Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference
Biodiversity Conservation in Coffee:
transforming productive practices in the coffee sector by
increasing market demand for certified sustainable coffee. 2007-13

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, full 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 Project Biodiversity Conservation in Coffee: transforming productive practices in the coffee sector by increasing market demand for certified sustainable coffee (PIMS 3083).

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

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project title:	Biodiversity Conservation in Coffee: transforming productive practices in the coffee sector by increasing market demand for certified sustainable coffee			
GEF Project ID:	3083		*at endorsement (Million US$)*	*at completion (Million US$)*
UNDP Project ID:	40021	GEF financing:	12,000,000	
Country:	Guatemala Honduras El Salvador Colombia Perú Brasil	Rainforest Alliance:	3.625,000	
Region:	Latin America	Government:	911,000	
Focal Area:	Biodiversity	Other:	105,540,581	
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	OP3 y OP4	Total co-financing:	110,076,581	
Executing Agency:	UNDP	Total Project Cost:	122,076,581	
Other Partners involved:	Imaflora Salvanatura Icade Fundacion Natura	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		September, 2006
		(Operational) Closing Date: September 07, 2013	Proposed: September 07, 2013	Actual: September 07, 2013

OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

PROJECT OBJECTIVES AND ITS CONTEXT: This project seeks to promote biodiversity conservation by generating demand for coffee produced in compliance with the Sustainable Agriculture Network (SAN) standards. In order to satisfy this demand, it is focused on building supply of RA certified coffee in six coffee producing countries - Brazil, Colombia, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras and Peru - thereby contributing to the conservation of the Atlantic Forest, Cerrado, Mesoamerican, and the Tropical Andes BD hotspots. As the project seeks to transform the coffee sector to provide market incentives through RA certification, it expects in addition to produce conservation benefits in other coffee growing regions across the globe. In 2013, the project aims to result in the certification of 1,500,000 ha of coffee from which 500,000 metric tons (t) of RA certified (RAC) coffee will be sold to more than 300 coffee companies (roasters).

The main objective and outcomes are the following: **(Annex A. Result Framework)**

Objective: Demand and sales of biodiversity- friendly coffee increases from niche to mainstream product allowing a significant growth in farms adopting biodiversity-friendly, sustainable productive practices and showing on-farm BD benefits.

Outcome 1:   Demand for biodiversity-friendly coffee on international coffee markets has increased
Outcome 2:   Consumer interest to purchase certified coffee increased
Outcome 3:   National capacities to certify all sizes of coffee farms in biologically rich production landscapes has increased.
Outcome 4:   Economic sustainability of certified coffee farms has increased
Outcome 5:   Increased capacity to engage policy makers in coffee-producing and consuming countries in promoting sustainable coffee practices and to monitor and respond to policy initiatives/threats to sustainable coffee.
Outcome 6:   Increased learning and adaptive management

OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results under the program strategies and interventions implemented by the Biodiversity Conservation in Coffee project from 2007 - 2013. As part of this objective, the evaluation will also collate and analyze specific lessons and best practices which may be of relevance to other projects in the six target geographical regions, and would aid Rainforest Alliance in the implementation of UNDP supported, GEF financed projects elsewhere in the world.

The sub-objectives of the evaluation are:

- To assess actual or anticipated changes brought about by mainstreaming sustainability in coffee production, including environmental benefits and changed livelihoods;
- To determine the effectiveness of the supply-chain approach used by the project to trigger conservation of biodiversity and improved livelihoods;
- To assess progress made in responding to mid-term evaluation recommendations;
- To gauge the prospects for institutional sustainability in target countries as the GEF funding is phased out;
- To incorporate a structured facilitated learning process for implementing partners and key stakeholders in order to synthesize the evaluation information and reach agreement about key findings recommendations;

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.

EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

An overall approach and method[1] for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported, GEF financed projects has developed over time. Within this framework the evaluators are 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.

- Relevance. The extent to which a development initiative and its intended outputs or outcomes are consistent with national and local policies and priorities and the needs of intended beneficiaries. .
- Effectiveness. Is a measure of the extent to which the initiative´s intended results (outputs or outcomes) have been achieved or the extent to which progress toward outputs or outcomes has been achieved.
- Efficiency: measures how economically resources or inputs (such as funds, expertise and time) are converted to results. An initiative is efficient when it uses resources appropriately and economically to produce the desired outputs.
- Sustainability. Measure the extent to which benefits of initiatives continue after external development assistance has come to an end. Assessing sustainability involves evaluating the extent to which relevant social, economic, political, institutional and other conditions are present and, based on that assessment, making projections about the national capacity to maintain, manage and ensure the development results in the future.
- Impact: measures changes in human development and people's well-being that are brought about by development initiatives, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.

 A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR **(Annex C).** The evaluators are 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 evaluators are expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with key stakeholders , in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office (Flor de Maria Bolaños), project team (Michelle Deugd, Oscar Maroto), UNDP GEF Technical Adviser (Andrew Bovarnik) based in the region, and key participating actors. The evaluators are expected to conduct a field mission to Brasil, Guatemala and Honduras, including the project sites and the organizations/individuals detailed below **(Annex B).**

The evaluators 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** 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**) 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

---

[1] For additional information on methods, see the Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results, Chapter 7, pg. 163

following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary.   The obligatory rating scales are included in **Annex D**.

Evaluation Ratings:			
1. Monitoring and Evaluation	*rating*	**2. Implementing agency –IA & Executing Agency -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 evaluators will receive assistance from Rainforest Alliance's Project Team and UNDP Country Office (CO) 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 programs. 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 evaluator 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]

CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

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

Conclusion and recommendations: this section must provide the concluding points to this evaluation and specific recommendations. Recommendations should be as specific as possible indicating to whom this are addresses. This section should include:
• Final remarks or synthesis on relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, results and sustainability of the project;
• Final remarks on the achievement of project outcomes and objective;
• Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project;
• Actions to follow up on to reinforce initial benefits from the project;
• Proposals for modifications and future directions that reinforce the main objectives.

Lessons learned: The evaluator will present lessons on all aspects of the project that may be considered relevant in this evaluation. The evaluator will be expected to give special attention to analyzing lessons and proposing recommendations on aspects related to factors that contributed or hindered: attainment of project objectives and results, sustainability of project benefits, innovation, catalytic effect and replication, and project monitoring and evaluation. Some questions to consider are:
• Is there anything noteworthy/special/critical that was learned during project implementation that is important to share with other projects so they can avoid this mistake/make use of this opportunity?
• What would you do differently if you were to begin the project again?
• How does this project contribute to technology transfer?
• To what extent have UNDP GEF projects been relevant to local, national, regional, global efforts to reduce poverty / enhance democratic governance / strengthen crisis prevention and recovery capacity / promote gender equality and empowerment of women? Please explain.
• Has this project been able to generate global environmental benefits while also contributing to the achievement of national and/or regional environmental management and sustainable development priorities? If yes, please elaborate.

IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The evaluation is being solicited by UNDP, led by the Guatemala Country Office as project Implementing Agency. Flor de Maria Bolaños, Program Analyst will be the contact person at the UNDP Guatemalan Country Office. The Guatemala Country Office will lead evaluation. Rainforest Alliance will lead the coordination and logistical arrangements of the evaluation as well as day-to-day support to the evaluators (travel, accommodation, office space, communications, etc) and timely provision of per diems and contractual payments.   Rainforest Alliance will also support and organize the site missions (travel arrangements, meetings with key stakeholders and beneficiaries, interviews, field trips).

---

[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

EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the evaluation will be *44* days according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation	4 days *(recommended: 2-4)*	date 07 June 2013
Evaluation Mission	28 days (*r: 7-15*	date 17 July 2013
Draft Evaluation Report	10 days (*r: 5-10*)	date 31 July 20 2013
Final Report	2 days *(r;: 1-2*)	Date 02 August 2013

EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluator 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
1ST draft of the terminal evaluation 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 terminal evaluation 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 will include two international experts. One candidate will be designated as the team leader and will be responsible for finalizing the report. The candidates selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities. Both candidates should be bilingual with excellent command of English and very good knowledge of Spanish. Portuguese is a plus. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage.

The candidates must present the following qualifications:

Expert in Market-driven Conservation Strategies (team leader). The candidate should be very familiar with market-driven conservation strategies, with strong knowledge of certification systems. It is important that s/he understands how companies (particularly food companies) and markets work and of the opportunities and limitations of working with a supply-chain approach (as opposed to a centrally planned approach).

Deliverables

As the Expert in Market-driven Conservation Strategies and team leader of the evaluation team, the Consultant will be responsible for the following products:
- Evaluation of the project's design, the established objectives and achieved results.
- Evaluation of sustainability relative elements, ownership, evaluation and monitoring and efficiency.
- Evaluation of strategy and project development.
- Evaluation of the relation between the different actors and their specific roles.
- Evaluation of the achievement of project's results, objectives and impacts.
- Evaluate the project's developed strategy's effectiveness in particular in the development of the Management Plan.
- Assist in the development of the project's evaluation, results and impacts.
- Evaluate the management aspects and the project's financial planning.
- Assess implementation capacity of the different project's components, carefully reviewing the ability to carry out their specific responsibilities.
- Evaluate the cross-institutional relationships social context that have helped or hindered the implementation and effective achievement of the project's objectives.
- Compile and edit the material produced by the evaluation team and prepare the final report.
- Assist the project team in the organization of interviews prior to the country missions and visits to coffee companies
- Participate in the interviews and obtain information for the evaluation.

Written Evaluation Report
- Coordinate the design and formulation of the written evaluation report in conjunction with the Expert on Biodiversity consultant.
- Co-author with the Expert on Biodiversity consultant the report sections related to the Project Goal and Project Objective
- Serve as primary author of the sections and text related to "market and customer demand for certified coffee" (i.e., Outcome 1 and Outcome 2 of the Project's Logical Framework)
- Co-author with the Expert on Biodiversity consultant the sections and text capacity building, economic sustainability, policy and adaptive management sections (i.e, Outcome 3, Outcome, 4, Outcome 5, and Outcome 6 of the Project's Logical Framework)
- Incorporate into the written evaluation report the findings of the Expert on Biodiversity consultant related to the project's impact on biodiversity.
- Coordinate the distribution of the draft evaluation report to UNDP and RA. (List of specific recipients and their contact information to be provided by the project team.)
- Coordinate with the Expert of Biodiversity consultant the incorporation of feedback from UNDP and RA on initial draft evaluation report.
- Coordinate the distribution of the final written evaluation report to UNDP and RA.
- Presentation of TE findings to Project Steering Committee

Expert in Biodiversity Conservation in Productive Landscapes. The candidate should be very familiar with the challenges of conservation in productive landscapes and preferably have detailed knowledge on coffee certification. The candidate should have an advanced understanding of the agricultural sector in tropical countries particularly in Latin America. In addition, the candidate must be sufficiently strong in the Natural Sciences that s/he will be able to review and understand the conclusions of a number of studies that aim to document the impact of the project on biodiversity.

Deliverables

As the Expert in Biodiversity Conservation in Productive Landscapes, the Consultant will be responsible for the following products:
- Evaluation of the project's design, the established objectives and achieved results.
- Evaluation of sustainability relative elements, ownership, evaluation and monitoring and efficiency.
- Evaluation of strategy and project development.
- Evaluation of the relation between the different actors and their specific roles.
- Evaluation of the achievement of project's results, objectives and impacts.
- Evaluate the project's developed strategy's effectiveness in particular in the development of the Management Plan.
- Assist in the development of the project's evaluation, results and impacts.
- Evaluate the management aspects and the project's financial planning.
- Assess implementation capacity of the different project's components, carefully reviewing the ability to carry out their specific responsibilities.
- Evaluate the cross-institutional relationships social context that have helped or hindered the implementation and effective achievement of the project's objectives.
- Review the conclusions of a number of studies that aim to document the impact of the project on biodiversity.
- Assist the project team in the organization of interviews prior to the country missions.
- Participate in the interviews and obtain information for the evaluation.

Written Evaluation Report
- Assist the evaluation team leader in the design and formulation of the written evaluation report.
- Serve as primary author on the report sections related to the Project Goal and Project Objective with input from the evaluation team leader.
- Serve as primary author of text related to the projects biodiversity impacts and its approach to biodiversity monitoring.
- Read and provide feedback on drafts of the sections related to "market and customer demand for certified coffee" (i.e., Outcome 1 and Outcome 2 of the Project's Logical Framework)
- Co-author with the evaluation team leader the sections and text capacity building, economic sustainability, policy and adaptive management sections (i.e, Outcome 3, Outcome, 4, Outcome 5,
- and Outcome 6 of the Project's Logical Framework)
- Review draft report before it is distributed to UNDP and RA.
- Assist the evaluation team leader to incorporate the feedback from UNDP and RA on initial draft evaluation report into a final report.
- Review final written evaluation report before it is distributed to UNDP and RA.
- Participate making a presentation of the TE findings at Project Steering Committee meeting in conjunction with the evaluation team leader.

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'

PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

The evaluator will be contracted directly from the project budget through NGO/NEX modality with Rainforest Alliance.   Payment will be upon products submission. The quality of the evaluator's work will be assessed by the UNDP-CO and UNDP-GEF- RCU. If the quality does not meet standard UNDP expectations or UNDP-GEF requirements, the evaluators will be required to re-do or revise (as appropriate) the work before being paid final installments.

%	Milestone
35%	At Inception Report submission and approval
25%	Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report
40%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report

APPLICATION PROCESS

Applicants shortlisted from the regional office's roster are requested to apply online (http://www.rainforest-alliance.org/about/careers) by May 13, 2013. Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV indicating clearly which of the two positions is being sought. The two positions will be advertised separately and will consist of two separate application processes. The application should contain a technical proposal outlining the evaluation design and estimation methods that will be utilized to conduct the evaluation in accordance with this TOR. The proposal shall also include a budget indicating the total cost of the assignment (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs); and timeline of key events, a current and complete C.V. in English and/or Spanish with indication of the e-mail and phone contact.

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. Applications should be sent to The Rainforest Alliance, Human Resources Dept. to the email address: crpersonnel@ra.org and using the following format in the subject line: first name and last name, BCC Terminal Evaluation, Position (Team Leader or Biodiversity Specialist).

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULT FRAMEWORK

Project Logical Framework and Objectively Verifiable Impact Indicators

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators				
Goal	Increased conservation of globally important biodiversity in coffee landscapes by transformation of the coffee market in support of sustainable productive practices on coffee farms				
	Indicator	**BASELINE**	**TARGET**	**Sources of verification**	**Risks and Assumptions**
Project Objective Demand and sales of biodiversity-friendly coffee increases from niche to mainstream product allowing a significant growth in farms adopting biodiversity-friendly, sustainable productive practices and showing on-farm BD benefits.	1. Growth in habitat area under sustainable management on certified farms 2. Increased populations of keystone species on certified farms show BD conservation benefits	93,000 hectares of coffee as of August 1, 2005 Populations of keystone species on non-certified farms (see monitoring plan for species)	10% of area of world coffee production, plus conservation area on certified coffee farms, or 1,500,000 hectares by year 7. 5% or 750,000 ha by year 4 Monitoring system established and operating by the end of year 1. By year 4 documented increase in keystone species on certified farms (see monitoring plan).	Certification records RAC Coffee Impact Monitoring System	Market fluctuations will not severely limit the interest of farmers in getting and staying certified Consumers and companies will maintain interest in sustainability issues
Outcome 1 Demand for biodiversity-friendly coffee on international coffee markets has increased	1. Volume of certified coffee sold 2. Number of roasters of varying sizes buying certified coffee	30,000 metric tons per year **Roaster baseline**: Category Roast / size coffee in	10% of total export market, or 500,000 metric tons per year in year 7. 5% or 250,000 by year 4 **Roaster targets**: category 2013 / size Targets A 1 B 5	Client and products database report Client and products database report	Companies find increased reason to promote responsible sourcing policies

	A	100k up	C 0 5
	B	10k- 100k	D 0 25
	C	5k to 10k	E 1 300
	D	1k to 5k	Total 0 336
	E	1 to 1000	82
	Total		83

3. Number of outlets selling biodiversity-friendly, RAC coffee.	**Point of Sale baseline** (showing company categories of varying sizes)**:**	**Point of Sale targets:**	Client and products database report
	category / size — **Numbe outle**	**category / size** — **2013**	
	A — 10k u	A — 6	
	B — 5k to 1	B — 10	
	C — 1k to	C — 20	
	D — 100 to 1	D — 50	
	E — 1 to 1	E — 500	
	Total	**Total** — 586	

Outputs for Outcome 1

1.1 Existing markets and market segments expanded

1.2 Efficient information management enables scaling up number of certified coffee buyers

1.3 New markets and new companies sell certified coffee.

1.4 Coffee companies

made aware of full range of benefits from engaging with certification 1.5 Company employees embrace biodiversity-friendly coffee					
Outcome 2 Consumer interest to purchase certified coffee increased	1. Consumers in key markets increasingly recognize the seal.	Baseline survey to be done in key countries by several coffee companies at project inception.	Within five years after introduction of certified products on a market, 20% of coffee consumers will recognize the seal. By the end of year 2, project will have produced systems and materials to support company campaigns	Consumer surveys conducted every 2 years by coffee (retail) companies.	Consumers increasingly find certified products a credible way for them to support sustainability and conservation of BD. Corporations that conduct consumer surveys on sustainability will share information with the project.
Outputs for Outcome 2 2.1 Roasters and retailers increase promotion of certified coffee to consumers 2.2 Media in key markets writes stories about the benefits of biodiversity-friendly agriculture and certification. 2.3 Key stakeholders support biodiversity-					

friendly agriculture. 2.4 Large institutional consumers (such as Fortune 500 companies, large universities, government institutions) have sustainable procurement policies and source certified coffee, FSC paper and other sustainable products					
Outcome 3 National capacities to certify all sizes of coffee farms in biologically rich production landscapes has increased	Number of auditors RAC has obtained ISO 65 accreditation Increase in satisfaction levels with RAC among farmers who are audited for the first time Increased volume of certified coffee produced by smallholders.	Number (tbd) of auditors at project start date (in each of the 6 countries and combined); Initial phase of preparation to obtain accreditation Baseline survey will determine satisfaction levels among newly certified farmers 23% of total certified production comes from smallholders	Number of auditors has doubled by year 3 and tripled by year 7 By year 2, RAC has been ISO 65 accredited Dissatisfaction has been reduced by 40% in year 4 and 67% in year 7 30% of total certified production comes from smallholders in year 7 By the end of year 2, group certification system is fully developed and auditors trained in its application	Auditor training workshop records. ISO accreditation Annual survey. Certification records	Local agricultural technical assistance providers are willing to receive training in certification standards and provide technical assistance to producers.

Outputs for Outcome 3 3.1 Producers implement changes required to get certified. 3.2 Biodiversity threats are reduced due to changes implemented by producers involved in program 3.3 Capacity has been built to manage growth in certification 3.4 Local capacity created for technical extension service in implementation of standards 3.5 A group certification system developed and applied					
Outcome 4 Economic sustainability of certified coffee farms has increased	Certified farmers earn better prices than comparable non-certified farmers Certified farmers feel certification has helped improve their ability to survive a future coffee crisis	Baseline information will be collected during the harvest/sales season in year 1. Baseline information will be collected in year 1 through a study of certified farmers	In year 3, at least 50% of farmers earn a clearly detectable price premium. By year 7, 67% of farmers earn a premium By year 3, 50% of farmers feel better prepared. By year 7, 80% of farmers feel better prepared	Benchmark studies track a representative group of farmers Annual surveys of certified farmers	Certified farms will be willing to share price with project partners. Coffee industry is willing to continue to reward certified sustainable coffee

14

Outputs for Outcome 4 4.1 Best Management Practices collected and promoted among certified farmers 4.2 Access to markets for certified products improved for certified farmers 4.3 Farmers' access to financing (particularly for small producers) has been improved through partnerships with financing institutions and programs 4.4 Coffee quality improvement techniques promoted with producers 4.5 Sustainable terms of trade promoted throughout the supply chain 4.6 Good business, marketing and sales practices promoted with producers					
Outcome 5 Increased capacity to engage policy makers in coffee-producing and consuming countries in promoting sustainable coffee practices and to monitor and respond to policy initiatives/threats to sustainable coffee. .	1. Number of policy initiatives/threats addressed in major coffee producing and coffee consuming countries; extent of success in addressing these (high,	RAC partners have limited influence on policy issues.	By year 6, effective response to policy opportunities and threats to facilitate greater demand for RAC coffee.	Periodic reports from the various policy initiatives; media coverage.	Policy makers will be willing to engage with the project partners in the various countries/ markets.

	medium, low).				
	2. Policy working groups formed with relevant public, private and research organizations in each of the 6 project countries (over time the priority policy issues that have been identified and the extent to which they've been addressed).	During the project inception, current levels of policy-level activity/engagement will be determined for each of the 6 countries.	By end of year 2, policy working groups established in the 6 project countries and at least one policy issue identified as a priority.	Periodic written reports from these groups stating the opinion of group members regarding the extent to which they feel the group is being effective.	
Outputs for Outcome 5 5.1 Policies implemented and policy threats mitigated in producing countries 5.2 Fiscal incentives implemented by project country governments 5.3 Policies implemented and policy threats mitigated in consuming countries					
Outcome 6 Increased learning and adaptive management	1. Systematic information is available to document the impact of certification on biodiversity and social-economic conditions.	Currently only sporadic measure of the impacts of the certification system	By year 2, systematic information is generated annually in each project country. By year 5, clear evidence has been obtained of the biodiversity benefits in coffee By year 2, clear evidence of adaptive management leading	Decisions taken in yearly strategic planning exercises	

			to changes in the design and implementation of program activities.	Yearly reports from Impact Monitoring Program	
	2. Learning enables improved strategic planning and program design and implementation.	No widespread or systematic use of adaptive management.			
Outputs for Outcome 6 6.1 Monitoring program established in all project countries 6.2 Landscape level planning and monitoring established in two pilot countries 6.3 Adaptive management and strategic planning system established at project and certification system levels 6.4 Lessons learned and impact data are gathered, documented and disseminated to key internal and external audiences. 6.5 Multi-stakeholder consultation and involvement at country and international levels secures inputs in certification program and standard setting process.					

IMPACT MEASUREMENT TEMPLATE

Key Impact Indicator	Target	Means of Verification	Sampling frequency	Location
Growth in habitat area under sustainable management on certified farms	Increase of certified area from 92,000 ha. in 2006 to 1,500,000 ha. in 2013	Certification records	Yearly	Globally
Reduction in key threats to biodiversity on coffee farms	A scorecard of common threats shows substantial reduction in threats	Certified Coffee Impact Monitoring System	Yearly	Coffee regions in six project countries
Increased populations of keystone species on certified farms show BD conservation benefits	By year 4 documented increase (see monitoring plan) in keystone species on certified farms compared to non-certified farms	Certified Coffee Impact Monitoring System	Yearly	Coffee regions in six project countries

Indicators proposed in Project Objective Monitoring Plan 2006-2013

Threat reduction objective	Indicator	Location
Overall	Overall coffee production area All countries	All countries
	Certified coffee production area	
	Natural forest fragments on certified farms	
	Area in healthy agro forests	El Salvador and Colombia
	Certified farm area adjacent to water bodies	All countries
	Kilometers of rivers and streams	El Salvador and Colombia
	Indicator Species	
	Bird Species	
Specific Objective 1: Minimize conversion of agroforests to more intensive (high disturbance) land uses: Degradation	Land conversion rate from traditional coffee farms	El Salvador and Colombia
	Coffee Sales at a premium	All countries
	Certified coffee profit margins and national average coffee profit margins	

Specific Objective 2: Increase connectivity of forest fragments through improved regeneration of forests and expansion of certified agroforests	Shape, size and proximity of forest fragments to neighbouring fragments	Corridor, 30 farm sample minimum
	Protection enforcement rates	All certified farms
Specific Objective 3: Reduce extraction of flora and fauna (including subsistence and sport hunting)	Key species	El Salvador and Colombia
	Wages	All countries
Specific Objective 4: Reduce forest fires	Area burned (Ha)	30 randomly selected certified
	Alternative waste solutions farms	
Specific Objective 5.a. Reduce direct contamination of freshwater habitats	Volume of waste in streams	30 randomly selected certified farms at entry and exit points
	Organic discharge	
5.b. Reduce indirect contamination of freshwater habitats	Oxygen content of water	30 randomly selected certified farms at entry and exit points
	Acidity (pH) of water	
	Coliforms in water samples	
	Agrochemicals in water samples	
	Agrochemical use on certified farms versus non certified farms	
5.c. Reduce erosion and sedimentation of freshwater habitats	Sediments index	
	Herbicide Use	

ANNEX B: LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE EVALUATORS AND LIST OF STAKEHOLDERS TO BE INTERVIEWED

- Project Document
- PIR 2008
- PIR 2009
- PIR 2010
- PIR 2011
- PIR 2012
- First-year Project Implementation Progress Report
- Mid-term Project Implementation Progress Report
- Mid-Term Evaluation Report
- Annual work plans
- Country Strategies for Brazil, Colombia, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras and Peru
- Marketing strategy
- Project Manager's presentations to the Project Steering Committee meetings
- Minutes from the Project Steering Committee meetings
- Financial audit reports
- Farm to Market newsletters
- Package of information about Rainforest Alliance
- Package of marketing materials
- Package of communication materials and articles written by news media

- Package of producer capacity building materials
- SAN standards
- Impact monitoring reports
- SAN Standard Implementation in Coffee Production: An Analysis of Related Costs vs. Price Premiums

Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals:

<u>Rainforest Alliance</u>
Tensie Whelan, President.
Chris Wille, Chief of Agriculture.
Ria Stout, Director, Sustainable Agriculture
Edward Millard, Director, Sustainable Landscapes.
Sabrina Vigilante, Director, Sustainable Value Chain
Marcel Clement, Sustainable Value Chain, Europe.
Alex Morgan, Sustainable Value Chain, North America.
Dianne Jukofsky, Vice President of Communications.
Michelle Deugd, Senior Manager.
Elizabeth Kennedy, Director, Evaluation & Research
David Hughell, Research and Geospatial Analyst.
Deanna Newsom, Evaluation & Research Specialist.
Gabriela Sanabria, Projects Administrator.
Reiko Enomoto, Training Manager.
Sandy Vargas, Technical Services Specialist.
Rebecca Sanborn, Traceability Manager.

<u>SAN</u>
Ana Garzón, SAN Coordinator.
Oliver Bach, Standards and Policy Manager, Sustainable Agriculture Network.
Country Coordinators: Gerardo Medina/Peru, Oscar Nausa/Colombia, Rodrigo Cascalles /Brazil, Alvaro Moises/El Salvador, Miguel Alvarez/Honduras.

UNDP
Flor de Maria Bolaños, UNDP CO.
Nely Herrera, UNDP CO.
Andrew Bovarnick, UNDP/GEF
Leif Pedersen, UNDP, Costa Rica.

In addition, the evaluator should interview a representative sample of participants from the market and supply development sectors, including:
- Coffee company representatives (market demand development) from roaster/retailer companies in Europe and North America.
- Producer representatives (supply development): individual producers and group representatives in two project countries (Peru and El Salvador).

TENTATIVE TIMELINE

ACTIVITY	PLACE	COMMENTS
Planning (Due Date 07 June; Days Allocated 4)		
Initial mission to BCC Headquarters	Costa Rica	In-depth briefing and scoping of key issues to be addressed with full participation of the project team
Initial interview with UNDP CO and UNDP/GEF Regional Technical Advisor	Remote	In-depth briefing and scoping of key issues to be addressed
Review of documents provided by the project team	Remote	Listed in Annex 2
Review and analysis of financial information	Remote	Provided by the Project Administrator
Inception Report	Guatemala	Evaluator submits to UNDP and RA no later than two weeks before the evaluation mission
Evaluation (Due Date 17 July; Days Allocated 28)		
Telephone interviews with key actors	Remote	Includes coffee company representatives, industry experts, policy makers, as well as RA and SAN staff
Field Visits	Brazil, Guatemala, Honduras	Visit coffee farms to inspect farm management practices, and interview farmers and key stakeholders
Visits to coffee roasters / retailers	North America and Europe	Interview key individuals to examine the perceived benefits of RA certification, extent of cofinancing / leveraging, etc
One-day lessons learned workshop	Guatemala	Present and discuss initial findings with UNDP, project team, SAN partners prior to the preparation of a full first draft
Draft report (Due Date 31 July; Days Allocated 10)		
Final interviews / cross checking	Guatemala, Costa Rica	Cross checking with UNDP, and project team
Presentation of draft report	Guatemala, Costa Rica	Presentation of draft report for comments and suggestions
Presentation of final report (Due Date 02 Aug; Days Allocated 2)		

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?			
To what extent were the objective and outcomes of the program relevant to the situation in each target country, and to the needs of different actors along the value chain?	•	•	•
Did the country specific context affect the outcomes of the project?	•	•	•
	•	•	•
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
Are the project outcomes commensurable with the expected outcomes as described in the ProDoc, and the problems it was intended to address?	•	•	•
To what extent were the program objective and outcomes achieved?	•	•	•
To what extent was the program implemented as planned?		•	•
To what extent were program participants, especially producers correctly identified and targeted?		•	•
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?			
Was the project cost effective? Are there significant variances between the original design and the final cost per outcome?	•	•	•
How efficient was the financial management of the project, including its quarterly disbursement process.	•	•	•
Were administrative costs reasonable and according to the original design? Was the project the least cost option?	•	•	•
	•	•	•
What are the perceived or actual, positive or negative effects of the	•	•	•

participation fee			
Was there a clear definition of roles and responsibilities within the project structure?	•	•	•
Were adaptive management measures implemented in an efficient manner? Were the ME systems an effective tool to implement these changes?	•	•	•
Were effective information management systems put in place during the life of the project?	•	•	•
Did the Steering Committee fulfill its role as the main decision making body for the project?	•	•	•
	•	•	•
	•	•	•
	•	•	•
	•	•	•
	•	•	•
	•	•	•
	•	•	•
	•	•	•
	•	•	•
	•	•	•
	•	•	•
	•	•	•
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
Were national implementing partners fully empowered by the program? Will they continue carrying out program activities and other essential commitments?	•	•	•

Which aspects of the SAN increased capacity and structure are attributed to and of specific relevance to the program?	•	•	•
Are there positive or negative changes in public policy issues related to coffee certification attributable to the program?	•	•	•
Are there plausible causal links between increased capacity on the supply side and training efforts mobilized by the program?	•	•	•
Does the training materials and activities respond to differentiated needs for producers with distinct educational levels, production systems and economic capacities?	•	•	•
Did the program apply any development strategies to limit social and gender inequities?	•	•	•
	•	•	•
	•	•	•
	•	•	•

Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?

What is the magnitude of the change in the amount of certified habitat area under sustainable management?	•	•	•
Is there evidence of any changes to key threats to biodiversity on certified coffee farms?	•	•	•
Are there any indications of change in the number of keystone species on certified farms larger than non-certified farms?	•	•	•
	•	•	•

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 3. Moderately Likely (ML):moderate risks 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks	2. Relevant (R) 1.. Not relevant (NR) *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]

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]

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])

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])

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

---

[4]The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes).

[5] UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

[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.

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: _____