**Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference**

**Integrated livestock and crop conservation programme (illcp)**

**Project/Award no.: 00048573/00042329**

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 Integrated Livestock and Crop Conservation Programme (ILCCP) (PIMS # 2911)

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

Project Summary Table

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Title: |  | | | | | |
| GEF Project ID: | | 2911 |  | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | | *at completion (Million US$)* |
| UNDP Project ID: | | 48573 | GEF financing: | 921,985 | | 921,985 |
| Country: | | Bhutan | IA/EA own: | 400,000 | | 5,000 |
| Region: | | Asia-Pacific | Government: | 750,000 | | 2,074,500 |
| Focal Area: | | Biodiversity | Other: | 850,000 | | 690,000 |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): | | OP 13 – Agro-biodiversity | Total co-financing: | 1,600,000 | | 2,769,500 |
| Executing Agency: | | National Biodiversity Center (MoAF) | Total Project Cost: | 2,897,485 | | 3,691,485 |
| Other Partners involved: | | District agriculture & livestock sector (in 8 districts) | ProDoc Signature (date project began): | | | 30 July 2007 |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | | Proposed:  30 June 2011 | Actual:  30 June 2012 |

Objective and Scope

The project was designed to contribute to the attainment of food security and self-sufficiency in Bhutan through the maintenance of adequate levels of indigenous agro-biodiversity. Specifically, the project assists in mainstreaming of agro-biodiversity conservation into livestock and crop development in Bhutan.

In order to achieve this objective, the project worked in eight target sites and at the institutional/policy level to overcome the barriers that currently prevent effective mainstreaming of agro-biodiversity conservation in agricultural and livestock development. The project adopted the “Triple Gem” concept of the Ministry of Agriculture and Forests (MoAF) in which value is added to traditional varieties and breeds by improving productivity, developing markets, and facilitating market accessibility.

The goal of the project is to ensure that the attainment of food security and self sufficiency in Bhutan is based on the maintenance of adequate levels of indigenous agro-biodiversity.

The overall objective is to mainstream agro-biodiversity conservation into livestock and crop development policy and practices in Bhutan.

The project initially had seven outcomes and later reduced to three following the MTR recommendations. These are:

**Outcome 1:** At a systemic level, the capacity of the MoA is adequate to mainstream agro-biodiversity conservation into the attainment of food security and self-sufficiency.

**Outcome 2:** Capacity of MoAF agencies (NBC, and Stakeholders) strengthened to support farmers in agro biodiversity conservation.

**Outcome 3:** Farmers benefit from sustainable utilization of traditional varieties and breeds of IGR

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects.

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

Evaluation approach and method

An overall approach and method[[1]](#footnote-1) for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects have 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 ([*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 the project sites, including interviews with the organizations and individuals associated with the project (***location and list of project sites, and stakeholders included in the tentative 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 ( [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 | 0 | 5,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Loans/Concessions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * In-kind support | 400,000 |  | 750,000 | 2,074,500 | 850,000 | 690,000 | 1,600,000 | 2,764,500 |
| * Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals | **400,000** | **5,000** | **750,000** | **2,074,500** | **850,000** | **690,000** | **1,600,000** | **2,764,500** |

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 Bhutan. 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 19 days according to the following plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Timing | Completion Date |
| **Preparation (Home based)**   1. **Desk review of documents;** 2. **Inception report** | 2 days | *23 November* |
| **Evaluation Mission including de-briefing** | 11 days | *26 Nov - 06 December* |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | 5 days | *20 December* |
| **Final Report** | 1 day | *31December* |

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 *one international and one national evaluator.* The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The international evaluator will lead the evaluation team and will be responsible for finalizing the 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:

* Professional background in Plant/Animal Genetic Resource Management related fields. A minimum of 8 years of working experience is required;
* Knowledge of UNDP and GEF;
* Previous experience with results‐based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
* Highly knowledgeable of participatory monitoring and evaluation processes, and experience in evaluation of technical assistance projects with major donor agencies;
* Demonstrate ability to assess complex situations, succinctly distills critical issues, and draw forward-looking conclusions and recommendations;
* Ability and experience to lead multi disciplinary and national teams, and deliver quality reports within the given time.
* Writing and communication will be in English, and must be excellent in English and communication skills.

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 8accordance with the principles outlined in the [UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'](http://www.unevaluation.org/ethicalguidelines)

Payment modalities and specifications

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| % | Milestone |
| *15%* | At contract signing |
| *20%* | Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report |
| *65%* | Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report |

Application process

Applicants are requested to apply online (http://jobs.undp.org) or by email to procurement at [procurement.bt@undp.org](mailto:procurement.bt@undp.org) by 31st October 2012. Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions. The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in English with indication of the e‐mail and phone contact. Shortlisted candidates will be requested to submit a price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs).

UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

**Selection Criteria**

The consultants who fulfill the above requirements will be assessed based on the following criteria:

* Technical evaluation comprising of 70%, and
* Financial evaluation of 30%

Annex A: Project Logical Framework (Revised in 2010)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcomes** | **Outputs** | **Indicators** | **Baselines** | **Targets** | **Sources of verification** | **Risks and Assumptions** |
| **Outcome 1:** At a systemic level, the capacity of the MoA is adequate to mainstream agro-biodiversity conservation into the attainment of food security and self-sufficiency | Output 1.1. Draft National Policies and guidelines incorporating agro biodiversity conservation. | Number of national policies, plans and guidelines (identified) incorporating biodiversity, and especially agro-biodiversity | No National Biodiversity Policy Framework, No National Food and Nutrition Security Policy | By the end of the project, RNR sector 11th Five Year Plan, NationalBiodiversity Policy and Food and Nutrition Security Policy include strong elements on conservation of agrobiodiversity | MoAF and project reports | Institutional mandates do not prevent effective coordination and cooperation |
| Output 1.2. Policy analysis of sectoral policies identifies gaps and inconsistencies | Number of recommendations to different sectors on implementing the National Biodiversity Policy and National Food and Nutrition Security Policy. | Agro biodiversity Conservation elements are not integrated in Agriculture and Livestock development Sector polices | Practical recommendations for agriculture, livestock and Forest sectors developed to strengthen Sectoral policies, and practices related to agro biodiversity conservation, including wild relatives of agricultural crops | MoAF and project reports | Institutional mandates do not prevent effective coordination and cooperation |
| **Outcome 2:** Capacity of MoAF agencies (NBC, and Stakeholders) strengthened to support farmers in agro- biodiversity conservation | Output 2.1. Strengthening of capacity of NBC. | Capacity of NBC in ex-situ management of AnGR and PGR | Lack technical capacity in AnGR cryopreservation, PGR characterization & documentation and equipment maintenance | Staff capacities on processing, cryopreservation, conservation AnGr and PGR characterisation, Gene Bank’s equipment and information system upgraded | Project reports |  |
| Output 2.2. *Ex situ* collections of AnGR are established and gaps in existing PGR databases are addressed through PGR collection. | Ex-situ conservation facilities for AnGR.  Number of AnGR doses and PGR samples preserved in the Gene Bank  Study on two CWR | Only basic equipments in place for AnGR.  PGR Gene Bank established.  No study | *Ex situ* collections of AnGR are established.  Collections built up to 2,000 samples of PGR and 4000 doses of AnGR  At least two CWR assessed and conserved in-situ | Reports of NBC |  |
| Output 2.3. Livestock and agriculture development agencies and Dzongkhag Extension staff trained in the importance of/ and approaches to agro biodiversity conservation | Capacity of Livestock and agriculture development agencies. | Lack technical capacity agro biodiversity management | Technical capacity of agriculture and livestock development agencies built in agro biodiversity management | Reports of NBC |  |
| Output 2.4. Agriculture and livestock sector policies integrate agrobiodiversity conservation issues | Number of agencies and *Dzonkhags* incorporating agro biodiversity conservation as part of regular program | MoA agencies provide no support regarding agro biodiversity conservation in selected sites | 1. NLBP under DoL incorporates breeding and management of traditional livestock varieties (in-situ and ex-situ) 2. DAMC incorporates marketing of agro biodiversity products amongst programs on farmers’ cooperatives. 3. At least 4 potentials Gewogs include in-situ agro biodiversity management 4. DoF includes agro biodiversity theme especially wild relatives of crops) in the national forest survey. | Surveys and interviews | MoAF policy strengthens emphasis on agrobiodiversity conservation in RNRRC’s |
| **Outcome 3:** Farmers benefit from sustainable utilization of traditional varieties and breeds of IGR | Output 3.1. Yield of traditional crop varieties and livestock breeds improved through breeding and cultural improvements | Production of traditional crop varieties and traditional livestock breeds increased | Baseline info on different commodities in different sites | 1. One product per site in at least 6 sites for crops increased by 15% over baseline 2. Communities in at least 4 sites in 3 districts undertake actions to conserve traditional breeds of Yak and local cattle (Nublang) | MoAF reports and surveys | Yield improvement programmes yield prompt results |
| Output 3.2. Traditional varieties and breeds have access to new and larger markets. | Increased revenue to farmers from traditional crop varieties and traditional livestock breeds/ and their products | No products exist.  No experience in marketing | 1. Farmers at least 11 sites increase income by15% on average over baseline through better production and marketing of traditional crops and animal breeds and products | MoAF reports and surveys | Viable market opportunities are identified  Markets are stable and training of farmers is effective |
| Output 3.3. Farmers, agricultural and livestock sector professionals and the general public are aware of the contribution of agro biodiversity conservation to food security and self-sufficiency | Levels of public awareness increased | Baseline info on different commodities in different sites | 1. Surveys of farmers, agricultural and livestock sector professionals and the general public reveal that awareness of the importance of agro-biodiversity conservation for food security and self-sufficiency has increased significantly by the end of the project, compared with surveys in year 1 | Project reports and surveys | Awareness raising efforts effect long-term, rather than ephemeral improvements |

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Sl. #** | **Documents** |
| **A** | **Project Document** |
| 1 | ILCCP, 2007 |
| **B** | **UNDP Documents** |
| 1 | Common Country Programme Action Plan (cCPAP) 2008 - 2012 |
| 2 | United Nations Development Assistance Framework for the Kingdom of Bhutan 2008-2012 |
| **C** | **Government Documents** |
| 1 | Bhutan Millennium Development Goals: Needs Assessment and Costing Report (2006-2015) – Planning Commission, Royal Government of Bhutan |
| 2 | Biodiversity Action Plan of Bhutan |
| 3 | 10 Five-Year Plan Document of MoA |
| 4 | Biodiversity Act of Bhutan |
| 5 | Vision 2020 |
| 6 | Draft of bylaws for Farmers’ groups |
| **D** | **UNDP/GEF Guidance Documents** |
| 1 | Guidance for conducting terminal evaluation of UNDP supported, GEF financed projects. |
| 2 | GEF Focal Area Strategy paper 2007 |
| 3 | GEF Tracking Tools for Strategic Objective 1 and Strategic Objective 2 |
| **E** | **Key Project Outputs** |
| 1 | Project Progress Reports |
| 2 | Minutes of the Project Board Meetings |
| 3 | PIR/APR 2010/2011/2012 |
| 4 | Baseline survey report |
| 5 | Training/study visit report |
| 6 | Market assessment and analysis report |
| 7 | Publications on plant & animal genetic resources of Bhutan |
| 8 | Impact assessment of project intervention |
| 9 | Project monitoring reports |
| 10 | Mid-Term Evaluation Report |
| 11 | Documentary on Animal Genetic Resources |
| 12 | Documentary on Plant Genetic Resources |
| 13 | MTV on Agrobiodiversity |
| 14 | Plant Gene Bank Protocol |

Annex C: Evaluation Questions

| **Evaluative Criteria Questions** | | **Indicators** | **Sources** | **Methodology** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels? | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards? | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Annex D: Rating Scales

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution*** | ***Sustainability ratings:*** | ***Relevance ratings*** |
| 6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings  5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings  4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS)  3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings  2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems  1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems | 4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability | 2. Relevant (R) |
| 3. Moderately Likely (ML):moderate risks | 1.. Not relevant (NR) |
| 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks  1. Unlikely (U): severe risks | ***Impact Ratings:***  3. Significant (S)  2. Minimal (M)  1. Negligible (N) |
| *Additional ratings where relevant:*  Not Applicable (N/A)  Unable to Assess (U/A | | |

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 |

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: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Annex H: sites and commodities

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Dzongkhag** | **Final site specific commodities** | | |
| **Haa** | **Gakiling**   1. Buckwheat (Sweet & Bitter) 2. Nublang 3. Piggery 4. Poultry | **Sombeykha**   1. Nublang 2. Buckwheat (Sweet & Bitter) 3. Mustard 4. Piggery and poultry | **BJI:**  Yak |
| **Chukha** | **Getena**   1. Pig 2. Maize | **Metekha**   1. Buckwheat (Sweet & Bitter) 2. Foxtail Millet | |
| **Samtse** | **Ugyentse**   1. Sheep 2. poultry | **Dumtoe**   1. Finger millet (kalo &Payli millet 2. poultry and piggery and cattle | |
| **Tsirang** | **Mendelgang**   1. Poultry 2. Rice | **Semjong**   1. Legumes 2. Maize 3. Poultry | |
| **Zhemgang** | **Bardo**   1. Poultry 2. Piggery | **Nangkhor(**Rice )   1. Karma Tekpa, 2. Karpo 3. Korfokpa | |
| **Bumthang** | **Tang**   1. Barley 2. Horse 3. Sheep (at Dechenpelrithang farm | **Chhoekhor**   1. Yak 2. Buckwheat (Sweet & Bitter) | |
| **Trashigang** | **Uzrong**   1. Pig, 2. Poultry (Yebja) | **Shongphu**   1. Barley 2. Soya Beans 3. Mustard 4. Siri | **Merak**   1. Yak 2. Yutha |
| **Pemagatshel** | **Decheling**   1. Finger Millet 2. Foxtail Millet 3. Pig, poultry – only monitoring. 4. Local siri cattle | **Chemong**   1. Pig, poultry- only monitoring. 2. Local cattle: Siri | |

Annex I: Tentative Schedule for the TE of ILCCP

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Dates** | **Program** |
| 24/25/Nov | Arrival of International Consultant to Bhutan.  Desk review and collection of documents to be done by local consultant prior to commencing the work. |
| 26/Nov | Meeting with senior officials of the Royal Government and UNDP.   * National Biodiversity Center (NBC) * Planning & Policy Division/MoAF (PPD) * Department of Agriculture (DoA) * Department of Livestock (DOL) * National Livestock Breeding Programme (NLBP) * Department of Agriculture & Marketing Cooperatives (DAMC) * UNDP Country Office |
| 27/Nov | * Travel from Thimphu to Bumthang |
| 28-29/Nov | * Meeting with district officials (District Agriculture & Livestock Officer) * Visit ILCCP sites under Bumthang District (Dzongkhag). Meet with the project SHs and beneficiaries (Dzongkhag SHs (DAO/DLO, LEO Choekhor, AEO Choekhor), RDC Jakar, NSBF, beneficiary farmers of Choekhor and Tang . |
| 30Nov | * Travel to Trashigang |
| 1-2/Dec | * Meeting with district officials (District Agriculture & Livestock Officer) * Visit ILCCP sites under Trashigang District (Dzongkhag). Meet with the project SHs and beneficiaries (Dzongkhag SHs (DAO/DLO, LEO Merak/Odzrong/Shongphu, AEO Shongphu), beneficiary farmers of Merak, Shongphu and Odzrong |
| 3-4/Dec | * Travel back to Thimphu |
| 5/Dec | * Work on the presentation of the preliminary findings of the evaluation. |
| 6/Dec | * Debriefing on the preliminary findings of the review. |
| 7/Dec | * Departure of International Consultant |
| 20/Dec | * Submission of the draft report |
| 21-27/Dec | * Feedback and comments from the project IP and UNDP |
| 28/Dec | * Incorporate comments/feedback into the report by the consultants. |
| 31/Dec | * Submission of the final report to NBC/UNDP CO. |

**Focal Persons:**

National Biodiversity Center

Dr. Tashi Yangzom Dorji (Program Director of NBC-Project Director): yangzome2011@gmail.com

Asta Tamang, Princial Biodiversity Officer-Project Manager:[astapgrfa@yahoo.com](mailto:astapgrfa@yahoo.com)

UNDP Country Office, Bhutan

Karma Rapten, Assistant Resident Representative - Energy, Environment and Disaster Management Unit [karma.rapten@undp.org](mailto:karma.rapten@undp.org)

Tashi Dorji, Project Support Officer, Energy, Environment and Disaster Management Unit

[tashi.dorji@undp.org](mailto:tashi.dorji@undp.org)

UNDP Asia-Pacific Regional Center in Bangkok

Sameer Karki, Regional Technical Advisor

[sameer.karki@undp.org](mailto:sameer.karki@undp.org)

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: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)