

TERMS OF REFERENCE
Terminal Evaluation of the UNEP/GEF project
“Shepherding Biodiversity Back into South Africa’s Productive Landscapes”
GEF Project ID 9382

Section 1: PROJECT BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW

1. Project General Information

Table 1. Project summary

GEF Project ID/SMA ID¹:	9382	Umoja/ IMIS no.	01333
Implementing Agency (UNEP Division/Branch/Unit):	GEF Biodiversity and Land Degradation Unit, Ecosystems Division	Executing Agency:	UNEP, Landmark Foundation Trust (NGO, South Africa)
Sources of Funding (Co-finance):	Landmark Foundation Trust South Africa (NGO), Woolworths, Green Fund via Development Bank of south Africa (DBSA), Tamarisk Trust (philanthropist)		
Relevant SDG(s):	SDG 1, Target 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, SDG 2, Target 2.1, 2.2., 2.3, 2.4, 2.5 SDG 3, Target 3.8, 3.9 SDG 4, Target 4.1, 4.4. SDG 6, Target 6.1, 6.2, 6.3 SDG 7, Target 7.1, 7.2 SDG 12, Target 12.8 SDG 15, Target 15.1, 15.3, 15.5, 15.5, 15.7, 15.9		
MTS (at approval):	MTS 2014-2017		
POW Output(s) number/reference (applicable for projects approved pre-2022)	PoW Outputs 1 and 2 for EA 3 (a):	POW Expected Accomplishment(s) number/reference (applicable for projects approved pre-2022):	MTS 2014-2017 Subprogramme 3 Ecosystem management Expected Accomplishment (a) use of the ecosystem approach in countries to maintain ecosystem services and sustainable productivity of terrestrial and aquatic systems is increased
Sub-programme:	Nature Action (Ecosystems Management at approval)	Programme Coordination Project:	N/A
UNEP approval date:	June 2016	GEF approval date:	May 2016
GEF Operational Programme #:	BD-4	GEF Strategic Priority:	
Project type:	MSP	Focal Area(s):	Biodiversity
Expected start date:	????	Actual start date:	June 2016
Planned completion date:	December 2020	Actual operational completion date:	????
Planned total project budget at approval:	US\$ 6,517,750	Actual total expenditures reported as of 30 Dec 2023	US\$ 1,040,650
GEF grant allocation:	US\$ 1,017,750	GEF grant expenditures reported as of 30 Dec 2023	US\$ 1,040,650
Expected Medium-Size Project co-financing:	US\$ 5,500,000	Secured Medium-Size Project/Full-Size Project co-financing:	US\$ 7,078,843
No. of formal project revisions:	N/A	Date of last approved project revision:	N/A

¹ SMA refers to the ID provided by the Integrated Planning, Management and Reporting Solution (IPMR) system, which was introduced by UNEP in July 2023.

No. of Steering Committee meetings:	???	Date of Last Steering Committee meeting:	???
Mid-term Review/ Evaluation (planned date):	N/A	Mid-term Review/ Evaluation (actual date):	N/A
Terminal Evaluation (planned date):	30 June 2021	Terminal Evaluation (actual date):	June 2024
Coverage - Country:	South Africa	Coverage - Region:	Africa
Dates of previous/future project phases:	N/A	Date of first disbursement:	03 August 2016

2. Project Rationale²

1. The project focused on the conservation and restoration of the top trophic levels (i.e. top and meso predators) in the targeted rangeland ecosystems, aiming to positively affect improved conservation of the entire trophic pyramid, and mitigate the negative and cascading effects of removing the influence of natural predation from the productive landscapes. The project aimed to strategically focus its work through various ecotones across the Western, Northern and Eastern Cape Provinces of South Africa (SA), incorporating biodiversity hotspot areas of Fynbos (Cape Floristic Region), Succulent- and Nama-Karoo, Grassland and Thicket biomes. This focus in the early implementation phases of this pilot project was to ensure that project results could be later replicated and scaled up throughout the SA region and beyond.

2. The project focused on the arid zones of South Africa. While the specific study sites were located between key protected areas, care was taken to ensure that good representation of the biomes of the region were captured in the pilot sites for future replication and up-scaling. As such, the Cape Floristic Region, succulent Karoo, Nama Karoo, subtropical thicket biome and grasslands were represented in the project domain. The project areas were contained within the central southern region of the arid region of South Africa where good representation of the above biomes was evident, and represented by an area circumscribed by the following towns: Beaufort West, Graaff Reinet, Colesberg, Willowmore, and Riversdale. The protected areas incorporated in this broad area were: Camdeboo National Park, Mountain Zebra National Park, Karoo National Park, Addo National Park, Tankwa Karoo National Park and Baviaanskloof Nature Reserve, Swartberg Nature Reserve, Kammanasie Nature Reserve, and Garcia Nature Reserves (the latter four being provincial nature reserves and part of the Cape Floristic Region World Heritage Site).

3. The project targeted work in 10 farms/economic units where landholding in the various areas was estimated to be about 5,000ha per unit with an assumption of effectively working on at least 50,000ha. The project target areas and demonstration farms were chosen within and around the wider regions that contain areas of recognised biological importance and surrounding existing private conservation areas and Protected Areas (PAs). There were several reasons for this:

4. (i) Private and public funded efforts for the conservation of biodiversity were already taking place within and near these existing PAs. The project intervention aimed to be synergistic with these efforts and provide opportunities for the expansion of conservation efforts, through the (re)establishment of wildlife corridors on production livestock farms resulting in improved genetic connectivity between PAs (and improved status of biodiversity both on and off protected areas);

5. (ii) Protected Areas are often (wrongly) blamed for being the cause/source of predation on livestock by wild predators. The GEF project aims to demonstrate that synergistic efforts between PAs and the farmers in surrounding production landscapes can result (a) in significant added value for farm products originating from 'Fair Game'(ethically branded produce) farms, (b) improved biodiversity conservation through better connectivity and production, and (c) more local 'green' employment opportunities. This approach, mainstreaming BD conservation in production landscapes surrounding PAs, may be the key to sustain both PAs and the surrounding rural economy; and

6. (iii) Shepherding has been on a declining trend in all these commercial livestock farming regions for many decades, resulting in loss of local employment opportunities. This project aims to reverse this trend. The envisaged alternative mainly focussed on removing capacity barriers to facilitate the uptake of more wildlife-friendly livestock farming practices. This approach was intended to underpin the mainstreaming of biodiversity conservation practices on extensive areas of livestock farms. Key additional outcomes expected from this intervention included the development of training programmes and testing the efficacy of several wildlife-friendly control methods. This was, in turn, intended to generate: New national capacity and new

² Grey =Info to be added

management/training tools; Development of sound monitoring and evaluation tools to assess the efficacy of several predator-control/livestock management options, as the basis for adaptive management and early warning systems to keep damage to livestock within acceptable levels and support biodiversity conservation; Production of a wide range of peer-reviewed technical studies, as well as simple educational and illustrative materials, to support advocacy efforts and to underpin legislative and policy making processes at the national level; Support improved genetic connectivity between wildlife populations: wildlife corridors were to be re-opened between protected areas as it was anticipated that fewer individuals would be killed on surrounding farms, thus improving genetic flow between wildlife populations; and biodiversity stewardship was to be promoted as the project demonstration farms served as the basis for an important conservation extension programme. This was intended to underpin replication and up-scaling of project results across the Southern African region, and beyond. (at approval the project was identified as contributing to UNEP PoW 2016-2017, Ecosystems Management, Expected Accomplishment 'a', Output 2 (312).

3. Project Results Framework

7. An abridged version of the project's Results Framework is presented below, showing the planned components, Outcomes and Outputs.

Table 2. Results Framework (summary)

Project Objective: To foster biodiversity conservation on livestock farms, through a return to human shepherding and the development of a wildlife-friendly produce branding scheme, leading to Payment for Ecosystem Services as a tool in conservation and local economic development.						
Project Components/ Programs	Financing Type	Project Outcomes	Project Outputs	Trust Fund	(in \$)	
					GEF Project Financing	Confirmed Co-financing
Component 1. Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation on livestock farms through biodiversity-friendly shepherding practices	TA	Outcome 1. Biodiversity-friendly shepherding practices are documented, tested and applied on large commercial farms through training of herders	Output 1.1. Conduct an evaluation of the actual environmental and economic impact of all methods of management of predation and damage-causing animals on livestock farms, both lethal (where livestock farmers continue to prefer this method), and non-lethal methods (where farmers wish to test these methods on their farms). Output 1.2. Biodiversity-friendly shepherding practices are tested and applied on selected pilot livestock farms covering approximately 50 000 ha, resulting in the return of wildlife and improved biodiversity conservation and improved connectivity between existing protected areas and other adjacent non-protected sites of conservation importance. Output 1.3. BD-friendly shepherding associations are developed and operational at 5 farms covering approximately 30 000 ha, supporting wildlife conservation and providing the platform for demonstration, training and education activities as well as the basis for replication and upscaling of best practices at the national level. A further 5 farms (20 000 ha) participate in piloting shepherding programmes or surrogate measures. Output 1.4. A shepherding Academy is established and operational, with innovative curriculum developed, and partnerships developed with several other training/educational institutions in the country. Output 1.5. Production standards and templates for management that foster improved BD conservation on livestock farms are developed and widely promoted through the work of the Academy, the	GEF TF	429,477	3,750,000

			Landmark Foundation, government entities and their broad network of partners.			
Component 2. Payment for Ecosystem Services (PES) schemes linked to wildlife-friendly and socially responsible labeling of farm products	TA	Outcome 2. Wildlife-friendly and socially responsible labeling of farm products provides the basis for the establishment of payment for Ecosystem Service (PES) schemes that support local development and BD conservation	Output 2.1. A Brand scheme standards (see annex 14) and Brand membership (see annex 13) structures are developed and operationalised, building on ongoing work by the Landmark Foundation and partners Output 2.2. A Payment for Ecosystem Services (PES) scheme is developed and tested, linking to the Brand partnership (the sellers of Ecosystem Services [ES] products) and the wider public (buyers of ES products), and resulting in direct and measurable benefits to biodiversity conservation on livestock farms Output 2.3 Identification and analysis of direct and measurable benefits to biodiversity conservation on livestock farms	GEF TF	272,000	850,000
Component 3. Wildlife protection on production landscapes promoted, biodiversity monitoring and impact assessments conducted and knowledge management enhanced	TA	Outcome 3. Wildlife protection and compliance by brand scheme participants is promoted on farms, biodiversity monitoring programme is developed and implemented and awareness on BD friendly shepherding methods created.	Output 3.1. Wildlife protection and compliance by brand scheme participants is encouraged through financial incentives (premium on their produce) and financial disincentives resulting from non-compliance through the audited, certified and accredited Fair Game brand membership scheme are effected. Output 3.2. An effective Biodiversity monitoring programme is developed and implemented, to assess changes in the status of biodiversity in the participating livestock farms and the overall targeted rangeland ecosystems. Output 3.3. An evaluation of the actual environmental and economic impact of all methods of management of predation and damage-causing animals on livestock farms, both lethal (where livestock farmers continue to prefer this method), and non-lethal methods (where farmers wish to test these methods on their farms). Output 3.4. Results are independently evaluated and lessons learnt are published and widely disseminated, mainly targeting farmers as well as decision/policymakers	GEF TF	223,750	900,000
Subtotal					925,227	5,500,000
Project Management Cost (PMC)					92,523	
Total GEF Project Financing					1,017,750	5,500,000

4. Executing Arrangements

8. The project was implemented by UNEP through the designated Task Manager for the project, who worked together towards fulfilment of the project's objectives. UNEP processed legal instruments and disbursements to the **Executing Agency** (EA) and used a UNEP Project Cooperation Agreement (PCA) which is a legal document to be signed before work commences. The Executing Agency was the Landmark Foundation (LF). UNEP received all reports before distribution to the Project Steering Committee (PSC) and GEF and managed the project according to the GEF Project Cycle. UNEP was accountable to GEF for project delivery and had ultimate responsibility for supervising project development and guiding project development activities. The UNEP-Sub-regional office in South Africa was the contact point between the EA (Landmark Foundation) and the GEF **Implementing Agency** (UNEP). The UNEP Sub-regional office in South Africa represented the UNEP Ecosystems Division on the Project Steering Committee in the event that representatives of the UNEP Ecosystems Division were not able to attend.

9. The Project was guided by a **Project Steering Committee** composed of Department for Environmental Affairs (DEA) as the chair, South Africa National Parks Authority (SANParks) South Africa National Biodiversity Institute (SANBI), Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Education, Local Governments and NGOs, private sector, Provincial Conservation Departments and Statutory Boards, University of Pretoria (Veterinary Faculty) as the

research partner, and the National Project Manager and UNEP. The PSC was responsible for, among other things, to adopt the project's strategic decisions, reports and approve annual work plans, budgets and financial procurement, as well as oversee of the use of financial resources.

10. Landmark Foundation as the project Executing Agency managed the GEF grant, coordinated execution with all key partners, and provided technical and financial management services for execution of the project. The LF organized Project Steering Committee Meetings and was responsible for involving all relevant government representatives such as SANBI and SANParks, civil society, academic and private-sector stakeholders and UNEP (as the GEF executing Agency for the project). LF reported to UNEP for technical and financial delivery of the project outputs while it reported to the DEA and PSC for policy backstopping purposes.

5. Project Cost and Financing

11. The project had an overall budget of **USD US\$6,517,750** made up of a GEF Grant allocation of **US\$1,017,750** and co-financing of US\$5,500,000 to support the achievement of results. Table 3 below shows the estimated project budget and sources of funding as per the project design documentation.

Table 3. Project Budget (at approval)

GEF financing amount				US\$ 1,017,750			
Expected Co-financing amount				US\$ 5,500,000			
Co-finance							
Landmark Foundation		Philanthropist	Woolworths	Green Fund	GEF Agency (UNEP)		5,500,000
Cash	In-kind	Cash	Cash	Cash	Cash	In-kind	
100,000	100,000	4,600,000	100,000	500,000	-	100,000	

6. Implementation Issues

12. The project risk rating was deemed by project management to be low from inception till the end of the project. Management asserted that most of the outputs were substantively achieved. However, there was a concern around uptake beyond the project activities moving into replication and upscaling amongst commercial farmers. At project completion this risk was, reportedly, being offset through the incentivising of ethical and ecologically sensitive brand scheme producers. This incentive scheme, in time, is intended to ensure the upscaling and replication envisaged by the project. This scheme is a project output and it is anticipated that it will continue after project completion.

13. One further concern relevant to the assessment of project performance has been the 1:300-year drought that the project area experienced throughout the project cycle that has had both ecological and commercial impacts on the producers on whom most of the project activities are being focused. Just as this drought was partially alleviated the project endured an extended constraint of the COVID19 lockdown that severely hampered field activities. This additional and added challenge possibly impacted the appetite for, and attitudes towards, innovations that were attempting new mechanisms of ecologically sensitive production.

Section 2. OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

7. Objective of the Evaluation

14. In line with the UNEP Evaluation Policy³ and the UNEP Programme Manual⁴, the Terminal Evaluation is undertaken at operational completion of the project to assess project performance (in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency), and determine outcomes and impacts (actual and potential) stemming from the project, including their sustainability. The Evaluation has two primary purposes: (i) to provide evidence of results to meet accountability requirements, and (ii) to promote operational improvement, learning and knowledge sharing through results and lessons learned among UNEP and Landmark Foundation Trust and other project partners especially Green Fund (DBSA), Tamarisk Trust (South African Philanthropist),

³ <https://www.unenvironment.org/about-un-environment/evaluation-office/policies-and-strategies>

⁴ <https://wecollaborate.unep.org>

Woolworth Trust and Department of Environmental Affairs. Therefore, the Evaluation will identify lessons of operational relevance for future project formulation and implementation, especially where a second phase of the project is being considered. Recommendations relevant to the whole house may also be identified during the evaluation process.

8. Key Evaluation Principles

15. Evaluation findings and judgements will be based on **sound evidence and analysis**, clearly documented in the Evaluation Report. Information will be triangulated (i.e. verified from different sources) as far as possible, and when verification is not possible, the single source will be mentioned (whilst anonymity is still protected). Analysis leading to evaluative judgements should always be clearly spelled out.

16. **The “Why?” Question.** As this is a Terminal Evaluation and a follow-up project is likely [or similar interventions are envisaged for the future], particular attention will be given to learning from the experience. Therefore, the “why?” question should be at the front of the consultants’ minds all through the evaluation exercise and is supported by the use of a theory of change approach. This means that the consultant(s) needs to go beyond the assessment of “what” the project performance was and make a serious effort to provide a deeper understanding of “why” the performance was as it was (i.e. what contributed to the achievement of the project’s results). This should provide the basis for the lessons that can be drawn from the project.

17. **Attribution, Contribution and Credible Association:** In order to *attribute* any outcomes and impacts to a project intervention, one needs to consider the difference between what has happened with, and what would have happened without, the project (i.e. take account of changes over time and between contexts in order to isolate the effects of an intervention). This requires appropriate baseline data and the identification of a relevant counterfactual, both of which are frequently not available for evaluations. Establishing the *contribution* made by a project in a complex change process relies heavily on prior intentionality (e.g. approved project design documentation, logical framework) and the articulation of causality (e.g. narrative and/or illustration of the Theory of Change). Robust evidence that a project was delivered as designed and that the expected causal pathways developed supports claims of contribution and this is strengthened where an alternative theory of change can be excluded. A *credible association* between the implementation of a project and observed positive effects can be made where a strong causal narrative, although not explicitly articulated, can be inferred by the chronological sequence of events, active involvement of key actors and engagement in critical processes.

18. **Communicating evaluation results.** A key aim of the Evaluation is to encourage reflection and learning by UNEP staff and key project stakeholders. The consultant(s) should consider how reflection and learning can be promoted, both through the evaluation process and in the communication of evaluation findings and key lessons. Clear and concise writing is required on all evaluation deliverables. Draft and final versions of the Main Evaluation Report will be shared with key stakeholders by the Evaluation Manager. There may, however, be several intended audiences, each with different interests and needs regarding the report. The consultant(s) will plan with the Evaluation Manager which audiences to target and the easiest and clearest way to communicate the key evaluation findings and lessons to them. This may include some, or all, of the following; a webinar, conference calls with relevant stakeholders, the preparation of an Evaluation Brief or interactive presentation.

9. Key Strategic Questions

19. In addition to the evaluation criteria outlined in Section 10 below, the Evaluation will address the **four strategic questions** listed below. These are questions of interest to UNEP and to which the project is believed to be able to make a substantive contribution. In addition, five questions are included that are required when reporting in the GEF Portal and these must be addressed in the TE.

Q1: *To what extent has the Project fostered biodiversity conservation on livestock farms, through a return to human shepherding and the development of a wildlife-friendly produce branding scheme, leading to Payment for Ecosystem Services as a tool in conservation and local economic development?*

Q2: *What are the most successful examples enabled by the project with a potential for their scaling-up?*

Q3: *What changes were made to adapt to the effects of COVID-19 and how did they influence the project’s performance?*

Q4: *In what ways, and to what extent, have the needs and interests of differentiated groups been considered in the implementation and monitoring of the project?*

20. Address the following questions required for the GEF Portal in the appropriate parts of the report and provide a **summary of the findings in the Conclusions section of the report**:

a) *Under Monitoring and Reporting/Monitoring of Project Implementation:*

What was the performance at the project's completion against Core Indicator Targets? (For projects approved prior to GEF-7, these indicators will be identified retrospectively and comments on performance provided⁵).

b) *Under Factors Affecting Performance/Stakeholder Participation and Cooperation:*

What were the progress, challenges and outcomes regarding engagement of stakeholders in the project/program as evolved from the time of the MTR? *(This should be based on the description included in the Stakeholder Engagement Plan or equivalent documentation submitted at CEO Endorsement/Approval)*

c) *Under Factors Affecting Performance/Responsiveness to Human Rights and Gender Equality:*

What were the completed gender-responsive measures and, if applicable, actual gender result areas? *(This should be based on the documentation at CEO Endorsement/Approval, including gender-sensitive indicators contained in the project results framework or gender action plan or equivalent)*

d) *Under Factors Affecting Performance/Environmental and Social Safeguards:*

What was the progress made in the implementation of the management measures against the Safeguards Plan submitted at CEO Approval? The risk classifications reported in the latest PIR report should be verified and the findings of the effectiveness of any measures or lessons learned taken to address identified risks assessed. *(Any supporting documents gathered by the Consultant during this review should be shared with the Task Manager for uploading in the GEF Portal)*

e) *Under Factors Affecting Performance/Communication and Public Awareness:*

What were the challenges and outcomes regarding the project's completed Knowledge Management Approach, including: Knowledge and Learning Deliverables (e.g. website/platform development); Knowledge Products/Events; Communication Strategy; Lessons Learned and Good Practice; Adaptive Management Actions? *(This should be based on the documentation approved at CEO Endorsement/Approval)*

10. Evaluation Criteria

21. All evaluation criteria will be rated on a six-point scale. Sections A-I below, outline the scope of the criteria. A weightings table in excel format will be provided by the Evaluation Manager to support the determination of an overall project rating. The set of evaluation criteria are grouped in nine categories: (A) Strategic Relevance; (B) Quality of Project Design; (C) Nature of External Context; (D) Effectiveness, which comprises assessments of the availability of outputs, achievement of outcomes and likelihood of impact; (E) Financial Management; (F) Efficiency; (G) Monitoring and Reporting; (H) Sustainability; and (I) Factors Affecting Project Performance. The Evaluation Consultant(s) can propose other evaluation criteria as deemed appropriate.

A. Strategic Relevance

22. The Evaluation will assess the extent to which the activity is suited to the priorities and policies of the donors, implementing regions/countries and the target beneficiaries. The Evaluation will include an assessment of the project's relevance in relation to UNEP's mandate and its alignment with UNEP's policies and strategies at the time of project approval. Under strategic relevance an assessment of the complementarity of the project with other interventions addressing the needs of the same target groups will be made. This criterion comprises four elements:

i. **Alignment to the UNEP Medium Term Strategy⁶ (MTS), Programme of Work (POW) and Strategic Priorities**

23. The Evaluation should assess the project's alignment with the MTS and POW under which the project was approved and include, in its narrative, reflections on the scale and scope of any contributions made to the planned results reflected in the relevant MTS and POW. UNEP strategic priorities include the Bali Strategic Plan for Technology Support and Capacity Building⁷ (BSP) and South-South Cooperation (S-SC). The BSP

⁵ This is not applicable for Enabling Activities

⁶ UNEP's Medium Term Strategy (MTS) is a document that guides UNEP's programme planning over a four-year period. It identifies UNEP's thematic priorities, known as Sub-programmes (SP), and sets out the desired outcomes, known as Expected Accomplishments (EAs), of the Sub-programmes. <https://www.unenvironment.org/about-un-environment/evaluation-office/our-evaluation-approach/un-environment-documents>

⁷ <http://www.unep.fr/ozonaction/about/bsp.htm>

relates to the capacity of governments to: comply with international agreements and obligations at the national level; promote, facilitate and finance environmentally sound technologies and to strengthen frameworks for developing coherent international environmental policies. S-SC is regarded as the exchange of resources, technology and knowledge between developing countries.

ii. Alignment to Donor/GEF/Partner Strategic Priorities

24. Donor, including GEF, strategic priorities will vary across interventions. GEF priorities are specified in published programming priorities and focal area strategies. The Evaluation will assess the extent to which the project is suited to, or responding to, donor priorities. In some cases, alignment with donor priorities may be a fundamental part of project design and grant approval processes while in others, for example, instances of 'softly-earmarked' funding, such alignment may be more of an assumption that should be assessed.

iii. Relevance to Global, Regional, Sub-regional and National Environmental Priorities

25. The Evaluation will assess the alignment of the project with global priorities such as the SDGs and Agenda 2030. The extent to which the intervention is suited, or responding to, the stated environmental concerns and needs of the countries, sub-regions or regions where it is being implemented will be considered. Examples may include: UN Development Assistance Frameworks (UNDAF), national or sub-national development plans, poverty reduction strategies or Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Action (NAMA) plans or regional agreements etc. Within this section consideration will be given to whether the needs of all beneficiary groups are being met and reflects the current policy priority to leave no one behind.

iv. Complementarity with Relevant Existing Interventions/Coherence⁸

26. An assessment will be made of how well the project, either at design stage or during the project inception or mobilization⁹, took account of ongoing and planned initiatives (under the same sub-programme, other UNEP sub-programmes, or being implemented by other agencies within the same country, sector or institution) that address similar needs of the same target groups. The Evaluation will consider if the project team, in collaboration with Regional Offices and Sub-Programme Coordinators, made efforts to ensure their own intervention was complementary to other interventions, optimized any synergies and avoided duplication of effort. Examples may include UNDAFs or One UN programming. Linkages with other interventions should be described and instances where UNEP's comparative advantage has been particularly well applied should be highlighted.

Factors affecting this criterion may include:

- Stakeholders' participation and cooperation
- Responsiveness to human rights and gender equality
- Country ownership and driven-ness

B. Quality of Project Design

27. The quality of project design is assessed using an agreed template during the evaluation inception phase, ratings are attributed to identified criteria and an overall Project Design Quality rating is established. The complete Project Design Quality template should be annexed in the Evaluation Inception Report. Later, the overall Project Design Quality rating¹⁰ should be entered in the final evaluation ratings table (as item B) in the Main Evaluation Report and a summary of the project's strengths and weaknesses at design stage should be included within the body of the report.

Factors affecting this criterion may include (at the design stage):

- Stakeholders participation and cooperation
- Responsiveness to human rights and gender equality

C. Nature of External Context

⁸ This sub-category is consistent with the new criterion of 'Coherence' introduced by the OECD-DAC in 2019.

⁹ A project's inception or mobilization period is understood as the time between project approval and first disbursement. Complementarity during project implementation is considered under Efficiency, see below.

¹⁰ In some instances, based on data collected during the evaluation process, the assessment of the project's design quality may change from Inception Report to Main Evaluation Report.

28. At evaluation inception stage a rating is established for the project's external operating context (considering the prevalence of conflict, natural disasters and political upheaval¹¹). This rating is entered in the final evaluation ratings table as item C. Where a project has been rated as facing either an Unfavourable or Highly Unfavourable external operating context, and/or a negative external event has occurred during project implementation, the ratings for Effectiveness, Efficiency and/or Sustainability may be increased at the discretion of the Evaluation Consultant and Evaluation Manager together. A justification for such an increase must be given.

D. Effectiveness

i. Availability of Outputs¹²

29. The Evaluation will assess the project's success in producing the programmed outputs and making them available to the intended beneficiaries as well as its success in achieving milestones as per the project design document (ProDoc). Any *formal* modifications/revisions made during project implementation will be considered part of the project design. Where the project outputs are inappropriately or inaccurately stated in the ProDoc, reformulations may be necessary in the reconstruction of the Theory of Change (TOC). In such cases a table should be provided showing the original and the reformulation of the outputs for transparency. The availability of outputs will be assessed in terms of both quantity and quality, and the assessment will consider their ownership by, and usefulness to, intended beneficiaries and the timeliness of their provision. It is noted that emphasis is placed on the performance of those outputs that are most important to achieve outcomes. The Evaluation will briefly explain the reasons behind the success or shortcomings of the project in delivering its programmed outputs and meeting expected quality standards.

Factors affecting this criterion may include:

- Preparation and readiness
- Quality of project management and supervision¹³

ii. Achievement of Project Outcomes¹⁴

30. The achievement of project outcomes is assessed as performance against the project outcomes as defined in the reconstructed¹⁵ Theory of Change. These are outcomes that are intended to be achieved by the end of the project timeframe and within the project's resource envelope. Emphasis is placed on the achievement of project outcomes that are most important for attaining intermediate states. As with outputs, a table can be used where substantive amendments to the formulation of project outcomes is necessary to allow for an assessment of performance. The Evaluation should report evidence of attribution between UNEP's intervention and the project outcomes. In cases of normative work or where several actors are collaborating to achieve common outcomes, evidence of the nature and magnitude of UNEP's 'substantive contribution' should be included and/or 'credible association' established between project efforts and the project outcomes realised.

Factors affecting this criterion may include:

- Quality of project management and supervision
- Stakeholders' participation and cooperation
- Responsiveness to human rights and gender equality
- Communication and public awareness

¹¹ Note that 'political upheaval' does not include regular national election cycles, but unanticipated unrest or prolonged disruption. The potential delays or changes in political support that are often associated with the regular national election cycle should be part of the project's design and addressed through adaptive management by the project team. From March 2020 this should include the effects of COVID-19.

¹² Outputs are the availability (for intended beneficiaries/users) of new products and services and/or gains in knowledge, abilities and awareness of individuals or within institutions (UNEP, 2019)

¹³ In some cases 'project management and supervision' will refer to the supervision and guidance provided by UNEP to implementing partners and national governments while in others, specifically for GEF funded projects, it will refer to the project management performance of the executing agency and the technical backstopping provided by UNEP.

¹⁴ Outcomes are the use (i.e. uptake, adoption, application) of an output by intended beneficiaries, observed as changes in institutions or behavior, attitude or condition (UNEP, 2019)

¹⁵ All submitted UNEP project documents are required to present a Theory of Change with all submitted project designs. The level of 'reconstruction' needed during an evaluation will depend on the quality of this initial TOC, the time that has lapsed between project design and implementation (which may be related to securing and disbursing funds) and the level of any formal changes made to the project design.

iii. Likelihood of Impact

31. Based on the articulation of long-lasting effects in the reconstructed TOC (*i.e. from project outcomes, via intermediate states, to impact*), the Evaluation will assess the likelihood of the intended, positive impacts becoming a reality. Project objectives or goals should be incorporated in the TOC, possibly as intermediate states or long-lasting impacts. The Evaluation Office's approach to the use of TOC in project evaluations is outlined in a guidance note available and is supported by an excel-based flow chart, 'Likelihood of Impact Assessment Decision Tree'. Essentially the approach follows a 'likelihood tree' from project outcomes to impacts, taking account of whether the assumptions and drivers identified in the reconstructed TOC held. Any unintended positive effects should also be identified and their causal linkages to the intended impact described.

32. The Evaluation will also consider the likelihood that the intervention may lead, or contribute to, unintended negative effects (e.g. will vulnerable groups such as those living with disabilities and/or women and children, be disproportionately affected by the project?). Some of these potential negative effects may have been identified in the project design as risks or as part of the analysis of Environmental and Social Safeguards.

33. The Evaluation will consider the extent to which the project has played a catalytic role¹⁶ or has promoted scaling up and/or replication as part of its Theory of Change (either explicitly as in a project with a demonstration component or implicitly as expressed in the drivers required to move to outcome levels) and as factors that are likely to contribute to greater or long-lasting impact.

34. Ultimately UNEP and all its partners aim to bring about benefits to the environment and human well-being. Few projects are likely to have impact statements that reflect such long-lasting or broad-based changes. However, the Evaluation will assess the likelihood of the project to make a substantive contribution to the long-lasting changes represented by the Sustainable Development Goals and/or the intermediate-level results reflected in UNEP's Expected Accomplishments and the strategic priorities of funding partner(s).

Factors affecting this criterion may include:

- Quality of Project Management and Supervision (including adaptive management)
- Stakeholders participation and cooperation
- Responsiveness to human rights and gender equality
- Country ownership and driven-ness
- Communication and public awareness

E. Financial Management

35. Financial management will be assessed under three themes: *adherence* to UNEP's financial policies and procedures, *completeness* of financial information and *communication* between financial and project management staff. The Evaluation will establish the actual spend across the life of the project of funds secured from all donors. This expenditure will be reported, where possible, at output/component level and will be compared with the approved budget. The Evaluation will verify the application of proper financial management standards and adherence to UNEP's financial management policies. Any financial management issues that have affected the timely delivery of the project or the quality of its performance will be highlighted. The Evaluation will record where standard financial documentation is missing, inaccurate, incomplete or unavailable in a timely manner. The Evaluation will assess the level of communication between the

¹⁶ The terms catalytic effect, scaling up and replication are inter-related and generally refer to extending the coverage or magnitude of the effects of a project. Catalytic effect is associated with triggering additional actions that are not directly funded by the project – these effects can be both concrete or less tangible, can be intentionally caused by the project or implied in the design and reflected in the TOC drivers, or can be unintentional and can rely on funding from another source or have no financial requirements. Scaling up and Replication require more intentionality for projects, or individual components and approaches, to be reproduced in other similar contexts. Scaling up suggests a substantive increase in the number of new beneficiaries reached/involved and may require adapted delivery mechanisms while Replication suggests the repetition of an approach or component at a similar scale but among different beneficiaries. Even with highly technical work, where scaling up or replication involves working with a new community, some consideration of the new context should take place and adjustments made as necessary.

Project/Task Manager and the Fund Management Officer as it relates to the effective delivery of the planned project and the needs of a responsive, adaptive management approach.

Factors affecting this criterion may include:

- Preparation and readiness
- Quality of project management and supervision

F. Efficiency

36. Under the efficiency criterion the Evaluation will assess the extent to which the project delivered maximum results from the given resources. This will include an assessment of the cost-effectiveness and timeliness of project execution.

37. Focusing on the translation of inputs into outputs, cost-effectiveness is the extent to which an intervention has achieved, or is expected to achieve, its results at the lowest possible cost. Timeliness refers to whether planned activities were delivered according to expected timeframes as well as whether events were sequenced efficiently. The Evaluation will also assess to what extent any project extension could have been avoided through stronger project management and identify any negative impacts caused by project delays or extensions. The Evaluation will describe any cost or time-saving measures put in place to maximise results within the secured budget and agreed project timeframe and consider whether the project was implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternative interventions or approaches.

38. The Evaluation will give special attention to efforts made by the project teams during project implementation to make use of/build upon pre-existing institutions, agreements and partnerships, data sources, synergies and complementarities¹⁷ with other initiatives, programmes and projects etc. to increase project efficiency.

39. The factors underpinning the need for any project extensions will also be explored and discussed. As management or project support costs cannot be increased in cases of 'no cost extensions', such extensions represent an increase in unstated costs to implementing parties.

Factors affecting this criterion may include:

- Preparation and readiness (e.g. timeliness)
- Quality of project management and supervision
- Stakeholders participation and cooperation

G. Monitoring and Reporting

40. The Evaluation will assess monitoring and reporting across three sub-categories: monitoring design and budgeting, monitoring implementation and project reporting.

i. Monitoring Design and Budgeting

41. Each project should be supported by a sound monitoring plan that is designed to track progress against SMART¹⁸ results towards the provision of the project's outputs and achievement of project outcomes, including at a level disaggregated by gender, marginalisation or vulnerability, including those living with disabilities. In particular, the Evaluation will assess the relevance and appropriateness of the project indicators as well as the methods used for tracking progress against them as part of conscious results-based management. The Evaluation will assess the quality of the design of the monitoring plan as well as the funds allocated for its implementation. The adequacy of resources for Mid-Term and Terminal Evaluation/Review should be discussed if applicable.

ii. Monitoring of Project Implementation

42. The Evaluation will assess whether the monitoring system was operational and facilitated the timely tracking of results and progress towards projects objectives throughout the project implementation period. This assessment will include consideration of whether the project gathered relevant and good quality baseline data that is accurately and appropriately documented. This should include monitoring the representation and participation of disaggregated groups (including gendered, marginalised or vulnerable groups, such as those

¹⁷ Complementarity with other interventions during project design, inception or mobilization is considered under Strategic Relevance above.

¹⁸ SMART refers to results that are specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-oriented. Indicators help to make results measurable.

living with disabilities) in project activities. It will also consider the quality of the information generated by the monitoring system during project implementation and how it was used to adapt and improve project execution, achievement of outcomes and ensure sustainability. The Evaluation should confirm that funds allocated for monitoring were used to support this activity.

43. The performance at project completion against Core Indicator Targets should be reviewed. For projects approved prior to GEF-7, these indicators will be identified retrospectively and comments on performance provided.

iii. Project Reporting

44. UNEP has a centralised project information management system (Anubis) in which project managers upload six-monthly progress reports against agreed project milestones. This information will be provided to the Evaluation Consultant(s) by the Evaluation Manager. Some projects have additional requirements to report regularly to funding partners, which will be supplied by the project team (e.g. the Project Implementation Reviews and Tracking Tool for GEF-funded projects). The Evaluation will assess the extent to which both UNEP and donor reporting commitments have been fulfilled. Consideration will be given as to whether reporting has been carried out with respect to the effects of the initiative on disaggregated groups.

Factors affecting this criterion may include:

- Quality of project management and supervision
- Responsiveness to human rights and gender equality (e.g disaggregated indicators and data)

H. Sustainability

45. Sustainability¹⁹ is understood as the probability of the benefits derived from the achievement of project outcomes being maintained and developed after the close of the intervention. The Evaluation will identify and assess the key conditions or factors that are likely to undermine or contribute to the endurance of achieved project outcomes (i.e. 'assumptions' and 'drivers'). Some factors of sustainability may be embedded in the project design and implementation approaches while others may be contextual circumstances or conditions that evolve over the life of the intervention. Where applicable an assessment of bio-physical factors that may affect the sustainability of project outcomes may also be included.

i. Socio-political Sustainability

46. The Evaluation will assess the extent to which social or political factors support the continuation and further development of the benefits derived from project outcomes. It will consider the level of ownership, interest and commitment among government and other stakeholders to take the project achievements forwards. In particular the Evaluation will consider whether individual capacity development efforts are likely to be sustained.

ii. Financial Sustainability

47. Some project outcomes, once achieved, do not require further financial inputs, e.g. the adoption of a revised policy. However, in order to derive a benefit from this outcome further management action may still be needed e.g. to undertake actions to enforce the policy. Other project outcomes may be dependent on a continuous flow of action that needs to be resourced for them to be maintained, e.g. continuation of a new natural resource management approach. The Evaluation will assess the extent to which project outcomes are dependent on future funding for the benefits they bring to be sustained. Secured future funding is only relevant to financial sustainability where a project's outcomes have been extended into a future project phase. Even where future funding has been secured, the question still remains as to whether the project outcomes are financially sustainable.

iii. Institutional Sustainability

48. The Evaluation will assess the extent to which the sustainability of project outcomes (especially those relating to policies and laws) is dependent on issues relating to institutional frameworks and governance. It will consider whether institutional achievements such as governance structures and processes, policies, sub-

¹⁹ As used here, 'sustainability' means the long-lasting maintenance of outcomes and consequent impacts, whether environmental or not. This is distinct from the concept of sustainability in the terms 'environmental sustainability' or 'sustainable development', which imply 'not living beyond our means' or 'not diminishing global environmental benefits' (GEF STAP Paper, 2019, Achieving More Enduring Outcomes from GEF Investment)

regional agreements, legal and accountability frameworks etc. are robust enough to continue delivering the benefits associated with the project outcomes after project closure. In particular, the Evaluation will consider whether institutional capacity development efforts are likely to be sustained.

Factors affecting this criterion may include:

- Stakeholders participation and cooperation
- Responsiveness to human rights and gender equality (e.g. where interventions are not inclusive, their sustainability may be undermined)
- Communication and public awareness
- Country ownership and driven-ness

I. Factors Affecting Project Performance and Cross-Cutting Issues

(These factors are rated in the ratings table but are discussed within the Main Evaluation Report as cross-cutting themes as appropriate under the other evaluation criteria, above. If these issues have not been addressed under the evaluation criteria above, then independent summaries of their status within the evaluated project should be given.)

i. Preparation and Readiness

49. This criterion focuses on the inception or mobilisation stage of the project (i.e. the time between project approval and first disbursement). The Evaluation will assess whether appropriate measures were taken to either address weaknesses in the project design or respond to changes that took place between project approval, the securing of funds and project mobilisation. In particular the Evaluation will consider the nature and quality of engagement with stakeholder groups by the project team, the confirmation of partner capacity and development of partnership agreements as well as initial staffing and financing arrangements. *(Project preparation is included in the template for the assessment of Project Design Quality).*

ii. Quality of Project Management and Supervision

50. In some cases 'project management and supervision' may refer to the supervision and guidance provided by UNEP to implementing partners and national governments while in others, specifically for GEF funded projects²⁰, it may refer to the project management performance of the executing agency and the technical backstopping and supervision provided by UNEP. The performance of parties playing different roles should be discussed and a rating provided for both types of supervision (UNEP/Partner/Executing Agency) and the overall rating for this sub-category established as a simple average of the two.

51. The Evaluation will assess the effectiveness of project management with regard to: providing leadership towards achieving the planned outcomes; managing team structures; maintaining productive partner relationships (including Steering Groups etc.); maintaining project relevance within changing external and strategic contexts; communication and collaboration with UNEP colleagues; risk management; use of problem-solving; project adaptation and overall project execution. Evidence of adaptive management should be highlighted.

iii. Stakeholder Participation and Cooperation

52. Here the term 'stakeholder' should be considered in a broad sense, encompassing all project partners, duty bearers with a role in delivering project outputs and target users of project outputs and any other collaborating agents external to UNEP and the Executing Agency. The assessment will consider the quality and effectiveness of all forms of communication and consultation with stakeholders throughout the project life and the support given to maximise collaboration and coherence between various stakeholders, including sharing plans, pooling resources and exchanging learning and expertise. The inclusion and participation of all differentiated groups, including gender groups should be considered.

53. The progress, challenges and outcomes regarding engagement of stakeholders in the project/program occurring since the MTR should be reviewed. *(This should be based on the description*

²⁰ For GEF funded projects, a rating will be provided for the Project Management and Supervision of each of the Implementing and Executing Agencies. The two ratings will be aggregated to provide an overall rating for Quality of Project Management and Supervision

included in the Stakeholder Engagement Plan or equivalent documentation submitted at CEO Endorsement/Approval).

iv. Responsiveness to Human Rights and Gender Equality

54. The Evaluation will ascertain to what extent the project has applied the UN Common Understanding on the human rights-based approach (HRBA) and the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People. Within this human rights context the Evaluation will assess to what extent the intervention adheres to UNEP's Policy and Strategy for Gender Equality and the Environment²¹.

55. In particular the Evaluation will consider to what extent project-implementation and monitoring have taken into consideration: (i) possible inequalities (especially those related to gender) in access to, and the control over, natural resources; (ii) specific vulnerabilities of disadvantaged groups (especially women, youth and children and those living with disabilities) to environmental degradation or disasters; and (iii) the role of disadvantaged groups (especially those related to gender) in mitigating or adapting to environmental changes and engaging in environmental protection and rehabilitation.

56. Note that the project's effect on equality (i.e. promoting human rights, gender equality and inclusion of those living with disabilities and/or belonging to marginalised/vulnerable groups) should be included within the TOC as a general driver or assumption where there is no dedicated result within the results framework. If an explicit commitment on this topic is made within the project document then the driver/assumption should also be specific to the described intentions.

57. The completed gender-responsive measures and, if applicable, actual gender result areas should be reviewed. (This should be based on the documentation at CEO Endorsement/Approval, including gender-sensitive indicators contained in the project results framework or gender action plan or equivalent).

v. Environmental and Social Safeguards

58. UNEP projects address environmental and social safeguards primarily through the process of environmental and social screening at the project approval stage, risk assessment and management (avoidance, minimization, mitigation or, in exceptional cases, offsetting) of potential environmental and social risks and impacts associated with project and programme activities. The Evaluation will confirm whether UNEP requirements²² were met to: *review* risk ratings on a regular basis; *monitor* project implementation for possible safeguard issues; *respond* (where relevant) to safeguard issues through risk avoidance, minimization, mitigation or offsetting and *report* on the implementation of safeguard management measures taken. UNEP requirements for proposed projects to be screened for any safeguarding issues; for sound environmental and social risk assessments to be conducted and initial risk ratings to be assigned are evaluated above under Quality of Project Design).

59. The Evaluation will also consider the extent to which the management of the project minimised UNEP's environmental footprint.

60. Implementation of the management measures against the Safeguards Plan submitted at CEO Approval should be reviewed, the risk classifications verified and the findings of the effectiveness of any measures or lessons learned taken to address identified risks assessed. Any supporting documents gathered by the Consultant should be shared with the Task Manager.

vi. Country Ownership and Driven-ness

61. The Evaluation will assess the quality and degree of engagement of government / public sector agencies in the project. While there is some overlap between Country Ownership and Institutional Sustainability, this criterion focuses primarily on the forward momentum of the intended projects results, i.e. either a) moving forwards from outputs to project outcomes or b) moving forward from project outcomes towards intermediate states. The Evaluation will consider the engagement not only of those directly involved in project execution and those participating in technical or leadership groups, but also those official

²¹The Evaluation Office notes that Gender Equality was first introduced in the UNEP Project Review Committee Checklist in 2010 and, therefore, provides a criterion rating on gender for projects approved from 2010 onwards. Equally, it is noted that policy documents, operational guidelines and other capacity building efforts have only been developed since then and have evolved over time. https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/7655/-Gender_equality_and_the_environment_Policy_and_strategy-2015Gender_equality_and_the_environment_policy_and_strategy.pdf.pdf?sequence=3&isAllowed=y

²²For the review of project concepts and proposals, the Safeguard Risk Identification Form (SRIF) was introduced in 2019 and replaced the Environmental, Social and Economic Review note (ESERN), which had been in place since 2016. In GEF projects safeguards have been considered in project designs since 2011.

representatives whose cooperation is needed for change to be embedded in their respective institutions and offices (e.g. representatives from multiple sectors or relevant ministries beyond Ministry of Environment). This factor is concerned with the level of ownership generated by the project over outputs and outcomes and that is necessary for long-lasting impact to be realised. Ownership should extend to all gendered and marginalised groups.

vii. Communication and Public Awareness

62. The Evaluation will assess the effectiveness of: a) communication of learning and experience sharing between project partners and interested groups arising from the project during its life and b) public awareness activities that were undertaken during the implementation of the project to influence attitudes or shape behaviour among wider communities and civil society at large. The Evaluation should consider whether existing communication channels and networks were used effectively, including meeting the differentiated needs of gendered or marginalised groups, and whether any feedback channels were established. Where knowledge sharing platforms have been established under a project the Evaluation will comment on the sustainability of the communication channel under either socio-political, institutional or financial sustainability, as appropriate.

63. The project's completed Knowledge Management Approach, including: Knowledge and Learning Deliverables (e.g. website/platform development); Knowledge Products/Events; Communication Strategy; Lessons Learned and Good Practice; Adaptive Management Actions should be reviewed. This should be based on the documentation approved at CEO Endorsement/Approval.

Section 3. EVALUATION APPROACH, METHODS AND DELIVERABLES

64. The Terminal Evaluation will be an in-depth evaluation using a participatory approach whereby key stakeholders are kept informed and consulted throughout the evaluation process. Both quantitative and qualitative evaluation methods will be used as appropriate to determine project achievements against the expected outputs, outcomes and impacts. It is highly recommended that the consultant(s) maintains close communication with the project team and promotes information exchange throughout the Evaluation implementation phase in order to increase their (and other stakeholder) ownership of the evaluation findings. Where applicable, the consultant(s) will provide a geo-referenced map that demarcates the area covered by the project and, where possible, provide geo-reference photographs of key intervention sites (e.g. sites of habitat rehabilitation and protection, pollution treatment infrastructure, etc.)

65. The findings of the Evaluation will be based on the following:

(a) A **desk review** of:

- Relevant background documentation
- Project design documents (including minutes of the project design review meeting at approval); Annual Work Plans and Budgets or equivalent, revisions to the project (Project Document Supplement), the logical framework and its budget;
- Project reports such as six-monthly progress and financial reports, progress reports from collaborating partners, meeting minutes, relevant correspondence and including the Project Implementation Reviews and Tracking Tool etc.;
- Project deliverables

(b) **Interviews** (individual or in group) with:

- UNEP Task Manager (TM);
- Project management team, including the Project Manager within the Executing Agency, where appropriate;
- UNEP Fund Management Officer (FMO);
- Portfolio Manager and Sub-Programme Coordinator, where appropriate;
- Project partners, including Landmark Foundation Trust, Green Fund (DBSA), Tamarisk Trust (South African Philanthropist), Woolworth Trust, Department of Environmental Affairs;
- Relevant resource persons;

- Representatives from civil society and specialist groups (such as women's, farmers and trade associations etc).
- (c) **Surveys** [where appropriate]
- (d) **Field visits** [where appropriate and feasible]
- (e) Other data collection tools as deemed necessary

11. Evaluation Deliverables and Review Procedures

66. The Evaluation Team will prepare:

- **Inception Report:** (see Annex 1 for a list of all templates, tables and guidance notes) containing an assessment of project design quality, a draft reconstructed Theory of Change of the project, project stakeholder analysis, evaluation framework and a tentative evaluation schedule.
- **Preliminary Findings Note:** typically in the form of a PowerPoint presentation, the sharing of preliminary findings is intended to support the participation of the project team, act as a means to ensure all information sources have been accessed and provide an opportunity to verify emerging findings. In the case of highly strategic project/portfolio evaluations or evaluations with an Evaluation Reference Group, the preliminary findings may be presented as a word document for review and comment.
- **Draft and Final Evaluation Report:** containing an executive summary that can act as a stand-alone document; detailed analysis of the evaluation findings organised by evaluation criteria and supported with evidence; lessons learned and recommendations and an annotated ratings table.

67. An **Evaluation Brief**, (a 2-page overview of the evaluand and key evaluation findings) for wider dissemination through the UNEP website may be required. This will be discussed with the Evaluation Manager no later than during the finalization of the Inception Report.

68. **Review of the Draft Evaluation Report.** The Evaluation Consultant(s) will submit a draft report to the Evaluation Manager and revise the draft in response to their comments and suggestions. Once a draft of adequate quality has been peer-reviewed and accepted, the Evaluation Manager will share the cleared draft report with the Task Manager, who will alert the Evaluation Manager in case the report contains any blatant factual errors. The Evaluation Manager will then forward the revised draft report (corrected by the Evaluation Consultant(s) where necessary) to other project stakeholders, for their review and comments. Stakeholders may provide feedback on any errors of fact and may highlight the significance of such errors in any conclusions as well as providing feedback on the proposed recommendations and lessons. Any comments or responses to draft reports will be sent to the Evaluation Manager for consolidation. The Evaluation Manager will provide all comments to the Evaluation Consultant(s) for consideration in preparing the final report, along with guidance on areas of contradiction or issues requiring an institutional response.

69. Based on a careful review of the evidence collated by the Evaluation Consultants and the internal consistency of the report, the Evaluation Manager will provide an assessment of the ratings in the final evaluation report. Where there are differences of opinion between the evaluator and the Evaluation Manager on project ratings, both viewpoints will be clearly presented in the final report. The Evaluation Office ratings will be considered the final ratings for the project.

70. The Evaluation Manager will prepare a **quality assessment** of the first draft of the Main Evaluation Report, which acts as a tool for providing structured feedback to the Evaluation Consultant(s). The quality of the final report will be assessed and rated against the criteria specified in template listed in Annex 1 and this assessment will be appended to the Final Evaluation Report.

71. At the end of the evaluation process, the Evaluation Office will prepare a **Recommendations Implementation Plan** in the format of a table, to be completed and updated at regular intervals by the Task Manager. The Evaluation Office will track compliance against this plan on a six-monthly basis for a maximum of 12 months.

12. The Evaluation Consultant

72. For this Evaluation, the Evaluation Team will consist of an Evaluation Specialist who will work under the overall responsibility of the Evaluation Office represented by an Evaluation Manager, Pauline Marima, in

consultation with the UNEP Task Manager, Jane Nimpamya, Fund Management Officer, George Saddimbah and the Sub-programme Coordinator of the Nature Action Sub-programme, Marieta Sakalian. The consultant(s) will liaise with the Evaluation Manager on any procedural and methodological matters related to the Evaluation, including travel. It is, however, each consultant's individual responsibility (where applicable) to arrange for their visas and immunizations as well as to plan meetings with stakeholders, organize online surveys, obtain documentary evidence and any other logistical matters related to the assignment. The UNEP Task Manager and project team will, where possible, provide logistical support (introductions, meetings etc.) allowing the consultants to conduct the Evaluation as efficiently and independently as possible.

73. The Evaluation Consultant will be hired over a period of **8 months from the start date** and should have the following: a university degree in environmental sciences, international development or other relevant political or social sciences area is required and an advanced degree in the same areas is desirable; a minimum of 5 years of technical or evaluation experience is required, preferably including evaluating large, regional or global programmes and using a Theory of Change approach; and a good/broad understanding of wildlife conservation is desired. English and French are the working languages of the United Nations Secretariat. For this consultancy, fluency in oral and written English is a requirement. Working knowledge of the UN system and specifically the work of UNEP is an added advantage. The work will be home-based with possible field visits.

74. The Evaluation Consultant will be responsible, in close consultation with the Evaluation Office of UNEP for overall management of the Evaluation and timely provision of its outputs, described above in Section 11 Evaluation Deliverables, above. The Evaluation Specialist will make substantive and high- quality contributions to the evaluation process and outputs. The consultant will ensure that all evaluation criteria and questions are adequately covered.

75. In close consultation with the Evaluation Manager, the Evaluation Consultant will be responsible for the overall management of the Evaluation and timely provision of its outputs, data collection and analysis and report-writing. More specifically:

Inception phase of the Evaluation, including:

- preliminary desk review and introductory interviews with project staff;
- draft the reconstructed Theory of Change of the project;
- prepare the evaluation framework;
- develop the desk review and interview protocols;
- draft the survey protocols (if relevant);
- develop and present criteria for country and/or site selection for the evaluation mission;
- plan the evaluation schedule;
- prepare the Inception Report, incorporating comments until approved by the Evaluation Manager

Data collection and analysis phase of the Evaluation, including:

- conduct further desk review and in-depth interviews with project implementing and executing agencies, project partners and project stakeholders;
- (where appropriate and agreed) conduct an evaluation mission(s) to selected countries, visit the project locations, interview project partners and stakeholders, including a good representation of local communities. Ensure independence of the Evaluation and confidentiality of evaluation interviews.
- regularly report back to the Evaluation Manager on progress and inform of any possible problems or issues encountered and;
- keep the Project/Task Manager informed of the evaluation progress.

Reporting phase, including:

- draft the Main Evaluation Report, ensuring that the evaluation report is complete, coherent and consistent with the Evaluation Manager guidelines both in substance and style;

- liaise with the Evaluation Manager on comments received and finalize the Main Evaluation Report, ensuring that comments are taken into account until approved by the Evaluation Manager
- prepare a Response to Comments annex for the main report, listing those comments not accepted by the Evaluation Consultant and indicating the reason for the rejection; and
- (where agreed with the Evaluation Manager) prepare an Evaluation Brief (2-page summary of the evaluand and the key evaluation findings and lessons)

Managing relations, including:

- maintain a positive relationship with evaluation stakeholders, ensuring that the evaluation process is as participatory as possible but at the same time maintains its independence;
- communicate in a timely manner with the Evaluation Manager on any issues requiring its attention and intervention.

13. Schedule of the Evaluation

The table below presents the tentative schedule for the Evaluation.

Table 3. Tentative schedule for the Evaluation

Milestone	Tentative Dates
Evaluation Initiation Meeting	Within 1 week from start date
Inception Report	1 month from starting date
Mission to South Africa (7 days inclusive of return travel)	1.5 - 2 months from starting date
Presentation of preliminary findings	2.5 months from starting date
Draft report submitted to Evaluation Manager (and Peer Reviewer)	3.5 months from starting date
Draft Report submitted to Task Manager and core project team	5 months from starting date
Draft Report shared with wider group of stakeholders	6 months from starting date
Submission of Final Report	7-8 months from starting date

14. Contractual Arrangements

76. Evaluation Consultant will be selected and recruited by the Evaluation Office of UNEP under an individual Special Service Agreement (SSA) on a “fees only” basis (see below). By signing the service contract with UNEP /UNON, the consultant certifies that they have not been associated with the design and implementation of the project in any way which may jeopardize their independence and impartiality towards project achievements and project partner performance. In addition, they will not have any future interests (within six months after completion of the contract) with the project’s executing or implementing units. All consultants are required to sign the Code of Conduct Agreement Form.

77. Fees will be paid on an instalment basis, paid on acceptance by the Evaluation Manager of expected key deliverables. The schedule of payment is as follows:

Schedule of Payment for the Evaluation Consultant

Deliverable	Percentage Payment
Approved Inception Report (as per annex document #9)	30%
Approved Draft Main Evaluation Report (as per annex document #10)	30%
Approved Final Main Evaluation Report	40%

78. Fees only contracts: Where applicable, air tickets will be purchased by UNEP and 75% of the Daily Subsistence Allowance for each authorised travel mission will be paid up front. Local in-country travel will only be reimbursed where agreed in advance with the Evaluation Manager and on the production of acceptable receipts. Terminal expenses and residual DSA entitlements (25%) will be paid after mission completion.

79. The consultant may be provided with access to UNEP’s information management systems (e.g. SharePoint Dropbox, etc.) and if such access is granted, the consultants agree not to disclose information from that system to third parties beyond information required for, and included in, the evaluation report.

80. In case the consultant is not able to provide the deliverables in accordance with these guidelines, and in line with the expected quality standards by the UNEP Evaluation Office, payment may be withheld at the discretion of the Director of the Evaluation Office until the consultants have improved the deliverables to meet UNEP's quality standards.

81. If the consultant fails to submit a satisfactory final product to UNEP in a timely manner, i.e. before the end date of their contract, the Evaluation Office reserves the right to employ additional human resources to finalize the report, and to reduce the consultants' fees by an amount equal to the additional costs borne by the Evaluation Office to bring the report up to standard²³.

²³ This may include contract cancellation in-line with prevailing UN Secretariat rules.

Annex 1: Tools, Templates and Guidance Notes for use in the Evaluation

The tools, templates and guidance notes listed in the table below, and available from the Evaluation Manager, are intended to help Evaluation Managers and Evaluation Consultants to produce evaluation products that are consistent with each other and which can be compiled into a biennial Evaluation Synthesis Report. The biennial summary is used to provide an overview of progress to UN Environment and the UN Environmental Assembly.

This suite of documents is also intended to make the evaluation process as transparent as possible so that all those involved in the process can participate on an informed basis. It is recognised that the evaluation needs of projects and portfolio vary and adjustments may be necessary so that the purpose of the evaluation process (broadly, accountability and lesson learning), can be met. Such adjustments should be decided between the Evaluation Manager and the Evaluation Consultants in order to produce evaluation reports that are both useful to project implementers and that produce credible findings.

ADVICE TO CONSULTANTS: As our tools, templates and guidance notes are updated on a continuous basis, kindly download documents from the link provided by the Evaluation Manager during the Inception Phase and use those versions throughout the Evaluation.

List of tools, templates and guidance notes available:

Document #	Name
1	00_Tools Description and Mapping (Word file)
2	00a_UNEP Glossary Results Definitions (PDF file)
3	00b_List of Documents Needed for Evaluations (Word file)
4	01_Evaluation Criteria (Word file)
5	02_Criterion Rating Descriptions Matrix (Word file)
6	03_Evaluation Ratings Table ONLY (Word file)
7	04_Weighted Ratings Table (Excel file)
8	05_Project Identification Table ONLY (Word file)
9	06_Inception Report Structure and Contents (Word file)
10	07_Main Evaluation Report Structure and Contents (Word file)
11	08_TOC Reformulation Justification Table ONLY (Word file)
12	09_Quality of Project Design Assessment (Word file)
13	09a_Quality of Project Design Assessment Template.xlsx (Excel file)
14	10_Stakeholder Analysis Guidance Note (Word file)
15	11_Gender Methods Note for Consultants (Word file)
16	12_Safeguards Methods Note for Consultants (Word file)
17	13_Use of Theory of Change in Project Evaluations (Word file)
18	14_Financial Tables (Word file)
19	15_Likelihood of Impact.xlsm (Excel file)
20	15a_Likelihood of impact Test Case (Excel file)
21	16_Recommendations Quality Guidance Note (Word file)
22	16a_In Report Template Presenting Recommendations and Lesson Learned (Word file)
23	17_TE-MTE GEF Cover Page Prelims and Style Sheet Main Evaluation Report (Word file)
24	18_TE-MTE Non GEF Cover Page Prelims and Style Sheet Main Evaluation Report (Word file)
25	19_Quality of Evaluation Report Assessment FINAL ONLY (Word file)
26	20_Evaluation Methodology Structure (Word file)
27	21_GEF Portal Annex Template (Word file)
28	Process 1_Evaluation Process Guidelines for Consultants (Word file)
29	Process 2_Template for Attestation Letter (Word file)
30	Process 3_Evaluation Consultants Agreement Form (Word file)
31	Process 4_Guidelines for Field Work During Coronavirus (Word file)
32	Process 5_Evaluation Consultants Team Roles (Word file)
33	Process 6_Template for Reference Checks (Word file)

GEF portal inputs

Question: What was the performance at the project's completion against Core Indicator Targets ? (For projects approved prior to GEF-7 ²⁴ , these indicators will be identified retrospectively and comments on performance provided ²⁵).
Response: (Might be drawn from Monitoring and Reporting section)

²⁴ The GEF is currently operating under the seventh replenishment period of the GEF Trust Fund covering the period July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2022. The GEF Portal Reporting Guide for FY20 Reporting Process indicates that GEF-6 projects that have yet to map existing indicators to GEF-7 Core Indicators need to do so at MTR stage or (if already there) at the time of the TE.

²⁵ This is not applicable for Enabling Activities

Question: What were the progress, challenges and outcomes regarding engagement of stakeholders in the project/program as evolved from the time of the MTR? <i>(This should be based on the description included in the Stakeholder Engagement Plan or equivalent documentation submitted at CEO Endorsement/Approval)</i>
Response: (Refer to Section V. I: Factors Affecting Performance)
Question: What were the completed gender-responsive measures and, if applicable, actual gender result areas? (This should be based on the documentation at CEO Endorsement/Approval, including gender-sensitive indicators contained in the project results framework or gender action plan or equivalent)
Response: (Refer to Section V. I: Factors Affecting Performance)
Question: What was the progress made in the implementation of the management measures against the Safeguards Plan submitted at CEO Approval? The risk classifications reported in the latest PIR report should be verified and the findings of the effectiveness of any measures or lessons learned taken to address identified risks assessed. <i>(Any supporting documents gathered by the Consultant during this review should be shared with the Task Manager for uploading in the GEF Portal)</i>
Response: (refer to Section V. I: Factors Affecting Performance)
Question: What were the challenges and outcomes regarding the project's completed Knowledge Management Approach, including: Knowledge and Learning Deliverables (e.g. website/platform development); Knowledge Products/Events; Communication Strategy; Lessons Learned and Good Practice; Adaptive Management Actions? <i>(This should be based on the documentation approved at CEO Endorsement/Approval)</i>
Response: (Refer Section V. D: Effectiveness, Component 4 and Section V. I: Factors Affecting Performance)
Question: What are the main findings of the evaluation?
Response: