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1. **Background and Context**

The UN-REDD Programme is the United Nations Joint collaborative initiative on Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and forest Degradation (REDD) in developing countries. The Programme was launched in 2008 and builds on the convening role and technical expertise of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), referred to as the participating UN organizations. The UN-REDD Programme supports nationally-led REDD+ processes and promotes the informed and meaningful involvement of all stakeholders, including Indigenous Peoples and other forest-dependent communities, in national and international REDD+ implementation.

The UN-REDD Programme supports national REDD+ readiness efforts in two ways: (i) direct support to the design and implementation of UN-REDD National Programmes; and (ii) complementary support to national REDD+ action through common approaches, analyses, methodologies, tools, data and best practices developed through the UN-REDD Global Programme.

* 1. **UN-REDD Programme – Zambia Quick Start Initiative**

**Table 1: Programme information**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Programme title:** | UN-REDD Programme – Zambia Quick Start Initiative |
| **Programme Objectives:** | The Programme's objectives are: (a) to build institutional and stakeholder capacity to implement REDD+; (b) to develop an enabling policy environment for REDD+; (c) to develop REDD+ benefit-sharing model; and (d) to develop Measurement, Reporting and Verification (MRV) systems for REDD+ |
| **Approval date:** | 18.03.2010 | **Fund transfer date:** | 03.11.2010 |
| **Completion date:** | 30.06.2015 | **Non cost extension date:** | 30.08.2013 |

* + 1. **Objective, Expected Outcomes and Outputs**

The goal of the programme is to prepare Zambian institutions and stakeholders for effective nationwide implementation of the REDD+ mechanism. The specific programme objectives are to:

i) Build institutional and stakeholder capacity to implement REDD+

ii) Develop an enabling policy environment for REDD+

iii) Develop REDD+ benefit-sharing models

iv) Develop Monitoring, Reporting and Verification (MRV) systems for REDD+

**Outcome 1. Capacity to manage REDD+ Readiness strengthened**

This outcome will build capacity support for executing the National Joint Programme (NJP) by integrating it into the national development planning process and overall climate change strategy. Communication is also a key aspect of this outcome with analysis of lessons learned and establishment of a communication framework. In addition capacity, will be built with respect to financial and managerial support. The outputs are as follows:

* Output 1.1: REDD+ Readiness coordination and management bodies established and functioning.
* Output 1.2: REDD+ Readiness Process integrated into the national development planning process.
* Output 1.3: Communication and advocacy strategy as input in overall climate change strategy developed and implemented.
* Output 1.4: Mapping and gap analysis of relevant initiatives undertaken.

**Outcome 2. Broad-based stakeholder support for REDD+ established**

This outcome requires the involvement of a wide range of stakeholders, ranging from local community groups and the general public to government departments and international donors. It is therefore of critical importance that an effective means of stakeholder participation is established to ensure the timely implementation of REDD+ in Zambia. The outputs are as follows:

* Output 2.1: Stakeholders engagement process functioning. REDD+ requires commitment and involvement from affected stakeholders and it is therefore necessary to develop a stakeholder engagement framework. A key element of this framework is to promote a continuous and proactive engagement process within REDD+ in Zambia. Support of ongoing REDD+ initiatives undertaken by NGOs, the private sector and bilateral partners will be made possible through this output.
* Output 2.2: Conflict resolution and redress mechanism reviewed.

.

**Outcome 3. National governance framework and institutional capacities for the implementation of REDD+ strengthened**

This outcome builds the capacity for Zambia to effectively execute REDD+ nationally. It will develop the institutional, legal and financial mechanisms for supporting REDD+ related initiatives. The outputs are as follows:

* Output 3.1: Institutional capacity to implement REDD+ framework developed.
* Output 3.2: National REDD+ Strategy process integrated into the national development planning process.
* Output 3.3: Legislative framework to facilitate implementation of REDD+ strengthened.
* Output 3.4: Mechanism to administrate and channel REDD+ finance established.
* Output 3.5: Benefit sharing model approved.

**Outcome 4. National REDD+ strategies identified**

Community-based REDD+ strategies need to be developed to counteract the drivers of

deforestation. These need to be socially and economically viable alternatives to deforestation to prevent losses being incurred by stakeholders. If any economic loss is incurred by communities, or the benefits are not transparent, sufficient or tangible, rates of deforestation and forest degradation are unlikely to be effectively reduced. The outputs are as follows:

* Output 4.1: Drivers of deforestation and forest degradation assessed.
* Output 4.2: Candidate activities for REDD+ identified.

**Outcome 5. MRV capacity to implement REDD+ strengthened**

This outcome will use existing methodologies to establish an effective Monitoring, Reporting and Verification (MRV) System for REDD+. The expected outputs are as follows:

* Output 5.1: REDD+ integrated with forestry inventory system (ILUA) opportunities.
* Output 5.2: Operational Land Monitoring System established and institutionalized.
* Output 5.3: GHG emissions and removals from forest lands estimated and reported.

**Outcome 6. Assessment of Reference emission level (REL) and Reference level (RL) undertaken**

The objective of this outcome is to support Zambia in its ability to report on emission reductions through REDD+ related activities. The expected outputs are as follows:

* Output 6.1: Historical rates of forest area and carbon stock changes reviewed.
* Output 6.2: National circumstances assessed.
	+ 1. **Executing Arrangements**

The REDD+ readiness programme is implemented by the REDD+ Coordination Unit (RCU) in close collaboration with the Technical Committee of the Interim Inter-Ministerial Climate Change committee (IICCS) and other Ministries and key stakeholders. The IICCS is the national institutional framework for coordinating climate change activities. It is worth mentioning that, at national level, the government has also encouraged the use of existing Institutional Arrangements to facilitate REDD+ processes. Notably, for example, the IICCS, aims to provide a coordination role to ensure harmonized approach to addressing climate change. The setting up of the Climate Change Secretariat has been a major achievement in the country, in terms of ensuring cross-sectoral collaboration and harmonization of policies on climate change. It equally provides a framework for integrating REDD+ issues across various sectors. In that sense, the REDD+ National Coordinator was institutionally relocated to this climate-change secretariat, to foster linkages between the REDD+ process and the overall climate change agenda.

The Coordination unit has worked with all the key stakeholders and partners across various Ministries through strong stakeholder engagement, strategic partnership building including with civil society, and facilitated mainstreaming into key national policy and development processes.

In addition, the UN-REDD National Programme has been fully integrated into the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) 2010-2015 now transiting to Sustainable Development Framework which coordinates all UN activities in Zambia. The UN-REDD programme in Zambia is also integrated into the United Nations Joint Programme on Climate Change.

* + 1. **Cost and Financing**

The total amount transferred to the UN-REDD Programme – Zambia Quick Start Initiative is US$ 4.49 million as shown in Table 2.

**Table 2: Programme Financing (US$)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Participating UN** **Organization** | **Amount allocated** | **Amount Transferred****from the UN-REDD** **Multi-Partner Trust Fund** |
| **FAO** | 2,180,000 | 2,180,000 |
| **UNDP** | 1,995,000 | 1,995,000 |
| **UNEP** | 315,001 | 315,001 |
| **Total:** | 293,738 | 293,738 |
|  | **4,490,000** | **4,490,000** |

* + 1. **Programme Implementation Status**

The UN-REDD programme has been implementing and concluding major outputs and outcomes in line with the Warsaw Framework. The National Programme was finalised officially on 31st December 2014. All the major outcomes and outputs of the programme have been achieved. It is important to mention that, the reporting on the progamme implementation status has been clustered and organized around the Warsaw Framework for ease of reporting and in line with the re-orientation of the national programme that took place in 2013. The following notable achievements have been made in Zambia:

1. **Strategy Development**: Zambia has developed a draft REDD+ Strategy, anchored on widespread stakeholder consultations, communication and knowledge management at national and provincial levels. The draft REDD+ strategy provides the overall vision, measures and actions to address deforestation and forest degradation in Zambia. It demonstrates the country’s global and national commitments to promote REDD+. Its vision is to realize a prosperous climate change resilient economy by 2030, anchored upon sustainable management and utilization of Zambia’s natural resources towards improved livelihoods.

Its goal is to contribute to national reductions in greenhouse gas emissions by improving forest and land management, and to ensure equitable sharing of both carbon and non-carbon benefits among stakeholders. The strategy is guided by seven core principles: effectiveness, efficiency, fairness, transparency, accountability, inclusiveness and sustainability. The strategy provides the framework to facilitate stakeholder consultations, ensure buy-in of the strategy as well as consensus building on how to address drivers of deforestation. Underpinning the strategy development are key studies including the drivers of deforestation, economic context of REDD+, the economic valuation of forests and ecosystem services, finance, incentives and benefit sharing opportunities for REDD+, amongst other (see annex 1 for full details).

Implementation of the national REDD+ strategy will focus on tackling different drivers of deforestation in both the forestry and other identified key sectors such as agriculture, energy, mining and land-use. The strategy will be implemented through a landscape approach at the watershed level and through national-level policy reforms. It will take into account all land uses in a holistic way (including water and wildlife) and will work to lessen the competition for natural resources among different sectors. The approach ensures that the best possible balance is achieved among a range of different development objectives, including climate change mitigation and adaptation, environmental and biodiversity conservation, enhanced economic productivity, and improved livelihoods. It also offers opportunities for Zambia to be supported in the implementation of its policies and measures as outlined in the draft national REDD+ strategy and consistent with national development priorities.

1. **Measurement, Reporting and Verification System (MRV)**: The Government has also developed a Web Portal which incorporates the National Forest Monitoring System (NFMS) and a REDD+ Wiki/Database. The idea of bringing the NFMS and the REDD+ Wiki together is novelty. Amongst others, it will enrich and enhance stakeholder engagement and insights on REDD+, and potentially offering a gateway for including information on governance, REDD+ activities, and overall social & environmental safeguards on REDD+. Zambia's work in the area of MRV for REDD+ has focused on the development of a decentralized national forest monitoring system. This has required extensive in-country capacity building and infrastructure development. Ten provincial forest monitoring laboratories have been established and equipped with tools for forest monitoring such as computers with Geographic Information System (GIS) software, Geographical Positioning System (GPS) units for forest monitoring field activities and printers and plotters for fieldmap production. These provincial laboratories are manned by a group of trained cross-sectoral technicians from forestry, agriculture and planning sectors providing a decentralized hub of MRV expertise. The laboratories will provide near real-time spatial data on deforestation and forest degradation which can be relayed to the central national forest monitoring laboratory in Lusaka to inform national reporting. This innovative approach is in-line with the decentralization policy of the Government of the Republic of Zambia.
2. **FREL/FRL:** Zambia has completed its land cover mapping for 1990, 2000, 2010 as well as Forest Inventories in all the 10 Provinces as a basis for FREL/FRL development. A roadmap for FREL/FREL construction has been developed. Importantly, Zambia has also integrated in its strategy Approach to FREL/FRL integrated into draft REDD+ strategy based on national circumstances and in line with UNFCCC guidance. The FREL/FRL are an important component of the REDD+ readiness since performance based payment system will depend on reliable data especially the land cover and forest inventory. The work on land cover mapping is going through refinement with all key stakeholders involved including public and private sectors.
3. **Country Approach to Safeguards:** A country approach to safeguards is also outlined in the strategy. As part of this, a Technical report on the assessment of Policies, Legal and Regulatory Frameworks for REDD+ implementation was commissioned. Amongst others, the report identifies existing REDD+ safeguards, gaps and proposes recommendations that will inform the development of the REDD+ strategy and its subsequent implementation. Furthermore, a comprehensive assessment on how to develop SIS was conducted based on an Issues and Options report and strong stakeholder consultations in all the 10 provinces. SIS may build on already established REDD+ Wiki linked to NFMS and web portal. The approach for SIS is outlined in the draft strategy and will be rooted in Zambia’s existing legal framework (national policies, laws and regulations that define and regulate the effective implementation and compliance of the safeguards), the country’s institutional framework (existing procedures for implementing and enforcing the legal framework), and an outline of the compliance framework (with a monitoring and information system; grievance and redress mechanisms; and noncompliance mechanisms).

In addition to the above-mentioned, the NP has provided support to policy and legal processes including the draft Forest Policy, which was approved by Cabinet in December 2014. The policy makes explicit reference to the REDD+ objectives notably, “Zambia is expected to contribute to minimizing the impact of greenhouse gas emissions and conserving biodiversity through the achievement of these policy objectives related to socio-economic and ecologically sustainable forest management, maintaining and increasing the total natural forest cover and by increasing the percentage of land under plantation.”[Forest Policy 2014]. The policy embraces social and environmental safeguards and recognizes carbon as a forest product like timber and others” (Ref: draft strategy). The policy provides guidance on broad forestry related issues including institutional and governance mechanisms. Furthermore, the Forest Bill, 2015 has already been approved by cabinet and expected to be passed by Parliament in 2015.

Furthermore, the Government has made great progress in the area of strategic partnership building and resource mobilization. In the area of resource strategic partnerships, the Government with the support of UN—REDD has established a partnership platform on REDD+ comprising Cooperating partners supporting environment and climate change issues. This platform will ensure coordination as well as leverage future mobilization and investment opportunities for REDD+. It is worth noting that the country is now benefitting from financial resources and investments from the World Bank’s BioCarbon Fund Initiative for Sustainable Forest Lands (ISFL). The ISFL provides great impetus for the strategy implementation as well as a lever for additional financial resources and investments for REDD+ in Zambia. There are other existing and emerging opportunities for REDD+ implementation including from USAID, Finland GEF and other UN agencies, amongst others. Furthermore, the Forest Investment Programme (FIP) sub-committee has just approved funds for Zambia to develop a REDD+ Investment Plan, which is seen as part of efforts to support Zambia’s REDD+ strategy implementation.

Additional information on the implementation of the Zambia UN-REDD National Programme can be found in the Annual and Semi-Annual Programme Reports. Further updates on implementation in 2015 will be provided at the beginning of the evaluation. The Strategic Review of the Zambia UN-REDD National Programme and the associated management response, action plan and revised work plan and budget are important documents for understanding the changes or revisions that were made to programme objectives and expected results. The Final Evaluation should build on the Strategic Review where possible, and in particular, verify the extent to which the Strategic Review recommendations have been implemented including on stakeholder engagement.

1. **Evaluation Objective and Scope**

The scope of the evaluation is the Zambia UN-REDD National Programme. The evaluation will be based on data available at the time of evaluation and discuss outputs delivered by the programme from the time of inception, August 2010, until the time of closure in June 2015. It will also assess the likelihood of future outcomes and impact that may not have been achieved yet by the end of June 2015.

The evaluation of the UN-REDD National Programme is undertaken to assess (i) programme performance in terms of relevance, effectiveness (outputs and outcomes) and efficiency, (ii) sustainability and up-scaling of results, and (iii) actual and potential impact stemming from the programme. The evaluation has the following objectives:

* To provide evidence of results to meet accountability requirements.
* To assess the status of REDD+ readiness in Zambia, gaps and challenges that need to be addressed to achieve REDD+ readiness and the UN-REDD Programme’s future role in the REDD+ process in the country.
* To promote learning, feedback and knowledge sharing through results and lessons learned among the participating partners and stakeholders including the Government and UN Organizations and other partners. The evaluation will identify lessons of operational and technical relevance for future programme formulation and implementation in the country, especially future UN-REDD Programmes, and/or for the UN-REDD Programme as a whole.

The primary audience for the evaluation will be the Government of Zambia, the three participating UN Organizations of the UN-REDD Programme and the programme resource partners. The secondary audience for the evaluation will be the national REDD+ stakeholders and the UN-REDD Policy Board. The evaluation will also be made available to the public through the UN-REDD Programme website ([www.un-redd.org](http://www.un-redd.org)).

* 1. **Evaluation Criteria**

To focus the evaluation objectives, by defining the standards against which the initiative will be assessed, the following five evaluation criteria will be applied:

1. **Relevance**, concerns the extent to which the National Programme and its intended outcomes or outputs are consistent with national and local policies and priorities and the needs of the intended beneficiaries. Relevance also considers the extent to which the initiative is aligned with the UN-REDD Programme Strategy 2011-2015[[1]](#footnote-1) (or the UN-REDD Programme Framework Document[[2]](#footnote-2) for Programmes approved before November 2010) and the corporate plans of the three participating UN Organizations. Relevance vis-a-vis other REDD+ or REDD+-related programmes implemented in the country should also be examined, in terms of synergies, complementarities and absence of duplication of efforts.
2. **Effectiveness**, measures the extent to which the National Programme’s intended results (outputs and outcomes) have been achieved or the extent to which progress towards outputs and outcomes has been achieved. To explain why certain outputs and outcomes have been achieved better or more than others, the evaluation will review:

**a) Processes that affected the attainment of project results** – which looks at examination of preparation and readiness of the project, country ownership, stakeholder involvement, financial planning, performance of national and local implementing agencies and designated supervision agency, coordination mechanism with other relevant donors projects/programmes, and reasons for any bottlenecks and delays in delivery of project outputs, outcomes and the attainment of sustainability.

**b) Implementation approach -** including an analysis of the project's result framework, performance indicators, adaptive management to changing conditions, overall project management and mechanisms applied in project management in delivering project outcomes and outputs.

1. **Efficiency**, measures how economically resources or inputs (such as funds, expertise and time) are converted to achieving stipulated outcomes and outputs.
2. **Sustainability**, analyse the likelihood of sustainable outcomes at programme termination, with attention to sustainability of financial resources, the socio-political environment, catalytic or replication effects of the project, institutional and governance factors, and environmental risks.
3. **Impact**, measures to what extent the National Programme has contributed to, or is likely to contribute to intermediate states towards impact, such as changes in the governance systems and stakeholder behaviour, and to impact on people’s lives and the environment. The evaluation will assess the likelihood of impact by critically reviewing the programmes intervention strategy (Theory of Change) and the presence of the required drivers and assumptions for outcomes to lead to intermediate states and impact.
	1. **Evaluation Questions**

The following list includes standard questions and issues that the UN-REDD National Programme evaluation should address. It is based on the internationally accepted evaluation criteria mentioned above, i.e. relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability, as well as an additional category of questions regarding factors affecting programme performance. The evaluation will assess the Zambia UN-REDD National Programme as follows:

1. **Relevance**
2. The National Programme’s relevance to:
* Country needs;
* National development priorities as expressed in national policies and plans as well as in sector development frameworks;
* UN Country Programme or other donor assistance framework approved by the government;
* The UNDAF and the UN Joint Programme on Climate Change;
* The UN-REDD Programme Framework Document[[3]](#footnote-3);
* Other REDD+ related programmes in the country, in particular the National REDD+ Strategy;
1. Robustness and realism of the theory of change underpinning the National Programme, including logic of causal relationship between inputs, activities, expected outputs, outcomes and impacts against the specific and development objectives and validity of indicators, assumptions and risks.
2. Quality and realism of the National Programme design, including:
* Duration;
* Stakeholder and beneficiary identification;
* Institutional set-up and management arrangements;
* Overall programme results’ framework
* Approach and methodology.
1. Evolution of National Programme objectives since programme formulation.
2. **Effectiveness**
3. Extent to which the expected outputs have been produced, their quality and timeliness.
4. Extent to which the expected outcomes have been achieved.
5. Assessment of gender mainstreaming in the National Programme. This will cover:
* Analysis of how gender issues were reflected in Programme objectives, design, identification of beneficiaries and implementation;
* Analysis of how gender relations and equality are likely to be affected by the initiative;
* Extent to which gender issues were taken into account in Programme management.
* Assessment of likely distribution of benefits and costs between stakeholders.
1. Use made by the National Programme of the UN-REDD Programme’s normative products, guidelines and safeguards, e.g. the UN-REDD Programme Guidelines on Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC), and the UN-REDD / FCPF Guidelines on Stakeholder Engagement in REDD+ Readiness, and the extent of which they have contributed towards national safeguards[[4]](#footnote-4).
2. Actual and potential contribution of the National Programme to the normative work of the three participating UN Organizations, e.g. contribution towards the “Delivering as One” initiative and lessons learned incorporated into broader organizational strategies.
3. **Efficiency**
4. Cost and timeliness of key outputs delivered compared to national and regional benchmarks
5. Administrative costs (including costs for supervision and coordination between participating UN agencies) compared to operational costs
6. Any time and cost-saving measures taken by the programme
7. Any significant delays or cost-overruns incurred, reason why and appropriateness of any remedial measures taken
8. **Sustainability**
9. Major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the programme.
10. The prospects for sustaining and up-scaling the National Programme’s results by the beneficiaries after the termination of the initiative. The assessment of sustainability will include, as appropriate:
* Institutional, technical, economic and social sustainability of proposed technologies, innovations and/or processes;
* Perspectives for institutional uptake, support and mainstreaming of the newly acquired capacities, or diffusion beyond the beneficiaries or the National Programme.
1. **Impact**
2. Extent to which the initiative has attained, or is expected to attain, its social and environmental objectives; this will also include the identification of actual and potential positive and negative impacts produced by the initiative, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended
3. Presence of the required drivers and assumptions for outcomes to lead to intermediate states and impact.
4. **Factors affecting performance**
5. The evaluation will assess factors and processes that affected project results with particular attention to preparation and readiness of the project, country ownership, and stakeholder involvement, effectiveness of national and local implementing agencies, financial planning and management and coordination mechanisms.
6. Management and implementation of the National Programme, including:
* Quality and realism of work plans;
* Quality of operational management;
* Performance of coordination and steering bodies;
* Quality and quantity of administrative and technical support by the three participating UN Organizations; and
* Timeliness, quality and quantity of inputs and support by the Government and partners.
1. Financial resources management of the National Programme, including:
* Adequacy of budget allocations to achieve outputs;
* Coherence and soundness of budget revisions in matching implementation needs and programme objectives;
* Rate of delivery and budget balance at the time of the evaluation.
* Efficiency of fund-management arrangements.
1. Assessment of coordination mechanisms :
* Between the three participating UN organizations to ensure joint delivery.
* Between the Government and the three participating UN organizations to ensure programme outcomes are achieved.
* Within and between Government ministries in order to ensure programme outcomes is achieved.
* Between the National Programme and other bilateral and multilateral REDD+ initiatives.

In addition, the evaluation will review the following crucial questions:

* What is the status of REDD+ readiness in the country, looking at the typical REDD+ readiness components, and to which extent the programme contributed to each.
* What are the prospects for follow-up and scaling-up REDD+ in Zambia, providing suggestions for potential UN-REDD engagement (if pertinent).
1. **Evaluation Methodology**

The UN-REDD National Programme final evaluation will adhere to the UNEG Norms & Standards[[5]](#footnote-5). It will be conducted by two independent consultants under the overall responsibility and management of the three participating UN Organizations’ Evaluation Departments through their participation in the Evaluation Management Group, in consultation with relevant headquarter, regional and country staff of the participating UN Organizations.

Evaluation findings and judgements should be based on sound evidence and analysis, clearly documented in the evaluation report. Information will be triangulated (i.e. verified from different sources) to the extent possible, and when verification is not possible, the single source will be mentioned[[6]](#footnote-6). Analysis leading to evaluative judgements should always be clearly spelled out. The limitations of the methodological framework should also be spelled out in the evaluation reports.

The evaluation will assess the programme with respect to a minimum set of evaluation criteria using the table for rating performance in Annex 6.

In attempting to attribute any outcomes and impacts to the programme, the evaluators should consider the difference between what has happened with and what would have happened without the programme. This implies that there should be consideration of the baseline conditions and trends in relation to the intended programme outcomes and impacts. This also means that there should be plausible evidence to attribute such outcomes and impacts to the actions of the project. Sometimes, adequate information on baseline conditions and trends is lacking. In such cases this should be clearly highlighted by the evaluators, along with any simplifying assumptions that were taken to enable the evaluator to make informed judgements about project performance.

As this is a final evaluation, particular attention should be given to learning from the experience. Therefore, the “why?” question should be at the front of the consultants’ minds throughout the evaluation exercise. This means that the consultants need to go beyond the assessment of “what” the programme performance was, and make a serious effort to provide a deeper understanding of “why” the performance turned out the way it did, i.e. of processes affecting attainment of programme results. This should provide the basis for the lessons that can be drawn from the programme. In fact, the usefulness of the evaluation will be determined to a large extent by the capacity of the consultant to explain “why things happened” as they happened and are likely to evolve in this or that direction, which goes well beyond the mere assessment of “where things stand” today. The consultant could also provide recommendations for the way forward.

* 1. **Tools**

The Zambia UN-REDD National Programme final evaluation will make use of the following tools:

1. A desk review of project documents including, but not limited to:
* Relevant background documentation, including the UN-REDD Programme Framework Document[[7]](#footnote-7);
* Relevant reports, such as National Programme Annual, Semi-Annual and quarterly Reports, publications, external evaluations by donors, partners etc.;
* Project design documents, such as the National Programme Document, annual work plans and budgets, revisions to the logical framework and project financing;
* Documentation related to National Programme outputs and relevant materials published on the Programme website, reports from workshops or consultations etc.;
* The final report of the Strategic Review of the Zambia UN-REDD National Programme;
* Other relevant documents, such as possible new national policy documents, sector plans and available evaluations bearing relevance for UN-REDD.
1. Semi-structured interviews[[8]](#footnote-8) with key informants, stakeholders and participants, including:
* Government counterparts;
* Government stakeholders including all ministries participating from coordinating bodies or steering committees;
* Civil Society Organizations;
* Country , regional and headquarter personnel from the three UN-Agencies involved in the National Programme, e.g. the Programme Management Unit, Resident Coordination and Regional Technical Advisers;
* Representatives from other bi-lateral or multi-lateral initiatives co-financing the NP if applicable.
1. The Theory of Change and subsequent application of ROtI approach on progress towards impact[[9]](#footnote-9).

A list of key stakeholders and other individuals who should be consulted would be included in Annex 5.

1. **Consultation process**

While fully independent in its judgements, the Evaluation Team will adopt a consultative and transparent approach with internal and external stakeholders. Throughout the process the evaluation team will maintain close liaison with: the Evaluation Management Group (Consisting of representatives of the evaluation departments of the three participating UN Organizations and the UN-REDD Secretariat), the REDD+ Coordination Unit, UN headquarters, regional, sub-regional and country level staff members, and other key stakeholders. Although the team is free to discuss with the authorities concerned anything relevant to its assignment, it is not authorized to make any commitments on behalf of the Government, the donor or the participating UN Organizations.

The draft evaluation report will be circulated among the three participating UN Organizations, including the Evaluation Management Group, REDD+ Coordination Unit and other key stakeholders, including civil society, for comment before finalisation; suggestions will be incorporated as deemed appropriate by the evaluation team.

1. **The Evaluation Team**

The Evaluation Team should consist of two evaluators, including one team leader. The evaluation team should comprise the best available mix of skills that are required to assess the Zambia UN-REDD National Programme. Knowledge of the country in question, good technical understanding of the REDD+ field, as well as competence and skills in evaluation will be required. To the extent possible the Evaluation Team will be balanced in terms of geographical and gender representation to ensure diversity and complementarity of perspectives.

The Evaluation Team members will have had no previous involvement in the formulation, implementation or backstopping of the initiative, and have no future engagement with the UN-REDD programme or the operational units, in Zambia or within the participating UN agencies, involved in UN-REDD. All members of the Evaluation Team will sign the Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct[[10]](#footnote-10) Agreement Form (Annex 3).

The Evaluation Team is responsible for conducting the evaluation as set out in these TORs and applying the approach and methods proposed in the inception report they will prepare. All team members, including the Team Leader, will participate in briefing and debriefing meetings, discussions, field visits, and will contribute to the evaluation with written inputs.

1. **Evaluation Team Deliverables**
	1. **Inception Report**

Before going into data collection the Evaluation Team shall prepare an *inception report* containing a thorough review of the project design quality and the evaluation framework. The *inception report* should detail the evaluators’ understanding of what is being evaluated and why, showing how the evaluation questions can be answered by way of: proposed methods and sources of data, as well as data collection procedures. The *inception report* will also present a draft, desk review-based Theory of Change of the National Programme, identifying outcomes, intermediate states towards impact, drivers and assumptions for evaluation. The *inception report* should also include a proposed schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables, as well as a desk based Theory of Change of the programme[[11]](#footnote-11). The evaluation framework should summarize the information available from programme documentation against each of the main evaluation parameters. Any gaps in information should be identified and methods for additional data collection, verification and analysis should be specified. The evaluation framework will present in further detail the evaluation questions under each criterion with their respective indicators and data sources. This will allow the three participating UN Organizations to verify that there is a shared understanding about the evaluation and clarify any misunderstandings at the outset. A list of important documents and web pages that the evaluators should read at the outset of the evaluation and before finalizing the evaluation design and the inception report is included in Annex 4. The Inception Report will be shared with the three participating UN Organizations and other relevant stakeholders and reviewed by the Evaluation Management Group.

* 1. **Evaluation Reporting**

At the end of the field mission, the consultants will prepare a *preliminary findings report* (mission Aide memoire) and present their first findings to stakeholders in Lusaka at a debriefing session. The *preliminary findings report* should be shared with stakeholders invited to the debriefing session in advance of the meeting.

The reviewers shall prepare a *draft evaluation report* within three weeks after the field mission. The Team Leader bears responsibility for submitting the draft report to the UN-REDD Secretariat within three weeks from the conclusion of the mission, and the Secretariat will immediately transmit the draft report to the evaluation departments of the three participating UN Organizations. The evaluation departments will verify that the draft report meets their evaluation quality standards and may request a revision of the draft report by the consultants before it is shared with a wider audience. The draft evaluation report will then be circulated among the three participating UN Organizations, including the Evaluation Management Group, and other key stakeholders for comments. Comments will be incorporated as deemed appropriate by the Evaluation Team. The consultants will prepare a *response to comments* in the form of a table listing all comments partially or entirely rejected by the evaluation team with an explanation why, which will be shared with stakeholders to ensure transparency. Confidential comments on the report will not be shared.

The *final evaluation report* will illustrate the evidence found that responds to the evaluation issues, questions and criteria listed in the Terms of Reference. The length of the final evaluation report should be 15-18,000 words, excluding executive summary and annexes. Supporting data and analysis should be annexed to the report when considered important to complement the main report. The recommendations will be addressed to the different stakeholders and prioritized: they will be evidence-based, relevant, focused, clearly formulated and actionable. Lessons learned will be based on programme experience and will specify the scope of their applicability beyond the programme.

The Evaluation Team shall propose the outline of the report in the inception report, based on the template provided in Annex 2 of this Terms of Reference. The report shall be prepared in English, and translated into French and Spanish.

Annexes to the evaluation report will include, though not limited to, the following as relevant:

* Terms of reference for the evaluation;
* Additional methodology-related documentation;
* Profile of team members;
* List of documents reviewed;
* List of institutions and stakeholders interviewed by the evaluation team;
* List of programme outputs/Programme results framework;
* Evaluation tools.

The Evaluation Team is fully responsible for its independent report which may not necessarily reflect the views of the Government or the three participating UN Organizations. An evaluation report is not subject to technical clearance by the evaluation departments of the three participating UN Organizations, but has to meet the quality standards for evaluation of the three Organizations. The final report will be published on the UN-REDD Programme web site ([www.un-redd.org](http://www.un-redd.org)).

The Evaluation Team will be invited to present the findings, recommendations and lessons learned from the evaluation to a relevant event bringing (UN-)REDD stakeholders together in Zambia, to promote the dissemination and ownership of evaluation results. The inception report should suggest at which appropriate event(s) this could be done. The Team may, after completion of the evaluation process, also be invited by one or more participating UN agencies to present the evaluation at regional office or headquarters level.

1. **Evaluation timetable and budget**

Table 3 outlines the tentative timetable and responsibility of the evaluation process. The timetable will be adjusted according to the availability of the selected consultant.

**Table 3: UN-REDD National Programme Evaluation Timeline**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Date: | Activity | Responsibility |
| May 2015 | Draft National Programme Final Evaluation Terms of Reference (draft to be based on the “National Programme Final Evaluation Template”) | The UN three participating UN Organizations prepare the first draft of the TORs. The National Programme staff ensures the draft Terms of Reference is shared with the Government counterpart and other relevant key stakeholders, including civil society, for information and their comments. |
| June 2015 | Review National Programme Final Evaluation Terms of Reference | Evaluation Management Group (Evaluation Departments of the three participating UN Organizations and the UN-REDD Secretariat) |
| July 2015 | Recruit consultants | National Programme Evaluation budget holder in consultation with the Evaluation Management Group (Evaluation departments of the three participating UN Organizations and the UN-REDD Secretariat) |
| August 2015 | Preparation of Inception Report  | Evaluation Team (consultants)Logistical support provided by the participating UN Organizations National Programme staff |
| August 2015 | Review inception report  | The three participating UN Organizations and the Evaluation Management Group (Evaluation departments of the three participating UN Organizations and the UN-REDD Secretariat) |
| September 2015 | Evaluation Mission, including preparation of  *preliminary findings report*  | Evaluation Team (consultants)Logistical support provided by the participating UN Organizations’ National Programme staff. Also, a one day debriefing workshop with stakeholders will be held at the end of the Evaluation Mission. At this workshop the *preliminary findings report* will be presented.  |
| October 2015 | Preparation of draft evaluation report and submission to UNREDD Secretariat. | The draft evaluation report will be submitted to the UN-REDD Secretariat at the latest 3 weeks after the mission has been completed.  |
| October 2015 | Review Draft Evaluation Report by the evaluation departments of the participating UN Organizations  | The Evaluation Management Group (Evaluation departments of the three participating UN Organizations and the UN-REDD Secretariat) reviews the draft from the point of view of its evaluation quality and make comments to the Evaluation Team in that respect. If need be, the evaluation team will revise the draft report. The latter will be then circulated to other stakeholders for comment. |
| October 2015 | Review Draft Evaluation Report by the participating UN Organisations, Government Counterpart, UN Country Offices and other stakeholders  | The National Programme staff should ensure the Draft Evaluation Report is shared with the Government Counterpart and other relevant key stakeholders, including civil society, for information and their comments. |
| October 2015 | Final Report  | Evaluation Team (consultants)Logistical support provided by the participating UN Organizations National Programme staff |
| October –2015 | Presentation of evaluation results in Zambia | Evaluation Team (consultants) |
| November 2015 | Management response from the Participating UN Organizations  | Participating UN Organizations |
| November 2015 | Management response from the Government Counterpart  | Government Counterpart |
| (TBC) | Dissemination of the report | The UN country offices on the national level and the UN-REDD Programme Secretariat on the global level (e.g. PB). |

**Annex 1: Evaluation consultancies Terms of Reference**

The Evaluation Team should consist of two evaluators, including one team leader. The Team Leader must have sound evaluation experience. The Team Leader will lead, organize, and supervise the work of the evaluation team, ensuring a division of labour that is commensurate with the skills profiles of the individual team members. He or she will have overall responsibility for the production of deliverables, in particular the evaluation report, and is ultimately accountable for its quality.The evaluation team should comprise the best available mix of skills that are required to assess the Zambia UN-REDD National Programme, and ideally include in-depth knowledge of the National Programme country, good technical understanding of REDD+, as well as competence and skills in evaluation. To the extent possible the Evaluation Team will be balanced in terms of geographical and gender representation to ensure diversity and complementarity of perspectives.

The Evaluation Team members shall have had no previous direct involvement in the formulation, implementation or backstopping of the National Programme, and have no future engagement with the UN-REDD programme or the operational units, in Zambia or within the participating UN agencies, involved in UN-REDD. All members of the Evaluation Team will sign the Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct[[12]](#footnote-12) Agreement Form (Annex 3).

The Evaluation Team is responsible for conducting the evaluation as described in the overall TORs of the evaluation, and applying the approach and methods they will propose in the inception report. All team members, including the Team Leader, will participate in briefing and debriefing meetings, discussions, field visits, and will contribute to the evaluation with written inputs and oral presentations. The Evaluation Team shall collaborate on a single document for each of the three main deliverables (inception report, preliminary findings report and main report), while the Team Leader is responsible for coordinating the inputs and ensuring all deadlines are met.

Competencies:

* Independent from the UN-REDD Programme and the participating UN Organizations, FAO, UNDP and UNEP.
* The evaluation team should comprise the best available mix of skills that are required to assess the National Programme, including:
* Broad knowledge of REDD+ and its role in climate change policies and approaches, with 5-10 years’ experience in the implementation of forestry and /or climate change projects and programmes in developing countries;
* Good technical understanding of REDD+;Preferably in-depth knowledge of Zambia and and how REDD+ fits in with that;
* Demonstrate experience from evaluations of similar types of programmes, using a Theory of Change approach to evaluation or demonstrated strong knowledge of Monitoring and Review methods for development projects.
* Excellent writing and editing skills.
* Attention to detail and respect for timelines.

Qualification requirements for both consultants:

* Advanced university degree in social science, development studies, forestry, environment and natural resources or relevant field.
* Minimum 12 (team leader)/7 (team member) years of professional experience is required, longer professional experience is an advantage, including proven experience from developing countries.
* Fluency in English language, both written and spoken is a requirement. Knowledge of local language would be a distinctive advantage.Familiarity with project implementation in complex multi donor-funded projects.

Deliverables:

* An inception report prepared;
* A preliminary findings report prepared and presented it at the end of the mission to programme stakeholders;
* A consolidated draft report that meets the quality requirements of the evaluation departments of the three participating UN agencies produced. The team leader is responsible for consolidating the report;
* A response to comments received from stakeholders on the draft report prepared;
* A consolidated final report produced. The team leader is responsible for consolidating the report.

Application:

Total days: 65 days

The work shall be completed in accordance with the below time schedule:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Consultant One (Team Leader)** | **Consultant Two** | **Dates**  |
| Preparation of inception report outlining consultants understanding of key tasks as well as a work plan for the implementation of activities  | 3 days | 3 days |  |
| Desk review, evaluation mission, stakeholder meetings, draft evaluation report | 20 days | 22days |  |
| Draft final report, which has been approved and accepted  | 9 days | 7 days |  |
| Total | 32 days | 32 days |  |

Schedule of Payment:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Deliverables** | **Percentage payment to Consultant One (Team leader):** | **Percentage payment to Consultant Two:** |
| An acceptable and satisfactory inception report  | 20% | 20% |
| A draft evaluation report  | 30% | 30% |
| Submission and approval of the final evaluation report, which incorporates comments and recommendations from Government, UN and key stakeholders | 50% | 50% |

**Annex 2: Annotated UN-REDD National Programme evaluation report outline**

The Evaluation Team can modify the structure of the report outline below, as long as the key contents are maintained in the report and the flow of information and analysis is coherent and clear. The length of the UN-REDD National Programme final evaluation report should be 15-18,000 words, excluding executive summary and annexes.

**Acknowledgements**

Insert acknowledgements.

**Composition of the Evaluation Team**

Insert description of the composition of the Evaluation Team.

**Table of Contents**

Insert Table of Contents.

**Acronyms**

When an abbreviation is used for the first time in the text, it should be explained in full; it will be included in the list of acronyms when it is used repeatedly within the report.

**Executive Summary**

The Executive Summary should:

* Be in length approximately 10-15% of the main report, excluding annexes;
* Provide key information on the evaluation process and methodology;
* Illustrate key findings and conclusions;
* List all recommendations: this will facilitate the drafting of the Management Response to the evaluation.

**1. Introduction**

**1.1 Background and purposes of the evaluation**

This section will include:

* The purpose of the evaluation, as stated in the Terms of Reference;
* National Programme title, starting and closing dates, initial and current total budget;
* Dates of implementation of the evaluation.

It will also mention that Annex I of the evaluation report is the evaluation Terms of Reference.

**1.2 Methodology of the evaluation**

This section will comprise a description of the methodology and tools used and evaluation criteria that were applied by the evaluation. This should also note any limitations incurred in applying the methodology by the evaluation team.

**2. Context of the National Programme**

This section will include a description of the developmental context relevant to the National Programme including major challenges in the area of the intervention, political and legislative issues, etc. It will also describe the process by which the programme was identified and developed and cite other related and bilateral interventions if relevant.

**3. Concept and relevance**

**3.1 Design**

National Programmes are built on assumptions on how and why they are supposed to achieve the agreed objectives through the selected strategy; this set of assumptions constitutes the programme theory or ‘theory of change’ and can be explicit (e.g. in a logical framework matrix) or implicit in a programme document.

This section will include a diagram and short description of the programme theory of change, including its results chains from outputs to impact, impact drivers and assumptions and will analyse critically:

* The appropriateness of stated development goals and outcomes (immediate objectives);
* The causal relationship between outputs, outcomes (immediate objectives) and impact (development objectives);
* The extent to which drivers for change have been recognized and supported by the programme;
* The relevance and appropriateness of indicators;
* The validity of assumptions and risks.

This section will also critically assess:

* The programme’s institutional set-up and management arrangements;
* The adequacy of the time-frame for implementation;
* The adequacy of resources from all parties and appropriateness of budget allocations to achieve intended results;
* The adequacy of the methodology of implementation to achieve intended results;
* The quality of the stakeholders’ and beneficiaries identification.

**3.2 Relevance**

This section will analyse the extent to which the National Programme’s objectives and strategy were consistent with country’s expressed requirements and policies, with beneficiaries’ needs, and other programmes, at the time of approval and at the time of the evaluation.

There will also be an analysis of the degree to which the programme corresponds to priorities in the UN-REDD Programme Strategy.

**4. Results and contribution to stated objectives**

**4.1 Outputs and outcomes**

This section will critically analyse the National Programme outputs: ideally, the evaluation team should directly assess all of these, but this is not always feasible due to time and resources constraints. Thus, the detailed analysis should be done on a representative sample of outputs that were assessed directly, while a complete list of outputs prepared by the programme team should be included as annex. If appropriate, the section will also include an analysis of gaps and delays and their causes and consequences.

Further, the section will critically analyse to what extent expected outcomes (specific/immediate objectives) were achieved. It will also identify and analyse the main factors influencing their achievement and the contributions of the various stakeholders to them.

**4.2 Gender issues**

This section will analyse if and how the programme mainstreamed gender issues. The assessment will cover:

* Analysis of how gender issues were reflected in objectives, design, identification of beneficiaries and implementation;
* Analysis of how gender relations and equality and processes of women’s inclusion were and are likely to be affected by the initiative;
* Extent to which gender issues were taken into account in programme management.

**4.3 Capacity development**

 The evaluation will assess:

* The extent and quality of programme work in capacity development of beneficiaries;
* The perspectives for institutional uptake and mainstreaming of the newly acquired capacities, or diffusion beyond the beneficiaries or the programme.

**4.4 Sustainability**

This section will assess the prospects for long-term use of outputs and outcomes, from an institutional, social, technical and economic perspective. If applicable, there will also be an analysis of environmental sustainability (maintenance and/or regeneration of the natural resource base).

**4.5 Impact**

 This section will assess the current and foreseeable positive and negative impacts produced as a result of the programme, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended. It will assess the actual or potential contribution of the programme to the planned development objective and to UN-REDD strategic objectives, described in the UN-REDD Programme Strategy 2011-2015.

**5. Implementation**

**5.1 Budget and Expenditure**

This section will contain the analysis of the National Programme financial resources and management, including:

* Efficiency in production of outputs;
* Coherence and soundness of Budget Revisions in matching implementation needs and programme objectives; and
* Assessment of rate of delivery and budget balance at the time of the evaluation, compared to the initial plan.

**5.2 Programme Management**

 This section will analyse the performance of the management function, including:

* Efficiency and effectiveness of operations management, both within the programme and by the participating UN Organizations, including timeliness, quality, reasons for delays and assessment of remedial measures taken if any;
* Effectiveness of strategic decision-making by programme management;
* Realism of annual work-plans;
* Efficiency and effectiveness of monitoring system and internal evaluation processes;
* Elaboration and implementation of an exit strategy;
* Role and effectiveness of institutional set-up, including steering bodies;

**5.3 Technical Backstopping**

This section will analyse the extent, timeliness and quality of technical backstopping the programme received from involved units in the participating UN Organizations, at all levels (headquarter, regional, sub-regional and country offices).

**5.4 Government’s participation**

This section will analyse government’s commitment and support to the programme, in particular:

* Financial and human resources made available for programme operations;
* Uptake of outputs and outcomes through policy or investment for up-scaling.

**6. Conclusions and Recommendations**

Conclusions need to be substantiated by findings consistent with data collected and methodology, and represent insights into identification and/or solutions of important problems or issues. They may address specific evaluation questions raised in the Terms of Reference and should provide a clear basis for the recommendations which follow.

 The Conclusions will synthesise the main findings from the preceding sections: main achievements, major weaknesses and gaps in implementation, factors affecting strengths and weaknesses, prospects for follow-up, any emerging issues. It will consolidate the assessment of various aspects to judge the extent to which the programme has attained, or is expected to attain, its intermediate/specific objectives. Considerations about relevance, costs, implementation strategy and quantity and quality of outputs and outcomes should be brought to bear on the aggregate final assessment.

The section will include an assessment of the three participating UN Organizations role as implementing organizations and the quality of the feedback loop between the programme and the organizations’ normative role, namely:

* Actual use by the programme of relevant participating UN Organizations’ normative products (databases, publications, methodologies, etc.);
* Actual and potential contribution of programme outputs and outcomes to the participating UN Organizations normative work.

Recommendations should be firmly based on evidence and analysis, be relevant and realistic, with priorities for action made clear. They can tackle strategic, thematic or operational issues. Recommendations concerned with on-going activities should be presented separately from those relating to follow-up once the National Programme is terminated. Each recommendation should each be introduced by the rationale for it; alternatively, it should be referenced to the paragraphs in the report to which it is linked.

Each recommendation should be clearly addressed to the appropriate party(ies), i.e. the Government and the Participating UN Organizations at different levels (headquarter, regional, and national). Responsibilities and the time frame for their implementation should be stated, to the extent possible. Although it is not possible to identify a ‘correct’ number of recommendations in an evaluation report, the evaluation team should consider that each recommendation must receive a response.

**7. Lessons Learned**

The evaluation will identify lessons and good practices on substantive, methodological or procedural issues, which could be relevant to the design, implementation and evaluation of similar projects or programmes, especially future UN-REDD activities and programmes in Zambia. Such lessons/practices must have been innovative, demonstrated success, had an impact, and be replicable.

**Annexes to the evaluation report**

I. Evaluation Terms of Reference

II. Brief profile of evaluation team members

III. List of documents reviewed

IV. List of institutions and stakeholders met during the evaluation process

The team will decide whether to report the full name and/or the function of the people who were interviewed in this list.

V. List of programme outputs

This includes training events, meetings, reports/publications, initiatives supported through the programme. It should be prepared by the programme staff, in a format decided by the evaluation team, when details cannot be provided in the main text because too cumbersome.

VI. Evaluation tools

**Annex 3: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct[[13]](#footnote-13) Agreement Form**

The form is to be completed by all consultants and included as an annex in the final report.

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form**

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System

Name of Consultant: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**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 4: Documents to be consulted**

The following list of documents should be consulted by the evaluators at the outset of the evaluation and before finalizing the evaluation design and the inception report:

* UN-REDD Programme Strategy:

<http://www.unredd.net/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_download&gid=4598&Itemid=53>

* Zambia Final UN-REDD National Joint Programme
* Final Report of the Strategic Review of the UN-REDD Programme-Zambia Quick-Start Initiative
* Annual and quarterly work plans
* Minutes of the meetings of the Technical Committee meeting and Programme Steering Committee (PSC)
* National REDD+ Strategy of Zambia
* Issues and options report for REDD+ Strategy Development and Implementation
* Technical Paper on the Adequacy of Policy, Legal and Regulatory Instruments for REDD+ Implementation in Zambia
* Technical Paper for Agriculture and NRM Issues and Options for REDD+ Strategy Development and Implementation
* Assessment of previous, ongoing and planned forest management activities with potential for REDD+
* Assessment of Financing, Incentives and Benefit Sharing Options and Considerations for REDD+
* Engaging Private Sector in REDD+ implementation in Zambia
* Assessment of Institutional Capacities and Capacity Building Needs for REDD+ in Zambia
* Stakeholder Assessment and Engagement Plan
* Communication strategy for REDD+ in Zambia
* Guiding technical document on Zambia’s Forest Reference Levels
* Preliminary study of drivers of deforestation in Zambia
* Economic Valuation of forests and ecosystem services
* Detailed study of drivers of deforestation and degradation
* Study of alternatives livelihoods and opportunity cost of REDD+ in Zambia
* Forest Management Practices with potential for REDD+ in Zambia
* Legal preparedness for REDD+ in Zambia
* IPCC compliant GHG reporting methodology for Forest Lands in ZambiaDraft web portal and wiki
* Workshop and training reports

**Annex 5: Key stakeholders and partners**

The following list of key stakeholders and other individuals should be consulted:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Title / Organisation** | **Contact information** |
| **Zambian Government** |
| Mr. Ignatius Makumba | Director of Forestry Department | Ignatius Makumba <inmakumba@gmail.com |
| Mr. David Kaluba | Coordinator, Interim Climate Change Climate Change Secretariat  |  |
| Mr. Deuteronomy Kasaro | National REDD+ focal point/Mitigation Specialist  | deutkas@yahoo.co.uk |
|  |  |  |
| Mr. Davies Kashole | UN-REDD Project Officer, Forestry Department | dkashole@gmail.com |
| Ms. Maureen Mwale | UN-REDD Project Officer, Forestry Department | mwalecm@yahoo.com |
| Mr. Abel Siampale | Technical expert from the Forestry Department | abel.m.siampale@gmail.com |
| Mr. Moses Kaumba  | UN-REDD Project Officer | kaumbam@ymail.com |
|  |  |  |
| **Participating UN Organizations** |
| Ms. Janet Rogan | UNDP Resident Representative and UN Resident Coordinator  | Janet.rogan@one.un.org |
| Mr. Martim Maya | UNDP Country Director  | Martim.maya@undp.org |
| Winnie Musonda  | Assistant Resident Representative and Environment Advisor | Winnie.musonda@undp.org |
| Elsie G. Attafuah | Senior Regional Technical Advisor, UNDP/UN-REDD and former Technical Advisor for Zambia | Elsie.attafuah@undp.org |
| Andsone Nsune | M and E Advisor, UNDP | Andsone.nsune@undp.org |
| Velice Nangavo | Project Officer | Velice.nangavo@undp.org |
| Mazuba Mwambazi | UN-REDD Administrative Assistant | Mazuba.mwambazi@undp.org |
| Daniel Pouakouyou | Regional Technical Advisor | Daniel.pouakouyou@unep.org |
| Thais Narciso | Associate Programme Officer | Thais.narciso@unep.org |
| Mr. Julian Fox | Former UN-REDD expert and ILUA II CTA in Zambia | Julian.fox@fao.org |
| Ms. Celestina Lwatula | FAO Programme Assistant | Lwatula, Celestina (FAOZM) <celestina.lwatula@fao.org> |
| Mr. Philippe Crete | UN-REDD regional advisor for Africa | Philippe.crete@fao.org |
| Mr. Georges Okech | FAO representative in Zambia | george.okech@fao.org |
| Ms. Rebecca Tavani | FAO NFI expert supporting ILUA II | Rebecca.Tavani@fao.org |
| **Donor/Bilateral Organizations** |
| Hans Peter Melby | Head of Co-operation, Royal Norwegian Embassy in Zambia  | Hans.peter.melby@mfa.no |
| Government of Finland | Elizabeth Ndhvolu, Environment Advisor | Elizabeth.ndhlovu@formin.fi |
| Indira Janaki Ekanayake | Senior Agriculture Economist, Agriculture Global Practice (GFADR), World Bank | iekanayake@worldbank.org |
| Anna Toness | Office Director, Economic Development, Anna Toness, And Catherine Tembo, Forest and Climate Change Officer | atoness@usaid.govctembo@usaid.gov |
|  |  |  |
| **Non-Governmental Organizations/Private Sector** |
| Zambian Climate Change Network (ZCCN) |  |  |
| Community Based Natural Resource Management Forum  |  |  |
| Zambian Institute of Environmental Management  |  |  |
| Hassan Sachedina | BioCarbon Partners | hassan@biocarbonpartners.com |
| Dale Lewis | COMACO |  |
| Misael Kokwe | Natural Reource Consultative Forum/Technical Coordinator of Climate Smart Agriculture Project | Misael.kokwe@gmail.com  |
|  |  |  |
| **Research Institutes** |
| Centre for International Forestry Research (CIFOR) | Dr. Davidson Gumbo, Head of CIFOR, Zambia  | d.gumbo@cgiar.org |
| University of Zambia | Dr. Mick Mwala, Dean of Agriculture, University of Zambia  | mmwala@yahoo.com; mmwala@unzaa.zm |
| Copperbelt University | Dr. Royd Vinya, School of Natural Resources  | royd.vinya@gmail.com/ royd.vinya@cbu.ac.zm |
| Forest Research, Kitwe |  |  |
| Centre for Environmental Research, Education and Development (CERED) | Prof. Patrick Matakala | ceredc@gmail.com |

**Annex 6: Rating Programme Performance**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Comments** |
| **Agency Coordination and implementation:** Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S) Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) |
| Overall Quality of Project Implementation | (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| *Agency coordination* | (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| *Project Supervision* | (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 Programme Results** | (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, project implementation:*** | ***Sustainability ratings:***  | ***Relevance ratings*** |
| 6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings 5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS)3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems | 4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability | 2. Relevant (R) |
| 3. Moderately Likely (ML):moderate risks | 1. Not relevant (NR) |
| 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks1. Unlikely (U): severe risks | ***Impact Ratings:***3. Significant (S)2. Minimal (M)1. Negligible (N) |
| ***Additional ratings where relevant:***Not Applicable (N/A) ; Unable to Assess (U/A) |

1. The UN-REDD Programme Strategy 2011-2015 is available on:

<http://www.unredd.net/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_download&gid=4598&Itemid=53> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The UN-REDD Programme Framework Document is available on:

<http://www.unredd.net/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_download&gid=4&Itemid=53> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. The UN-REDD Programme Framework Document is available on: <http://www.unredd.net/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_download&gid=4&Itemid=53> [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. None of the guidelines referred to were available during most of the period of programme implementation. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. UNEG Norms & Standards: <http://uneval.org/normsandstandards> [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Individuals should not be mentioned by name if anonymity needs to be preserved. In such cases sources can be expressed in generic term (Government, NGO, donor etc.). [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. The UN-REDD Programme Framework Document is available on: <http://www.unredd.net/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_download&gid=4&Itemid=53> [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Face-to-face or through any other appropriate means of communications [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. GEF Evaluation Office, (OPS4) Progress towards Impacts: The ROtl Handbook: Towards enhancing the impacts of environmental projects – Methodological paper 2. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN system: [www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct](http://www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct) [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. GEF Evaluation Office, (OPS4) Progress towards Impacts: The ROtl Handbook: Towards enhancing the impacts of environmental projects – Methodological paper 2. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN system: [www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct](http://www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct) [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System: [www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct](http://www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct) [↑](#footnote-ref-13)