



TERMS OF REFERENCE
for International/National Consultant for Terminal Evaluation of the 'National Grasslands Biodiversity Programme' project

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 the Project title (PIMS 2929) *National Grasslands Biodiversity Programme*.

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

Project Title	National Grasslands Biodiversity Programme.			
GEF Project ID:	PIMS No. 2929		at endorsement (Million US\$)	at completion (Million US\$)
Country:	South Africa	GEF	8,650,000	8,650,000
Region:	Southern Africa	Government:	See below - cofinancing	n/a
Focal Area:	Ecosystems & Biodiversity	Other:	See below -cofinancing	n/a
Operational Program:	SP 1: Ecosystems & Biodiversity management mainstreaming	Total co-financing:	37,261,764	37,261,764
Executing Agency:	DEA -SANBI	Total Project Cost:	339,466,000	339,466,000
Other Partners involved:	ProDoc Signature (date project began):			
		(Operational) Closing Date: March 2013?	Proposed: December 2013	Actual: December 2013

OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The Grasslands biome is the second largest biome in South Africa, occupying 29% of the country's land territory. The biome is a repository of globally significant biodiversity, constituting, in particular, a rich storehouse of floristic, avian and invertebrate diversity. However, in common with other temperate grasslands across the globe South Africa's grasslands are critically threatened. 30% of the area has already been irreversibly transformed by anthropogenic activities and only 2.8% is formally conserved in protected areas. These areas are not representative of species and habitat diversity across the biome. Most of the grasslands habitat presently lies in production landscapes allocated to livestock production, agriculture (cereals, some food crops and cash crops such as sugarcane), and afforestation with fast growing exotic tree species. South Africa's largest urban and industrial centre is located within the grasslands, namely the conurbation of Johannesburg and Pretoria, and these environs are a conservation

hotspot. Production activities constitute the main threat to grasslands biodiversity. The high turnover of biodiversity across the grasslands landscape and the nature of threats imply that expansion of protected areas alone will not be sufficient to protect this heritage. There is an unmet need, instead, to mainstream biodiversity management into the production practices of the major production sectors providing the stimulus for land use change in the biome, and devise win-win strategies that conserve biodiversity while catering for development.

The NGBP was designed to complement existing conservation endeavours in the biome by seeking to mainstream conservation objectives into the agriculture, forestry, urban development and coal mining sectors. The programme will lift a number of critical barriers to conservation management, namely, market failure, systemic and institutional capacity weaknesses and management know-how within production sector institutions. These barriers will be addressed through the development of new management tools geared to the needs of specific sectors that protect biodiversity as part of production processes, by internalising the non-pecuniary values of ecosystem services in production, and by strengthening capacity in production sector institutions to address conservation imperatives as part and parcel of economic development. The baseline situation is characterised by many uncoordinated efforts to manage grassland biodiversity. Although the enabling environment for 'mainstreaming' is largely in place, with a supportive policy and legal framework, there is a gap between policy and implementation. This provides an entry point for interventions. The NGBP is designed as a catalytic initiative, which will help coordinate existing conservation efforts and address critical management gaps, such that the effort comes to equal more than the sum of the parts.

The project's five Outcomes are as follows:

- Outcome 1: Enabling environment for biodiversity conservation in production landscapes is strengthened
 - Outcome 2: Grassland biodiversity conservation objectives mainstreamed into agriculture
 - Outcome 3: The forestry sector directly contributes to biodiversity conservation objectives in the grasslands biome
 - Outcome 4: Grassland biodiversity management objectives mainstreamed into urban economy in Gauteng
 - Outcome 5: Biodiversity management secured in coal mining sector
- 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 for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The reviewer 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 (fill in TOR Annex C) The reviewer 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 reviewer 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 reviewer is expected to conduct a field mission to South Africa, including, but not limited to, the following project sites (list):

- Biodiversity stewardship sites in mining, agriculture, and forestry sectors (e.g. Kwamadlangampisi Protected Environment, Chrissiesmeer Protected Environment, Phongola Bush PE, Gilboa Estate, etc)
- Forestry small grower pilot projects (e.g. Oswathini, Isanqawe, Umgano)
- Biodiversity priority sites in Gauteng
- Ecological infrastructure and water security demonstration project (e.g. uMngeni river catchment)
- Mpumalanga coal mining pilot sites
- Biodiversity friendly red meat pilot sites (e.g. KZN, Eastern Cape)

The reviewer is also expected to attend a one or two day (t.b.d.) close out conference of the Grasslands Programme during the mission.

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

- UNDP South Africa Country Office & Regional Technical Advisor
- South African National Biodiversity Institute
- Departments of
 - Environmental Affairs,
 - Water Affairs,
 - Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries,
 - Mineral Resources
- Provincial departments & agencies
 - Gauteng Department of Agriculture and Rural Development
 - Ezemvelo KwaZulu Natal Wildlife
 - Mpumalanga Tourism and Parks Agency
 - Eastern Cape Rural Development Agency
- Municipalities in Gauteng, including City of Johannesburg, City of Tshwane, Ekurhuleni Metropolitan Municipality, West Rand District Municipality & Sedibeng District Municipality
- Sector organisations
 - Forestry South Africa
 - CoalTech
 - AgriSA and relevant commodity organisations
 - South African Mining and Biodiversity Forum
 - Chamber of Mines
- NGOs
 - WWF South Africa
 - Birdlife South Africa
 - ICLEI
- Selection of representatives from companies in mining and forestry sectors
- Selection of land owners participating in pilot projects at site level

The reviewer will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – incl. Annual APR/PIR and other Reports, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress

reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other material that the reviewer considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the reviewer for review is included in 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), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The review 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 TOR Annex D. A useful table to include in the evaluation report is set out below.

Rating Project Performance		
Criteria	Rating	Comments
Monitoring and Evaluation: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S) Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory, (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)		
Overall quality of M&E	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
M&E design at project start up	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
M&E Plan Implementation	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
IA & EA Execution: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S) Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)		
Overall Quality of Project Implementation/Execution	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Implementing Agency Execution	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Executing Agency Execution)	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Outcomes Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S) Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)		
Overall Quality of Project Outcomes	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Relevance: relevant (R) or not relevant (NR)	(rate 2pt. scale)	
Effectiveness	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Efficiency	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Sustainability: Likely (L); Moderately Likely (ML); Moderately Unlikely (MU); Unlikely (U)		
Overall likelihood of risks to Sustainability	(rate 4pt. scale)	
Financial resources	(rate 4pt. scale)	
Socio-economic	(rate 4pt. scale)	
Institutional framework and governance	(rate 4pt. scale)	
Environmental	(rate 4pt. scale)	
Impact: Significant (S), Minimal (M), Negligible (N)		

Environmental Status Improvement	(rate 3 pt. scale)	
Environmental Stress Reduction	(rate 3 pt. scale)	
Progress towards stress/status change	(rate 3 pt. scale)	
Overall Project Results	(rate 6 pt. scale)	

PROJECT FINANCE / CO-FINANCE

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 reviewer(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 financing (mill. US\$)		own Government (mill. US\$)		Partner Agency (mill. US\$)		Total (mill. US\$)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	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 to the extent that the project was intended to do so. In addition, the evaluation will be included in the country office evaluation plan.

IMPACT

The reviewers 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, or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.

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 (include

Country name).The UNDP CO will contract the reviewers 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 Reviewers team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the evaluation will be approximately 30 days according to the following proposed plan:

Activity	Timing	Anticipated Completion Date (approx. dates)
Preparation	5 days (<i>recommended: 2-4</i>)	27 – 31 January 2014
Evaluation Mission	18 days (<i>r: 7-15</i>)	3 – 21 February 2014
Draft Evaluation Report	5 days (<i>r: 5-10</i>)	3 March 2014
Final Report	2 days (<i>∴ 1-2</i>)	24 March 2014

EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
Inception Report	Reviewer provides clarifications on timing and method	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission.	Reviewer 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 reviewer is required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report.

**When submitting the final evaluation report, the reviewer 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 (1-2 international/national reviewers). The consultant(s) shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. (If the team has more than 1 reviewer, one will be designated as the team leader and will be responsible for finalizing the report). The reviewers selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

- Bachelor's Degree with minimum 10 years of relevant professional experience;

- Solid understanding and proven record of project and project cycle management and application of adaptive management;
- Demonstrable analytical skills;
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evidence-based evaluation;
- Experience in applying SMART indicators and strong competency in Logframe approach
- Knowledge of UNDP and GEF, in particular UNDP programming in South Africa and GEF Biodiversity strategies
- Project evaluation experiences of UNDP project in general and financed by GEF in particular will be considered a strong advantage;
- Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s), including Biodiversity
- Excellent English writing skills, ability to communicate complex, technical information to technical and general audiences in a clear manner both orally and in writing, ability to communicate with different stakeholders with various perspectives and views in a construction manner.
- Experience working in Africa. Experience in South Africa would be an advantage.

REVIEWER 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'.

TOR ANNEX A: APPROVED1 REVISED PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

INDICATOR	BASELINE	MID-TERM TARGET	END TERM TARGET	SOURCES OF VERIFICATION	RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS
Objective: Major production sectors are directly contributing to the achievement of biodiversity conservation priorities					
Contribution of GEF-funded Grasslands Programme to increased extent of protected areas (incl state & private land) in production landscapes in the grasslands biome	0	n/a	90 000 ha	National Protected Areas register and provincial databases; Proclamation documents	Proclamation is beyond the control of the Grasslands Programme
Outcome 1: Enabling environment for biodiversity conservation in production landscapes in the grasslands biome is strengthened					
1.1 Biodiversity sector plans (or bioregional plans) for grasslands biome produced and adopted by relevant authorities	0%	n/a	45% of biome	Approved biodiversity sector plans or bioregional plans	Formal adoption is beyond the control of the Grasslands Programme
1.2 Institutional mainstreaming effectiveness scorecard SANBI GDACE, Forestry SA But include additional agencies & calculate end targets: • EKZNW; MTPA • DAFF, DMR, DWA • CoalTech, AgriSA	Mainstreaming effectiveness scorecard has been developed 29% 28% 29% Calculate baseline for additional agencies	51% 43% 46% n/a	76% 72% 66% Calculate end target for additional agencies	Institutional effectiveness reports	Agencies are willing to participate in the scorecard process
Outcome 2: Grassland biodiversity conservation objectives mainstreamed into agriculture					
2.1 Agricultural laws, policies and guidelines incorporate biodiversity management objectives	Laws, policies and guidelines focus on production	Grasslands Biome Ecosystem Guidelines for agricultural land-use planning & decision-making	National Grazing Guidelines for Biodiversity (NGGB) developed and adopted by relevant sector bodies Biodiversity priorities inform provincial officials' recommendations in the CARA permitting process	Guideline documents; formal minuted adoption of NGGB by relevant sector bodies Biodiversity checklist used by provincial officials	Sector adoption is beyond the control of the Grasslands Programme
2.2 Market-based mechanisms incorporate biodiversity management objectives for red meat production	None	Value chain analysis completed & red meat pilot projects for	Industry approved standard developed	Pilot market-based mechanisms; Formal industry approval	Sector adoption and uptake of the standard is beyond the control of the Grasslands Programme

¹ Revisions to original project logframe approved by the Grasslands Programme Steering Committee (see minutes from meeting on 31 May 2011) and the UNDP South Africa Country Office (letter from Deputy Resident Representative dated 28 October 2011).

INDICATOR	BASELINE	MID-TERM TARGET	END TERM TARGET	SOURCES OF VERIFICATION	RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS
		environmentally friendly red meat production underway			
2.3 Amount of agricultural land in the grasslands biome where agricultural planning, decision making and extension incorporates biodiversity management objectives	0 ha	Amount of agricultural land in grasslands biome where: BMGP is being implemented: 60 000 Ha Amount of agricultural land in demonstration districts Stewardship has secured biodiversity: 9 000 Ha	Amount of agricultural land demonstration districts where: BMGP is being implemented: 100 000 Ha Amount of agricultural land in demonstration districts Stewardship has secured biodiversity: 22 000 Ha	M&E reports - Remote sensing and national land cover data - Site based monitoring in biodiversity priority areas	Landowners are willing to implement BGMP and biodiversity stewardship. Proclamation is beyond the control of the Grasslands Programme
Outcome 3: The forestry sector directly contributes to biodiversity conservation objectives in the grasslands biome					
3.1 Amount of land in forestry estate in grasslands biome under: 3.1.1 options areas 3.1.3 formal conservation	3.1.1 Basic management as unplanted land: 532,780 hectares 3.1.3 Formal conservation: 0 ha	3.1.1. Better management as unplanted land: 133,195hectares 3.1.3. Formal conservation: 15,000 hectares	3.1.1 300 000ha 3.1.2 35 000ha	3.1.1 Areas using conservation planning tool 3.1.2 Gazette notices	Use of planning tool leads to improved management Proclamation is beyond the control of the Grasslands Programme
3.2 No new plantation development in biodiversity priority areas within the grasslands biome	No formal definition of priority areas	Priority areas designated	No new plantations in designated priority areas.	Reference water-use licenses issued for timber in EC from EC SFRA-LAACs. Match these areas to Biodiversity screening tool maps which designate priority areas.	Not tracking illegal timber although there is no indication of significant illegal timber development in the EC.
3.3 Industry certification system and standards better incorporate grassland biodiversity objectives	National FSC compliant Standard not yet set Grassland biodiversity not adequately reflected in FSC Principles & Criteria No small grower certification system successfully implemented	National FSC compliant Standard exist FSC Principles & Criteria incorporate grassland biodiversity objectives Sustainable forestry management system for small growers piloted	National FSC compliant Standard exist (by mid-term) FSC Principles & Criteria incorporate grassland biodiversity objectives (by mid-term) Small grower certification system implemented		
Outcome 4: Grassland biodiversity management objectives mainstreamed into urban economy in Gauteng					
4.1 Biodiversity priorities accommodated in	Overlap between c-plan	10% increase	20% increase overlap	Gauteng conservation plan	Provincial & municipal officials

INDICATOR	BASELINE	MID-TERM TARGET	END TERM TARGET	SOURCES OF VERIFICATION	RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS
municipal open space frameworks (OSF) and spatial development frameworks (SDF).	and existing municipal SDFs and EMFs estimated at 40%	overlap		Municipal SDFs and EMFs Bioregional Plans	lack the required skills and capacity Conflicting mandates between conservation and planning / development Lack of buy-in to address biodiversity concerns in urban domain by political decision makers & private sector
4.2: Protected areas (incl state & private land) give legal protection to refugia representative of grassland biodiversity	0	12 000ha	30 000ha	Legal documents	Legal process and timeframes for proclamation gets full support from senior management at local and provincial level and proclamation process and systems in place and functioning GDARD and municipal officials lack the skills and capacity to facilitate proclamation Conflicting mandates between conservation and planning / development Proclamation is beyond the control of the Grasslands Programme
4.3: Biodiversity mainstreaming tools developed and adopted by land use planners and other decision-makers in Gauteng	0 tools developed	Draft Bioregional Plans (X3), Draft Guidelines (X2) and Draft Provincial Strategy (X1)	Approved Bioregional Plans (X3); Guidelines (X2) and Provincial Strategy (X1)	Tools approved and/or gazetted by relevant national, provincial or local government	Buy-in, approval and use of tools by political decision makers, planners and private sector is beyond the control of the Grasslands Programme
Outcome 5: Biodiversity management secured in coal mining sector					
5.1 Biodiversity stewardship is piloted with one mining company in the coal mining region of the grasslands	No land set aside	n/a	One biodiversity stewardship agreement on coal mining land signed by relevant authority	Biodiversity stewardship arrangements with mining companies	MTPA lacks the capacity to take forward biodiversity stewardship Processes for setting land aside under stewardship depend on mining companies and MTPA and is beyond the control of the Grasslands Programme.
5.2 Biodiversity information* used by the DMR, DWA, DEA and mining companies in the assessment and decision-making	Biodiversity information not used by the DMR, other authorities, and by	n/a	Biodiversity information used by DMR, DWA, DEA &	The DMR incorporates biodiversity information into its system.	Difficulty in accessing records of decision and thus determining if information is

INDICATOR	BASELINE	MID-TERM TARGET	END TERM TARGET	SOURCES OF VERIFICATION	RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS
<p>processes for the prospecting or mining of coal, and for the authorisation of associated activities</p> <p>* e.g. MBCP, threatened ecosystems data, areas earmarked for protection, including wetlands, offset guidelines</p>	mining companies		mining companies	Tracking will be done by inspecting the DMR's records of decision and comparing these with SANBI's inventory of sensitive areas.	being used.

TOR ANNEX B: LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE REVIEWERS

Reference Materials

- National Grasslands Biodiversity Programme Project Document
- Quarterly and Annual Project performance Reports
- Project Implementation Review (PIR) Reports
- Project M&E Plan
- Final Project Mid Term Review Report
- Any other relevant documents: Grasslands Sustainability Plan; Lessons Learnt reports; project website (www.grasslands.org.za)
- UNDP evaluation guidance documents, including
 - UNDP GEF Evaluation Report Format
 - UNDP Quality Criteria for Evaluation Report
 - Ethical Code of Conduct for Evaluation in UNDP
 - The Evaluation Policy of UNDP
 - United Nations Evaluation Group Standards for Evaluation in the UN (2005)
 - Guidelines for Ratings
 - Terminal Evaluation Sample Report Outline
 - Norms of Evaluation in the UN system

TOR ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

Evaluative Criteria	Questions	Indicators	Sources
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?			

The detailed skills, experiences and qualifications are presented below.

TOR ANNEX D: RATINGS

Ratings Scales		
Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution	Sustainability ratings	Relevance ratings
<p>6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): The project had no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency</p> <p>5: Satisfactory (S): There were only minor shortcomings</p> <p>4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS):there were moderate shortcomings</p> <p>3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): the project had significant shortcomings</p> <p>2. Unsatisfactory (U): there were major shortcomings in the achievement of project objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency</p> <p>1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): The project had severe shortcomings</p>	<p>4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability</p> <p>3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks</p> <p>2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks</p> <p>1. Unlikely (U): severe risks</p>	<p>2. Relevant (R)</p> <p>1. Not relevant (NR)</p> <p><i>Impact Ratings:</i></p> <p>3. Significant (S)</p> <p>2. Minimal (M)</p> <p>1. Negligible (N)</p>
<p>Additional ratings where relevant: Not Applicable (N/A) Unable to Assess (U/A)</p>		

TOR ANNEX E: EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT AGREEMENT FORM

Reviewers:

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. Reviewers must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Reviewers 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. Reviewers 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, reviewers 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, reviewers 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

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: _____

TOR ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE

The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

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

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)

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

10.3 Duties and Responsibilities of National Consultant

The national consultant will assist and collaborate with the Team Leader in all the tasks relating to the Terminal Evaluation including fieldwork, interpretation in meetings/interviews held in local language, and report writing as agreed with Team Leader.

10.4 Required Skills and Experience of National Consultant (Community Forestry)

- ***MSc degree background and at least 10 years experience in forestry and natural resource management, community-based forestry, or related fields.***
- Knowledge of monitoring and evaluation, and working experience in evaluating conservation and development projects.
- Demonstrable understanding of both conservation and development decision-making processes at national and district level is essential.
- Knowledge of community participation processes.
- Proficient English writing and communication skills; local language skills are an advantage
- Experience with GEF, the United Nations or other development agencies is an advantage.

12.0 Responsibilities and Logistics

- The evaluation team leader will have the overall responsibility for the quality and timely submission of the deliverables to the UNDP country office.
- UNDP, WWF and key District Local Governments will review and provide feedback on the evaluation TORs and evaluation reports.

- UNDP will be responsible for quality control.
- UNDP will be responsible for organizing the stakeholders' workshop to review the draft and eventually share the final evaluation report with WWF, District Local Governments and the beneficiaries.
- UNDP will provide logistical support to the reviewers in form of a vehicle for up-country project visits and work space in the UNDP building.