# UNDP-GEF Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference

# Introduction

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures[[1]](#footnote-1), all full and medium-sized country projects implemented by UNDP with GEF financing must undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. This termsof reference(TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the SLM Capacity Building for AngolaProject (PIMSNumber 3379)

The essentials of the projectto be evaluated are as follows:

# Project Summary Table

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Title: |  | | | | | |
| GEF Project ID: | | 3379 |  | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | | *at completion (Million US$)* |
| UNDP Project ID: | | 00052416 | GEF financing: | 0,750 | | 0,675 |
| Country: | | Angola | IA/EA own: | 0,400 | | 0,751 |
| Region: | | Southern Africa | Government: | 0,750 | | 0,350 |
| Focal Area: | | Land Degradation | Other: | 0,0 | | 0,0 |
| Operational Program: | | OP 15 | Total co-financing: | 1,150 | | 1,101 |
| Executing Agency: | | UNDP | Total Project Cost: | 1,900 | | 1,776 |
| Other Partners involved: | | Ministry of Environment, Ministry of Agriculture | ProDoc Signature (date project began): | | | November 2007 |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | | Proposed:  October 2010 | Actual:  December 2012 |

1. **Objective and Scope**
2. The objective of the project was to: Angola is the fourth largest country in Africa, covering an area of approximately 1,246,700 km2. The country contains about 47 hydrological basins, including the Zaire, Zambezi and Okavango, all currently experiencing problems related to inappropriate land management practices. Although the country is rich in both renewable and non-renewable natural resources (petroleum, diamonds, iron-ore, phosphates, copper, feldspar, gold, bauxite, uranium, zinc, lead, wolfram, manganese and tin), nearly three decades of civil war inflicted profound impact on all aspects of social and economic life of its people. Indeed, the country is undergoing a relative economic boom since the end of the war. However, according to the Poverty Reduction Strategy (PRS) 68% of the population still live below the poverty level, 28% of them in extreme poverty. The effects of war, including displacement, disruption of market activities and macroeconomic instability eroded the poor and working classes’ ability to invest in their future, particularly investment in sustainable land management. Land degradation is a major threat to national economy and the global environment.
3. There are three direct causes of land degradation; Unsustainable Agriculture, Deforestation/unsustainable use of Forests, and Overgrazing of Rangelands. This has contributed to overexploitation of the soil, leading to erosion, soil exhaustion and desertification. Key threats to SLM are declining fertility and productivity of agricultural lands, forest clearing for unsustainable agriculture, overgrazing and forest pasture destruction or degradation by fire, and climate change. The key barriers to addressing the root causes in order to remove the threats lie in the inadequate capacity of the government system to provide knowledge based, affordable techniques and incentives for SLM. Land managers therefore have limited knowledge on SLM techniques, have few incentives for adopting improved practices and have almost no extension services to support their efforts. Consequently, there is poor linkage between SLM and rural development initiatives, resulting in insufficient livelihood alternatives to subsistence cropping and to use of forests for timber and fuelwood and to meet energy requirements. The government authorities responsible for planning have limited capacity for cross-sectoral planning.
4. This project proposes four outcomes linked to the LDC – SIDS Portfolio Sustainable Land Management Programme. The first outcome is the analysis and preparation of an acceptable set of intervention techniques, which are turned into field training modules, for new extension agents, with-in participatory demonstration training programmes. This is coupled with applied research and promotion of farmer innovation in SLM. The second outcome addresses the institutional need for Government to monitor Land Degradation and device best practices from the set of SLM initiatives in country. Third and fourth outcomes address broader picture of the National Action Plan (NAP) via co-finance; and starting the Country Framework for TerrAfrica. These will be built into a database to allow government to coordinate the SLM efforts and to integrate best practice into the developing CSIF and NAP process within the UNCCD and TerrAfrica frameworks.

Objective and Scope:

* Individual and institutional capacities for SLM will be enhanced and demonstrated within on-ground pilot sites. A large part of this project is directed towards capacity building and knowledge management, targeting SLM institutions and personnel as well as land managers in Huambo province;
* Systemic capacity building and mainstreaming of SLM principles: this project also addresses policy development and mainstreaming of SLM at central and at decentralised Government levels in the project area and builds oversight capacity.
* Support to the production of the National Action Plan (NAP). The NAP is likely to be approved before project start up. The project will support development and implementation of a NAP communications strategy to raise awareness and obtain political support for its implementation at all levels.
* Support to the production of the MTIP (Medium Term Investment Plan of NAP), which complements the CSIF or Country Strategic Investment Framework of TerrAfrica.

This Terminal Evaluation is to cover the entire programme.

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 (2011).

The purpose of the evaluation is to:

* Assess overall performance against the project objectives as set out in the Project Document and other related documents
* Assess project relevance to national priorities, as well as UNDP and GEF strategic objectives
* Assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the project
* Critically analyze the implementation and management arrangements of the project
* Assess the sustainability of the project interventions and consider project impacts
* Document lessons and best practices concerning project design, implementation and management which may be of relevance to other projects in the country and elsewhere in the world.

# Evaluation approach and method

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 country focal points, steering committee, project team, and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Huambo including specific project sites. The evaluator is expected to use interviews as a means of collecting data on the relevance, performance and success of the project. Key stakeholders to be interviewed are listed in [Annex 1](#_Annex_X1:_List).

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports, including: Annual Reports, project budget revisions, progress reports, focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other material that s/he may consider useful for evidence based assessment. A list of documentation that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included with this Terms of Reference ([Annex 3](#_Annex_3:_List)).

Two weeks prior to the evaluation mission, the evaluator will submit a brief (2 page) inception note, to include:

* Further elaboration on the intended approach & method, consistent with this TOR.
* Planned timing for carrying out the evaluation mission.
* Any requests to include additional participatory techniques, such as surveys and focus groups, orother approaches for the gathering and analysis of data that are otherwise not specified in the TOR, and which may entail additional time or cost.
* Requests for additional project background information not included with this TOR

1. **Evaluation Criteria& Ratings**

Project performance will be measured based on the Project Logical Framework ([Annex 2](#_Annex_2:_Project)), 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,** as defined and explained in the hyperlinked guidance manual.Asagreed with GEF, ratings will be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are provided ([Annex 4](#_Annex_4:_Ratings)*).*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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 |  |

1. **Mainstreaming**

UNDP/GEF projects are key components in UNDP country programming. As such, the objectives and outcomes of the project should conform to UNDP country programme strategies as well as to GEF-required outcomes. Based from a review of key documents, including the Project Document, UNDP Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) and UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF), plus key stakeholder interviews, the evaluation will provide a brief assessment of the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP strategic priorities, such as poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and the empowerment of women.

1. **Impact**

The evaluators will offer their assessment of 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, or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements. [[2]](#footnote-2)

# Conclusions, lessons and recommendations

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

# Implementation arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Angola.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 evaluator to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the government etc. This should be done at least 2 weeks ahead of the evaluation mission to allow sufficient time for the evaluation team to provide their input and confirm that they can meet the proposed schedule.

# Evaluation timeframe

The total duration of the evaluation will be 25 days (02 –26 July, 2013) according to the following plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Timing | Completion Date |
| **Preparation** | 4days | 04/July |
| **Evaluation Mission** | 8 days | 13/July |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | 10 days | 23/July |
| **Final Report** | 03 days | 26/July |

# Evaluation deliverables

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Deliverable | Content | Timing | Responsibilities |
| **Inception Note** | Evaluator 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 FPs |
| **Final Report** | Revised report | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft | Sent to CO |

# Evaluation Team

The evaluation team will be composed of 1 international and 1 national consultant, with requisite technical and evaluation skills. The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have any conflict of interest with project related activities.

The Team members must present the following qualifications:

* Specialist in Environment, International, Team Leader)
* Minimum 10 years of relevant professional experience in Environment thematic area
* Recent experience with Result-Based Management evaluation methodologies
* Experience applying participatory monitoring approaches
* Experience applying objectively verifiable indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios
* Recent knowledge of the UNDP/GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy
* Recent knowledge of UNDP’s results-based evaluation policies and procedures
* Competence in Adaptive Management, as applied to natural resource management projects
* Demonstrable analytical skills
* Experience with multilateral or bilateral supported land management projects
* Excellent both English and Portuguese communication skills (oral, written and presentation).

# Evaluator Ethics

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct ([Annex 5](#_Annex_5:_Evaluation)) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the *2008* [UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations](http://www.unevaluation.org/ethicalguidelines).

# Payment modalities and specifications

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| % | Milestone |
| 20% | At contract signing |
| 50% | Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report |
| 30% | 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 by 5 September 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 and/or Portuguese with indication of the e‐mail and phone contacts.

Shortlisted candidates will be requested to submit a price offer indicating their proposed fee rate for the assignment, based against the above stipulated evaluation schedule. Following UNDP procurement rules, both technical competence (70%) and the consultant fee rate (30%) will be taken into account in the selection process. Qualified women and members of social minorities are strongly encouraged to apply.

## Annex 1: List of Stakeholders to be consulted

Mr. João Vintém, UNCCD Focal Point, Ministry of Environment

Mr. A. Gome Da Silva, ex - GEF OFP

Mrs. Ana Paula Carvalho Director, Provincial Directorate of Environment and Urban Affairs

Mr. Junior Chinendele chief of Department, Provincial Directorate of Environment and Urban Affairs

Ms. Kamia Carvalho, National Director, Ministry of Environment

Mr. Joaquim Lauriano, Consultant, Project Focal Point, Ministry of Environment

Mr. Francisco Carranza, FAO Terra

Mr. Alan Cain and Carlos Figueiredo, Development Workshop

Mrs. Maria de La-Salette Morgado ADRA Antena Huambo

Mr. Guilherme Pereira, Dean Faculty of Agrarian Sciences

Mr. Simão Paquisse Daniel Focal Point Ministry of Agriculture

Provincial Government in Huambo, Deputy Governor

Traditional authorities and Beneficiaries

## Annex 2: Project Logical Framework

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Strategy** | **Objectively verifiable indicators** | | | **Sources of verification** | **Risks and Assumptions** |
| **Goal:** Sustainable Land Management improved by increased extension delivery contributing to improved ecosystem health and improved livelihoods. | | | | | |
|  | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Target** |  |  |
| ***Objective:***Capacity developed for sustainable land management for key SLM stakeholders and sustainable land management principles mainstreamed into national policies, plans and processes. | Decision makers at national and local levels and the public, especially rural farmers have high levels of awareness of the importance of SLM and are adopting SLM principles in decision making and land management respectively  SLM reflected in National Policies, Laws, Development & Investment Plans (e.g. sustainable charcoal reflected in energy policy, a CBNRM policy adopted, etc.)    Decrease in soil erosion at pilot sites accompanied by an increase in agricultural productivity  Recovery of forests at pilot sites start to become evident as reflected in improved rates of regeneration for key species, slower rates of deforestation, improvement in tree population index, better species composition and community indices.  The national SLM Committee / Task Force embraces NAP Investment plan process and integrates it with developing CSIF planning framework for SLM. | SLM not reflected in any of the polices  Capacities for sustainable resources management depleted during the war, little exists today and it is not coordinated well adequately  Some decision makers starting to recognize importance of SLM, but too few and they have not yet found means to integrate it into development policies  NAP under preparation but not yet approved and does not have a financing plan yet | By mid-term NAP approved and being used as a framework for coordinating SLM  By mid-term training manuals developed and training started at the Province  By end of project the SLM training manuals are refined and available for training technical officers, extension workers and land managers throughout Angola.  By mid-term, key policies reviewed for SLM and by end of project they have been revised to mainstream SLM | Revised national plans  Rapid assessment of levels of awareness on SLM amongst stakeholders establishing the linkage between awareness-change in attitude-change in behavior chain of events.  MINAMB and university annual reports  Annual District and Provincial Development Reports  Documented M and E Framework  SLM Committee Outputs including CSIF documentation following TerrAfrica guidelines that are compatible with NAP processes | That there will be continued political commitment for integrating SLM approach into the long-term national planning for sustainable development.  That the economy will support increased returns on investment in sustainable land management practices providing an incentive for farmers to accept the extension packages for SLM, which is dependent on extension agents being able to offer packages that make economic sense to farmers  That land and resource tenure issues will not provide negative motivation discouraging adoption of improved practices |
| **Outcome 1: *Individual and institutional capacity for SLM developed*** | One strong institution (MINAMB) acting as the national agency for SLM and has established an interministerial mechanism for SLM coordination in the country  75% of extension service staff have skills, expertise and resources to provide SLM technical support to rural communities; SLM extension packages formulated based on demonstrated cost-benefits and best practices, and are being piloted in one Province, reaching at least 85% of land managers/farmers in the province.  Guidelines, Manuals, Protocols outlining Best Practices and toolkits in SLM developed and used  Revamped agricultural extension service, recommending sustainable land management practices following participatory extension approaches  Farmer and land manager’s own innovation recognized, documented and disseminated  An SLM teaching curriculum available for colleges and universities | There’s no institution currently charged with the responsibility of SLM or coordinating mainstreaming of SLM into polices and developments plans  There are very few technical officers or land managers with SLM specific skills, and the few skills that exist are not up to date or based on the reality in Angola  No guidelines or manuals on SLM or SLM extension currently available  Extension service is weak and has no specific tools to deal with SLM  Currently a lot of farmers innovating on their own (out of circumstance) but this is hardly recognized or documented; and there’s little farmer to farmer sharing. In addition, there’s almost no applied research being carried out on SLM | By mid-term training takes place in the province and skills are applied such that successful pilot activities take place on community level in Chipita area, focusing on more sustainable land management practices such as charcoal production and alternative energies, alternative incomes, improved agricultural practices etc.  By mid-term SLM relevant curricular in place (A. Neto University campus, Huambo)  By mid-term, a process to identify and reward farmer innovation his being implemented and farmers participate in applied research in partnership with the university. | TPR with annual report based on site visits  Project Final Report  Periodic newsletters and workshop reports  Mid-Term and Final project evaluation Reports  District and Provincial Reports  University reports | Other Development Partners, NGOs and other development / environmental organizations are willing and committed to integrate SLM into their field programs in the rural development sector  Sufficient interested, receptive individuals available for training  Continued availability of training opportunities through bilateral and multilateral cooperation  Institutions receptive to change  Institutions are able to retain the trained manpower |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome 2: *SLM mainstreamed into economic and sectoral development*** | Relevant policies contain specific sections on and follow principles of SLM.  Acts & regulations pertaining to SLM updated and harmonized.  Investment projects (e.g. in agriculture) are routinely scanned for adherence to SLM principles  An effective collaborative framework among all stakeholders in the SLM incorporate 100% of relevant sectors and players  A functional M and E system and an approved CSIF/ Investment Plan; Key ministries (finance and planning) are part of the collaborative framework and are aware of economic costs and benefits of SLM; political support for SLM at national level exists and pushes the SLM agenda forward | No SLM policy in place, relevant policies do not reflect SLM adequately and no guidelines for mainstreaming SLM  NAP not yet passed in Parliament  Provinces are not engaged in NAP process currently  1 outdated National Forest Management Plan;  No soil conservation guidelines / manuals; | By mid-term, a guideline on review and mainstreaming of SLM into policies available and by end of project, SLM principles integrated in policy framework  By end of project, updated and harmonized Acts and regulations promulgated  By mid-term, 25% of politicians are aware of SLM, LD and NAP and over 75% be end of project  By mid-term 50% of land users in Huambo province have a level of awareness on SLM options and more than 75% be end of project | Policy documents  Notifications of Acts / Regulations in Official Gazette  National Annual Sector Reports  Evaluation Reports  Surveys | Political support for mainstreaming SLM continues amongst the decision makers  Other Stakeholders in the Rural Development Agriculture and Natural Resources Management sector are ready and willing to participate in an adaptive management program for sharing SLM experiences  Stakeholders willing to share information |
| **Outcome 3: *National Action Programme completed*** | NAP approved and adopted as an SLM coordination mechanism and disseminated.  NAP Monitoring mechanism in place | Draft NAP exists, not approved or widely recognized as a coordinating mechanism  The few stakeholders doing anything on SLM are not coordinated | By mid-term an approved NAP is in place, sent to UNCCD, and is used as a mechanism for inter-sector coordination for SLM  NAP yearly reviewed | NAP document;  Distribution List;  NAP Coordination Committee  NAP Monitoring and review documents | NAP receives political endorsement  Capacity to implement NAP available |
| **Outcome 4: *Medium Term Investment Plan being financed and implemented(and linked to TerrAfrica)*** | Completed and adopted MTIP, based on SLM principles  80% Financing for MTIP committed  MTIP monitoring and review system in place  Angola on the TerrAfrica work programme | No MTIP therefore no MTIP financing or monitoring | By mid-term MTIP that adapts all the principles of the TerrAfrica’s Country Strategic Investment Framework (CSIF) is adopted by the TerrAfrica process with widespread support in government and amongst donors. Some projects identified through the MTIP process receive funding and are being implemented  By end of project Angola has become active on TerrAfrica work programme | Investment Plan (document);  Minutes of Meetings / Workshops/ Conferences  MTIP review documents | Donors and other potential investors interested in investing in SLM |
| **Outcome 5: *Adaptive management and learning in place(Project effectively managed)*** | Project Outputs and targets achieved  Project Monitoring reports prepared  Project audits  Lessons learned disseminated | No project | Project Outputs and targets achieved  All required project monitoring reports prepared  Yearly financial audits  Important and relevant lessons learned collected and disseminated | Project documents and reports  Monitoring reports  Audit documents  Technical documents  Website | Adaptive management culture and capacity available |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project strategy** | **Objectively verifiable indicators** | |  |  | **Sources and verification means** | **Risks and assumptions** |
| **Objective: To improve the ecosystem and the populations’ means of subsistence through sustainable land management and provision of extension services.** | | | | | | |
|  | **Indicator** | **Reference point** | **Goal** | |  | |
| **OE1- To develop individual and institutional SLM capacities** | A strong institution (MINAM) acting as national SLM agency. | The coordination among SLM institutional players (MINADER,MINAMB, IDF, IGCA, Municipal Adm., Traditional authorities) is not clear. | MINAMB, coordinates all SLM-related activities | | MINA reports, municipal and provincial administrations reports.  Monitoring and Evaluation Reports. | That the current government ministerial structure shall stay as it is until the end of the project. |
|
|
|
| **MINAMB coordinates the articulation of SLM stakeholders at the different levels.** |
|
| The extension services are more active and close to the rural communities, using SLM participatory methodologies. | The extension services are weak and deprived of specific SLM tools. | 75% of the extension services personnel has the aptitudes, skills and resources to provide the quality technical assistance required in SLM in rural communities. | | Training reports; Videos, Trainees, Rural Communities; EDAs | Institutions welcome change. |
| Training opportunities always available, through bilateral and multilateral cooperation. |
| Guidelines, manuals and protocols based on the best SLM practices. | Currently there is no literature on SLM produced in Angola. | In the medium term, relevant SLM curricula will be available at the UNIJES-Huambo. | | University JES, University students, Curricula plans. |  |
|
|
| Farmers and land managers innovate and disseminate their SLM practices. | Currently many farmers bring in their own innovations, but these are rarely recognized or documented. | In the long term, the innovations developed by farmers will be identified, systematized and disseminated by research institutions, including extension services and universities. | | Research manuals, Farmers, University students, EDAs, Researchers. | That the land and resources ownership issues may lead to distress and discourage the adoption of better SLM practices. |
|
| **R1OE1- Reinforced SLM capacity of individuals and institutions.** | Individuals and Institutions are able to disseminate their SLM experiences at the local and national level with the required quality. | There are no references of Institutions, officials, technicians or managers with specific SLM skills. The extension services, apart from being incipient, lack the specific SLM tools. | In the short term a training curriculum will be developed. In the medium term, a SLM pilot project will be implementedin the Huambo province. In the long term the Huambo experience may be applied in other parts of Angola. | | Training curriculum, Project letter, Training reports, Consultants and experts contracts, Trainees, Institutions (MINAMB,UNDP,EDAS,MINADER, IDF) | All SLM, Rural development and Natural resource management stakeholders are ready and willing to participate in the SLM program and share experiences. |
|
|
|
|
| Land users and other stakeholders adopt good SLM practices. | Huambo’s population subsistence strategies lead to the practice of extensive farming and rule-less exploitation of fuel wood and coal, without taking into account land use management options. | 50% of Huambo’s land users and other stakeholders reasonably understand the medium-term SLM options, and more than 75% by the end of the project. | | Project monitoring reports. Land users, Project team, Case studies, MINAMB, EDAS, IDF, Communal and Municipal Administrations. | All SLM, Rural development and Natural resource management stakeholders are ready and willing to participate in the SLM program and share experiences.. That the land and resources ownership issues may lead to distress and discourage the adoption of better SLM practices. |
| **OE2- MainstreamSustainable Land Management (SLM) in the national policies, plans and processes.** | SLM reflected in the national development policies, laws and plans. | SLM not reflected in any of these national policies. | In the medium term the main SLM policies shall have been revised | | NAP, MINAMB, UNDP. | National and local decision-makers’ political will to mainstream long term SLM approaches.Donors and other possible investors interested in researching SLM. |
|
|
|
| **R1OE2- UNCCD implementation mechanisms reinforced.** | National Action Plan (NAP) completed and implemented. | Currently there is a draft NAP to be used as a coordination mechanism for SLM initiatives. | In the medium termthe NAP shall be drafted and approved, contributing to UNCCD’s implantation. In the medium termthe NAP will be used as a SLM intersectorial coordination mechanism. The new ten year strategy of the UNCCD require that countries update their NAPs to integrate issues of mobilizing finance for the implementation of the NAP. We should use the project to lead this upgrade, especially as the formulation of the integrated financing strategy will be undertaken under outcome 4.  We shall take this as a recommendation and a reference when planning the implementation on this Outcome. | | NAP, NAP’s monitoring reports. MINAMB, UNDP, NAP’s Steering Committee. | National and local decision-makers’ political will to mainstream SM approaches. |
|
|
| **R2OE2- Angola participates actively inTerrAfrica work program.** | A medium term TerrAfricainvestment plan will be financed and implemented – we corporately agreed to upgrade the MTIP to a IFS (Integrated financing strategy) and to have the Global mechanism provide technical assistance to the project to do this. A first set of training is planned and I am sure project staff is aware of this. After the training, discussions will be held about how to move from the training to the real IFS. I attach an MoU signed between UNDP and the Global mechanism explaining their role in the IFS formulation. | No Medium Term Investment Plan (MTIP) has been financed, therefore there is no funding. | In the medium term, Angola is in TerrAfrica work program.  In the medium term, the IFS will be drafted and approved, based on SLM principles.  In the medium term, projects will identified by the IFS are being implemented | | Investment plan, minutes of meetings, project letters. |  |
|
|

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **PROJECT MANAGEMENT** | | | | | |
| **R.G-**  **Project implementation capacity reinforced** | Project’s management and implement. team able to ensure project’s quality results. | Currently the project only has its head manager. | Project results, activities and goals attained thanks to the intervention logic. | Monitoring reports. Plans of activities, Account statements. | Competency-based staff recruitment. |
|
|
|

## Annex 3: List of Documents to be reviewed by the evaluators

UNDAF

CPAP

Project Document

Pre-inception workshop report

Inception workshop report

Mid Term evaluation (Masego) report

Annual reports 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011

Memorandum of Understanding

Project Implementation Reports (PIRs)

Boarding meeting minutes

Studies completed by the project

## Annex 4: Ratings

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Ratings Scales** | | |
| *Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution* | *Sustainability ratings:* | *Relevance ratings:* |
| **6. Highly Satisfactory (HS):**  any shortcomings are of negligible significance | **4. Likely (L):**  negligible risks to sustainability | **2. Relevant (R)** |
| **5.Satisfactory** (S):  minor shortcomings | **3. Moderately Likely (ML):**  moderate risks | **1. Not relevant (NR)** |
| **4.Moderately Satisfactory(MS):**  moderate shortcomings | **2.Moderately Unlikely (MU):**  significant risks |  |
| **3.Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU):** significant shortcomings | **1.Unlikely (U):**  severe risks |
| **2.Unsatisfactory (U):**  major problems | *Additional ratings where relevant:* Not Applicable (N/A) ; Unable to Assess (U/A) | |
| **1.Highly Unsatisfactory (HU):**  severe problems |
|  |
|  | | |

## 

## Annex 5: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct Agreement Form

**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 reviewed and will abide by the 2008 UNEGEthical Guidelines for Evaluation.**

Signed at (place)on

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

## Annex 6: Evaluation Report Outline[[4]](#footnote-4)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| i. | Opening page:   * Name of the UNDP/GEF 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 * Executing Agency and 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: UN Editorial Manual[[5]](#footnote-5)) |
| 1. | Introduction   * Purpose of the evaluation * Scope &Methodology * Structure of the evaluation report |
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