

## UNDP-GEF: TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR TERMINAL EVALUATION

### Reducing Disaster Risks from Wildfire Hazards Associated with Climate change in South Africa

#### 1. INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP supported, GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) set out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the full-sized project- “Reducing Disaster Risks from Wildfire Hazards Associated with Climate change in South Africa” (PIMS 3947) implemented through the South African Department of Environmental Affairs. The prodoc was signed on April 13<sup>th</sup>, 2012. The project has been extended until 13 April 2016. The Terminal evaluation to be undertaken in 2016.

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

Project Title:	Reducing Disaster Risks from Wildfire Hazards Associated with Climate change in South Africa			
UNDP Project ID:	PIMS 3947	<b>Project financing</b>	<i>at endorsement (Million US\$)</i>	<i>at MTE (Million US\$)</i>
ATLAS Project ID:	00076680 (ZAF10)	GEF financing:	3,536,400	3,536,400
Country:	South Africa	IA/EA own:	180,000 (UNDP)	
Region:	Africa	Government:	30,122,000 (National DEA and Western Cape DAFF)	
Focal Area:	Climate Change Adaptation (SCCF)	Other:	638,100.00	
GEF Focal Area Strategic Program	<b>CCA-1 Reduce vulnerability to the adverse impacts of climate change</b>	Total co-financing:	30,940,100.00	
Executing Agency:	Department of Environment (DEA), Government of South Africa	Total Project Cost <b>in cash</b> :	34,476,500	
Other Partners involved:	Western Cape DAFF, Fire Protection Associations, FFA Group	ProDoc Signature (date project began):	13 April 2012	
			Planned closing date: 13 April 2015	Revised closing date: 13 April 2016

#### 2. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION AND OBJECTIVES

South Africa's draft Second National Communication (SNC, 2010) predicts the following general climate change trends for South Africa: (i) Assuming a moderate to high growth in greenhouse gas concentrations, by 2050 the coast is likely to warm by around 1-2°C and the interior by around 2-3°C. After 2050, under emissions scenarios that assume little mitigation effort, the rate of warming is projected to reach around 3-4°C along the coast and 6-7°C in the interior; and (ii) Rainfall projections for the summer rainfall region of the country show a tendency towards wetting, and for the winter rainfall region towards drying.

While wildland fires are a natural feature of fire-driven ecosystems in the country, changes in climate are having adverse effects through altering the future occurrence of wildland fires, and the area burned, in various ways that involve weather conditions conducive to combustion, fuels to burn and ignition agents. The wildland fire situation has worsened significantly across South Africa during the past several years. There have been major and catastrophic fires in many areas. Land use patterns are also changing rapidly under the influence of diverse factors, including the expansion of towns and cities, causing an expanding Wildland Urban Interface (WUI), and exposing more assets to the hazard of wildland fires.

The Fynbos Biome is identified in South Africa's Initial National Communication (INC, 2003) as the most vulnerable region in the country with respect to disaster risks from wildland fire due to patterns of urbanization, agriculture and potential impacts upon water catchment areas. Project activities are thus spatially focused in the Fynbos Biome.

The project was designed to develop the adaptive capacity of: (i) Fire Protection Associations (FPAs); (ii) the individual members of these FPAs; and (iii) communities at risk in the WUI, to more effectively manage the risks associated with an anticipated increase in impacts of climate-induced wildland fires in the Fynbos Biome.

This adaptive capacity is designed to be improved, as a result of the following suite of complementary project interventions: (i) expanding FPAs across the landscape, and rationalising their configuration and governance arrangements; (ii) adopting Integrated Fire Management (IFM) as a strategic adaptation approach to the increase in, and impacts of, climate-induced wildland fires; (iii) equipping, resourcing, staffing, financing and training of FPAs and FPA members to implement IFM; (iv) improving the quality of weather data, fire danger forecasting, early fire detection information and fire spread models; (v) mapping of annual pre-fire season risks to facilitate the implementation of mitigation measures to reduce environmental, social and economic risks; (vi) developing and implementing a suite of incentives to encourage a behavioural change in landowners and communities at risk; and (vii) improving the information and decision-support tools required to support the implementation of IFM.

The project's objective is to develop and implement integrated disaster risk management strategies to address climate change-induced fire hazards and risks. The project has three outcomes – along with their associated outputs and activities - which will contribute towards achieving the project objective.

These are-

Outcome 1: Capacity built at local level to manage increased incidence and extent of fires;

Outcome 2: Decision-support and risk management systems for fire management improved; and

Outcome 3: Innovative risk reduction interventions implemented.

### **3. OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE OF THIS TERMINAL EVALUATION (TE)**

The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

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

The project performance will be measured based on the indicators of the project's logical framework (see Annex 1).

The Terminal Evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The consultant 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 consultant is expected to conduct field missions to the Fynbos Biome, including the following project sites

Greater Cederberg FPA, Overberg District, Southern Cape FPA, Cape Winelands District and Cape Peninsula FPA. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

1. UNDP staff who carry out implementing responsibilities;
2. Executing agencies (including but not limited to staff of the project management unit, senior officials and task team/component leaders, some authorities, key experts and consultants in the subject area);
3. The Project Board members;
4. Project stakeholders and intended beneficiaries; including landowners, local government and local communities.

An evaluation consultant will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, progress reports, minutes of Project Board meetings, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the consultant considers useful for this evidence-based review. A list of documents that the project team and UNDP Country Office will provide to the consultant is included in Annex 2 of this Terms of Reference.

#### 4. EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

An overall approach and method for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The reviewer is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact, as defined and explained in the [UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects](#). A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR (see Annex 3). The reviewer is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The reviewer is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders.

#### 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 1), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The review will at a minimum cover the criteria of: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact. Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in TOR Annex 4. A useful table to include in the evaluation report is set out below.

Rating Project Performance		
Criteria	Rating	Comments
<b>Monitoring and Evaluation:</b> 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 entry/project start up	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
M&E Plan Implementation	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
<b>IA &amp; EA Execution:</b> 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)	
Quality of Implementing Agency (IA) Implementation	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Quality of Executing Agency (EA) Execution	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
<b>Outcomes</b> 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)	
<b>Sustainability:</b> Likely (L); Moderately Likely (ML); Moderately Unlikely (MU); Unlikely (U)		
Overall likelihood of 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)	
<b>Impact: Significant (S), Minimal (M), Negligible (N)</b>		
Environmental Status Improvement	(rate 3 pt. scale)	
Environmental Stress Reduction	(rate 3 pt. scale)	
Progress towards stress/status change	(rate 3 pt. scale)	
<b>Overall Project Results</b>	(rate 6 pt. scale)	

#### PROJECT FINANCE / CO-FINANCE

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

Co-financing (type/source)	UNDP own financing (mill. US\$)	Government (mill. US\$)	Partner Agency (mill. US\$)	Total (mill. US\$)
-------------------------------	------------------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------

	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual
Grants								
Loans/Concessions								
▪ In-kind support								
▪ Other								
Totals								

## MAINSTREAMING

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

## IMPACT

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

## CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

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

## IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this review resides with the UNDP Country Office (UNDP CO) in Pretoria, South Africa. The UNDP CO will contract the consultant and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the consultant. The FynbosFire project team will be responsible for liaising with the consultant to set up stakeholder interviews arrange field visits with missions to the Eastern and Western Cape. .

## EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

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

Activity	Timing	Anticipated Completion Date (approx. dates)
<b>Preparation</b> (Inception phase, desk top review and the submission of the inception report)	5 days	The week of 8 February 2016
<b>Evaluation Mission</b>	10 days	15 – 26 February 2016
<b>Draft Evaluation Report</b>	8 days	29 Feb-11 March 2016
<b>Final Report</b>	2 days	2-3 April 2016

## 5. TERMINAL EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
Inception Report	Evaluation consultant clarifies timing and method of review, proposes the timeline of the review process, including the proposed field mission itinerary developed in consultation with the Project Management Unit	Two week after the contract signature. No later than 1 week before the review mission	Evaluation consultant submits to UNDP (Country Office and Regional Technical Advisor) with PMU in copy.  PMU is expected to provide support to the consultant to develop the mission itinerary and schedule interviews to ensure the maximum exposure of the consultant to the project.
Presentation	Initial Findings	End of review mission	To project management and UNDP (Country Office and RTA)
Draft Report	Full report (as template in annex 6) with annexes	Within 2 weeks of the review mission	Sent to UNDP (CO & RTA), PMU, GEF OFP, and all other stakeholders interviewed/contacted for their review and comments  Evaluation consultant will receive any comments directly from stakeholders for his/her consideration.
Final Report	Revised report, with audit trail detailing how all received comment have (and have not) been addressed in the final review report.	Within 1 week of receiving comments on draft	Sent to UNDP CO.

## 6. REQUIRED QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE

One independent reviewer will conduct the evaluation. The consultant will not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities. The consultant should have prior experience in reviewing or evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage.

The evaluator must present the following qualifications:

- Masters Degree with minimum 10 years of relevant professional experience;
- Solid understanding and proven record of project and project cycle management and application of adaptive management;
- Demonstrable analytical skills;
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evidence-based evaluation;
- Experience in applying SMART indicators and strong competency in Logframe approach;
- Knowledge of UNDP and GEF, in particular UNDP programming in South Africa and GEF Biodiversity strategies;
- Project evaluation experiences of UNDP project in general and financed by GEF in particular will be considered a strong advantage;
- Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s), including Biodiversity;
- Excellent English writing skills, ability to communicate complex, technical information to technical and general audiences in a clear manner both orally and in writing, ability to communicate with different stakeholders with various perspectives and views in a construction manner;
- Experience working in Africa. Experience in South Africa would be an advantage.

## EVALUATOR ETHICS

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex 5) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG '[Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations](#)'.

## 7. PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

%	Milestone
10%	At submission and approval of inception report
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

## 8. APPLICATION PROCESS

All applications including [P11 form](#), CV, technical and financial proposals should be submitted by email at following address ONLY: [procurement.za@undp.org](mailto:procurement.za@undp.org) by 18:00 January 29, 2016. Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

**Recommended Presentation of Proposal:** Introduction about the consultant/CV; Proposed methodology and workplan (max 1 page); Financial proposal, including proposed fee and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc).

**Criteria for Evaluation of Proposal:** The selection will be made based on the educational background and experience on similar assignments. The price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total score and the technical score (from CV/P11 and proposed methodology will weigh as 70% of the total score).

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 1: FYNBOS Project logframe

<b>This project will contribute to achieving the following Outcome as defined in the CP:</b> Enhanced delivery of basic services through improved governance and planning capacities at the provincial and local levels (Energy and environment for sustainable development)
<b>Country Programme Outcome Indicators:</b> Enhanced planning capacity of provinces & district municipalities to deliver services; Enhanced involvement of local communities in MDG-based integrated development planning
<b>Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area:</b> Promote climate change adaptation
<b>Applicable GEF SCCF Goal:</b> Support developing countries to become climate resilient by promoting both immediate and longer-term adaptation measures in development policies, plans, programs, projects and actions
<b>Applicable GEF Expected Impact:</b> Reduced absolute economic losses at country level due to climate change, including variability
<b>Applicable GEF Impact Indicator:</b> Economic loss trend over a project period and beyond due to climate change, including variability

	Indicator	Baseline	Target/s (End of Project)	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions																								
<p><b>Project Objective</b></p> <p>Develop and implement integrated disaster risk management strategies to address climate change-induced fire hazards and risks.</p>	<p>Increased number and extent (ha) of non-damaging wildfires (i.e. 'minor' and 'insignificant' fires, as described in <a href="#">section 2.5</a>) per annum in the Fynbos Biome<sup>1</sup></p> <p>and</p> <p>Decreased number and extent (ha) of damaging veld fires (i.e. damaging and catastrophic fires, as described in <a href="#">section 2.5</a>) per annum in the Fynbos Biome</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Non-Damaging veld fires</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Area (ha)</th> <th>No.</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>145,200</td> <td>1,580</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Catastrophic fires</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Area (ha)</th> <th>No.</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>74,800</td> <td>420</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Based on the 5-year average of 2000 fires/annum covering an area of 220,000ha/annum. (the baseline info)</p>	Non-Damaging veld fires		Area (ha)	No.	145,200	1,580	Catastrophic fires		Area (ha)	No.	74,800	420	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Non-Damaging veld fires</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Area (ha)</th> <th>No.</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>&gt;165,000</td> <td>&gt;1,700</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Catastrophic fires</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Area (ha)</th> <th>No.</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>&lt;52,500 (or 30% reduction)</td> <td>&lt;300 (or 30% decrease)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The total areas burned (by non-damaging and damaging combined) might not show a significant reduction by the end of the project implementation; however, the socioeconomic consequences left by non-damaging veld fire and those by catastrophic fires are significantly different<sup>2</sup>.</p>	Non-Damaging veld fires		Area (ha)	No.	>165,000	>1,700	Catastrophic fires		Area (ha)	No.	<52,500 (or 30% reduction)	<300 (or 30% decrease)	<p>National Veldfire Information System</p> <p>AFIS records</p> <p>FPA/UFPA Fire reports</p>	<p><b>Assumptions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- WoF and WfW continues to receive adequate EPWP funding to maintain or increase its current capacity in IFM and invasive alien plant control respectively</li> <li>- Fire-prone developments in the WUI do not significantly increase in number and extent</li> <li>- The number of days where the risks of fire (as measured by the Fire Danger Index) are dangerously high follow the predicted climate trends</li> </ul> <p><b>Risks:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Failure to contain the spread of flammable woody invasive species adds to fuel loads</li> <li>- Municipalities fail to adopt a more proactive approach to wildland fire risk mitigation and pre-fire season preparedness</li> <li>- The financial allocation of public resources for IFM in wildland areas is incrementally reduced</li> <li>- Communities living in the WUI fail to cooperate in wildfire protection measures</li> </ul>
Non-Damaging veld fires																													
Area (ha)	No.																												
145,200	1,580																												
Catastrophic fires																													
Area (ha)	No.																												
74,800	420																												
Non-Damaging veld fires																													
Area (ha)	No.																												
>165,000	>1,700																												
Catastrophic fires																													
Area (ha)	No.																												
<52,500 (or 30% reduction)	<300 (or 30% decrease)																												

<sup>1</sup> Where the 5-year average for the baseline is 2000 fires/annum covering an area of 220,000ha/annum.

<sup>2</sup> To track the effectiveness of the project intervention by various socioeconomic impacts associated with the fires, the project will develop an appropriate indicator during the inception phase through further stakeholder consultation. (e.g., recovery costs from a fire incident, etc.)

<b>Outcome 1</b>  Capacity built at local level to manage increased incidence and extent of fires	<b>Outputs:</b> 1.1 Reconfiguration and governance options for FPAs are assessed and tested 1.2 Management capabilities of FPAs strengthened 1.3 Skills and competency levels of FPA members in IFM developed 1.4 Financial sustainability of FPAs enhanced				
	Number of FPAs <sup>3</sup> integrated into, and aligned with, the affected municipal structures (including the municipal land use planning, fire brigade and disaster management services).	1	>6	Annual performance audit of FPAs in the Fynbos Biome Municipal IDPs	<b>Assumptions:</b> - FPAs continue to be endorsed by government as an appropriate institutional structure to promote a partnership approach in reducing the frequency and severity of wildland fires - DAFF develops the capacity to fulfil a regulatory and oversight function to FPAs  <b>Risks:</b> - Municipalities fail to adopt a more proactive approach to wildland fire risk mitigation and pre-fire season preparedness - Private landowners do not register as members of FPAs and/or do not participate in the planning and implementation of preventative wildland fire measures in FPAs - The financial allocation of public resources for IFM in wildland areas is incrementally reduced
	Number of FPAs with the adaptive capacity <sup>4</sup> to effectively manage the risks associated with climate-induced fires	0	>6	Annual performance audit of FPAs in the Fynbos Biome	
	Number of wildland fire management staff completing specialized training and/or skills development in adaptation-related fire management technologies	0	>30 (short courses) >4 (full-time courses)	Training reports of fire management agencies. Project implementation reports.	
	Number of FPAs with adequate sustainable financing sources <sup>5</sup> to mitigate the increasing risk of wildfires as a consequence of climate change	1	>6	Annual performance audit of FPAs in the Fynbos Biome	

<sup>3</sup> Reference to FPAs in the PRF only refers to those FPAs located in the Fynbos Biome.

<sup>4</sup> This 'adaptive capacity' is assessed in terms of the following criteria: formally registered with DAFF; minimum staffing complement in place; FPA linked to a FDCC; minimum communications infrastructure and equipment in place; functioning management structure; Integrated Fire Management Strategy adopted; FPA rules and regulations adopted and audited; annual pre-fire season risk assessment undertaken; weather and fire danger forecasts disseminated to members daily; and annual pre-fire season planning and implementation of fire management measures.

<sup>5</sup> This will be determined by the ability of each FPA to sustain its minimum capacity (including regulatory, administrative, planning, communications, staffing, infrastructure and equipment) requirements.

<b>Outcome 2</b> Decision-support and risk management systems for fire management improved	<b>Outputs:</b> 2.1 Key fire management information collated and managed 2.2 Improved weather data used to develop and distribute locally relevant fire danger indices 2.3 Decision-support tools developed for FPAs 2.4 Wildland fire behavior modeling improves fire danger forecasting 2.5 Climate-change induced wildfire risk levels defined at local landscape scale 2.6 Wildland fire hazard assessments of 'communities at risk' in WUI undertaken, and risk management measures developed				
	Number of FPAs with functional, populated (i.e. data) and networked AFIS field terminals	0	6	Annual FPA performance audits	<b>Assumptions:</b> - The NVIS is established and operational - FPAs adopt the AFIS as an 'industry standard' - Relevant spatial and temporal data is available for undertaking fire risk assessments at both the landscape (FPA) and WUI scale - Municipal disaster management plans have a specific section focused on fire risk management  <b>Risks:</b> - Failure to contain the spread of flammable woody invasive species adds to fuel loads - Municipalities fail to adopt a more proactive approach to wildland fire risk mitigation and pre-fire season preparedness - Private landowners do not register as members of FPAs and/or do not participate in the planning and implementation of preventative wildland fire measures in FPAs - The financial allocation of public resources for IFM in wildland areas is incrementally reduced - Communities living in the WUI fail to cooperate in wildfire protection measures
	Coverage (ha) of area where fires are detected, profiled (for risk) and tracked by the FPA AFIS field terminals	0 ha	>4 million ha	NVIS National AFIS and AFIS Field terminal data Fire Reports	
	Number of AWSs recording local weather conditions under a changing climate regime in the high altitude mountain areas of the Fynbos Biome	<10	>50	Project implementation reports AFIS field terminals weather data history	
	Average percentage (across all FPAs) of FPA members receiving localised daily fire danger forecasts	<5%	>80%	Annual performance audit of FPAs in the Fynbos Biome	
	Extent (ha) of the Fynbos Biome with a local landscape level wildfire risk rating that integrates climate change scenarios into the risk assessment	~0ha	>3 million ha	FPA risk assessment maps	
	Number of municipalities (local, district and metropolitan) with climate-based fire risk information for wildlands integrated into the municipal disaster management plans.	0	>6	Municipal IDPs Municipal Disaster Management Plans	

<b>Outcome 3</b> Innovative reduction interventions implemented	<b>Outputs:</b> 3.1 A suite of incentives to encourage implementation of IFM measures developed 3.2 Wildland fire extension programme piloted in FPAs 3.3 Fire and insurance scheme developed 3.4 Cost-effectiveness of different fuel management measures in the WUI assessed				
	Percentage of landowners in the demonstration areas (Southern Cape FPA and Cedarberg FPA) that are paid up members of the FPA, and conform with the FPA rules and regulations	<20%	>60%	Annual FPA performance audits	<b>Assumptions:</b> - The development of fire insurance products for FPA members and 'communities at risk' is a viable investment for the insurance industry - FPA members and communities living in the WUI will respond positively to the suite of incentives developed by the project  <b>Risks:</b> - Failure to contain the spread of flammable woody invasive species adds to fuel loads - Municipalities fail to adopt a more proactive approach to wildland fire risk mitigation and pre-fire season preparedness - Private landowners do not register as members of FPAs and/or do not participate in the planning and implementation of preventative wildland fire measures in FPAs - The financial allocation of public resources for IFM in wildland areas is incrementally reduced - Communities living in the WUI fail to cooperate in wildfire protection measures
	Number of private landowners in FPAs instituting proactive risk management measures in response to insurance-based incentives	<10 (est.)	>100	Survey of private landowners in FPAs Insurance industry reports	
	Number of households in the targeted WUI areas that have an improved resilience to outbreaks of climate-induced wildfires	0	>2500	Project implementation reports Insurance industry reports	

## **Annex 2: List of Documents**

1. Project Document
2. Project implementation reports (APR/PIR's)
3. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
4. Project budget and financial data
5. Audit reports
6. The Mission Reports and Lessons learnt study
7. M&E Operational Guidelines, all monitoring reports prepared by the project
8. Financial and Administration guidelines
9. Midterm Review (MTR) report
10. List of contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Board and other partners to be consulted

The following documents will also be available:

11. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
12. Minutes of FYNBOS Meetings
13. Minutes of the FYNBOS Project Steering Committee Meetings
14. Maps (included in the Project document)
15. The GEF Completion Report guidelines; and
16. UNDP Monitoring and Evaluation Frameworks
17. UNDP Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF)
18. UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD)
19. UNDP Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP)
20. GEF focal area strategic program objectives

**Annex 3: Evaluation Questions**

This Evaluation Criteria Matrix must be fully completed/amended by the consultant and included in the TE inception report and as an Annex to the TE report.

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•		•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•

**Annex 4: Terminal Evaluation Rating Scale**

<b><i>Ratings for Effectiveness, Efficiency, Overall Project Outcome Rating, M&amp;E, IA &amp; EA Execution</i></b>	<b><i>Sustainability ratings:</i></b>	<b><i>Relevance ratings</i></b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6. Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings</li> <li>5. Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings</li> <li>4. Moderately Satisfactory (MS): moderate shortcomings</li> <li>3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings</li> <li>2. Unsatisfactory (U): major shortcomings</li> <li>1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe shortcomings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability</li> <li>3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks</li> <li>2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks</li> <li>1. Unlikely (U): severe risks</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Relevant (R)</li> <li>1. Not relevant (NR)</li> </ul>
<p><b><i>Additional ratings where relevant:</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not Applicable (N/A)</li> <li>Unable to Assess (U/A)</li> </ul>		

## Annex 5: 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>6</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>6</sup> [www.unevaluation.org/uneqcodeofconduct](http://www.unevaluation.org/uneqcodeofconduct)

## Annex 6: Table of Contents for the Terminal Evaluation Report

- 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 consultant name
  - 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>7</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>8</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

---

<sup>7</sup> UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

<sup>8</sup> See Annex 4 for rating scales.

- 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 (\*), implementation (\*), and overall assessment (\*)
  - Implementing Agency (UNDP) execution (\*) and Executing Agency execution (\*), overall project implementation/ execution (\*), coordination, and operational issues
- 3.3** Project Results
- Overall results (attainment of objectives) (\*)
  - Relevance (\*)
  - Effectiveness (\*)
  - Efficiency (\*)
  - Country ownership
  - Mainstreaming
  - Sustainability: financial resources (\*), socio-economic (\*), institutional framework and governance (\*), environmental (\*), and overall likelihood (\*)
  - 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
  - Co-financing table (if not already included in the report)
  - *Annexed in a separate file:* TE audit trail

