

Annex 1 Terms of Reference

1. Background

Sustainable Development of the Protected Area System of Ethiopia (SDPASE) has started on October, 2008. It is funded by the Global Environment Facility/UNDP. Co-financers of the project include the Government of Ethiopia and co-funding institutions like NGOs, bilateral development projects etc.

The Ethiopian Wildlife Conservation Authority (EWCA) has been charged by Government of Ethiopia and UNDP is the implementing agency of the project. SDPASE is embedded in EWCA, and GIZ-IS (German Agency for International Cooperation-International Services, former GTZ) is the implementing agent for the first phase of the project. EWCA, recently in 2007, is structured under the Federal Ministry of Culture and Tourism. According to the present legislation EWCA is charged with the management of 13 National Parks (NP), 9 of which have been under regional authority up to 2009. EWCA is also in charge of the wildlife sanctuaries and administers of the hunting industry.

The regional states have created their own organisations to deal with Protected Areas (Pas) and wildlife management. They use different models: Oromia state has formed an independent enterprise (Oromia Forest and Wildlife Enterprise), whereas most of the other states have put a department in charge of wildlife issues, either under the Bureau (Regional Ministry) of Culture and Tourism, or under the Bureau of Agriculture. The Project Document can be downloaded from the following web link:

<http://THEgefonline.org/projectDetailsSQL.cfm?projID=1239>

2. Introduction

2.1 UNDP/GEF evaluation policy

The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) policy at the project level in UNDP/GEF has four objectives: i) to monitor and evaluate results and impacts; ii) to provide a basis for decision making on necessary amendments and improvements; iii) to promote accountability for resource use; and iv) to document, provide feedback on, and disseminate lessons learned. A mix of tools is used to ensure effective project M&E. These might be applied continuously throughout the lifetime of the project – e.g. periodic monitoring of indicators -, or as specific time-bound exercises such as mid-term reviews, audit reports and independent evaluations.

In accordance with UNDP/GEF M&E policies and procedures, all projects with long implementation periods (over 5 or 6 years) are strongly encouraged to conduct mid-term evaluations. In addition to providing an independent in-depth review of implementation progress, this type of evaluation is responsive to GEF Council decisions on transparency and better access of information during implementation.

Mid-Term Evaluations are intended to identify potential project design problems, assess progress towards the achievement of objectives, identify and document lessons learned (including lessons that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP/GEF projects), and to make recommendations regarding specific actions that might be taken to improve the project. It is expected to serve as a means of validating or filling the gaps in the initial assessment of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency obtained from monitoring. The mid-term evaluation provides the opportunity to assess early signs of project success or failure and prompt necessary adjustments.

2.2 Project objectives and its context within Ethiopia

The overall objective of SDPASE is:

Ethiopia's biodiversity, ecosystems and ecological processes are effectively safeguarded from human-induced pressures and adequately represented in a sustainable Protected Area System that is contributing significantly to economic development, both locally and nationally.

SDASE has been planned in two stages:

Stage One is focussing on building capacity in the institutions of the sector and piloting field models. The purpose of stage one is: *Enabling frameworks and capacities for managing the system of protected areas that have biodiversity, ecosystem and ecological process conservation as major objectives will be implemented*

The following outcomes are to be achieved:

1. Protected Areas and Wildlife Conservation are mainstreamed into the Development Framework of Ethiopia, with greater political support and funding
2. Policy frameworks for Wildlife Conservation supported at Federal, Regional and Local levels
3. Increased institutional capacity for Protected Area Planning and Management, leads to functional system plan and improved Protected Area Management
4. New Protected Area Management Options are piloted, developing best practice to be replicated across the PA system
5. Mechanisms for financial sustainability for Ethiopia's Protected Area System are developed and demonstrated, for scale-up in Stage 2

Stage Two is planned to focus on implementation, scaling-up and replicating of good practices. It will consolidate the achievements of stage one and aim at achieving sustainable and effective management across the protected area system of Ethiopia. Its purpose is: *Working in an enabled environment, sustainable management of the system of protected areas that have biodiversity, ecosystem and ecological process conservation as a major objective is ensured*

Stage two will be entered into only when certain trigger indicators have been achieved during stage one, like the improvement of management effectiveness indicators of the four pilot protected areas (Omo, Nechsar, Bale, GCCA)., and the being in place of the components of a sustainable funding mechanism at the end of phase one.

Its outcomes are as follows:

1. Systemic capacity for protected area management consolidated
2. Sustainable financing mechanisms are contributing to protected area budgets
3. Replication of good practice models across protected area estate catalysed
4. Protected areas mainstreamed across all relevant sectors

3. Objectives of the evaluation:

The MTE is a requirement of UNDP/GEF for projects with a planned lifetime of more than 5 or 6 years. It was agreed between the project steering committee and UNDP to carry out the MTE in April 2012.

The MTE will provide material for decision makers whether, and if yes, how the second 4-year phase of the project will be implemented.

The specific objectives of the MTE are to:

- identify potential project design problems,
- assess progress towards the achievement of objectives,
- identify and document lessons learned (including lessons that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP/GEF projects),
- to make recommendations regarding the second phase,
- analyze the project performance up to now in the context of the institutional framework and events in Ethiopia during the first phase,
- analyze the trigger indicators for determining the entering into the next phase,
- Provide recommendations on how the second phase should be designed.

4. Scope of the evaluation

The project advises and supports EWCA and to a certain extent the regional wildlife authorities on how to strengthen and run the protected area system of Ethiopia. The emphasis of the project in the first phase is on capacity building at federal level. Thus the project has no implementing capacities of its own. It works through the respective EWCA departments. The MTE has therefore to:

- measure to what extent the capacity building process has been successful and what capacity building support has been provided to EWCA and the regional authorities will be needed in the second phase.
- evaluate all activities supported by UNDP/GEF and, where appropriate, activities supported by the host institutions, EWCA and Ministry of Culture and Tourism (MoCT).
- assess activities that other cooperating partners are supporting as long as there is a direct correlation with the project
- assess the relevance of the measures taken by the project and propose shifts in emphasis where necessary.
- assess the framework conditions (policies, laws, regulations etc.) and comment on their impact to the tasks of the project and EWCA.
- describe EWCA's core functions and services, and how it is organised to deliver.
- analyse EWCA's performance and future requirements to strengthen it.

Specifically, the evaluation report should assess:

- the relevance of the project within the local, national, regional and global context. The potential sustainability of results should be addressed and strategies to improve this element suggested.
- will make a brief analysis of the regions' Protected Areas (PA) set up, their strengths and weaknesses, how they fit in the national context, and the project's future role in their performance.
- an analysis needs to be provided of the co-financing in the sector, with special emphasis on its relevance, size, cooperation with EWCA and project and modes of delivery.
- assess whether the project's partnership strategy has been appropriate and effective including the range and quality of partnerships and collaboration developed with government, civil society, donors, the private sector and whether these have contributed to improved project delivery.
- assess relevance, efficiency and effectiveness of the project administration

- assess the sustainability and ownership of the project by the host organization
- propose a design for the second phase (if there is any), including outcomes, outputs, indicators, timetable, consultancies, financing and lessons learned.

Summarising the above, the following key questions will be looked into:

- What progress toward the outcomes has been made?
- What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving intended outcomes?
- To what extents have UNDP/GEF outputs and assistance contributed to outcomes?
- Has the project partnership strategy been appropriate and effective?
- How could the second phase of the project be designed and structured?

5. Products Expected from the Evaluation

- The evaluation team will produce an evaluation report of approximately 25 – 30 pages, excluding annexes, according to the attached detailed breakdown. The report will be in English and will be prepared and submitted in MS Word 2010, with tables in Excel where necessary.
- A PowerPoint presentation (10 – 15 slides) covering the key points of the MTE with the main findings and recommendations will also be provided.
- A draft of both of these should be submitted within two weeks of the end of data collection and meetings. The final copy will be submitted within a week of receiving written comments on the drafts.
- If there are any significant discrepancies between the impressions and findings of the evaluation team and stakeholders these should be explained in an Annex attached to the final report.

6. Methodology

6.1 Documentation review including, *inter alia*:

- Project Document and Logical Framework, including adaptations (inception report, etc.)
- Project implementation reports (PIR's)
- Minutes of the National Steering Committee meetings
- Quarterly and annual progress reports and work plans of the project;
- Audits reports
- Financial and Administration guidelines;
- EWCA documentation (BPR, re-demarcation proposals, gazetting proclamation proposals, plans etc.)
- National policies and strategies, laws, regulations and guidelines regarding the sector,
- Films, workshop reports, studies and publications, field work reports, METT reports,
- National Development Plans (PASDEP and GTP)

The following documents will also be available:

- The project M&E framework,
- Knowledge products from service providers,
- Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems;
- Maps,
- The GEF Implementation Completion Report guidelines; and,
- The UNDP Monitoring and Evaluation Frameworks.

6.2 Interviews with:

- UNDP/GEF staff who have project responsibilities;
- Staff of the Project Coordination Unit;
- Executing agencies;
- Members of the Project Steering Committee
- Project stakeholders, particularly partners and project beneficiaries;
- Relevant staff in participating government departments.

6.3 Field Visits:

Detailed work will concentrate on selected PAs, representing the full spectre of PAs in Ethiopia. To be determined with the consultants, possibly to Awash, Senkelle, Bale, a Controlled Hunting Area, WR Alideghe, and a Community Conservation Area

Implementation Arrangements

- Management arrangements – the international consultant will closely liaise with the UNDP country office. The planning and the administrative arrangements for the MTE will be done in close cooperation with the UNDP/GEF office in Pretoria, This office has to approve the TOR and the composition of the team. (Consultation with the offices and their prior approval when the evaluation is being initiated by headquarters); The consultancy contracts will be issued by the UNDP Country Office Ethiopia according to its guidelines.
- Both the international and national consultants are equally accountable for the final evaluation report.
- Time frame - The expected duration of this work is 4 weeks with a start date of 1st May 2012, and the completion of the MTE by end of Mayf, 2012.
- desk review 3 days
- briefings for evaluators 2 days
- travel 2 days
- visits to the field (including allocation for travel), interviews, questionnaires 10 days
- debriefings 2 days
- validation of preliminary findings with stakeholders through circulation of initial reports for comments, meetings, and other types of feedback mechanisms 4 days
- preparation of final evaluation report 7 days
- Logistical support needed: vehicle hire for field visits and appointments with key interviewees. Furthermore a round trip ticket for the international consultant and DSA for both consultants when they are out of Addis Ababa.

Reporting Arrangements

- The consultants will submit an inception report, a mid-term report and a final draft report for comments to both Ethiopian Wild Life Authority (EWCA) and the UNDP country representative in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. The inception report will provide details of the methodological approach to be used by the consultants to undertake the study.
- The Ethiopian Wild Life Authority (EWCA) in partnership with UNDP will coordinate the study and keep abreast of the mission's activities during the consultants stay. The study team will work closely with the Ethiopian Wild Life Authority (EWCA) and submit all draft reports to EWCA and UNDP; and

- Once the final draft of the report is produced, the document will be reviewed in order to obtain feedbacks on the study;
- Only after incorporating and/or responding to all the comment shall the consultants produce and submit a final report to UNDP.