

## TERMINAL EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

### INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the *Sustainable Land Management* (PIMS #2979.)

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

### PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	Sustainable Land Management			
GEF Project ID:	50965		<i>at endorsement (Million US\$)</i>	<i>at completion (Million US\$)</i>
UNDP Project ID:	00063220	GEF financing:	1,820,000.00	
Country:	Eritrea	IA/EA own:	1,000,000.0	
Region:	Africa	Government:	250,000 (In kind)	
Focal Area:	Land Degradation	Other:	1,000,000.00	
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):		Total co-financing:	2,250,000	
Executing Agency:	UNDP	Total Project Cost:	4,070,000	
Other Partners involved:	MoLWE	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		27/08/2009
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: 31/12/2013	Actual: 31/12/2015

### OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

#### Background information and project summary:

Natural resources are central to the livelihoods of the Eritrean population with over 80% of the rural population being engaged in agricultural and natural resource related activities. In the Central Highland Ecological Zone, this dependence is particularly critical since approximately 65% of Eritrea's total population lives there. However, severe land degradation which is arguably the most critical environmental problem facing the country has negatively affected agricultural production leading to increased vulnerability of local communities.

Although land degradation is prevalent throughout the country, it is particularly manifested in the central and northern highlands, with a degraded area covering 2.4 million hectares, constituting 19% of the total area of the country. This zone loses between 2 and 25 tons of soil per ha annually. The main direct causes of land degradation identified in Eritrea are: deforestation, unsustainable agriculture, overgrazing, insecure land tenure systems which act as a disincentive to investing in sustainable practices, poorly coordinated land use planning and limited application of

knowledge and technologies by farmers to enhance productivity. Additionally, capacity, knowledge and policy barriers have hindered application of sustainable land management in the country.

To address these challenges, the Government of the State of Eritrea in collaboration with UNDP, Global Environment Facility (GEF) and Norwegian Embassy developed the project Sustainable Land Management (SLM) which has been implemented from 2009 to December 2015. The project goal was to have *“Better managed land that provides the basis for ecosystems services and for meeting national development needs”*. This was to be achieved through provision of an enabling environment for sustainable land management (policy, capacity, knowledge, alternatives) necessary for adoption of SLM practices and alleviation of environmental degradation while improving livelihoods of the farming communities of the central highland zone. The design of the project was also in line with the objectives of the GEF Strategic Investment Program for SLM in Sub-Saharan Africa (SIP) and UNDAF. The project had four outcomes as summarized below:

**Outcome 1:** Replicable models of SLM are developed and representative communities use them to manage land in 28 villages of the central highland that are representative of the major agro-ecological zone for Central highlands, reducing the rate of land degradation. Outcome 1 was to be achieved through the following six outputs:

- *Sustainable models for improving agriculture, grazing lands and forested lands developed and piloted in 28 villages covering 140,000 ha and a suite of technologies made available.*
- *System of incentives and penalties are developed and applied at multiple levels to further the adoption of SLM practice.*
- *Regulations and standards for land redistribution of agricultural lands under the 1994 Land Proclamation are developed, approved and applied.*
- *Community-based, village-level land use planning and land redistribution methodologies are developed and piloted in 28 villages.*
- *Alternative income generating options piloted and linked to markets in 28 villages.*
- *Feedback from pilot villages used to finalize the SLM model, LUP and land redistribution methodologies and an integrated extension package to facilitate replication – potentially over 2 million ha; SLM extension package successfully replicated in adjacent sub-zobas in Zoba Maekel.*

**Outcome 2:** A system of knowledge management (KM) for SLM is developed and used to achieve SLM through mainstreaming of SLM principles into the regional and national development programs, projects, strategies, policies and legislation. Outcome 2 was to be achieved through the following 4 outputs:

- *Knowledge management (KM) network formed of institutions and projects concerned with SLM in the country.*
- *Capacity for research on SLM supported.*
- *SLM M&E established and linked to SLM country program and SIP.*
- *SLM is mainstreamed into relevant programmes, policies and legislation, and is integrated throughout development planning and budgeting processes.*

**Outcome 3:** Capacity for adoption of improved land management techniques and for upscaling to non-project areas provided at all levels: This outcome was to be achieved through the following 4 outputs:

- *Training programmes on SLM for different groups (farmers, land managers, technical officers) are available and training conducted (with a focus on pilot site).*
- *Extension package updated with SLM best practice provided and other relevant materials developed through KCAS successfully delivered to key target groups and intended impacts on awareness and skills base achieved.*
- *Service providers (example agricultural input suppliers, extension services, financial service providers) strengthened to provide effective and relevant SLM support to community level.*
- *SLM actions are linked to adaptation and mitigation measures.*

**Outcome 4:** Learning, evaluation, and adaptive management increased. Outcome 4 had the following 2 outputs:

- *Effective project management and implementation structures are established and function.*
- *Project M&E system established, adaptive planning takes place and project performance on track.*

The project was implemented through the National Execution (NEX) modality project with Central Region (Ministry of Agriculture) being the lead implementing partner. Other partners included: Ministry of Land, Water and Environment, Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Finance, Central regional Administration Office, National Agricultural Research Institute, Ministry of Energy and Mines (Energy Research and Training Center), Toker Integrated Community Development (local NGO).

#### **Objective and scope of the evaluation:**

The overall objective of the Terminal Evaluation is to review the achievements made to deliver the specified objectives and outcomes of the Sustainable Land Management project. It will establish the effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, performance and success of the project, including the sustainability of results. The evaluation will also evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of project design, implementation, monitoring and adaptive management and sustainability of project outcomes, including the project exit strategy. The evaluation will also collate and analyze specific lessons and best practices pertaining to the strategies employed, and implementation arrangements, which may be utilized to inform future programming.

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects.

## **EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD**

---

An overall approach and method<sup>1</sup> for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact**, as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR ([Annex C](#)) The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to **Sub Zoba Serejeka, Zoba Maekel location**, including project sites within **Toker catchment**. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: **UNDP Country Office, Ministry of Land, Water and Environment, Ministry of National Development, Ministry of Agriculture, Farmers/direct beneficiaries, Zoba Maekel and Sub Zoba Serejeka Administrations, UNCCD national focal point,**)

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project

---

<sup>1</sup> For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](#), Chapter 7, pg. 163

files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in [Annex B](#) of this Terms of Reference.

The project evaluation is to be undertaken in accordance with UN evaluation norms and policies and should embody a strong results-based orientation. It should be made clear that the evaluation team is responsible for revising the approach as necessary and present its methodological proposal as part of the inception report. Evaluation methods should be selected for their rigor in producing empirically based evidence to address the evaluation criteria, to respond to the evaluation questions, and to meet the objectives of the evaluation.

## EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS

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

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

## PROJECT FINANCE / COFINANCE

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

Co-financing (type/source)	UNDP own financing (US\$)		Government (US\$)		Norway Government		Partner Agency (GEF) (US\$)		Total (US\$)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Actual	Actual
Grants	958,000	958,000	0	0	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,820,000	1,820,000	3,778,000	3,778,000
Loans/Concessions										
In-kind support			250,000	250,000						

Other										
Totals	958,000	958,000	250,000	250,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,820,000	1,820,000	4,028,000	4,028,000

## MAINSTREAMING

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

## IMPACT

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

## CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

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

### *Findings and Conclusions*

In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria below should be rated using the following divisions: Highly Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Marginally Satisfactory and Unsatisfactory.

### *Project Formulation*

Conceptualization/Design. This should assess the approach used in design and an appreciation of the appropriateness of problem conceptualization and whether the selected intervention strategy addressed the root causes and principal threats in the project area. It should also include an assessment of the logical framework and whether the different project components and activities proposed to achieve the objective were appropriate, viable and responded to contextual institutional, legal and regulatory settings of the project. It should also assess the indicators defined for guiding implementation and measurement of achievement and whether lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) were incorporated into project design.

Country-ownership/Driveness. Assess the extent to which the project idea/conceptualization had its origin within national, sectoral and development plans and focuses on national environment and development interests.

Stakeholder participation. Assess information dissemination, consultation, and “stakeholder” participation in all stages of project design and implementation.

Replication approach. Determine the ways in which lessons and experiences coming out of the project were/are to be replicated or scaled up in the design and implementation of other projects (this also related to actual practices

### *Project Implementation*

Implementation Approach. This should include assessments of the following aspects:

<sup>2</sup> A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office: [ROTI Handbook 2009](#)

- I. The use of the logical framework as a management tool during implementation and any changes made to this as a response to changing conditions and/or feedback from M&E activities if required.
- II. Other elements that indicate adaptive management such as comprehensive and realistic work plans routinely developed that reflect adaptive management and/or; changes in management arrangements to enhance implementation.
- III. The project's use/establishment of electronic information technologies to support implementation, participation and monitoring, as well as other project activities.
- IV. The general operational relationships between the institutions involved and others and how these relationships have contributed to effective implementation and achievement of project objectives.
- V. Technical capacities associated with the project and their role in project development, management and achievements.

Monitoring and evaluation. Including an assessment as to whether there has been adequate periodic oversight of activities during implementation to establish the extent to which inputs, work schedules, other required actions and outputs are proceeding according to plan; whether formal evaluations have been held and whether action has been taken on the results of this monitoring oversight and evaluation reports.

Stakeholder participation. This should include assessments of the mechanisms for information dissemination in project implementation and the extent of stakeholder participation in management, emphasizing the following:

- I. The production and dissemination of information generated by the project.
- II. Local resource users' participation in project implementation and decision making and an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the approach adopted by the project in this arena.
- III. The establishment of partnerships and collaborative relationships developed by the project with local, national and international entities and the effects they have had on project implementation.
- IV. Involvement of governmental institutions in project implementation, the extent of governmental support of the project.

Financial Planning: Including an assessment of:

- I. The actual project cost by objectives, outputs, activities
- II. The cost-effectiveness of achievements
- III. Financial management (including disbursement issues)
- IV. Co-financing

Sustainability. Extent to which the benefits of the project will continue, within or outside the project domain, after it has come to an end. Relevant factors include for example: development of a sustainability strategy, establishment of financial and economic instruments and mechanisms, mainstreaming project objectives into the economy or community production activities.

Execution and implementation modalities. This should consider the effectiveness of the UNDP counterpart and Project Co-ordination Unit participation in selection, recruitment, assignment of experts, consultants and national counterpart staff members and in the definition of tasks and responsibilities; quantity, quality and timeliness of inputs for the project with respect to execution responsibilities, enactment of necessary legislation and budgetary provisions and extent to which these may have affected implementation and sustainability of the Project; quality and timeliness of inputs by UNDP and Government of State of Eritrea and other parties responsible for providing inputs to the project.

## *Results*

Attainment of Outcomes/ Achievement of objectives: Including a description and rating of the extent to which the project's objectives (environmental and developmental) were achieved using Highly Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Marginally Satisfactory, and Unsatisfactory ratings. If the project did not establish a baseline (initial conditions), the evaluators should seek to determine it through the use of special methodologies so that achievements, results and impacts can be properly established.

This section should also include reviews of the following:

Sustainability: Including an appreciation of the extent to which benefits continue, within or outside the project domain after GEF assistance/external assistance in this phase has come to an end.

Other aspects to assess in the review of Project formulation approaches would be UNDP comparative advantage as IA for this project; the consideration of linkages between projects and other interventions within the sector and the definition of clear and appropriate management arrangements at the design stage.

### Recommendations

- 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

### Lessons learned

This should highlight the best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success.

## IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

---

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in *Eritrea*. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

## EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

---

The total duration of the evaluation will be 25 days according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation	3 days (recommended: 2-4)	date
Evaluation Mission	12 days (r: 7-15)	date
Draft Evaluation Report	8 days (r: 5-10)	date
Final Report	2 days (r: 1-2)	date

---

## EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

---

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
<b>Inception Report</b>	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission.	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
<b>Presentation</b>	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission	To project management, UNDP CO
<b>Draft Final Report</b>	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs
<b>Final Report*</b>	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC.

\*When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluator is required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report.

## TEAM COMPOSITION

---

The evaluation team will be composed of one international consultant who will be the team leader for the evaluation and one national consultant. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities. The Team Leader will be responsible for overall coordination of the evaluation team, and have overall responsibility for the quality and timely submission of the final evaluation report to UNDP.

### The team leader will perform the following tasks:

- Lead and manage the evaluation mission;
- Assume overall leadership and responsibility for the analysis, quality and timely submission of the final report to the UNDP Country Office;
- Desk review of documents, development of draft methodology, detailed work plan and Evaluation matrix/outline;
- Briefing with UNDP, agreement on the evaluation scope, methodology and approach, including the methods for data collection and analysis; and outline of the Evaluation report;
- Prepare, finalize, and lead the presentation of the inception report;
- Decide the work specification for members of the evaluation team; ensure efficient division of tasks between the mission members;
- Interviews with project implementing partners, relevant government bodies, experts, beneficiaries and donor representatives;
- Field visit to the project sites and conduct interviews with local stakeholders;
- Elaboration of a summary key findings based on interviews and site visits performed;
- Debriefing with UNDP and project implementing partners;
- Conduct the evaluation in accordance with the proposed objective and scope of the evaluation and UNDP evaluation guidelines;
- Development and submission of the first evaluation report draft. The draft will be shared with the UNDP CO, and key project stakeholders for review and commenting;



- Present draft findings in the stakeholder workshop;
- Finalization and submission of the final Evaluation report through incorporating suggestions received on the draft report;
- Finalize the entire evaluation report and lessons learned report in English and submit it to UNDP CO Eritrea.

#### **Required Qualifications of the Team leader:**

- Minimum MSc. degree in natural resource, environment and sustainable development, environmental science or related fields;
- Minimum 8 years of relevant professional experience;
- Excellent technical knowledge of Sustainable Land Management;
- Knowledge of UNDP and GEF procedures and policies;
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
- Previous experience in conducting evaluation and programme reviews, especially in developing countries;
- Proven experience in Results-Based Management (RBM) and good understanding of gender mainstreaming into programmes/projects;
- Experience working with a wide range of institutions/organizations, including high-level government, UN agencies, and civil society;
- Excellent knowledge and experience of development issues including the MDGs, poverty reduction, environment and sustainable development, gender equity, gender mainstreaming in development.

#### **Competency requirements of the Team leader**

- Good analytical and strategic thinking skills;
- Extensive knowledge of qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods;
- Proven knowledge of evaluation methods;
- Sound knowledge of results-based management systems, and monitoring and evaluation methodologies; including experience in applying SMART indicators;
- Strong working knowledge of the UN and its mandate region, and more specifically the work of UNDP in support of Environment and Sustainable Development initiatives in the region;
- Excellent inter-personal, communication, and teamwork skills;
- Ability to meet tight deadlines;
- Excellent written and spoken English and presentational capacities

#### **The national consultant will undertake the following tasks**

- Mobilize documents, collect background materials;
- Actively participate in desk review of documents, development of draft methodology, detailed work plan and Evaluation outline;
- Actively participate in preparation and presentation of the inception report;
- Facilitate meetings with sector ministries and other national stakeholders;
- Assistance to international consultant in conducting interviews with project implementing partners; relevant government bodies, experts, beneficiaries and donor representatives;
- Arrange field visits and assistance to the international consultant in conducting interviews with relevant local stakeholders at project sites, provision of interpretation,
- Assistance to international consultant in conducting the evaluation in accordance with the proposed objective and scope of the evaluation;
- Assist the International Consultant in elaboration of a summary matrix of the project implementation key findings based on interviews and site visits performed;
- Participation in debriefings with UNDP CO representatives;
- Assistance to the International Consultant in developing the first draft of the Evaluation report. The draft will be shared with the UNDP and key project stakeholders for review and commenting;
- Actively participate in drafting related parts of the evaluation report ;
- Actively participate in conducting the analysis of the evaluation report;

- Assist the Team Leader in finalizing the draft evaluation report through incorporating suggestions received.

### Required Qualifications of the National Consultant

- MSc. degree in natural resource, environment and sustainable development, environmental science or related fields;
- At least 5 years of work experience in the area of sustainable development and environmental management in Eritrea;
- Sound knowledge and understanding of the social, economic and environmental management/challenges in Eritrea;
- Previous experience in conducting evaluation and programme reviews;
- Familiarity with the UN system;
- Very good knowledge and experience of development issues including the MDGs, poverty reduction; environment and sustainable development, gender equity, gender mainstreaming in development;
- Experience in Results-Based Management (RBM) and understanding of gender mainstreaming into programmes/projects.

### Competency requirements of the National Consultant

- Good analytical and strategic thinking skills
- Excellent inter-personal, communication, and teamwork skills
- Excellent written and spoken English and presentational capacities
- Extensive knowledge of qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods
- Ability to meet tight deadlines
- Excellent oral and written communications skills in English, especially in drafting and editing reports

## EVALUATOR ETHICS

---

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

## PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

---

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

%	Milestone
10%	At contract signing
40%	Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report
50%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report

## APPLICATION PROCESS

---

Applicants are requested to apply online (indicate the site, such as <http://jobs.undp.org>, etc.) by (date). Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions. The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in English with indication of the e-mail and phone contact. Shortlisted candidates

will be requested to submit a price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs).

UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

## ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

### Logical Framework and Objectively Verifiable Impact Indicators

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators				
<b>Goal</b>	Better managed land provides the basis for ecosystems services and for meeting national development needs				
	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
<b>Objective</b> – To create the enabling environment (policy, capacity, knowledge, alternatives) necessary for adoption of sustainable LM practices and alleviate environmental degradation while improving livelihoods of the farming communities of the CHZ.	1. % decrease of degraded land area in Serejeka sub-zoba	Relevant baseline values to be established during inception phase; measure of current extent of land degradation will include, but will not be limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Land area (ha) of sub-zoba with signs of soil erosion</li> <li>- Ha of land area deforested, using long-term time series</li> <li>- Liters of water abstraction for agricultural use (irrigation) per ha (distribution map)</li> <li>- Soil fertility levels (baselines to be established at pilot village level); relevant measures to be determined</li> <li>- Level of NRM yields (e.g. crops)</li> </ul>	Overall 25% decrease in degraded area; individual targets to be developed as per established measure during inception period	Baseline report/ verification; of current (project start and project process) situation; GIS based and research based assessments (e.g. part of SLM models); link to Transects done by MoA/NARI a relevant  Project progress reports (PIR/APR)  Local level M&E and SLM resource tracking  MoA annual assessment	No prevalence of severe droughts
	2. Ha of land under new (private) land tenure arrangements	Currently the 1994 Land Proclamation is not applied and 0 ha of land in the Serejeka sub-zoba are under long-term private ownership/ tenure	More than 50% of land in the sub-zoba are under private title, following the provisions of the 1994 Land Proclamation	Under the 1994 Land Proclamation registered Title deeds; registrar of the Land Administration  Project progress reports (PIR/APR)	Implementation of Land Proclamation rolls out to plan
	3. Decrease of population living below the poverty	Currently 66% of the population in Serejeka sub-zoba live below the poverty line (according to the international definition	The poverty rate is reduced to at least 40% in the sub-zoba	Xxx (assessment report that provides baseline)  Baseline report/ verification; of current (project start and project process) situation	No unforeseeable disasters occur such as extreme weather (e.g.

	line in Serejeka sub-zoba	of poverty; assessed in xxx through xxx)		Project M&E Plan to be developed during inception phase	severe drought) or war
<b>Outcome 1</b>  Replicable models of SLM are developed and representative communities use them to manage land in 28 villages of the central highland that are representative of the major agro-ecological zone for central highlands, reducing the rate of land degradation	4. % Increase in land (ha) managed through community-level SLM plans	Currently no community-level SLM plans are in place <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No of villages with functional SLM plans in place</li> <li>- Area (ha) managed through application of SLM plans</li> </ul>	The management of land in Serejeka sub-zoba is guided by community level SLM plans (the Serejeka sub-zoba constitutes approximately 240,000 ha and 28 villages are situated in the sub-zoba)	Baseline report/ verification; precise ha and village nos through GIS assessment  Community level SLM plans  Project progress reports (PIR/APR)  Mid-term review and end of project evaluation	Communities are willing to participate
	5. Ratio of source of household incomes in the 28 pilot villages - income from agriculture versus other alternative income sources	Baseline to be established during inception phase for pilot villages (Survey)	Ratios clearly indicate income diversification (as a measure of resilience); final targets to be established during inception phase	Socio-economic baseline survey to be conducted in the 28 identified pilot villages during inception phase  Subsequently: Local level M&E and SLM resource tracking  Project progress reports (PIR/APR)	Enabling environment to allow communities to establish economically meaningful alternative incomes is given
	6. No. of households in 28 pilot villages benefiting from application of Land Proclamation	Currently the 1994 Land Proclamation is not applied and 0 households in the pilot area are currently benefiting from its application	More than 50% of rural/ land based households benefit from private tenure, following the provisions of the 1994 Land Proclamation	Under the 1994 Land Proclamation registered Title deeds; registrar of the Land Administration  Project progress reports (PIR/APR)	Implementation of Land Proclamation rolls out to plan

<b>Outcome 2</b>  A system of knowledge management (KM) for SLM is developed and used to achieve SLM through mainstreaming of SLM principles into the regional and national development programs, projects, strategies, policies and legislation	7. Increased knowledge about SLM practices amongst all project key stakeholders/ SLM platform members	Knowledge baseline to be established during KCAS development during inception phase (Knowledge & Awareness survey amongst representative sample of key stakeholder groups)	50% of population in 28 pilot villages and 100% of all extension personnel reach knowledge and awareness target (set after baseline survey)	Knowledge and Awareness baseline survey to be undertaken at onset of project  Periodic M&E; e.g. in line with mid-term and end-of project evaluations	Baseline study to be undertaken at onset of project
	8. Coordinated SLM KM “platform” operational and self-sustaining	No formal SLM-KM “platform” exists to date	A minimum of 7 SLM-KM “platforms” established (1 national, 3 regional and 3 sub-regional)	Component reports (on KM; potentially outsourced and governed through contract)  Project progress reports (PIR/APR)  Mid-term and end-of project evaluations	
	9. Evidence of successful mainstreaming of SLM principles in key policies	The existing draft land use policy does not integrate SLM principles and standards	SLM fully integrated (mainstreamed) into the new, approved land use policy	Discussion paper on land use policy  Final reviewed policy document	Land Use policy process follows relevant timeline
	10. Zoba and sub-zoba annual budgets (in target area) include allocations for replication/adoption of SLM models to new villages and for the extension and implementation of SLM activities	Baseline information on Zobas and sub zobas budget allocated to SLM practices will be determined during the inception phase	40 % increment on their budget for SLM practices	Annual budgets of zoba and sub-zoba	Government/ zoba administration are transparent (e.g. allowing a review of their budget)

<b>Outcome 3</b>  Capacity building programs and adaptive management systems are developed at all levels for improved governance of SLM, particularly enabling grass root community to implement improved SLM	11. % of annual increase in budget available for implementation of Capacity Support Strategy and Action plan (CSSAP) (in pilot area)	Baseline value for CSSAP implementation to be determined during CSSAP	Annual increase of at least 15% (target value to be verified during baseline assessment) including from co-financing sources	CSSAP baseline survey  Project progress reports (PIR/APR)  Co-financing figures (to be tracked as part of ongoing project management)  Mid-term and end-of project evaluations	(Increasing) Budget availability in Eritrea
	12. No. of individuals that apply the through the project developed extension packages	No extension package available; baseline of people who apply packages is 0%	80% of all land managers in the 28 pilot villages use the packages; additionally more than 150 land managers in “replicate” areas do so; 100% of extension officers in Maekel zoba are knowledgeable about the extension packages and use them in their extension work	KCAS baseline survey; survey to be conducted as part of extension package dissemination strategy Project progress reports (PIR/APR)  Mid-term and end-of project evaluations	
	13. Ratio of US\$ leveraged through SLM relevant carbon finance project (s) and reinvestment into CCA activities in pilot area	Currently no SLM relevant carbon finance project identified	At least one project identified, prepared and under implementation	CC reports (UNFCCC focal point)  Project progress reports (PIR/APR)  Mid-term and end-of project evaluations	CDM successfully established in Eritrea
<b>Outcome 4</b>  Learning, evaluation, and adaptive management increased	14. Level of performance score achieved in scheduled evaluations	Project design: to establish performance score (use GEF BD score as guidance)	A minimum of satisfactory performance (approx. 50% of all scheduled activities implemented to plan) at mid-term of project ; at least 90% at end of project	Project progress reports (PIR/APR)  Mid-term and end-of project evaluations	Relevant performance score developed (e.g. based on BD SPs)

## ANNEX B: LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE EVALUATORS

1. *Sustainable Land Management Project document, progress reports and PIR reports*
2. *PIR*
3. *Prodoc (SLM)*
4. *Progress Reports*
5. *Common Country Assessment report*
6. *United Nations – Eritrea Strategic Partnership Cooperation Framework (SPCF)*
7. *SPCF Mid Term Evaluation Report (2013-2014)*
8. *National Development and sector Strategies, Plans and Policies*
9. *UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD) 2013 – 2016*
10. *UNDP Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) 2013-2016*
11. *Country Programme Strategy for utilization of OP5 grant funds :The GEF – Small Grants Programme/Eritrea*
12. *Millennium Development Goals Reports in Eritrea*
13. *UNDP Results-Oriented Annual Report (ROAR) for Eritrea (2013-2015)*
14. *National Human Development Reports*
15. *UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluation for results*
16. *UNDP Guidelines for Outcome Evaluators*
17. *UN Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation*



## ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

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

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
<b>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?</b>			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
<b>Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?</b>			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•		•	•
<b>Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?</b>			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
<b>Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?</b>			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
<b>Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?</b>			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•

## ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

<b><i>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&amp;E, I&amp;E Execution</i></b> 6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings 5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings 4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS) 3: Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings 2: Unsatisfactory (U): major problems 1: Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems	<b><i>Sustainability ratings:</i></b> 4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks	<b><i>Relevance ratings</i></b> 2. Relevant (R) 1.. Not relevant (NR)  <b><i>Impact Ratings:</i></b> 3. Significant (S) 2. Minimal (M) 1. Negligible (N)
<b><i>Additional ratings where relevant:</i></b> Not Applicable (N/A) Unable to Assess (U/A)		

## ANNEX E: EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT AND AGREEMENT FORM

### Evaluators:

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

### Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form<sup>3</sup>

#### 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: \_\_\_\_\_

<sup>3</sup>[www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct](http://www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct)

## ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE<sup>4</sup>

---

- i. Opening page:
  - Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
  - UNDP and GEF project ID#s.
  - Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report
  - Region and countries included in the project
  - GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program
  - Implementing Partner and other project partners
  - Evaluation team members
  - Acknowledgements
- ii. Executive Summary
  - Project Summary Table
  - Project Description (brief)
  - Evaluation Rating Table
  - Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons
- iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations  
(See: UNDP Editorial Manual<sup>5</sup>)
- 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<sup>6</sup>)
- 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

---

<sup>4</sup>The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

<sup>5</sup> UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

<sup>6</sup> Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations.

- Project Finance:
  - Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (\*)
  - UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (\*) coordination, and operational issues
- 3.3** Project Results
- Overall results (attainment of objectives) (\*)
  - Relevance(\*)
  - Effectiveness & Efficiency (\*)
  - Country ownership
  - Mainstreaming
  - Sustainability (\*)
  - Impact
- 4.** Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons
- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
  - Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
  - Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
  - Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success
- 5.** Annexes
- ToR
  - Itinerary
  - List of persons interviewed
  - Summary of field visits
  - List of documents reviewed
  - Evaluation Question Matrix
  - Questionnaire used and summary of results
  - Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

## ANNEX G: EVALUATION REPORT CLEARANCE FORM

---

*(to be completed by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and included in the final document)*

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

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

UNDP GEF RTA

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

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