**Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference**

**Capacity Building and Knowledge Management for Sustainable Land Management in Lesotho**

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP supported 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 theCapacity Building and Knowledge Management for Sustainable Land Management in Lesotho

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

Project Summary Table

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Title: | Capacity Building and Knowledge Management for Sustainable Land Management in Lesotho | | | | | |
| GEF Project ID: | | PIMS 3044 |  | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | | *at completion (Million US$)* |
| UNDP Project ID: | | 00063046 | GEF financing: | US $1,724,500 | |  |
| Country: | | Lesotho | IA/EA own: | US $350,000 | |  |
| Region: | | SA | Government: | US $112,471 + US $400,000(in kind)  = US $512,471 | |  |
| Focal Area: | | Land Degradation | Other: |  | |  |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): | | - SLM model and techniques ready for national implementation  - Local and national capacity for adapting and scaling up proven SLM models and techniques in place.  - SLM Policy Enabling Environment | Total co-financing: | US $862,471 | |  |
| Implementing Agency | | UNDP | Total Project Cost: | US $ 2,586,971 | |  |
| Executing Agency: | | Ministry of Forestry and Land Reclamation |  |  | |  |
| Other Partners involved: | |  | ProDoc Signature (date project began): | | | September 2009 |
| (Operational) Closing D Capacity Building and Knowledge Management for Sustainable Land Management in Lesotho ate: | | Proposed:  January 2014 | Actual: December 2014 |

Objective and Scope

The integral functioning of Lesotho’s mountainous ecosystems is vital not only to the livelihoods and welfare of its people, but for the delivery of ecosystem services and global environmental benefits to a large part of Southern Africa. The mountainous Kingdom is the source of rivers that reach the Atlantic Ocean in the west and supply an increasing proportion of the water consumed in South Africa’s industrial heartland. SLM in Lesotho is therefore a vital ingredient of broader environmental wellbeing. Unfortunately, the Kingdom is largely characterized by inhospitable terrain, harsh climate, dense populations and intensively utilized and highly degraded natural resources. Despite numerous attempts and extensive but fragmented technical knowledge, barriers in capacity, knowledge and SLM models continue to obstruct efforts to adopt effective sustainable land management practices and action. As a result, land degradation continues to impoverish local livelihoods and to impose broader environmental costs on the region beyond Lesotho’s borders.

The goal of this MSP is that sustainable land management provides a strong base for sustainable development in Lesotho while providing a range of global benefits to the region. In order to overcome these barriers and address the corresponding programmatic gaps, the specific objective of this MSP is that, supported by a knowledge management network, Lesotho is equipped at local and national levels with the techniques, approaches, capacity and strategy for upscaling successful SLM in support of national biodiversity conservation, food security and poverty reduction strategies. Three project outcomes are intended to achieve this objective:

* + 1. Proven, strengthened, participatory, replicable models and techniques that successfully overcome current institutional and governance barriers to SLM are ready for national implementation.
    2. Adequate local and national capacity for adapting and scaling up proven SLM models and techniques in place.
    3. SLM Policy Enabling Environment - Enhanced awareness, dialogue, understanding and analysis of SLM best practice at resource user, community, local government, NGO and national government levels across the country, reflected in the relevant policies, strategies and programmes.

By building a proven, replicable SLM model for Lesotho and strengthening the capacity and knowledge needed for its subsequent use across the country, implementation of this project will make a direct contribution to the kingdom’s Poverty Reduction Strategy, to its Food Security Policy and to the fulfillment of its National Action Programme in response to the UN Convention to Combat Desertification.

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 has 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 Semonkong, Makhoalipane Community Council, including some but not all of the following project sites*.*

**List of villages**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grazing Association** | **Area Chief** | **Village Name** | **# of Household** |
| **Ramosebo** | Ha Ramosebo | Matsatseng | 10 |
| Ha Chechane | Mokoallong | 34 |
| Ha Mantsa | Ha Mantsa | 31 |
| **Ha Elia** | Ha Elia | Ha Elia (Meeling) | 11 |
|  | Ha Mphafolane | Ha Mphafolane | 73 |
| **Rapoleboea** | Ha Fochane | Ha Mateu | 31 |
|  | Ha Mahlomola | Ha Mahlomola | 44 |
| **Ha Tsokotsa** | Ha Tsokotsa | Ha Tsokotsa | 53 |
|  | Ha Lerumonyane | Ha Lerumonyane | 52 |
| **Tsenekeng** | Tsenekeng | Ha Rasefale | 35 |
| **Ha Nthapo** | Ha Nthapo | Mpatana | **16** |
| **Ha Seng** | Ha Seng | Moeaneng (Ha Seng) | 43 |
| **Boreipala** | Boreipala | Ha Tlhabi | 30 |
| Ha Taniele | Ha Taniele | Motse-Mocha (Ha Taniele) | 26 |
| Hlabathe | Hlabathe | Ha Lekhetho | 41 |
| Hlabathe | Hlabathe Moreneng | 26 |

Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

**The project key stakeholders**

**National:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Organization/Institution** | **Name of Officer** | **Position** | **Contacts** |
| Ministry of Forestry and Land Reclamation | Doreen Chaoana(Ms) | Principal Secretary | 58698659  dcmapetja@yahoo.com |
| Ministry of Forestry and Land Reclamation | Seetla Mabaso(Mr) | Deputy Principal Secretary | Seetla.Mabaso@yahoo.com  58884351 |
| Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security | Ntitia Tuoane(Mr) | Director, Dept. of Field Services | ntitia@hotmail.com  63048270 |
| Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security | Seipati Mofolo (Ms) | Chief Fish Production Officer | [Seipati2011@gmail.com](mailto:Seipati2011@gmail.com)  63096840 |
| Ministry of Tourism Environment and Culture | Lisebo Motjotji (Ms) | Deputy Director, Department of Environment | [Lisebomotjotji@yahoo.co.za](mailto:Lisebomotjotji@yahoo.co.za)  59227153 |
| GEF Operational Focal Point | Stanley Damane (Mr) | Director, Department of Environment | [Stanleydamane@hotmail.com](mailto:Stanleydamane@hotmail.com)  62000010/22320534 |
| Department of Range Resources Management, MFLR | Rats’ele Rats’ele (Mr) | Director, Dept. of Range Resource Management | [ratselec@yahoo.com](mailto:ratselec@yahoo.com)  588843417 |
| Department of Forestry, MFLR | Elias Sekaleli (Mr) | Director, Dept. of Forestry | [Elias.sekaleli@yahoo.com](mailto:Elias.sekaleli@yahoo.com)  58884338 |
| Energy and Environment Head, UNDP | Limomane Peshoane (Mr) | Head of Energy & Environment Unit, UNDP | [Limomane.peshoane@undp.org](mailto:Limomane.peshoane@undp.org)  58742832 |
| SLM Project Monitoring Officer, UNDP | Mabohlokoa Tau (Ms) | SLM Project Monitoring Officer, UNDP | [Mabohlokoa.tau@undp.org](mailto:Mabohlokoa.tau@undp.org)  62133550 |
| Planning Unit, MFLR | Paepae Selahla (Mr) | Seniors Economic Planner | [pselahla@yahoo.com](mailto:pselahla@yahoo.com)  67104480 |
| Food and Agricultural Organization | Bokang Mantutle (Mr) | Agricultural Officer | [Bokang.mantutle@fao.org](mailto:Bokang.mantutle@fao.org)  58753767/22273300 |
| Lesotho Non-Government Organization (LCN) | Seabata Motsamai (Mr) | Executive Director | [Seabata.motsamai@lcn.org](mailto:Seabata.motsamai@lcn.org)  58991144/22317205 |
| Ministry of Local Government, Department of Decentralization | M. Mokuoane (Mr) | Director, Decentralization Dept. | [mokuoanec@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:mokuoanec@yahoo.co.uk)  58000314/63597234 |
| Ministry of Energy Meteorology and Water Affairs, Department of Water Affairs | Mafanana Mokhatla (Ms) | Director, Dept. of Water Affairs | [fananam@gmail.com](mailto:fananam@gmail.com)  [director@dwa.gov.ls](mailto:director@dwa.gov.ls)  63079965/ 58666677/ 22317516 |
| Participatory Ecological Land Use Management (PELUM) | Mamotebang Moeketsi (Mr) | Director, PELUM | [dorcaspelum@gmail.com](mailto:dorcaspelum@gmail.com)  58745457/62745457 |
| Department of Soil and Water Conservation, MFLR | Refuoe Boose (Mr) | Director, Dept. of Soil and Water Conservation | [Rboose2000@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:Rboose2000@yahoo.co.uk)  58767886 |
| SLM Technical Advisor | Qalabane Chakela (Mr) | SLM project Technical Advisor | [Qalabane.chakela@gmail.com](mailto:Qalabane.chakela@gmail.com)  59139356 |

**International:**

1. UNDP Country Offices in Lesotho
2. Regional UNDP-GEF office in Ethiopia

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in [Annex B](#_TOR_Annex_B:) of this Terms of Reference.

Evaluation Criteria & Ratings

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see  [Annex A](#_TOR_Annex_A:)), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact.** Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in  [Annex D](#_TOR_Annex_D:).

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Ratings:** | | | |
| **1. Monitoring and Evaluation** | ***rating*** | **2. IA& EA Execution** | ***rating*** |
| M&E design at entry |  | Quality of UNDP Implementation |  |
| M&E Plan Implementation |  | Quality of Execution - Executing Agency |  |
| Overall quality of M&E |  | Overall quality of Implementation / Execution |  |
| **3. Assessment of Outcomes** | **rating** | **4. Sustainability** | **rating** |
| Relevance |  | Financial resources: |  |
| Effectiveness |  | Socio-political: |  |
| Efficiency |  | Institutional framework and governance: |  |
| Overall Project Outcome Rating |  | Environmental : |  |
|  |  | Overall likelihood of sustainability: |  |

Project finance / cofinance

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Co-financing  (type/source) | UNDP own financing (mill. US$) | | Government  (mill. US$) | | Partner Agency  (mill. US$) | | Total  (mill. US$) | |
| Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Actual | Actual |
| Grants |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Loans/Concessions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * In-kind support |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Mainstreaming

UNDP supported GEF financed projects are key components in UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programmes. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender.

Impact

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.[[2]](#footnote-2)

Conclusions, recommendations & lessons

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

Implementation arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Lesotho*.* 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 21 working days according to the following plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Timing | Completion Date |
| **Preparation** | 3 days | 3rd October 2014 |
| **Evaluation Mission** | *10*  days | 17th October 2014 |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | 5 days | 27th October 2014 |
| **Final Report** | 3 days | 31st October 2014 |

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 a national and international consultants*.* The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The international consultant will be designated as the team leader 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:

**International consultant**

1. Masters or Ph.D. degree in social sciences related to international development, i.e. economics, international relations, public and business administration or equivalent;

2. Extensive (at least 10-year) experience and proven track record with land degradation and/or natural resource management, policy advice, development and implementation;

3. Highly knowledgeable of participatory monitoring and evaluation processes, and experience in evaluation of at least 3 projects with a major donor agencies;

4. Familiar with sustainable land management techniques and models in Africa either through management and/or implementation or through consultancies in analysis and evaluation of sustainable land management projects

5. Demonstrated ability to assess complex situations, succinctly distills critical issues, and draw forward-looking conclusions and recommendations;

7. Ability and experience to lead multi- disciplinary and national teams, and deliver quality reports within the given time;

8. Writing and communication will be in English, and must have excellent communication skills in English. The consultant must bring his/her own computing equipment.

**Local consultant:**

1. Masters degree in social sciences related to international development, i.e. economics, international relations, public and business administration or equivalent;

2. At least 5 years experience with land degradation and/or natural resource management, policy advice, development and implementation;

3. Demonstrated skills and experience in development project implementation and management;

4. Knowledgeable on sustainable land management in the country, climate change issues and priorities, and related policies and legislations;

5. Proficient in writing and communicating both in English and in Sesotho and also ability to interpret to the international counterpart and also to translate necessary written documents into English.

**Team Qualities:**

1. Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;

2. Experience applying participatory monitoring approaches;

3. Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;

4. Recognized expertise in sustainable land management models and techniques;

5. Familiarity with sustainable land management policies and management structures in Lesotho;

6. Demonstrable analytical skills;

7. Work experience in relevant areas for at least 10 years;

8. Experience with multilateral or bilateral supported projects;

9. Project evaluation experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset;

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

Payment modalities and specifications

(*this payment schedule is indicative, to be filled in by the CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on their standard procurement procedures)*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| % | Milestone |
| *10%* | At contract signing (for international consultants upon arrival in Maseru) |
| *40%* | Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report |
| *50%* | Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report |

Application process

Applicants are requested to apply online at <http://jobs.undp.org> and/or http://www.ls.undp.org by the 11th September 2014. 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.

Annex A: Project Logical Framework

STRATEGIC RESULTS FRAMEWORK (SRF) and GEF Increment

The Strategic Results Framework is cross referenced to the SIP Results Framework as currently designed[[3]](#footnote-3). Links are shown in the table in ***bold italics***.

| **Goal/Objective/Outcomes** | **KPIs** | | **Targets for Key Performance Indicators** | **Means of Verification** | | **Critical Assumptions/Risks** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Long-Term Goal:** Sustainable land management provides a strong base for sustainable development and ecosystem restoration in Lesotho to support better livelihoods and provide a range of global environmental benefits. | | | | | | |
| **Project Objective:** Supported by a knowledge management network, Lesotho begins to alleviate poverty, achieve more sustainable livelihoods and deliver global environmental benefits on the basis of enhanced local and national techniques, approaches, capacity and strategy for upscaling successful SLM. | Land under SLM model  Reduction in extent of land degradation  Improvement in the Enabling environment for SLM  Improved score for the socio-economics index  Increase in biological productivity of the land  Improvement in carbon stocks | 250,000 ha under direct SLM (project pilot area) and 500,000 ha impacted by up-scaling in next 2 yrs. A Country  Of the 250,000 ha under direct SLM, at least half registers reduction in land degradation by at least 20% as measured by reduction in soil erosion, improvement in soil organic matter (as a primer for soil carbon) and structure, increased ground cover  At national level, the country attains at least a 75% score on Composite Index for the SLM Enabling Environment against baseline as measured by policy changes, availability of finance resources to address SLM at national level, functionality of SLM institutions etc.  At the project level, the at least 50% increase over the baseline on social and economic indicators for households, such as diversification of incomes, reduction in poverty index, reduction in food vulnerability, etc.  Strategic Investment framework  At pilot project level, at least a 25% increase in biological productivity (vegetation cover enhanced with rainfall use productivity) by end of Project Year 3.  Efforts will be made to measure and monitor % change in soil carbon, particularly if the project succeeds in adding a carbon finance layer to the project. | | | Community planning documents  CSIF documents  National Policy(s) documents  Participatory wealth ranking exercises in sample communities in each of the 7 Community Council areas.  Participatory attitude measurement tool applied by sample households in each of the 7 Community Council areas.  Participatory assessment tool applied by livestock owners and wild plant resource collectors in each of the 7 Community Council areas. | New local government system continue to receive the current levels of political support and legitimacy which is necessary for it to serve as the basis for proposed SLM approach  HIV/AIDS does not reduce participating institutions’ human resource and skill levels below critical thresholds  Local economies can support return on investments in SLM therefore providing resource users with incentives to continue their commitment to SLM  All groups and agencies willing to participate proactively in knowledge management processes |
| **Outcome 1:** Proven, strengthened, participatory, replicable models and techniques that successfully overcome current institutional and governance barriers to SLM, strengthen country partnerships and integrate SLM into country programmes are ready for national implementation. | An SLM model formulated, tested in pilot area and ready for upscaling to the rest of the country (with similar resources and resource management issues);  Viable alternative IGAs tested and ready for upscaling;  Households in pilot areas benefit from IGAs | Baseline: there has been limited piloting of models and techniques and limited discussion of their potential. But they are not yet widely known or sustainable, and the significant new potential of Community Councils as resource management institutions is threatened by uncertainty about how they will operate on the ground. There are few effective partnerships between government, bilateral and multilateral agencies in promoting SLM, which is poorly integrated into national environmental and development programmes. There are few IGAs in the mountain Districts and almost no concerted effort at testing and refining them.  Mid term: Arrangements for resource user groups and Community Councils to collaborate in SLM being piloted in at least seven Community Council (CC) areas. Selected IGAs being piloted in the 7 CC areas involving at least 5% of the target population.  End of project: at least seven Community Councils collaborating effectively with user groups in their areas to implement SLM plans, these pilot models validated, and the approach is endorsed for national implementation. Government, NGO, bilateral and multilateral agencies are collaborating effectively in promoting SLM, which is better integrated into national environmental and development programmes. At least 5% of the target population benefiting from IGAs which are ready for extension to areas with similar NR management issues. | | | User group constitutions and records including monitoring reports on resource condition  Community Council records  MFLR and MOAFS reports on IWM  MFLR and MOLG training materials for user groups and Community Councils  Reports of participatory assessments of models and techniques by user groups and Community Councils  Community Council, MFLR and MOLG plans for national SLM implementation  Records of collaboration between government, bilateral and multilateral agencies  *SIP Coalition and Knowledge Management Assessment survey tool may be used* | Technical agencies willing to collaborate  User group and IWM concepts can be harmonised  Community Councils are able to mobilise adequate operating resources  Community Councils retain legitimacy in their constituencies  Resource users willing to work together in group structures  Principal and other Chiefs continue current levels of willingness to co-operate  SLM initiatives in the country continue current desires and willingness to focus on a single institution (the Community Council) |
| **Outcome 2:** Adequate local and national capacity in place and is adapting and scaling up proven SLM models and techniques. | National agency responsible for SLM established and has skills, mandate and authority to facilitate SLM;  255,000 ha of land under improved SLM practices;  Innovative tools for SLM such as land functionality analysis, economic valuation techniques exist and are being applied;  Increased levels of adoption of SLM measures outside pilot sites;  Community Council members’ and civil servants’ scores on knowledge and attitude measurement tool | Baseline: several Ministries, parastatals, programmes and NGOs are committed to upscaling effective SLM models and techniques; their combined human and operational resources are substantial. But, despite GOL decentralisation and policy statements, these resources and commitments are fragmented and ineffective and there is no plan to integrate them around an SLM strategy.  Mid term: Institutional roles, responsibilities and relationships for upscaling effective SLM models and techniques have been clarified, agreed and piloted, and draft strategy for upscaling has been prepared.  End of project: Resource users and local, district and central government agencies have the conceptual, human resource and operational capacity to adapt and scale up proven SLM models and techniques. This is reflected in a 25% increase in their scores on a knowledge and attitude measurement tool and hactarage of land directly managed using SLM measures and extent of adoption of SLM practices outside pilot areas | | | Reports on use of knowledge and attitude measurement tool  MFLR, MOAFS and MOLG training materials and reports  MFLR, MOAFS and MOLG work plans (national and district levels)  Reports of participatory self-assessments by sample user groups and local, district and central government agencies of their conceptual, human resource and operational capacity | Relevant Ministries and other agencies continue their collaboration.  Current levels of GOL domestic resource allocation to MOLG and MFLR are maintained  Community Councils are prepared to give SLM adequate attention in their planning and resource allocation |
| **Outcome 3:** Lesotho adopts a programmatic approach to SLM - The enhanced awareness, dialogue, understanding and analysis of SLM best practice at resource user, community, local government, NGO and national government levels across the country, is reflected in strengthened, synergistic, multisectoral policies, strategies and programmes that achieve an integrated approach to natural resource management. | National level policy on SLM either approved or planned  National development strategies revised to reflect SLM principles (PRSP, Agricultural policy, NAP, etc.);  SLM content in Community Council plans and budgets  SLM content in statements of national environmental and development policy and accompanying budgets;  SLM knowledge management network mode of operation  Availability of synthesis of SLM lessons learned and best practice  A Country strategic investment framework for SLM exists and finance being mobilised to implement priority projects  Existence of National SLM Framework  The public and policy makers have high levels of awareness of importance of SLM | Baseline: many people are aware of good SLM techniques and practices, but the knowledge base is scattered and fragmented and more technical than strategic. There is no SLM knowledge management network in Lesotho, so no structure through which awareness and understanding can be spread and enhanced. Policies, strategies and programmes refer to technical SLM measures without explaining adequately the institutional and governance frameworks through which these measures can be achieved. There is no programmatic approach to mainstreaming SLM and no strategic investment framework for SLM  Mid term: a Lesotho SLM knowledge management network is stimulating the exchange of information and ideas about SLM best practice on cultivated and range lands at resource user level and at the level of local, district and central government, with the active participation of NGOs, parastatals and development agencies. A draft synthesis of SLM lessons and best practice identifies policies, strategies and programmes into which these should be mainstreamed. Discussion about this mainstreaming has been initiated. A country special advisory group consisting of a mix of development partners and government is formed and is facilitating discussions on a programmatic approach to SLM  End of project: the Lesotho SLM knowledge management network has been institutionalised so that it can continue to function without project resources. The network has completed a synthesis of SLM lessons learned and best practice. The enhanced SLM models and techniques piloted by the project are central to the strengthened commitment to SLM that has been mainstreamed into the relevant policies, strategies and programmes, as expressed in a National SLM Framework. These achievements are reflected in the content of participating Community Council plans, in which at least 15% of proposed activities have SLM content or impact and in which at least 15% of budgets are dedicated to SLM. At national level, at least 15% of recurrent and capital budgets support SLM. | | | Knowledge management network materials (e.g. information sheets, newsletters)  Records of workshops  Synthesis of SLM lessons and best practice  Plans for post-project operation of knowledge management network  Relevant policy statements or plans to revise policy, e.g. National SLM Framework, Food Security Policy, Poverty Reduction Strategy, local government policy  Community Council development and environmental management plans and budgets  Statements of national environmental and development policy and resource allocation  *SIP Advocacy Index tool may be used*  *SIP Composite Index for the SLM Enabling Environment tool may be used* | Relevant agencies at all levels are willing to participate proactively in the knowledge management network during and after the project  Those responsible for policy preparation/revision processes are willing to mainstream SLM |

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Document** | **Description** |
| Project document | The Project Document and Revisions |
| Project reports | Project Inception Report  Project Annual Work-plans  Project Quarterly Reports  Project UNDP Annual Reports  Baseline reports  Consultancy reports |
| Annual Project Report to GEF | Project Implementation Reports for 2010,2011,2012, 2013 and 2014 |
| Other relevant materials: | Financial Audit Reports 2010,2011,2012, 2013 and 2014  Press articles  Minutes of Project Steering Committee Meetings  Monitoring Field visits reports  Technical Reports  Mid-term Evaluation Report |
| GEF and UNDP/GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy | <http://thegef.org/MonitoringandEvaluation/MEPoliciesProcedures/mepoliciesprocedures.html>)  (<http://www.undp.org/gef/05/monitoring/policies.html>). |
| Atlas Risk Management System | UNDP-GEF Risk Management Strategy resource kit, available as Annex XI at <http://www.undp.org/gef/05/monitoring/policies.html> |

Annex C: Evaluation Questions

*This is a generic list, to be further detailed with more specific questions by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on the particulars of the project.*

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

Annex D: Rating Scales

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution*** | ***Sustainability ratings:*** | ***Relevance ratings*** |
| 6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings  5: Satisfactory (S): minor 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[[4]](#footnote-4)**

**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[[5]](#footnote-5)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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[[6]](#footnote-6)) |
| **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[[7]](#footnote-7)) |
| **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: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

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. Annex 1 of the SIP Programme Brief, 26 September 2006. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. 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-7)