**Terms of Reference**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Title** | National Consultant Mid Term Review of the Kidepo Critical Landscape Conservation Project |
| Duty Station | Kampala, Uganda |
| Languages Required | English |
| Closing Date | TBD |
| Tentative Starting Date | TBD |
| Expected Duration Of Assignment | 30 Working Days |
| Type Of Consultancy | Individual Consultant (International) |

1. BACKGROUND

The Government of Uganda through the National Environment Management Authority (NEMA) with support from United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and Global Environmental Facility (GEF) is implementing the project “Conservationand Sustainable Use of the Threatened Savannah Woodland in the Kidepo Critical Landscape in North Eastern Uganda”.

This UNDP/GEF-GOU initiative is a partnership programme implemented as a joint venture of national government partners. The partners include:-

1. The National Environment Management Agency (NEMA,
2. Uganda Wildlife Authority
3. National Forestry Authority
4. District Local Governments of Kaabong, Kotido, Abim, Otuke, Agago and Kitgum.

 The Project Document covering the period 2013-2017 was signed by Government and UNDP in July 2013 and full project implementation began in 2014. The project is scheduled to end on 31-Jul-2017.

The Government of Uganda has made significant investments in most protected areas (PAs) in the country. However, the Kidepo Critical Landscape of North Eastern Uganda, encompassing eight protected areas under a range of management authorities received limited investment over the past 20 years due to protracted conflict, and proportionately suffer from lower management effectiveness compared to other sites. The long-term solution proposed by this project is to strengthen the national system of protected areas in Uganda by improving the management effectiveness of protected areas in the Kidepo Critical landscape in the North Eastern part of the country, thus affording biodiversity sufficient protection from emerging and future threats. This can be achieved through providing planned, targeted and effective support to the operational capacity of core PAs within the landscape and through creating a coordinated landscape management approach in the KCL to serve as a shield against human-induced pressures on Uganda’s threatened biodiversity.

This proposed project in the Kidepo Critical Landscape of PAs and buffer zones in northern Uganda satisfies the requirements for GEF financing under GEF Biodiversity Focal Area, Strategic Objective one: Improve sustainability of Protected Area systems. The project will directly bring 416,485 ha of land under strengthened PA management arrangements designed to conserve biodiversity, involving three different forms of PA Status (NP, CFR and CWA) as well as public lands, with a wider positive influence on an additional 239,215 ha of dispersal areas. In total the project will thus bring enhanced biodiversity protection to over 655,700 ha of target PAs and linked dispersal areas. The project will comprise two complementary components, which will be cost shared by the GEF and co-financing. Each addresses a different barrier and has discrete outcomes.

Component 1. Strengthening Management Effectiveness of the Kidepo Critical Landscape PA Cluster.

Component 2. Integrating PA Management in the Wider Landscape.

By addressing management deficits in these sites, the proposed project is expected to strengthen the national PA system in Uganda as a whole as well as improve livelihoods for communities within the landscape. This is to be achieved through enhanced management both of PAs and of biodiversity outside PAs, such as that of the Shea tree, which provides significant economic benefits to communities, thus demonstrating the importance of biodiversity to livelihoods of the rural communities.

1. OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) policy at the project level in UNDP has four key objectives namely:- i) to monitor and evaluate results and impacts; ii) to provide a basis for decision making on necessary amendments and improvements; iii) to promote accountability for resource use; and iv) to document, provide feedback on, and disseminate lessons learned. A mix of tools is used to ensure effective project M&E. These might be applied continuously throughout the lifetime of the project, e.g, periodic monitoring of indicators, or as specific time-bound exercises such as mid-term reviews, audit reports and independent evaluations. From the GEF guidance notes, MTRs are a monitoring tool to assess project status and challenges, identify corrective actions to ensure that projects are on track to achieve planned outcomes. MTRs are required for full-sized UNDP supported projects with GEF financing such as this one.

The Mid-Term Reviews (MTR) are beneficial for project implementation as they provide an independent in-depth review of implementation progress, and this is responsive to the need for transparency and better access of information during implementation. This MTR is going to cover the project period up to date. The MTR will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP in the UNDP Evaluation guidelines.

**Overall Objective of the MTR:**

This MTR is intended to identify potential project design problems, assess progress towards the achievement of objectives, identify and document lessons learned (including lessons that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP projects), and to make recommendations regarding specific actions that might be taken to improve the project. It is expected to serve as a means of validating or filling the gaps in the initial assessment of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency obtained from monitoring. The MTR provides the opportunity to assess early signs of project success or failure and prompt necessary adjustments. The specific objectives of the MTR are to:-

* identify unforeseen project design problems;
* assess progress towards the achievement of objectives we can say here – especially objectives towards delivering global environmental benefits and improving livelihoods;;
* identify the changes caused by the project to sustainable livelihoods
* make recommendations regarding what should be done during the rest of the project life;
* analyze the project performance up to now in the context of the institutional framework and events in Uganda.

**Scope of work and Evaluation questions:-**

The TE will assess the overall relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of the Kidepo programme and will be guided by the following key questions (but not limited to these) relating to the above highlighted issues.

**1. Relevance:** Assess the relevance of the projectto the problems it was intended to address **and** how the project relates to the main objectives of the project outputs, outcomes, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?

**2. Efficiency:** Assess the project implementation efficiency/ arrangement through the government structures in line withinternational and national norms and standards?

**3. Effectiveness:** To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?

**4. Impact:** Assess whether there are indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status. Clearly specify the unexpected positive and negative results that the project has registered to date?

**5. Sustainability:** To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental mechanisms to address project risks so as to sustain long-term project results? Clearly specify project sustainability measures and/or exit strategies in place to sustain the key initiatives/outcomes identified.

**6. Role of UNDP:** To what extent has UNDPfulfilled its roles during implementation of the project and to what extent has the project developed human and institutional capacity

The details of each evaluation question is in Annex B below.

**In addition to the above the Lead Consultant will:**

* Review of documentation to be provided by the project (implementation/evaluation reports) (list in Annex A)
* Conduct fieldwork together with the national consultant and interview stakeholders, national and local Government officials, and communities to generate authentic information and opinions.
* Write and compile the information and reports as needed.
* Responsible for presentation of key findings highlighting achievements, constraints, and make practical recommendations to decision makers and stakeholders.
* Finalize the Mid-term Evaluation Report using the Outline in Annex E.

**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 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 B) 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 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, and GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other material 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 A of this Terms of Reference.

In addition, interviews with key informants and stakeholders will be held. Questionnaires, Focus Group Discussions, Interviews, Field visits, Observations, Participation of partners and Benchmarking should be used.

**EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS**

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (Annex H), 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 Rating scales are included in  [Annex I](#_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) |  |

**Evaluation deliverables (Products Expected from the MTR)**

* An Inception Report (within 3 working days of signing the contract), this should provide details of the methodological approach to be used by the consultants to undertake the study as well as well specified time schedule/frame.
* A Draft evaluation report of approximately 40 pages, excluding annexes, according to the attached detailed breakdown. The report will be in English and will be prepared and submitted in MS Word, font 12, with tables in Excel where necessary.
* A PowerPoint presentation (10 – 15 slides) covering the key points of the MTR with the main findings and recommendations also provided.
* A Final MTR Report submitted within a week of receiving written comments on the drafts from UNDP and partners.

N.B The Evaluator Must Provide Evidence Based Information That Is Credible, Reliable And Useful

1. **EVALUATION TIMEFRAME**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Deliverables / Outputs | Estimated Duration to Complete | Target Due Dates  | Review and Approvals Required  |
| Desk review of documents and preparation of inception Report (home-based) | 3 days | TBD | UNDP Team Leader |
| Travel for international consultant | 2 day | TBD | UNDP Team Leader |
| Presentation of Inception Report | 1 day | TBD | UNDP Team Leader E&E and KCL Project Coordinator NEMA |
| Fieldwork (at both national level and in the districts) | 6 days | TBD | Program Manager  |
| Power point presentation of field work findings to Key stakeholders including UNDP, Ministry of Finance Planning and Economic Development, NEMA, UWA, NFA and, the District Local Governments of Kaabong, Kotido, Abim, Otuke, Agago and Kitgum | 1 day | TBD | Program Manager, KCL Project Coordinator NEMA, Program Officer UNDP and Team Leader E&E |
| Prepare and submit Draft Report to UNDP for review by Regional Technical Advisor, Project Coordination Unit, GEF Operational Focal Point |  2 days | TBD | KCL Project Coordinator NEMA, Program Analyst UNDP and Team Leader E&E |
| Travel for international consultant | 1 day | TBD | None |
| Preparation and submission of Final Mid Term Review Report (Home based) | 4 days | TBD | Program Analyst and Team Leader E&E , RTA, KCL Project Board  |
| Total | 19 days + 2 travel days |  TBD |  |

N.B If there are any significant discrepancies between the impressions and findings of the evaluation team and stakeholders these should be explained in an Annex attached to the final report.

**WORKING ARRANGEMENT**

**Institutional Arrangement**

a) With overall reporting to the UNDP Country Director, the Consultant will work on day to day basis with KCL Project Manager and the Project Coordinator NEMA, and shall be supervised by the Team Leader, Energy and Environment Unit. The consultant will include travel costs and per diems within the country in their financial proposals. The Project Implementing partner will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluation team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits and coordinate with Government. The planning and the administrative arrangements for the MTR will be done in collaboration with the UNDP Head Quarters and the RTA. UNDP will support organization of stakeholder workshops to review the report.

b) The Consultant will liaise, interact, and collaborate/meet with officials from District Local Governments of Kaabong, Kotido, Abim, Otuke, Agago and Kitgum as well as relevant Central Government Ministries, Departments and Agencies.

c) UNDP will support the Consultant in the following areas;

* Access to required information (copy of project document, Annual Work plans, Progress reports and other project related reports);
* Access to UNDP Office and its infrastructure (e.g conference room and internet while at UNDP);
* Support and assistance to gain access to relevant stakeholders for consultations;
* Transport for visits both within Kampala and in the field (for official purposes only);
* UNDP Kampala and the Project Office will coordinate the study and keep abreast of the mission’s activities during the consultant’s stay.

**Reporting Arrangements**

The Lead Consultant will report to NEMA on all technical obligations and to UNDP on all contractual obligations.

**DURATION OF THE WORK**

The assignment will be executed in a period of 30 (includes 2 for travel) working days (spread over one month) from October to December, 2015. The Consultant is expected to adhere to the specific dates.

1. **TEAM COMPOSITION**

The evaluation team will be composed of a total of two consultants including 1 international (Lead/ Team Leader) Consultant and 1 national consultant. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects.

**Duties of the National Consultant**

The National Consultant will support and provide inputs to the Team Leader / Lead Consultant provide support for e production of the agreed products. S/he will deliver on the following:-

1. Identify strengths and weaknesses in the Programme design and implementation, in particular implementation arrangements and its impacts on efficiency and effectiveness of converting resources (money, time) into results and impacts;
2. Ascertain achievements and impacts to date; to what extent the Programme has moved towards achievement of the objectives and outputs under the three outcomes in the results framework and the need for continued focus (in particular achieving global environment benefits and improvement in livelihoods);
3. Assess likelihood of sustainability of results and determine the key elements of the exit strategy that would increase the likelihood of sustaining critical results;
4. Examine the significance of un-expected effects, whether beneficial or detrimental in character
5. Assess to what extent the Programme has contributed to building capacity at national, district and community levels to formulate, implement and monitor actions/activities for biodiversity conservation
6. Assess the validity of assumptions used in the development of the Kidepo Critical Landscape programme, and this Kidepo Critical Landscape project;
7. Identify and assess lessons learnt and best practices in relation to achievement of the programme objectives and outputs
8. Assess how the Kidepo Critical Landscape Project has adapted to emerging issues and trends such as climate change, energy and other emerging issues, etc.
9. Mobilise stakeholders for consultations and provision of information regarding the evaluation.

**Required Skills and Experience of the Lead Consultant**

* At lease an MSc degree and at least 7 years’ experience in natural resources management, Agriculture, climate change adaptation/ mitigation, socio-economic development or related fields.
* Familiarity with Biodiversity conservation related projects in Uganda and particularly the national parks and community wildlife management areas, either through managing or evaluating donor-funded projects.
* Substantive knowledge of participatory M&E processes is essential, and experience with CBOs/community development processes; design, implementation and/or management of community and local level sustainable livelihoods initiatives and country experience in Uganda are advantages.
* A good wealth of experience in the evaluation of technical assistance projects, if possible with UNDP or other UN development agencies and major donors, is required. A demonstrated understanding of UNDP principles and expected impacts in terms of poverty reduction and sustainable development is essential.
* Familiarity and knowledge of the UN Convention to Conserve Biodiversity, and knowledge of integrated approaches to drylands development and capacity development for management of Biodiversity loss would be an asset
* Excellent English writing and communication skills. Demonstrated ability to assess complex situations in order to analyse critical issues succinctly and clearly and draw forward-looking conclusions.
* Experience in supporting small multi-disciplinary, multi-national teams to deliver quality products in high stress, short deadline situations.
* Experience of working with Local Governments and Community Based Organisations in the areas of Natural Resource Management is an advantage.

**Competencies**

* Excellent Analytical Skills;
* Positive, constructive attitude towards work;
* Ability to act professionally and flexibly to engage with government officials, donor representatives, and local communities.

**Language Requirement**

* Excellent English writing and communication skills;

**Schedule of Payments and Proposal Evaluation Criteria**

Payment to the Consultant will be made in two instalments upon satisfactory completion of the following deliverables;

* 30% of the contract amount upon submission of an acceptable inception report;
* 70% of the contract amount upon submission, presentation and approval of FINAL Evaluation report

Details of the evaluation process are in Annex D

**Evaluation of Proposals (Method and Criteria)**

|  |
| --- |
| Individual consultants will be evaluated based on the following methodology:*1. Cumulative analysis* *The award of the contract shall be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:**a) responsive/compliant/acceptable, and**b) Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation. 70%-30%.**\* Technical Criteria weight; [70%]**\* Financial Criteria weight; [30%]* *Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 490 points (70% of the total technical points) would be considered for the Financial Evaluation****Technical Criteria – Maximum 1000 points**** *Expertise of the Individual – 300 Points*
* *Description of approach/methodology to assignment – 700 Points*

 |

***Financial Assessment***

***Lump Sum Amount*** approach shall be used *with the following expectations:-*

1. *The lump sum amount must be “all-inclusive”;*
2. *The contract price is fixed regardless of changes in the cost components;*
3. *For duty travels, UN’s Daily Subsistence Allowance (DSA) rates prevailing at the time of sourcing, for the duty station and all other cities indicated in the TOR as part of duty travel destinations will be used. This will give offerors an indication of the cost of living in a duty station/destination, to aid their determination of the appropriate fees and financial proposal amount, but it does not imply that Offerors are entitled to DSA payment; and*
4. *The initial payment includes the actual cost of the IC’s travel to arrive at the designated Duty Station. This implies that the completion of the journey can be considered as one of the deliverables payable upon arrival.*

APPLICATION PROCESS

Applicants are requested to apply online at <http://jobs.undp.org> by**, 2015**. Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions. 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.

**DOCUMENTS TO BE INCLUDED WHEN SUBMITTING THE PROPOSALS.**

|  |
| --- |
| Interested individual consultants must submit the following documents/information to demonstrate their qualifications **in one single PDF document:**1. Duly accomplished **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the template provided by UNDP.
2. **Personal CV or P11**, indicating all past experience from similar projects, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the Candidate and at least three (3) professional references.
3. **Technical proposal:**
	1. Brief description of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment
	2. A methodology, on how they will approach and complete the assignment (Annex F).
4. **Financial proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price, supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template provided (Annex G)
 |

1. 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](#_TOR_Annex_A:) H), 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 performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are also included in  [Annex I](#_TOR_Annex_D:).

Evaluator ethics

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex C) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'.

ANNEX A: LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE EVALUATORS

* Kidepo Critical Landscape Conservation Project Document
* Quarterly and Annual Project performance Reports
* Project Implementation Review (PIR) Reports
* Project budgets and files
* UN Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness;
* UNCBD Global Strategic Plan;
* GEF Biodiversity Conservation Focal Area Objectives (for GEF 5);
* Project Monitoring & Evaluation Framework
* UNDP GEF [Evaluation Report Format](http://www.undp.org/eo/documents/erc/Evaluation_Report.doc)
* [UNDP Quality Criteria for Evaluation Report](http://www.undp.org/eo/documents/erc/Evaluation_Report.doc)
* [Ethical Code of Conduct for Evaluation in UNDP](http://www.undp.org/eo/documents/erc/Code_of_Conduct.doc)

ANNEX B: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The TE will assess the overall relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of the Kidepo programme and will be guided by the following key questions (but not limited to these) relating to the above highlighted issues:

**Relevance:**

* How does the project relate to the main objectives of the UNCBD, to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?
* Is the project likely to deliver the global environment benefits expected by the GEF CBD Focal Area objectives and are the indicators selected by the project relevant to measure the expected global environment benefits?
* To what extent is it contributing to dry lands development and to UNDP's CPAP and Uganda’s overall development goals?
* How have project activities changed in response to new environment conditions, particularly the changing political agendas for land use and ownership? Have the changes been appropriate in line project objectives?
* Is the project still relevant to the problems it was intended to address?

**2. Efficiency:**

* Assess the project implementation efficiency in line withinternational and national norms and standards?
* Assess the impact of the location of the PMU on the timely implementation of project activities and delivery; how has this affected efficiency of conversion of resources (money, time) to project results?
* Assess the impact of implementation arrangement through the government structures on the efficiency of delivery of project results; how has this arrangement affected the efficiency of converting project resources (money, time) into project results, in the context Paris Aid Effectiveness concept?
* How does this project compare with similar projects on efficiency of converting resources to results? Are there standards for such a comparison?
* To what extent is the programme delivered in a timely and cost-effective manner (use the above sub-questions to answer this question)?

**3. Effectiveness:**

* To what extent have the expected outcomes/results and objectives of the project been achieved?
* To what extent is M&E being used to monitor and guide project implementation? Is it effective? How can it be improved?
* What progress has been made towards achieving project national and lower level results? What has affected achievement of the results?

**4. Impact:**

* Assess the indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status in the project area.
* To what extent is the programme contributing to longer term outcomes in the country? How relevant, appropriate and strategic are the project results to national goals and the UNDP mandate?
* Quantify the changes in the baseline values for the indicators of global environment benefits and assess the likelihood of the project reaching the current targets;
* Quantify the changes in the indicators of strengthening Biodiversity conservation and protected area management and assess the likelihood of the project achieving the targets under the current implementation arrangement;
* What are the unexpected positive and negative results that the project has registered to date?

**5. Sustainability:**

* What project initiatives can realistically be expected to be sustained?
* Can those initiatives/outcomes be sustained beyond this funding given the current project set up?
* To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?
* Is there an enabling environment that supports ongoing positive impacts?
* What project sustainability measures exist and what factors are likely to negatively affect project sustainability? Which key factors require attention in order to improve prospects for sustainability of project results?
* How appropriate is the project knowledge transfer strategy? What lessons have been learnt from project implementation?
* What should be the main elements of the project exit strategy in order to sustain the key initiatives/outcomes identified under bullet 1?

**6. Role of UNDP**

* To what extent has UNDP fulfilled its roles during implementation of the project?
* To what extent has the project developed human and institutional capacity?

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluative Criteria** | **Questions** | **Indicators**  | **Sources** |
| **Relevance:** How does the project relate to the main objectives of the project outputs, outcomes, 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:** Assess the project implementation efficiency in line withinternational 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:** Assess whether there are indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status |
|  |  |  |  |

ANNEX D: EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT 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**

**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 E: DETAILS OF EVALUATION PROCEDURE FOR PROPOSALS**

UNDP reserves the right to undertake a post-qualification exercise aimed at determining, to its satisfaction the validity of the information provided by the Proposer. Such post-qualification shall be fully documented and, may include, but need not be limited to, all or any combination of the following:

* + 1. Verification of accuracy, correctness and authenticity of information provided by the Proposer on the legal, technical and financial documents submitted;
		2. Validation of extent of compliance to the RFP requirements and evaluation criteria based on what has so far been found by the evaluation team;
		3. Inquiry and reference checking with Government entities with jurisdiction on the Proposer, or any other entity that may have done business with the Proposer;
		4. Inquiry and reference checking with other previous clients on the quality of performance on ongoing or previous contracts completed;
		5. Physical inspection of the Proposer’s offices, branches or other places where business transpires, with or without notice to the Proposer;
		6. Quality assessment of completed outputs, works and activities similar to the requirements of UNDP, where available; and
		7. Other means that UNDP may deem appropriate, at any stage within the selection process, prior to awarding the contract.

**Clarification of Proposals**

To assist in the examination, evaluation and comparison of Proposals, UNDP may, at its discretion, ask any Proposer for a clarification of its Proposal.

UNDP’s request for clarification and the response shall be in writing. Notwithstanding the written communication, no change in the prices or substance of the Proposal shall be sought, offered, or permitted, except to provide clarification, and confirm the correction of any arithmetic errors discovered by UNDP in the evaluation of the Proposals.

Any unsolicited clarification submitted by a Proposer in respect to its Proposal, which is not a response to a request by UNDP, shall not be considered during the review and evaluation of the Proposals.

**Responsiveness of Proposal**

UNDP’s determination of a Proposal’s responsiveness will be based on the contents of the Proposal itself. A substantially responsive Proposal is one that conforms to all the terms, conditions, TOR and other requirements of the RFP without material deviation, reservation, or omission.

If a Proposal is not substantially responsive, it shall be rejected by UNDP and may not subsequently be made responsive by the Proposer by correction of the material deviation, reservation, or omission.

**Non-conformities, Reparable Errors and Omissions**

Provided that a Proposal is substantially responsive, UNDP may waive any non-conformities or omissions in the Proposal that, in the opinion of UNDP, do not constitute a material deviation.

Provided that a Proposal is substantially responsive, UNDP may request the Proposer to submit the necessary information or documentation, within a reasonable period of time, to rectify non material non conformities or omissions in the Proposal related to documentation requirements. Such omission shall not be related to any aspect of the price of the Proposal. Failure of the Proposer to comply with the request may result in the rejection of its Proposal.

Provided that the Proposal is substantially responsive, UNDP shall correct arithmetical errors as follows:

### if there is a discrepancy between the unit price and the line item total that is obtained by multiplying the unit price by the quantity, the unit price shall prevail and the line item total shall be corrected, unless in the opinion of UNDP there is an obvious misplacement of the decimal point in the unit price, in which case the line item total as quoted shall govern and the unit price shall be corrected;

### if there is an error in a total corresponding to the addition or subtraction of subtotals, the subtotals shall prevail and the total shall be corrected; and

### if there is a discrepancy between words and figures, the amount in words shall prevail, unless the amount expressed in words is related to an arithmetic error, in which case the amount in figures shall prevail subject to the above*.*

If the Proposer does not accept the correction of errors made by UNDP, its Proposal shall be rejected.

**PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Summary of Technical Proposal Evaluation Forms | Score Weight | Points Obtainable |
|
| 1. | Expertise of Individual applicant  | 30% | 300 |
| 2. | Proposed Methodology, Approach and Implementation Plan | 70% | 700 |
|  | **Total** | **1000** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Technical Proposal Evaluation :Form 1 | Points Obtainable |
|
| **Proposed Methodology, Approach and Implementation Plan** |
| 2.1 | To what degree does the Proposer understand the task?  | 40 |
| 2.2 | Have the important aspects of the task been addressed in sufficient detail? | 100 |
| 2.3 | Are the different components of the project adequately weighted relative to one another? | 70 |
| 2.4 | Is the proposal based on a survey of the project environment and was this data input properly used in the preparation of the proposal?  | 100 |
| 2.5 | Is the conceptual framework adopted appropriate for the task? | 90 |
| 2.6 | Is the scope of task well defined and does it correspond to the TOR? | 200 |
| 2.7 | Is the presentation clear and is the sequence of activities and the planning logical, realistic and promise efficient implementation to the project? | 100 |
|  |  | 700 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Expertise of the Individual Consultant** |
| 1.1 Reputation of individual / Credibility / Reliability  | 20 |
|  |  |
| 1.2 Relevance of specialized knowledge | 100 |
| 1.3 Experience on similar program/projects | 90 |
| 1.4 Experience on projects in the region | 60 |
| 1.5 Experience of work with UDNP/major multilateral/bilateral programs | 30 |
|  | 300 |

 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

„„ „„ Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report

„„ Region and countries included in the project

„„ 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.

ANNEX G: PROPOSAL SUBMISSION FORM[[1]](#footnote-1)

[insert: *Location*]

*[insert: Date*

To: [*insert: Name and Address of UNDP focal point]*

Dear Sir/Madam:

 I, the undersigned, hereby offer to provide professional services for [insert: title of services]in accordance with your Request for Proposal dated [*insert: Date*]and our Proposal. We are hereby submitting our Proposal, which includes the Technical Proposal and Financial Proposal sealed under a separate envelope.

I hereby declare that:

1. All the information and statements made in this Proposal are true and I accept that any misrepresentation contained in it may lead to our disqualification;
2. I are currently not on the removed or suspended vendor list of the UN or other such lists of other UN agencies, nor are we associated with, any company or individual appearing on the 1267/1989 list of the UN Security Council;
3. I have no outstanding bankruptcy or pending litigation or any legal action that could impair our operation as a going concern; and
4. I do not employ, nor anticipate employing, any person who is or was recently employed by the UN or UNDP.

I confirm that we have read, understood and hereby accept the Terms of Reference describing the duties and responsibilities required of us in this RFP, and the General Terms and Conditions of UNDP’s Contract for Professional Services.

I agree to abide by this Proposal for *[insert: period of validity as indicated in Data Sheet].*

 I **undertake, if our Proposal is accepted, to initiate the services not later than the date indicated in the Data Sheet.**

I fully understand and recognize that UNDP is not bound to accept this proposal, that we shall bear all costs associated with its preparation and submission, and that UNDP will in no case be responsible or liable for those costs, regardless of the conduct or outcome of the evaluation.

 I remain,

Yours sincerely,

Authorized Signature [*In full and initials*]:

Name and Title of Signatory:

Name of Firm:

Contact Details:

ANNEX H: FINANCIAL PROPOSAL FORM[[2]](#footnote-2)

The Proposer is required to prepare the Financial Proposal in an envelope separate from the rest of the RFP as indicated in the Instruction to Proposers.

The Financial Proposal must provide a detailed cost breakdown. Provide separate figures for each functional grouping or category.

Any estimates for cost-reimbursable items, such as travel and out-of-pocket expenses, should be listed separately.

In case of an equipment component to the service provider, the Price Schedule should include figures for both purchase and lease/rent options. UNDP reserves the option to either lease/rent or purchase outright the equipment through the Contractor.

The format shown on the following pages is suggested for use as a guide in preparing the Financial Proposal. The format includes specific expenditures, which may or may not be required or applicable but are indicated to serve as examples.

1. **Cost Breakdown per Deliverables\***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SN | Deliverables *[list them as referred to in the TOR]* | Percentage of Total Price (Weight for payment)  | Price (Lump Sum, All Inclusive) |
| 1 | 30% of the contract amount upon submission of an acceptable inception report; | 30% |  |
| 2 | 70% of the contract amount upon submission, presentation and approval of FINAL Evaluation report  | 70% |  |
|  | Grand Total  | 100% |  |

*\*Basis for payment tranches*

1. **Cost Breakdown by Cost Component (equal to a Cost Breakdown per deliverables ):**

The Proposers are requested to provide the cost breakdown for the above given prices for each deliverable based on the following format. UNDP shall use the cost breakdown for the price reasonability assessment purposes as well as the calculation of price in the event that both parties have agreed to add new deliverables to the scope of Services.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Cost Components** | **Unit Cost** | **Quantity** | **Total Rate for the Contract Duration** |
| **Personnel Costs** |  |  |  |
| Professional Fees Indicate charge per day  |  | 17 days |  |
| Communications |  | 17 days |  |
| Travel Costs e.g. Air ticket if applicable  |  | 1 return (again, if applicable) |  |
| Others (pls. specify, add more rows as you may need) |  |  |  |
| **Grand Total** |  |  |  |

ANNEX I: LOGICAL FRAMEWORK MATRIX

1. Results Framework for Kidepo Critical Landscape Project: Outcomes and Indicators

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPAP:**  | Natural and Energy resources are used and managed in a manner that is sustainable and contributing to growth and poverty reduction |
| **Country Programme Outcome Indicators:**  | (i) Number of institutions integrating environment, Climate Change and energy access in development plans; (Disaggregated by level i.e. National/ Local government); (ii) % of targeted Environment, natural resources management and Climate change adaptation/ mitigation pilot initiatives (innovative practices) implemented; (iii) Number of policies and strategies reviewed/ developed to draft stage. |
| **Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Programme:**  | BD1: Improve Sustainability of Protected Area Systems  |
| **Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes:**  | Improved management effectiveness of existing and new protected areas |
| **Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators:** | Increased coverage of threatened ecosystems and threatened species New protected areas (1) and coverage (95,600 ha) of unprotected ecosystems  |
| **Project Goal:** | ***The biodiversity and ecosystem values of the Kidepo Critical Landscape, Uganda, are conserved and provide sustainable benefit flows at local, national and global levels through enhanced operational capacity and functional landscape planning approaches.*** |
|  | **Objectively Verifiable Indicators** |

| **Project Strategy** | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Target by EOP**  | **Sources of verification** | **Assumptions** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Objective:** The Biodiversity of the Kidepo Critical Landscape in North Eastern Uganda is protected from existing and emerging threats  | Ecological stability of entire landscapes is increased, biodiversity is less threatened, and habitats are secured;  | Landscape level approaches will not be taken up to the extent that the opportunity allows; risks from climate change will impact the buffer zones but also PAs themselves, with net loss to biodiversity and to incomes | Effective Terrestrial protected area coverage increased from a baseline of Increased coverage of PA by 95,600 ha over a baseline of 240,075 ha. and designation of buffer zones to conserve dry season refugia for wildlife (227,389 hectares) | GIS and ground truthing, elephant monitoring, zebra monitoring, forest canopy cover monitoring, shea distribution and density | Collaborative approaches on a landscape level resulting in increased role of local communities in managing natural resource use and access as well as state and private sector actors. |
|  | Karenga CWA will have the necessary operational and governance capacity built by EoP to be gazetted to full NP status  | The existing baseline is centred on KVNP as the core area where wildlife are able to peacefully habitat; refugia are limited and insecure, corridors, like Karenga, are under threat | Increased coverage of PA by 95,600 ha over a baseline of 240,075 ha. and strengthened integrity of buffer zones to conserve dry season refugia for wildlife (227,389 hectares) | Gazettement notice; greater numbers of wildlife - measured by indicator species such as elephant, buffalo and zebra; enhanced operational capacity in KVNP, CFAs and Karenga | The management and operational capacity process that would enable Karenga to be brought to NP status will have proven the requirement for gazettement, and support will be enabled |
|  | Poaching levels will have decreased | Enforcement in the Kidepo Critical Landscape is currently too weak to deal with armed poachers from politically unstable South Sudan, and poaching is a growing problem | Reduced poaching pressures over an area of 428,311 ha comprising seven PAs (one NP, six CFRs) and a community wildlife management area, verified by 25% greater wildlife abundance over the course of the year by EoP | Enhanced and installed security operations in KVNP and six CFA as well as defined management regime in Karenga; reduced poaching, measured by reduction in carcass incidents | Strong support will be made available within UWA, NEMA and partners to improved operational interventions in KVNP, 6 CFA and Karenga community area  |
| METT scores are improved in the target PAs: Kidepo Valley NP, Nyangea, Morungole, Zulia, Timu, Lwala and Rom CFR.  | Baseline METT scores as follows: Kidepo Valley – 65%; Nyangea- 58%; Lwala - 45%, Timu 53%, Morungole – 42%; Zulia – 53% and Rom – 40%. Average score: 52% | Management Effectiveness Score for Kidepo Critical Landscape PA cluster (KVNP), Nyangea-Napore, Morungole, Zulia, Timu, Lwala and Rom CFRs); increased over the baseline score by at least 40%.  | Fauna and Flora Monitoring procedures, Biodiversity resources assessments, Ministry and landscape level Reports, and Project Docs, PA and Landscape plans, maps and GIS files, MTE and Terminal Evaluation (TE)  | Government and their community, civil society and private sector partners in the Kidepo Cluster PAs are effectively supported in training and management to ensure ongoing support and engagement in the process |
| Key indicator species in the Kidepo Critical Landscape PA cluster show measurable increase in numbers  | Elephant population in 2012 was 502; zebra: 75; buffalo: 3,990; these are relatively depleted numbers relative to the carrying capacity of the landscape | Key indicator species (elephants, zebra, buffalo) in the Kidepo Critical Landscape PA cluster show measurable increase in numbers of >25% by EoP | Annual Report on indicator species counts; Wildlife census reports, Project Annual and Quarterly work plans and progress reports, Data base | Census and indicator species counts will be carried out by EoP |
| Deforestation, community wildlife agreements | Cooperation between UWA and NFA is relatively limited; cooperation between different districts is minimal, especially in terms of managing wildlife and forest resources | A working model for integrating management of PAs and wider production landscapes is piloted and adopted in six districts in North Eastern Uganda (Kitgum, Kaabong, Agago, Otuke, Abim and Kotido) and secures wildlife corridors and dispersal areas covering approximately 227,389 ha - resulting in reduced deforestation of shea by 25 % | Partnership agreements and constitutions of coordination mechanisms, monitoring and evaluation of related activities; creation of secure wildlife corridors in the Kidepo landscape and documented support to establishment of the model. | All stakeholders remain interested in the concept of landscape level conservation during the lifespan of the project and support the formalisation of coordination initiatives and the promotion of wildlife corridors to enhance ecological sustainability. |
| Wildlife numbers are stable in the buffer zones | Wildlife and habitats are not sufficiently monitored nor effectively managed in buffer zones outside PAs; poaching is showing signs of an increase in dispersal areas | No net loss of natural habitat in the critical landscape and at least 40% reduction in hunting pressures in wildlife corridors and dispersal areas  | Remote sensing and GIS, backed up by ground truthing and ecological monitoring work, ongoing through to EoP | The savannah habitats of the Kidepo Critical Landscape as their wildlife numbers remain well monitored and characteristics understood |
| Common management approaches to habitat conservation.  | There are no management plans for PA buffer zones, as a result there lacks a coordinated response to wildlife and habitat conservation in the Kidepo Critical Landscape | PA buffer zone under approved district management plans in six districts (Kitgum, Kaabong, Agago, Otuke, Abim and Kotido) incorporating BD considerations | Management plans, district coordination policies and collective management planning processes in place | There is widespread support and capacity amongst the key stakeholders - district governments, UWA, NEMA, NFA and others in a coordinated approach to landscape management |
| Six district governments (Kitgum, Kaabong, Agago, Otuke, Abim and Kotido) are collaborating on shared management issues | No mechanism is presently in place for joint management planning for natural resource use by local governments in the critical landscape | District governments in six districts cooperate effectively to regulate and plan natural resource use over 227,389 ha of the critical landscape, resulting in a landscape level coordination mechanism that enshrines biodiversity conservation by mandate | Proof of district level commitment to habitat conservation and wildlife management | District governments are able to see the value in a coordinated approach to joint management of natural resources in the Kidepo Critical Landscape |
| **Component 1: Strengthening management effectiveness of the Kidepo Critical Landscape PA cluster** | Karenga is qualified for upgrading to higher PA status through consultative process  | Karenga is managed on a meagre budget, there is almost no management nor operational capacity; the area is at high risk from poaching and the loss of the wildlife corridor | Management and integrity of the 95,600 ha Karenga community wildlife management area strengthened, leading to its potential gazettement by end of project to safeguard a crucial wildlife corridor and dispersal area | Survey report, boundary marks, physical inspection, resolutions, minutes of meetings, annual and quarterly reports, workshop reports | Political intervention does not interfere with the process of both management improvements and ultimately gazettement, and communities are willing to cooperate |
|  | Existence of a functional and operational security system in 8 PAs.  | The Kidepo Cluster PAs, particularly the CFRs and Karenga lack operational capacity to manage secure PA operations in an effective manner, gaps exist in HR across park operations, lack of equipment means difficulty to manage fires, poaching and monitoring the ecosystem.  | Introduction of a security and enforcement system with a platform for information sharing and intelligence gathering among parks and other institutions; with databases that will be continuously updated. Includes provision of surveillance equipment, ranger uniforms, fire management tools | Security System. Surveillance equipment – radios, repeaters, GPS, cameras, night vision and firefighting equipment purchased, trained on, logged and in use. | Business and security plans will set cost coefficients for all prescribed PA functions and rolling operations plans will define site management priorities. |
| A business plan for the PA clusters | Business planning in northern Uganda's Kidepo PA cluster lacks local context and full understanding of the international dimension of financial and business planning requirements; business planning is limited as a result. Financial scorecards show scores of 72% for UWA and 39.5% for NFA | A sustainable financing plan for the PA cluster providing accurate revenue forecasts (from gate fees, concessions, film rights and other permissible uses to private sector investments), is developed approved and implemented, and matches revenue to priority management needs, measured by improvement in financial scorecard results by >25% and the creation of community trusts. | PA Management plan; Business plan; Project Annual and Quarterly work plans and progress reports; NFA Data bank; Project Annual and Quarterly work plans and progress reports; Number of beneficiaries | UWA, NEMA, NFA and other government and community partners willing to support the development of an objective planning process for the sustainable financing of PAs in the Kidepo Cluster and support implementation. |
|  | Field, quarterly and annual reports; field visits; field inspection reports of pilot sites |
| Ranger and staff training programme in existence and functioning in KVNP, Karenga and 6 CFR  | Rangers have insufficient capacity in KVNP, Karenga and 6 CFR to gather intelligence on poaching and fires; relations with tour operators and tourists often strained because of lack of customer care capacity; lack of value-add services. | Staff training programme in place covering all aspects of PA cluster operations ensuring 120 rangers and other field staff meet necessary competencies for planning, administration, conflict resolution, policing and enforcement). | Staff training programmes are in place across spectrum of operations in KVNP, Karenga and 6 CFR, covering necessary competencies for planning, administration, marketing, customer care, conflict resolution, policing and enforcement. | UWA, NEMA, NFA and partners are willing to take lessons learned from other countries and from NGOs, tour operators and other private sector partners on best practices for PA staff in core and new competencies.  |
| **Component 2: Integrating PA Management in the Wider Landscape** | Sustainable use options (a) Shea and (b) wildlife species that are regulated for sport hunting are implemented and the data is available for operational use  | No data available for sustainable use options for Shea tree harvesting and wildlife hunting: as a result there is unsustainable use of key species | Sustainable use options for Shea tree resources and wildlife established and implemented - resulting in reduction of pressure on savannah habitat in the landscape, particularly shea and elephant populations- | District resource centres, minutes of meetings, reports | National and district level stakeholders will support the process of identifying sustainable offtakes for Shea and selected wildlife |
|  | Biodiversity management is factored into decision-making governing land use management in District Development Plans | Management activities are carried out on NP, CFR district and community levels but with a lack of a landscape level coordination mechanism | Mechanisms (landscape level coordinated management plans and institutional governance systems) for enhancing sustainable management of Kidepo critical landscape promoted, with landscape management plan in place and enforced  | Existence of landscape level management plans and institutional mechanisms, minutes of meetings and subsequent actions. Central and district government consent and ratification of plans | NEMA, UWA, NFA and other related government institutions support a landscape approach to biodiversity management, ratified at national and district government level. |
| District governments in six districts (Kitgum, Kaabong, Agago, Otuke, Abim and Kotido) have proven capacity for managing natural resources sustainably | District Governments lack the competence and staff skills to monitor and enforce laws - as a result ther is a lack of understanding of the situation vis-à-vis sustainable hunting and Shea utilisation, leading to habitat degradation.  | Local Governments have the competence and staff skills to monitor and enforce laws on sustainable hunting and sustainable use of Shea tree in target districts, measured by a 40% increase in scores in capacity development scorecard | Training manual, strategic plan, number of people trained and equipped, inter-district committee in existence, enforcement guidelines and by-laws, regulation, ordinances in place | NEMA is able to effectively support District Governments in the process of capacity building and developing functioning systems to sustainably utilise key natural resources |
| National export strategy for shea products in place; 25% increase in sales; an operational market information centre for shea products; Certified products in marketplace | The Shea nut / butter market is currently not yielding sufficient returns to producers to justify the conservation of Shea: average yields are 122.5 kg/household/year and average prices for oil 2,500/+ UGX per litre | Measures to improve market access for Shea products in place, and employment and income generation among rural women in the pilot area increased through access to markets, leading to a 30% rise in the value of shea products and a 25% increase in sales from start of project | Record from UNBS and Uganda Export Promotion Board; Copies of Shea products export strategy; Sales values of Shea products at household level | There is widespread support amongst key stakeholders-especially the private sector-in bringing value and structure to the latent Shea nut / butter market |
| Existence of inter-district coordination body in place and functioning, with an M & E Plan  | Presently there is no District coordination mechanism in place, leading to a lack of coordination over the management of crucial savannah woodland habitats, Shea trees and wildlife | A District coordination mechanism in place in the project target area (six districts) to ensure that biodiversity management in National Parks, CFA and wildlife migration corridors and dispersal areas is factored into integrated decision-making governing land use management  | Records at the coordination offices and districts, UWA and NEMA records, M& E reports | Strong support will be sought and maintained until at least EoP for a coordinated approach to biodiversity management in the Kidepo Critical Landscape |
| Management plan, including zonation plan and regulations in place  | Management plans and regulations critical for wildlife dispersal are presently non-existent in the wider landscape  | Management plans and regulations on BD-friendly management in blocks identified as critical for wildlife dispersal developed and applied by local governments-resulting in security of buffer zones and wildlife corridors | Project records and District Government documentation, management plans | District governments and related stakeholders support and ratify the management planning processes effectively |
| Ordinances and by-laws and being enforced by EoP- | District ordinances and community by-laws are non-existent for Shea tree harvesting and wildlife hunting | District ordinances and community by-laws on the harvest of Shea trees and wildlife hunting reinstated or developed - resulting in 25% reduction in Shea tree deforestation and a 50% drop in the use of Shea for charcoal | Records at the coordination offices and districts, UWA and NEMA records, M& E reports | Districts have the capacity and the will to support the process |

ANNEX J: RATINGS

|  |
| --- |
| **Ratings Scales** |
| **Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution** | **Sustainability ratings** | **Relevance ratings** |
| 6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): The project had no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency5: Satisfactory (S): There were only minor shortcomings4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS):there were moderate shortcomings3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): the project had significant shortcomings2. Unsatisfactory (U): there were major shortcomings in the achievement of project objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): The project had severe shortcomings | 4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability3. Moderately Likely(ML): moderate risks2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks1. Unlikely (U): severe risks | 2. Relevant (R)1. Not relevant (NR)*Impact Ratings:*3. Significant (S)2. Minimal (M)1. Negligible (N) |
| Additional ratings where relevant:Not Applicable (N/A)Unable to Assess (U/A) |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Rating Project Performance** |
| **Criteria** | **Comments** | **Rating** |
| **Monitoring and Evaluation:** Highly satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (s), Moderately Satisfactory (MS) Moderately Unsatisfactory, Unsatisfactory (U) , Highly unsatisfactory |
| Overall quality of M&E | **Rate 6pt scale)** |  |
| M&E design at project start up |  |  |
| M&E plan implementation |  |  |
| **IA and EA execution:** Highly satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (s), Moderately Satisfactory (MS) Moderately Unsatisfactory, Unsatisfactory (U) , Highly unsatisfactory |
| Overall quality of implementation/execution |  |  |
| Implementing agency Execution |  |  |
| Executing agency execution |  |  |

1. *No deletion or modification may be made in this form. Any such deletion or modification may lead to the rejection of the Proposal.* [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. *No deletion or modification may be made in this form. Any such deletion or modification may lead to the rejection of the Proposal.* [↑](#footnote-ref-2)