of poor livestock husbandry;

2.4: Greater responsibility of local governments for rangeland management.

*Outcome 3.* An enabling environment which allows rangeland users to effectively and sustainably manage pastures.

Building on the local level capacity building and the project will create an institutional and regulatory framework that will ensure practical implementation of Pasture management on the ground. The PM mechanism will result in a practical set of rules that will fall within the mandate and legal remit of the Suusamyr AO and local community, as primary institutional scheme for Sustainable Pasture Management Mechanism. The following outputs are proposed to fulfill the expected reform and capacity building interventions:

3.1: Clearly defined institutional roles and responsibilities at national and local level;

3.2: Participatory designed leasing system for rangeland;

3.3: Economic incentives for leasing rangeland distant from home villages;

3.4: Conflict resolution/arbitration system;

3.5: Access to micro-credits;

3.6: Legal framework reflecting the challenges of modern pasture management;

3.7: Detailed proposals for institutional reforms.

*Outcome 4. Learning, evaluation, and adaptive management.*

This Outcome relates to overall project management, steering, reporting and evaluation as well as to capture and dissemination of lessons and best practices associated with project objectives and components. Project reporting on all activities and outputs (along with periodic reviews of the project work-plan and budget), and Project evaluation will follow standard UNDP and GEF requirements with particular emphasis being placed on ensuring that indicators are measuring satisfactory and sustainable project success. Outputs will include:

4.1: Project management;

4.2: Experiences with measures against overgrazing in high altitudes evaluated;

4.3: Outputs and activities adapted continuously according to achievements and failures of the project;

4.4: The project’s performance is monitored and evaluated;

4.5: Project results and lessons learnt disseminated for replication.

The Project has four primary outcomes summarized below:

Outcome I: A set of innovative pilot measures which have been designed and validated for demonstrating the feasibility and profitability of sustainable rangeland management.

Outcome II: Capacity and awareness of rural communities and local governments for monitoring, planning and regulating the use of pastures in a sustainable way.

Outcome III: An enabling environment which allows rangeland users to effectively and sustainably manage pastures.

Outcome IV: Learning, evaluation, and adaptive management.

Evaluation approach and method

An overall approach and method[[1]](#footnote-1) for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects have been 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 (*see* [*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 Kyrgyzstan, including the following project sites in Bishkek and Suusamyr Aiyl Okmotu*.* Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

* Project team;
* UNDP Country Office;
* GEF OFP;
* UNCCD FP;
* Ministry of Agriculture and Melioration of the KR;
* State Agency on Environment Protection and Forestry & GEF Focal Point;
* State Register of the Kyrgyz Republic;
* Jogorku-Kenesh (Parliament) of the KR, Committee on agrarian;
* Pastures department under the Ministry of Agriculture and Melioration of the KR;
* Jayil Raion Administration;
* Suusamyr Aiyl Okmotu,
* Pasture Users Association,
* Pasture Users Association Merger, jamaat members.
* UNDP “Environment for Sustainable Development” Programme;
* UNDP/CACILM “Multicountry Capacity Building” Project;
* UNDP/UNEP “Poverty & Environment Initiative” Project;
* UNDP “Climate Risk Management” Project;
* UNDP “Disaster Risk Management” Project;
* UNDP “Poverty Reduction Programme” Programme;
* LSG component of UNDP “Democratic Governance” Programme.

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.

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.[[2]](#footnote-2)

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 *Kyrgyzstan.* 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 12 days according to the following indicative plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Timing (indicative) | Completion Date (indicative) |
| **Preparation (desk review)** | *3* days (7-9 November 2012) |  *November 10 , 2012* |
| **Evaluation Mission (in-country field visits, interviews)** | *7* days (10-16 November 2012) | *November 17 , 2012* |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | *3* days (17-19 November 2012) | *November 20 , 2012* |
| **Final Report** | *3* days (20-22 November 2012) | *November 23 , 2012* |

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 and Project  |
| **Presentation** | Initial Findings  | End of evaluation field mission | To project management, UNDP CO and key stakeholders |
| **Draft Final Report**  | Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes | Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission | Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PMU, GEF OFP |
| **Final Report\*** | Revised report  | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP and key stakeholders’ comments on the 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 and 1 national evaluators.* The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The international Consultant will be a team leader and bear responsibility over submission of final report. The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The Team members must present the following qualifications:

**International evaluator**

* Master degree or equivalent in social or natural sciences;
* Minimum 10-years of professional experience in the fields of Sustainable Land Management (preferably, specialization in land degradation and pasture management);
* Proven track record of application of results-based monitoring approaches to evaluation of projects focusing on in environment/land degradation and pasture management (relevant experience in the CIS region and within UN system would be an asset);
* Familiarity with priorities and basic principles of pasture management and relevant international best-practices;
* Knowledge of and recent experience in applying UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures;
* Excellent English communication skills, knowledge of Russian would be an asset;

**National consultant**

* Master degree or equivalent in social or natural sciences;
* Minimum 5-years of professional experience in the field of environment protection and Sustainable Land Management (preferably, specialization in land degradation and pasture management);
* Basic knowledge of UNDP and GEF projects and implementation procedures;
* Previous experience with results‐based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
* Proficiency in English, Kyrgyz and Russian;

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

The service provider will be responsible for all personal administrative and travel expenses associated with undertaking this assignment including office accommodation, printing, stationary, telephone and electronic communications, and report copies incurred in this assignment. For this reason, the contract is prepared as a lump sum contract.

The remuneration of work performed will be conducted as follows: lump sum payable in 1 installment, upon satisfactory completion and approval by UNDP of all deliverables, including the Final Evaluation Report.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| % | Milestone |
| *100%* | Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report  |

Application process

Applicants are requested to apply online at <http://jobs.undp.org> by 26 October 2012. Individual consultants are invited to submit current and complete **P11** form in English, **Technical Proposal** and duly filled / signed **Financial proposal** (the templates can be downloaded from the next web link: http://www.undp.kg). Online application system accepts only one file and it is highly recommended to make all-in-one file. A financial proposal should indicate 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.

EVALUATION PROCESS

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The selection of candidates will be done in 3 stages:**1st stage: Desk review assessment** is carried out in accordance with the requirements set forth below.  Applications fully compliant to the below requirements will be invited for the 2nd stage of evaluation.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| # | Criteria |
| 1 | Master degree or equivalent in social or natural sciences |
| 2 | Minimum 10-years of professional experience in the fields of Sustainable Land Management (preferably, specialization in land degradation and pasture management); |

**2nd stage:** assessment of the **"Technical Proposal"**. Assessment is carried out in accordance with the requirements set forth below

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Criteria | Score | Min 70% |
| 1 | Knowledge of UNDP and GEF projects and implementation procedures; | 30 |
| 2 | Previous experience with results based monitoring and evaluation methodologies; | 30 |
| 3 | Familiarity with priorities and basic principles of pasture management and relevant international best-practices; | 20 |
| 4 | Knowledge of and recent experience in applying UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures; | 20 |

Applicants scored 70% out of 100% possible will participate in the next stage of evaluation.**3rd stage: - assessment of the "Financial proposals".** This specification provides for the piece-rate basis as a condition for payment, where the total budget will be paid in tranches based on the provision of relevant products, shown in the table "Expected results". All financial proposals shall include all expenses related to fulfillment of the TOR (fee and all other related costs). Contract award shall be recommended to the applicant achieving the highest cumulative score based on the below formula:**B= (Clow/C \* 0.3)+ (T/Thigh)\*0.7**Where:C = Evaluated bid priceC lowest= The lowest of all proposalsT = The total score(for all previous stages) awarded to the evaluated candidateHighest = The highest Technical Score**Applicant obtained the highest score will be recommended for contracting by the tender evaluation committee.** |

Annex A: Project Logical Framework

|  |
| --- |
| **Project Title:*****Demonstrating Sustainable Mountain Pasture Management in the Suusamyr Valley, Kyrgyzstan*** |
| **Project Goal:**Functional integrity of mountain rangelands in the highlands of Kyrgyzstan as a contribution to greater ecosystem stability, reduced soil erosion and enhanced food security. |

| **Project Strategy** | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Target** | **Sources of Verification** | **Risks and Assumptions** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Objective of the project:**To develop in the Susamyr Valley a cost-effective and replicable pasture management mechanism which reduces the negative effects of livestock grazing on land and which improves rural livelihoods. | Pilot measures which can serve as models in other areas of KyrgyzstanSurface area of degraded village and roadside rangelandLivestock-based revenues of rural population | Only scattered experiences70,714 ha of degraded pastures around six villages46% of families in Susamyr Valley are considered as poor | At least 3 successful comprehensive pilots by end of projectAt least 50% show signs of recoveryPercentage decreased by 10% | Project reports, evaluationsAssessments, reportsAssessments, reports | – Political stability– Ability of the government to overcome inter-agency competition– Timely delivery of co-financing and baseline financing– Influence of overall economic development may conceal project achievements– Poor people unable to make even minimal investments |
| **Outcome 1:**A set of innovative pilot measures which have been designed and validated for demonstrating the feasibility and profitability of sustainable rangeland management. | – Innovative approaches and technologies– Cost-effectiveness of sustainable rangeland management– Participatory approach | - None- Annual income of rural population through livestock- Not applied | - At least 3 demonstrated by end of project- Revenues from livestock increased by 10% until end of project- Applied in all pasture management measures by end of project | - reports- Survey - Meeting reports | - Pilot areas reveal as unsuitable for technical, political or socio-economic reasons- Innovations reveal as non-viable without project support- Little interest by local people |
| **Output 1.1:**Knowledge of the potential of the rangeland for livestock grazing in different parts of Susamyr Valley. | – Rangeland map showing the rangeland quality (rough classification of rangeland) | - Knowledge dispersed over many individuals | - Consolidated knowledge | - Map, report | - Local people ready to share their knowledge |
| **Output 1.2:**Grazing plan for village pastures that has been developed and introduced in a participatory manner. | – Series of workshops – Management agreement | - No such plan- No such agreement | - Grazing plan- Grazing agreement | - plan, map, report- signed agreement | - Local communities not interested- Individual interests stronger than interest for common welfare |
| **Output 1.3:**Basic infrastructure necessary for grazing at distant places. | – Programme of Infrastructure – Infrastructure is available at distant pastures according to programme  | - no such intact infrastructure | - infrastructure functioning | - assessments, reports | Unsolved ownership questions regarding existing, but damaged infrastructure |
| **Output 1.4:**Feed production (cultivation of fodder plants) introduced and promoted. | – Surface area used for fodder plant production | None | 500 ha. | - assessments, monitoring reports | No land available for fodder plant production (subsistence farming only providing crops for human consumption) |
| **Output 1.5:**Storage of hay and other feed for supplementary feeding in winter promoted. | – Amount of hay available in winter– Number of fodder silos– Amount of fodder stored in silos in winter | - to be determined- none- none | - increase by 20%- to be determined | - monitoring report- assessment, report | Local population not ready to invest in silos |
| **Output 1.6:**Improved shelters/stables which allow livestock to stay there longer during the cold season (avoidance of early grazing). | – Average period of herds staying in shelters/stables | - to be determined | - average period prolonged in spring by 3 weeks by end of project | - questionnaire among livestock farmers, monitoring report |  |
| **Output 1.7:**Village and roadside pastures improved with forage plants and fertilizer. | – Relative productivity of vegetation on village pastures | - productivity in untreated pasture (trial plot) | - increase by 15% | - vegetation assessment on sample plots, monitoring report | - species of forage plant not carefully selected- climate conditions do not allow to grow additional plants |
| **Output 1.8:**Enhanced marketing channels for livestock and livestock products. | – Efforts and resources required for marketing of livestock | - to be determined | - decrease of time and financial resources by 30% until end of project | - questionnaire among livestock farmers |  |
| **Outcome 2:**Capacity and awareness of rural communities and local governments for monitoring, planning and regulating the use of pastures in a sustainable way. | – Public awareness for rangeland degradation– Implementing rangeland management issues by local administrations– Provision of human and financial resources by local administration and user associations | - no. of news in the media- local administrations less interested- no resources provided | - no. of news in media increased by 100% by end of project- 5 significant decisions successfully implemented- amount to be defined | - evaluation of media- project reports- project reports | - political framework conditions do not allow the development of broad public awareness for environmental issues- lack of funds |
| **Output 2.1:**Pasture User Association (PUA) founded to advocate for the interests of herders and livestock owners. | – Legally registered PUA  | - no PUA | - founded by end of year 2 | - legal registration documents | - members cannot afford membership fee- PUA unable to hire professional staff |
| **Output 2.2:**Farmers and livestock owners trained in professional livestock and rangeland management. | – Training in various aspects of rangeland management and livestock breeding. | - no such training | - at least 70% of livestock owners took part in training by end of project | - reports on training | - livestock owners want to continue “as usual” |
| **Output 2.3:**Decision-makers fully aware of the negative environmental impacts of poor livestock husbandry. | – Public statements– Decrees related to livestock husbandry– Reports in media | - no environmental concerns in statements and decrees | - 80% of all statements reflect both environmental and livelihood concerns | - decrees, circulars, media reports |  |
| **Output 2.4:**Greater responsibility of local governments for rangeland management. | – civil servants in local governments who assume responsibility for rangeland management | - no civil servants exclusively responsible for rangeland management | - at least one person per community (local administration) | - reports | - newly appointed civil servants may be inactive |
| **Outcome 3:**An enabling environment which allows rangeland users to effectively and sustainably manage pastures. | – Information on rangeland– Regulations- economic incentives for sustainable rangeland management | - information not available, at least not in practicable form- regulations complicated and responsibilities spread over different organisations- no incentive system | - up-to-date information easily accessible for users- regulations supportive to sustainable rangeland management- 20% of livestock owners benefit from economic incentives (micro credits and others) | - reports, information systems- regulations, reports- reports | - government not fully supportive- delay in political decision-taking |
| **Output 3.1:**Clearly defined institutional roles and responsibilities at national and local level. | – Administrative procedures for range-leasing- description of institutional functions- job descriptions | - complicated procedures- unclear responsibilities-  | - simplified procedures- responsibilities without duplication |  |  |
| **Output 3.2:**Participatorily designed leasing system for rangeland. | – Workshops– Leasing plan | - no such plan | - plan available at the end of year 2 | - plan |  |
| **Output 3.3:**Economic incentives for leasing rangeland distant from home villages. | – Number of livestock owners leasing distant rangeland | - almost none | - 40% of village livestock owners (directly or indirectly through PUA) | - reports |  |
| **Output 3.4:**Conflict resolution/arbitration system. | – Successful cases of conflict resolution | - conflicts need to be solved by the court | - 3 successful cases per year (starting from year 2) | - reports | - PUA decisions may not be respected by non-members |
| **Output 3.5:**Access to micro-credits. | – Micro credits for rangeland rehabilitation and revival of transhumance | - no micro credits are given for this purpose | - 25 micro credits per village during life span of project | - reports by credit-giving institution | - general reservations against credits- credit-giving institutions not prepared to give micro credits to individual livestock owners of PUA |
| **Output 3.6:**Legal framework reflecting the challenges of modern pasture management. | – Draft regulations (decrees, circulars), bills | None | - drafts of 3 legally binding instruments | - documents | - bill will not be ratified- regulation will not be issued by political body |
| **Output 3.7:**Detailed proposals for institutional reforms. | - Institutional capacity assessment | - no such assessment | - assessment  | - assessment report | - it is a political decision beyond the project’s direct influence to put the recommendations into practice |
| **Outcome 4:**Learning, evaluation, and adaptive management. | – M&E system– Evaluation of experiences in other areas– Replication of project achievements in other areas | - no such system- not used- no | - system in place and functional- experiences evaluated and transformed into practical actions- Lessons learnt available to interested parties | Reports- expert reports- roundtables, meetings, etc. at national level |  |
| **Output 4.1:**Project management. | – Workplans, reports | - no workplans, no reporting | - timely implementation and delivery | - workplans- project reports |  |
| **Output 4.2:**Experiences with measures against overgrazing in high altitudes evaluated. | – Learning from other projects and experiences | - no building on international experience | - exchange with at least 5 similar projects | - activity report |  |
| **Output 4.3:**Outputs and activities adapted continuously according to achievements and failures of the project. | – Work plans;* Annual project reports
* Project implementation review
* project indicators are of high quality
 | - rigid 5-years work plans | - adapted work plans as needed - all indicators and targets to comply with SMART principles by the end of the first year | - work plans- revised logframe |  |
| **Output 4.4:**The project’s performance is monitored and evaluated. | – PMU in place– M&E system established | -none- none | – office operative by month 3– according to M&E plan | - reports- reports |  |
| **Output 4.5:**Project results and lessons learnt disseminated for replication. | – Regional symposium conducted– Report on lessons learnt– Participation of experts and decision-makers in international events- Replication strategy | - none- none- none- no replication strategy | – 2 symposia by the end month 6 and month 30– one report– participation of at least 10 experts throughout life of project- strategy drafted and discussed at national level | - proceedings- report- mission reports- strategy | - partnership for the conduction of symposia could not be established- key individuals not available |

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

**General documentation**

* UNDP Programme and Operations Policies and Procedures (POPP);
* UNDP Handbook for Monitoring and Evaluating for Results;
* GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy;
* GEF Guidelines for conducting Terminal Evaluations

**Project documentation**

* Project document;
* Annual Work Plans;
* Annual Project Reports;
* Project Implementation Review;
* GEF Operational Quarterly Reports;
* MTE report;
* Management response to MTE;
* Revised Project Logframes;
* Project Board Meeting minutes.

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

**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[[4]](#footnote-4)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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[[5]](#footnote-5)) |
| **1.** | Introduction* Purpose of the evaluation
* Scope & Methodology
* Structure of the evaluation report
 |
| **2.** | Project description and development context* Project start and duration
* Problems that the project sought to address
* Immediate and development objectives of the project
* Baseline Indicators established
* Main stakeholders
* Expected Results
 |
| **3.** | Findings (In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) must be rated[[6]](#footnote-6))  |
| **3.1** | Project Design / Formulation* Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)
* Assumptions and Risks
* Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design
* Planned stakeholder participation
* Replication approach
* UNDP comparative advantage
* Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
* Management arrangements
 |
| **3.2** | Project Implementation* Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
* Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)
* Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management
* Project Finance:
* Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (\*)
* UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (\*) coordination, and operational issues
 |
| **3.3** | Project Results* Overall results (attainment of objectives) (\*)
* Relevance(\*)
* Effectiveness & Efficiency (\*)
* Country ownership
* Mainstreaming
* Sustainability (\*)
* Impact
 |
| **4.**  | Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons* Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
* Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
* Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
* Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success
 |
| **5.**  | Annexes* ToR
* Itinerary
* List of persons interviewed
* Summary of field visits
* List of documents reviewed
* Evaluation Question Matrix
* Questionnaire used and summary of results
* Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form
* Co-financing table
 |

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: Mr. Vladimir Mamaev

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. 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-2)
3. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Moderately Satisfactory, 3: Moderately Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see Guidelines for conducting Terminal evaluations: http://www.thegef.org/gef/node/1905. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)