

Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference - Environmentally Sustainable Production Practices in Cocoa Landscapes
Phases I & II (ESP Phases I & II)

PROJECT/OUTCOME INFORMATION		
Project/outcome title	Environmentally Sustainable Production Practices in Cocoa Landscapes Phases I & II (ESP Phases I & II)	
Atlas ID	00095425	
Corporate outcome and output	UNSDP Outcome (s): Outcome 6: Urban and rural communities have access to affordable services, knowledge and tools to increase their resilience Expected Output(s): 6.3. Communities have greater capacities and skills to adopt environmental conservation practices, such as climate-smart agriculture	
Country	Ghana	
Region	RBA	
Date project document signed		
Project dates	Start	Planned end
	May 1, 2013	December 31, 2020
Project budget (USD)	Phase I: USD 1,701,600; Phase II: 1,850,002.59	
Project expenditure at the time of evaluation		
Funding source	Mondelez International	
Implementing party ¹	Ghana Cocoa Board	

¹ It is the entity that has overall responsibility for implementation of the project (award), effective use of resources and delivery of outputs in the signed project document and workplan.

BASIC CONTRACT INFORMATION

Location: Accra

Application Deadline: 22nd October, 2020

Type of Contract: Individual consultant

Assignment Type: Terminal Evaluation

Languages Required: English

Starting Date: 2nd November, 2020

Duration of Initial Contract: 8 weeks

Expected Duration of Assignment: 20 working days over a period of 8 weeks (Between 2nd October – 24th December)

1. Background and context

The Ghana Cocoa Board (COCOBOD), with funding from Mondelez International’s Cocoa Life Programme has been implementing over the past seven (7) years a projects dubbed “Environmental Sustainability and Policy” (ESP Phase I) and “Environmentally Sustainable Production Practices in Cocoa Landscapes (ESP Phases II).

The project phases have over the period aimed at creating institutional systems, tools and policies to rehabilitate cocoa landscapes, helping farmers in the Cocoa Life Programme adopt environmentally sustainable and climate change resilient cocoa production practices and to conserve ecosystems and natural resources in cocoa landscapes. Environmentally sustainable production practices have to do with how farmers can sustainably manage and conserve the current production environment, for example: how to spray responsibly, how to ensure long-term productivity with overhead shade trees and soil cover and how to protect forests and water bodies for biodiversity and human use. The expected results from the successful implementation of the two phases have been to:

- Strengthen national policies
- Effectively mainstream environmentally sustainable cocoa production practices into farmer training curricula by building the technical capacities of CHED CEAs mandated to provide farmer level trainings.
- Support farmers in the project districts adopt environmentally sustainable cocoa production practices on farms.
- Increased shade trees and carbon stocks on cocoa farms and in cocoa landscapes to provide short to long-term environmental and socio-economic benefits to farmers.
- The establishment of three Community Resource Management Areas to govern the use of natural resources at the landscape level including fire management; sacred groves protection and water resources management.
- Policy engagement with government on land tenure and tree tenure rights.

The project aims to deliver these results by meeting the following objectives:

1. Create the institutional systems, tools and policies to rehabilitate cocoa landscapes, conserve and expand forests, forest buffer zones and corridor (Phase I);
2. Farmers in the Cocoa Life program adopt environmentally sustainable and climate change resilient cocoa production practices on their farms (Phase II)
3. Cocoa production landscapes in the Cocoa Life communities and districts are managed sustainably to conserve ecosystems and natural resources (Phase II).

The objectives are expected to be achieved by attaining the following outcomes:

Phase I

- Outcome 1: Policies and institutions strengthened
- Outcome 2: Cocoa landscapes rehabilitated
- Outcome 3: Forests conserved
- Outcome 4: Cocoa Institutions and farmers knowledgeable on environmental best practices
- Outcome 5: Incentive based mechanisms in place
- Outcome 6: Public private sector coordination

Phase II

- Outcome 1: Mainstreaming environmentally sustainable production practices into farmer level practices
- Outcome 2: Natural resources and ecosystems management in cocoa production landscapes
- Outcome 3: Identifying Funding Mechanisms

The two phases of the project have been executed by the Ghana Cocoa Board (COCOBOD) in partnership with the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). The project has been under implementation since 1st May 2013 – 31 September 2016 (for Phase I) and 1st October 2016 - 31st December 2020 (Phase II) in selected Cocoa Life districts and communities in six regions of Ghana.

The Project target locations are in the Eastern, Ashanti, Central, Western North, Western and Ahafo Regions of Ghana. In all twelve project (12)² Districts Assemblies and a total of 330 communities in Cocoa Life’s cohorts 1, 2 and 3 are benefitting from the project.

2. Evaluation purpose, scope and objectives

The evaluation report will assess the achievement of project results against what was expected to be achieved and draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming. This will be done by assessing project performance against expectations set out in the project’s Logical Framework/Results Framework (see ToR Annex A), among others as agreed with UNDP and evaluation stakeholders at the inception phase. The evaluation report will promote accountability and transparency and assesses the extent of project accomplishments. The project has, since October 2016, worked at mainstreaming environmental practices in cocoa production through direct farmer engagements and training of COCOBOD’s Cocoa Health Extension Division (CHED) extension officers as well as getting communities involved in the sustainable management of their natural resources. It shall cover issues related to the various components of the project mentioned in paragraph 1 above. Recommendations from this evaluation will therefore be useful in sustaining the various results and interventions undertaken under this project. In addition, the evaluation must address how the intervention sought to strengthen the application of the rights-based approach and mainstream gender in during implementation.

The Findings section of the Terminal Evaluation (TE) report will cover the topics listed below. A full outline of the TE report’s content is provided in ToR Annex E.

The asterisk “(*)” indicates criteria for which a rating is required.

Findingsi. Project Design/Formulation

- National priorities and country driven-ness
- Theory of Change
- Gender equality and women’s empowerment
- Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)
- Analysis of Results Framework: project logic and strategy, indicators
- Assumptions and Risks
- Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g. same focal area) incorporated into project design
- Planned stakeholder participation
- Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
- Management arrangements

ii. Project Implementation

- Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)

² Project districts have evolved from the original 14 districts stated in the project document for ESP II

- Actual stakeholder participation and partnership arrangements
- Project Finance and Co-finance
- Monitoring & Evaluation: design at entry (*), implementation (*), and overall assessment of M&E (*)
- Implementing Agency (UNDP) (*) and Executing Agency (*), overall project oversight/implementation and execution (*)
- Risk Management, including Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)
- Any impact from COVID-19

iii. Project Results

- Assess the achievement of outcomes against indicators by reporting on the level of progress for each objective and outcome indicator at the time of the TE and noting final achievements
- Relevance (*), Effectiveness (*), Efficiency (*) and overall project outcome (*)
- Sustainability: financial (*), socio-political (*), institutional framework and governance (*), environmental (*), overall likelihood of sustainability (*)
- Country ownership
- Gender equality and women’s empowerment
- Cross-cutting issues (poverty alleviation, improved governance, climate change mitigation and adaptation, disaster prevention and recovery, human rights, capacity development, South-South cooperation, knowledge management, volunteerism, etc., as relevant)
- Catalytic Role / Replication Effect
- Progress to impact
- Any impact from COVID-19

iv. Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons Learned

- The TE team will include a summary of the main findings of the TE report. Findings should be presented as statements of fact that are based on analysis of the data.
- The section on conclusions will be written in light of the findings. Conclusions should be comprehensive and balanced statements that are well substantiated by evidence and logically connected to the TE findings. They should highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project, respond to key evaluation questions and provide insights into the identification of and/or solutions to important problems or issues pertinent to project beneficiaries (especially cocoa farmers), UNDP, COCOBOD and the donor, including issues in relation to gender equality and women’s empowerment.
- Recommendations should provide concrete, practical, feasible and targeted recommendations directed to the intended users of the evaluation about what actions to take and decisions to make. The recommendations should be specifically supported by the evidence and linked to the findings and conclusions around key questions addressed by the evaluation.
- The TE report should also include lessons that can be taken from the evaluation, including best practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success that can provide knowledge gained from the particular circumstance (programmatic and evaluation methods used, partnerships, financial leveraging, etc.) that are applicable to other UNDP interventions. When possible, the TE team should include examples of good practices in project design and implementation.
- It is important for the conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned of the TE report to incorporate gender equality and empowerment of women.

The TE report will include an Evaluation Ratings Table, as shown below:

ToR Table 1: Evaluation Ratings Table

Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E)	Rating ³
M&E design at entry	
M&E Plan Implementation	
Overall Quality of M&E	
Implementation & Execution	Rating
Quality of UNDP Implementation/Oversight	
Quality of Implementing Partner Execution	
Overall quality of Implementation/Execution	
Assessment of Outcomes	Rating
Relevance	
Effectiveness	
Efficiency	
Overall Project Outcome Rating	
Sustainability	Rating
Financial resources	
Socio-political/economic	
Institutional framework and governance	
Environmental	
Overall Likelihood of Sustainability	

3. Evaluation criteria and key guiding questions

It is expected that the evaluation will be guided by the set of questions provided in Annex B, to help define the information that the evaluation will generate. This will give intended users of the evaluation the information they seek in order to make decisions, take action or add to knowledge. Guiding evaluation questions should be further refined by the evaluation team and agreed with UNDP evaluation stakeholders during the inception phase.

4. Methodology

The evaluation report must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluation team will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation and implementation phases of the project.

Methodological approaches may include some or all of the following:

- Evaluation should employ a combination of both qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods and instruments.
- **Document review of all relevant documentation.** This would include a review of inter alia
 - Project proposal
 - Project document (contribution agreement).
 - Results framework.
 - Programme and project quality assurance reports.
 - Annual workplans.
 - Close-out report and lessons (Phase I)
 - Consolidated quarterly and annual reports.
 - Results-oriented monitoring report.
 - Highlights of project board meetings.

³ Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, Implementation/Oversight & Execution, Relevance are rated on a 6-point scale: 6=Highly Satisfactory (HS), 5=Satisfactory (S), 4=Moderately Satisfactory (MS), 3=Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), 2=Unsatisfactory (U), 1=Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). Sustainability is rated on a 4-point scale: 4=Likely (L), 3=Moderately Likely (ML), 2=Moderately Unlikely (MU), 1=Unlikely (U)

- Technical/financial monitoring reports.
- Training materials and manuals
- **Semi-structured interviews** with key stakeholders including COCOBOD representatives, the donor, representatives of key Cocoa Life implementing partners, project beneficiaries (farmers, relevant COCOBOD units, etc.):
 - **Development of evaluation questions** around relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability and designed for different stakeholders to be interviewed.
 - Key informant and focus group discussions with men and women, beneficiaries and stakeholders.
 - All interviews should be undertaken in full confidence and anonymity. The final evaluation report should not assign specific comments to individuals.
- **Surveys and questionnaires** including participants in project, and/or surveys and questionnaires involving other stakeholders at strategic and programmatic levels at both UNDP and COCOBOD.
- **Field visits** and on-site validation of key tangible outputs and interventions.
- The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach that ensures close engagement with the evaluation managers, implementing partners and direct beneficiaries.
- **Other methods** such as outcome mapping, observational visits, group discussions, etc.
- **Data review and analysis** of monitoring and other data sources and methods.
 - Ensure maximum validity, reliability of data (quality) and promote use; the evaluation team will ensure triangulation of the various data sources.

The final methodological approach including interview schedule, field visits and data to be used in the evaluation should be clearly outlined in the inception report and be fully discussed and agreed between UNDP, stakeholders and the evaluators.

5. Evaluation products (deliverables)

The relevant deliverables expected from the evaluation will include the following products and any other that may be agreed at the time of project inception between evaluators, UNDP, COCOBOD and other stakeholders:

- **Evaluation inception report** . The inception report should be carried out following and based on preliminary discussions with UNDP after the desk review, and should be produced before the evaluation starts (before any formal evaluation interviews, survey distribution or field visits) and prior to the country visit in the case of international evaluators.
- **Evaluation debriefings**. Immediately following an evaluation, the evaluation team would provide UNDP with preliminary debriefing and findings.
- **Draft evaluation report (within a duration stipulated in the ToR).**⁴ The programme unit and key stakeholders in the evaluation should review the draft evaluation report and provide an amalgamated set of comments to the evaluator within an agreed period of time, addressing the content required (as agreed in the TOR and inception report) and quality criteria as outlined in these guidelines.
- **Evaluation report audit trail**. Comments and changes by the evaluator in response to the draft report should be retained by the evaluator to show how they have addressed comments.
- **Final evaluation report**.

6. Evaluation team composition and required competencies

The evaluation shall be carried out by a team of external one (1) international (1) and local(1)and one (1) national consultants. The International Consultant will be the, the team leader, with overall responsibility for the conduct of the evaluation exercise as well as quality and timely submission of reports (inception, draft, final etc). The International Consultant will be accountable to UNDP for the delivery results on this assignment. The international consultant will be supported by a will work closely with a National Consultant to be selected locally by UNDP. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with UNDP implemented projects on commodities will be an advantage. The National Consultant will support the International Consultant who will have the overall

⁴ A length of 40 to 60 pages including executive summary is suggested.

responsibility for the conduct of the evaluation exercise as well as quality and timely submission of reports (inception, draft, final etc). The International Consultant will be accountable to UNDP for the delivery results on this assignment. The evaluator(s) cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation and/or implementation (including the writing of the project document), must not have conducted this project’s Mid-Term Review and should not have a conflict of interest with the project’s related activities.

National Consultant’s qualifications:

- A Master’s degree or above in Natural Resource Management, Environmental Management/Science, Agricultural Science, Development Studies, or other closely related field – especially to the cocoa sector or similar commodities **(10%)**
- Minimum of 8 years of professional experience in the technical areas of the project, with demonstrated understanding of good policies and practice of climate smart agriculture or natural resource management and governance, or working with farmers on delivery of extension services, and strong knowledge of Ghana’s cocoa sector **(60%)**
- Recent experience with evaluating projects with result-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies and in applying SMART indicators; knowledge and experience in evaluating UNDP projects would be an asset **(30%)**.

National Consultants competencies:

- i) Functional Competencies
 - Demonstrated ability to plan, organize logically, effectively implement and meet set deadlines
 - Excellent co-ordination skill.
 - Good interpersonal and communication skills, including ability to set out a coherent argument in presentations and group interactions
 - Eexcellent coordination skills
 - Conceptual and strategic analytical capacity coupled with fluency in written and spoken English and
 - Proven experience in participatory processes and in facilitating dialogue between Government, Development partners, private sector and civil society
 - Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;
 - Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
 - Competence in adaptive management, as applied to Climate Change Adaptation focal area;
 - Experience in working with UN or UNDP evaluations
 - An understanding of issues related to gender; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis;
 - Demonstrate experience in carrying out evaluation remotely.
- ii) Compliance with UN Core Values
 - Demonstrates integrity by modelling the UN’s values and ethical standards.
 - Promotes the vision, mission, and strategic goals of UNDP.
 - Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability.
 - Treats all people fairly without favouritism
- **Language skills required.**

The consultant must be fluent in spoken and written English Language and should be able to communicate effectively through this means.

Knowledge of local languages spoken in any of the project districts will be an advantage – in the case of national consultants.

Note: It is important that the evaluator(s) are individuals independent from any organization(s) that have been involved in designing, executing or advising any aspect of the intervention that is the subject of the evaluation.⁵

7. Evaluation ethics

⁵ For this reason, UNDP staff members based in other country offices, the regional centres and headquarters units should not be part of the evaluation team.

The TE team will be held to the highest ethical standards and is required to sign a code of conduct upon acceptance of the assignment. This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’. The evaluator(s) must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data. The evaluator(s) must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses with the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

8. Implementation arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing the TE resides with the UNDP Ghana Office. The UNDP Ghana Office will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the TE team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the TE team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

9. Time frame for the evaluation process

The total duration of the TE will be approximately over a time period of 8 weeks between *October 19, 2020 and December 11, 2020*. The expected timeframe for the International Consultant is expected not to exceed a total of 20 working days (*including up to 10 working days in the field and meeting stakeholders in duty station*). The tentative TE timeframe is as follows:

Timeframe	Activity
26- 30 October	Selection of Evaluator(s)
2 nd November	Preparation period for TE team (handover of documentation)
3 rd – 6 th November	Desk/ document review and preparation of TE Inception Report
13 th November	Finalization and Validation of TE Inception Report; (Virtual)
18 th – 26 th November	TE mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits, etc.
27 th November	Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings; earliest end of TE mission
30 th November – 11 th December	Preparation of draft TE report
14 th December	Circulation of draft TE report for comments
21 – 23 December	Finalization of TE report
24 th December	Submission of final TE report and audit trail

The following table breaks down the expected timeframe for the key deliverables:

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	TE Inception Report	TE team clarifies objectives, methodology and timing of the TE	No later than 2 weeks after start of assignment (or at least a before the TE mission:	TE team submits Inception Report to Commissioning Unit and project management
2	Evaluation debriefings/ Presentations	Initial Findings	End of TE mission	TE team presents to Commissioning Unit and project management
3	Draft TE Report	Full draft report (<i>using guidelines on report content in ToR Annex E</i>) with annexes	Within 2 weeks of end of TE mission:	TE team submits to Commissioning Unit, Project Coordinating Unit, GCP and COCOBOD

5	Final TE Report + Audit Trail	Revised final report and TE Audit trail in which the TE details how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final TE report <i>(See template in ToR Annex I)</i>	Within 1 week of receiving comments on draft report:	TE team submits both documents to the Commissioning Unit
---	-------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------

10. Payment Schedule

- 20% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final TE Inception Report and approval by the Commissioning Unit
- 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the draft TE report to the Commissioning Unit
- 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final TE report and approval by the Commissioning Unit and RTA (via signatures on the TE Report Clearance Form) and delivery of completed TE Audit Trail

Criteria for issuing the final payment of 40%

- The final TE report includes all requirements outlined in the TE TOR and is in accordance with the TE guidance.
- The final TE report is clearly written, logically organized, and is specific for this project (i.e. text has not been cut & pasted from other MTR reports).
- The Audit Trail includes responses to and justification for each comment listed

11. Application submission process and criteria for selection

Financial Proposal:

- Financial proposals must be expressed in a lump-sum for the total duration of the contract, including professional fees and travel costs (e.g. car rental for field mission). The DSA/perdiem will be arranged by UNDP.
- The lump sum is fixed regardless of changes in the cost components.

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

- a) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](#)^[3] provided by UNDP;
- b) **CV** and a **Personal History Form** ([P11 form](#))^[4];
- c) Brief description of **approach to work/technical proposal** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)
- d) **Financial Proposal** must be expressed in a lump-sum for the total duration of the contract, including professional fees and travel costs (e.g. car rental for field mission). DSA/perdiem will be arranged by UNDP. The proposal shall be supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the [Letter of Confirmation of Interest template](#). If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

All application materials should be submitted to the following email address ONLY: bids.gh@undp.org. by (4:30PM GMT, 22nd October, 2020) indicating the following reference “Consultant for Terminal Evaluation of the ESP Project in Ghana”. Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

Criteria for Evaluation of Proposal: Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated. Offers will be evaluated according to the Combined Scoring method – where the educational background and experience on similar assignments will be weighted at 70%

^[3]<https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/psa/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx>

^[4] http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc

and the price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring. The applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score that has also accepted UNDP’s General Terms and Conditions will be awarded the contract.

Criteria for Selection of the Best Offer

Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated. Offers will be evaluated according to the Combined Scoring method – where the educational background and experience on similar assignments will be weighted at 70% and the price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring. The applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score that has also accepted UNDP’s General Terms and Conditions will be awarded the contract.

12. TOR annexes


Annexes provided include:

- ToR Annex A: Results Framework
- ToR Annex B: Sample questions
- ToR Annex C: Evaluation Criteria Matrix template
- ToR Annex D: Project Information Package to be reviewed by TE team
- ToR Annex E: Content of the TE report
- ToR Annex F: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators
- ToR Annex G: TE Rating Scales
- ToR Annex H: TE Report Clearance Form
- ToR Annex I: TE Audit Trail

This TOR is approved by:

Name: Paolo Dalla Stella

Designation: Programme Specialist (Environment and Climate Change)

Signature: 
07-Oct-2020
Date Signed:

This TOR is approved by:

Name: Silke Hollander

Designation: Deputy Resident Representative (Officer-in-Charge)

Signature: 
07-Oct-2020
Date Signed:

ToR Annex A: Results Framework

Phase I

OUTCOMES, ACTIVITIES AND IMPLEMENTATION TIMEFRAME		
Outcome 1	Time to completion	Planned Activities
Output Strengthened land tenure systems <i>Baseline: Phase I outcomes & lessons-learned</i> <i>Indicators: Customary Land secretariats functional at the community level</i> <i>Targets: Detailed work plan to be formulated and agreed on target communities</i> <i>Means of Verification: Customary Land secretariats database</i>	Nov 2012→	COCOBOD and Lands Commission form inter-institutional relationship to coordinate on land tenure issues in cocoa landscapes
	Feb 2013→	Short policy papers on land tenure policies, legislation and acts with direct or indirect impact on the decision of farmers to adopt sustainable cocoa production practices completed
	June 2013→	Target communities to build capacity on land tenure issues and the objectives of the Land Administration Project
	June 2013→	Customary Land Secretariats functioning in pilot communities to support farmer tenure rights
	Dec 2013→	Land rental and land hiring agreements monitored in pilot communities using the Customary Land Secretariats system. Rental agreements captured in community database.
	June 2014→	Land Commission and COCOBOD form an agreement to work together and scale up institutional systems to secure land tenure rights in other districts and regions
	Dec 2015→	Customary Land Secretariats functioning in all districts and regions and sustainability spreading through the cocoa communities

OUTCOMES, ACTIVITIES AND IMPLEMENTATION TIMEFRAME		
Output Strengthen tree tenure systems <i>Baseline:</i> Phase I outcomes & lessons-learned <i>Indicators:</i> Tree registration system in place <i>Targets:</i> Detailed work plan to be formulated and agreed on target communities <i>Means of Verification:</i> National monitoring system	Feb 2013→	New tree tenure policy reviewed and analyzed for old and new forest tree plantings. Report produced on how existing policy will affect the cocoa sector
	March 2013→	National farmers capacitated on existing laws and acts regarding tree tenure
	June 2013→	Report completed on plausible approaches COCOBOD could use to design a monitoring and verification programme that collects and records information on tree plantings – report shared with national platform.
	Aug 2013→	Institutional system to monitor and verify tree plantings piloted in targeted communities
	Dec 2013→	Community Taungya schemes embraced in pilot communities as part of community action plans to promote tree plantings
Output Mass spraying programme strengthened <i>Baseline:</i> Phase I outcomes & lessons-learned <i>Indicators:</i> (1) Improve efficiency and effectiveness of mass spraying programme <i>Targets:</i> All cocoa growing regions <i>Means of Verification:</i> National monitoring system on pest and disease presence	Dec 2015→	Successful monitoring system scaled up to other districts and regions under the umbrella of COCOBODs institutional framework
	Jan 2013→	CRIG (entomology division) consults with pod forecasting teams and gains buy-in and support from forecasting team leaders on the idea of a public private pest and disease monitoring programme
	March 2013→	CRIG develops rapid assessment methodology for data collection
	May 2013→	Workshop held with forecasting teams to share methodology and gather feedback
	June 2013→	Forecasting teams trained on methodology

OUTCOMES, ACTIVITIES AND IMPLEMENTATION TIMEFRAME		
	Aug 2013→	Forecasting teams adopt methodology to gather pest and disease information in the field during forecasting exercises
	Nov 2013→	COCOBOD puts system in place (database) to collect data and provide output maps to mass spraying programme on pest and disease presence
	Dec 2013→	Monitoring results test against previous methodology. Publication accepted in scientific journal of results.
Output Environmental Indicators established for the cocoa sector <i>Baseline: No national indicators have been established for cocoa</i> <i>Indicators: National environmental, economic and social indicators established</i> <i>Targets: All cocoa growing regions</i> <i>Means of Verification: National monitoring system</i>	March 2013→	COCOBODs knowledge built on the need for environmental indicators resulting in agreement to include environmental indicators in COCOBODs monitoring programme
	June/July 2013→	Report developed on proposed set of environmental indicators based on the needs of COCOBOD and the industry.
	August/Sept 2013→	Environmental indicators presented to national cocoa platform to capacitate cocoa stakeholders on proposed indicators
	Dec 2013→	Methodology on how environmental indicator information can be collected, what system and tools will be required and how data will be used and illustrated for environmental reporting.

OUTCOMES, ACTIVITIES AND IMPLEMENTATION TIMEFRAME		
Output Rapid Biological Assessments	Jan 2013→ March 2013→ July 2013→ Dec 2013→ Oct 2015→	<p>Knowledge built on wildlife conservation concerns in cocoa landscapes. MoU developed to formalise working relationship.</p> <p>Rapid biological assessment methodology defined and areas recommended for baseline assessments. Findings and recommendations presented at stakeholder workshop. Comprehensive report completed</p> <p>Wildlife division liaises with COCOBODs GIS work and provides report recommending how baseline data can be incorporated into central COCOBOD GIS database</p> <p>Baseline measurements completed using rapid biological surveys. Long time frame for baseline will allow for seasonal differences in species composition</p> <p>Repeat surveys and compile biological report</p>
Outcome 2	Time to completion	Milestones
Output Rehabilitation of unproductive cocoa farms	Feb 2013→ July 2013→ Dec 2013→ March 2014→	<p>CRIG completes economic analysis of cocoa rehabilitation techniques</p> <p>Indicator established to monitor and verify farms rehabilitated</p> <p>Select rehabilitation techniques tested using short-term experiments in pilot community farms</p> <p>Desk top study and rehabilitation experimental pilots compared and analysed for publication (rehabilitation technique review and costs of different rehabilitation techniques)</p>

OUTCOMES, ACTIVITIES AND IMPLEMENTATION TIMEFRAME		
	June 2014→ July/Aug 2014→ Dec 2014→ March 2015→	<p>Recommended rehabilitation techniques included into national training curriculum and training modules</p> <p>CRIG researchers develop training programme for national extension officers on recommended rehabilitation approaches</p> <p>COCOBOD formalises organisational plan to strengthen the development and support of community nurseries to allow farmers to source good planting material (cocoa and non-cocoa)</p> <p>Indicator data on farmers adoption of rehabilitation techniques and areas rehabilitated recorded on central COCOBOD GIS database (to be confirmed with COCOBOD)</p>
Outcome 3	Time to completion	Milestones
Output Engage national REDD committee and REDD Initiatives in-country <i>Baseline: REDD readiness plan not fully developed</i> <i>Indicators: Yearly report</i> <i>Targets: One report per year</i> <i>Means of Verification: Reporting</i>	Dec 2012 June 2013 June 2014 June 2015	<p>Yearly reports completed on all new and existing REDD projects in Ghana that relate to agriculture production. More detail will be provided</p> <p>Updated REDD report completed</p> <p>Updated REDD report completed</p> <p>Updated REDD report completed</p>
Output Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) <i>Baseline: 90% of forests not engaged in sustainable management plans</i>	Dec 2012→ June 2013→	<p>Sustainable Forest Management specialist to lead on the development of a Sustainable Forest Management plan</p> <p>Communities identified to support a community that adopts Sustainable Forest Management plans</p>

OUTCOMES, ACTIVITIES AND IMPLEMENTATION TIMEFRAME		
Indicators: A further 10% of Forests function under SFM plans Targets: 2-3 communities engage SFM plans Means of Verification: Reports from community based monitoring	Dec 2013→	Specialist and forest conservation expert work with community to build knowledge of Community Resource Management Areas (CREMA)
	June 2014→	Community assisted to design a CREMA – ensuring equal benefit sharing, forest resource rights are well stipulated and good management plans are in place.
	Dec 2014→	REDD measurements and verification requirements in place
	Dec 2014→	Report compiled on CREMA approach and REDD component
	Feb 2015→	CREMA formally acknowledged and accepted by Forestry Commission as community operated and managed.
	June 2015→	CREMA fully functional
	Dec 2015→	Land use planning used in CREMAs and MAB developed
	June 2015→	Monitoring system for encroachment into Protect Areas and forest reserves in place using MAB.
Outcome 4	Time to completion	Milestones
Output Environment best practices Baseline: 70% of farmers implement some form of environmental best practices	Dec 2012→	CRIG compiles short research proposals on environmental best practices to steering committee for comments and approval
	Jan	Research proposals approved following revision process

OUTCOMES, ACTIVITIES AND IMPLEMENTATION TIMEFRAME		
Indicators: Farmers implementing all GRIG recommended environmental best practices Targets: 40% farmers adopt all environmental best practices Means of Verification: National monitoring system	2013→ June 2013→ Dec/Mar 2013/2014→ Feb 2014→ March 2014→ March 2014→ April 2014→ September 2014→	2-3 short-term research projects commence on environmental best practices Research projects completed, data analysed. Environmental best practices included into national extension curriculum Environmental practices included into training manual Wildlife best practices included into curriculum and training manual Training of national extension officers on environmental best practices Publications completed on research findings
Outcome 5	Time to completion	Milestones
Output Carbon market (Voluntary) Baseline: Cocoa farmers are not attached to any schemes for the payment of environmental services Indicators: Enhanced carbon sequestration in soil and vegetation	Jan 2013→ Feb 2013→	COCOBOD and CRIG knowledgeable on voluntary carbon market Business case for voluntary carbon market project with CCB standard determined

OUTCOMES, ACTIVITIES AND IMPLEMENTATION TIMEFRAME		
<p><i>across landscape in project demonstration sites</i></p> <p>Targets: 2-3 communities</p> <p>Means of Verification: Reports from national monitoring system and field surveys</p>	<p>April 2013→</p> <p>June 2013→</p> <p>Aug 2013→</p> <p>Dec 2013→</p> <p>July 2014→</p> <p>July 2014→</p> <p>Dec/March 2013/2014→</p>	<p>Pilot communities determined for voluntary carbon pilots with defined geographical areas</p> <p>Carbon baseline scenarios determined and additionality assessed for pilot communities with validation and verification process understood and underway.</p> <p>COCOBOD designs cocoa farmer's passbook to verify carbon sequestration – to satisfy monitoring requirements of VSC and CCB standards.</p> <p>Legal rights in place between COCOBOD and farmers on ownership of carbon credits</p> <p>Carbon expert works with COCOBOD and CCP pilot communities to complete Project Design Document (PDD) for VCS and CCB.</p> <p>GHG information system established</p> <p>Farmers capacitated by national extension officers on carbon sequestration and the contractual arrangements of the carbon programme</p>
<p>Output Additional income sources from crops</p> <p>Baseline: Farmers generate limited income from additional sources</p> <p>Indicators: Farmers improve income from additional crops that compliment cocoa</p> <p>Targets: 10% of overall farmers</p>	<p>Jan 2013→</p> <p>March 2013→</p> <p>March 2013→</p>	<p>Timber out grower scheme partners established</p> <p>Report on recommended shade tree species provided– with emphasis on biodiversity, carbon sequestration, and timber value</p> <p>Additional crops identified, comprehensive report detailing the most promising NFTP for cocoa farmers i.e. market potential, etc</p>

OUTCOMES, ACTIVITIES AND IMPLEMENTATION TIMEFRAME		
<i>Means of Verification: National monitoring scheme</i>	July 2013→	Out grower scheme designed
	Nov 2013→	Logistics of scaling up the propagation of targeted additional crops defined and propagated within communities
	Aug ongoing 2014→	National extension officers technically capacitated to deliver training on additional crops that are complimentary to cocoa
	2015 June→	Market chain analysis completed to determine additional income to farmer
Outcome 6	Time to completion	Milestones
Output Creation of national platform	2012 - 2015	See separate Project Document

Phase II

Intended Outcome as stated in the UNDAF/Country [or Global/Regional] Programme Results and Resource Framework: Outcome 3: National systems and existing institutional arrangements for climate change mitigation and adaptation and for disaster risk reduction, as defined in the Hyogo Framework for Action at the district, regional and national level are functional
Outcome indicators as stated in the Country Programme [or Global/Regional] Results and Resources Framework, including baseline and targets: Proportion of districts, regions and national agencies supporting the implementation of the national policy on climate change and disaster risk reduction
Applicable Output(s) from the UNDP Strategic Plan: Environment and Sustainable Development

Project title and Atlas Project Number: Environmentally Sustainable Production Practices in Cocoa Landscapes- Pillar V, Phase II										
EXPECTED OUTPUTS	OUTPUT INDICATORS	DATA SOURCE	BASELINE		TARGETS (by frequency of data collection)					DATA COLLECTION METHODS & RISKS
			Value	Year	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	FINAL	
Output 1.1 Farmers trained and equipped in environmentally sustainable production practices	1.1.1 Number of trainers trained on environmentally sustainable production practices	<i>Project Reports & Surveys</i>	1,000	2016	186	200	220	240	846	<i>Training Reports, No Risk</i>
	1.1.2. Number of cocoa farmers trained in environmentally sustainable production practices		40,000	2016	6,000	7,000	8,000	9,000	30,000	<i>Training Reports, No Risk</i>
	1.1.3 % of farmers adopting soil improvement practices in Cocoa Life Communities		40,000	2016	10%	25%	28%	32%	95%	<i>Surveys, No Risk</i>
Output 1.2 Farmers enhanced trees and carbon stocks on cocoa farms	1.2.1 Number of shade trees procured and distributed		NA		0	400,000	400,000		800,000	<i>Planting Data/Report. Risk - failure of farmers to complete forms accurately</i>
	1.2.2 Number of shade trees planted on cocoa farms in the project districts		NA		0	400,000	400,000		800,000	<i>Planting Data/Report. Risk - failure of farmers to complete forms accurately</i>
	1.2.3 % of farmers with adequate shade trees on their farms to enhance biodiversity		40,000	2016	10%	30%	30%	30%	100%	<i>Surveys, No Risk</i>
	1.2.4 Number of hectares planted		NA			22,200	22,200		44,400	<i>Farm mapping & measurement. Risk - mapping errors</i>
Output 1.3 Tree registration and tree tenure policies for the	1.3.1 Number of CHED CEAs and farmer cooperative leaders trained on tree registration modalities		NA		168		200	260	628	<i>Training Reports, No Risk</i>

adoption of environmentally sustainable cocoa production practices improved	1.3.2 Number of trees registered		NA		500,000	300,000	400,000	400,000	1,600,000	Registration Data No risk
	1.3.3 Number of farmers registered		NA		2,000	1,960	4,000	4,000	11,960	Registration Data No risk
Output 2.1 CREMAs established	2.1.1. Suitable areas for CREMA establishment identified, delineated and 2 new CREMAs established		NA		2	0	0	0	2	Surveys, No Risk
	2.1.2 % of forest degradation/deforestation at cocoa frontiers avoided		NA		10%	15%	15%	15%	55%	Survey. No risk
	2.1.3 % of farmers practicing sustainable ecosystem management practices		NA		6,000	7,000	8,000	9,000	30,000	Survey. No risk
	2.1.4 Number and percent of Water bodies in Cocoa Life Communities protected		80	2016	5	25	28	20	78	Surveys, No Risk
Output 2.2 Three community fire prevention volunteer brigades established and trained in the CREMAs	2.2.1. Three priority fire-prone areas identified		NA		1	2	0	0	3	Survey. No Risk
	2.2.2 Number of community fire prevention brigade members trained				1	2	8	0	3	Training Reports. Risk - community interest
	2.2.4 Hectares of protected areas of various forms in Cocoa Life Districts		NA		50 Ha	60 Ha	65 Ha	40 Ha	215 Ha	Mapping Risk - mapping errors
	2.2.5 Number of farmers trained on sustainable ecosystem management practices				186	200	220	240	846	Training Reports No Risk
Output 2.3 Enhance capacities of traditional authorities and community opinion leaders to	2.3.1 Number of community dialogues and capacity building trainings organized		NA		20	30	25	25	100	Training Reports No Risk
	2.3.2 Number of communities sensitized		NA		30	35	35	30	130	Training Reports No Risk

enable them enforce traditional conservation practices to conserve biodiversity	2.3.3 Number of farmers and landowners including chiefs who participated in community dialogue sessions				100	300	300	300	1,000	<i>Training Reports No Risk</i>
Output 3.1. Investigate additional funding mechanisms and develop new proposals	3.1.1 Number of proposals developed		NA		2	2	2	2	8	<i>Submission Records</i>
Output 3.2. Donor dialogues in Ghana and globally with the support of UNDP Global Commodities Programme to explore other funding opportunities	3.2.1 Number of dialogues held		NA		2	3	3	3	11	<i>Training Reports. No risk</i>

ToR Annex B: Sample questions

UNDAF evaluation sample questions

Relevance

- To what extent is the UNDAF aligned with the national development needs and priorities and should adjustment in UNDAF implementation be considered to align with the SDGs?
- How well does the design of the UNDAF address the needs of the most vulnerable groups in the country?
- To what extent is the UNDAF responsive to the changing environment in country at national and subnational levels and how should it adapt to these changes?

Effectiveness

- To what extent is the current UNDAF on track to achieve planned results (intended and unintended, positive or negative)?
- How were the United Nations programming principles mainstreamed in the design, implementation and monitoring and evaluation of the UNDAF?
- To what extent has the United Nations been able to form and maintain partnerships with other development actors including bilateral and multilateral organizations, civil society organizations and the private sector to leverage results?

Efficiency

- To what extent and how has the United Nations system mobilized and used its resources (human, technical and financial) and improved inter-agency synergies to achieve its planned results in the current UNDAF cycle?
- To what extent has the UNDAF increased the synergies between the programmes of United Nations agencies?

Sustainability

- What is the likelihood that the benefits that resulted from the previous and current UNDAF will continue at national and subnational levels through adequate ownership, commitment and willingness displayed by the Government?
- Looking at the past, the present and the future, how well designed is the UNDAF in order to remain valid in light of the changing environment?

Outcome evaluation sample questions

Relevance

- To what extent is the initiative in line with the UNDP mandate, national priorities and the requirements of targeted women and men?
- To what extent is UNDP support relevant to the achievement of the SDGs in the country?
- To what extent did UNDP adopt gender-sensitive, human rights-based and conflict-sensitive approaches?
- To what extent is UNDP engagement a reflection of strategic considerations, including the role of UNDP in a particular development context and its comparative advantage?
- To what extent was the method of delivery selected by UNDP appropriate to the development context?
- To what extent was the theory of change presented in the outcome model a relevant and appropriate vision on which to base the initiatives?

Effectiveness

- To what extent has progress been made towards outcome achievement? What has been the UNDP contribution to the observed change?
- What have been the key results and changes attained? How has delivery of country programme outputs led to outcome-level progress?
- Have there been any unexpected outcome-level results achieved beyond the planned outcome?

- To what extent has UNDP improved the capacities of national implementing partners to advocate on environmental issues, including climate change issues and disaster risk reduction?
- To what extent has UNDP partnered with civil society and local communities to promote environmental and disaster risk awareness in the country?
- To what extent have the results at the outcome and output levels generated results for gender equality and the empowerment of women?
- To what extent have marginalized groups benefited?
- To what extent have triangular and South-South cooperation and knowledge management contributed to the results attained?
- Which programme areas are the most relevant and strategic for UNDP to scale up or consider going forward?

Efficiency

- To what extent have the programme or project outputs resulted from economic use of resources?
- To what extent were quality country programme outputs delivered on time?
- To what extent were partnership modalities conducive to the delivery of country programme outputs?
- To what extent did monitoring systems provide management with a stream of data that allowed it to learn and adjust implementation accordingly?
- To what extent did UNDP promote gender equality, the empowerment of women, human rights and human development in the delivery of country programme outputs?
- To what extent have UNDP practices, policies, processes and decision-making capabilities affected the achievement of the country programme’s outcomes?
- To what extent did UNDP engage or coordinate with beneficiaries, implementing partners, other United Nations agencies and national counterparts to achieve outcome-level results?

Sustainability

- To what extent did UNDP establish mechanisms to ensure the sustainability of the country programme outcomes?
- To what extent do national partners have the institutional capacities, including sustainability strategies, in place to sustain the outcome-level results?
- To what extent are policy and regulatory frameworks in place that will support the continuation of benefits?
- To what extent have partners committed to providing continuing support (financial, staff, aspirational, etc.)?
- To what extent do mechanisms, procedures and policies exist to carry forward the results attained on gender equality, empowerment of women, human rights and human development by primary stakeholders?
- To what extent do partnerships exist with other national institutions, NGOs, United Nations agencies, the private sector and development partners to sustain the attained results?

Project evaluation sample questions

Relevance:

- To what extent was the project in line with the national development priorities, the country programme’s outputs and outcomes, the UNDP Strategic Plan and the SDGs?
- To what extent does the project contribute to the theory of change for the relevant country programme outcome?
- To what extent were lessons learned from other relevant projects considered in the project’s design?
- To what extent were perspectives of those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the attainment of stated results, taken into account during the project design processes?
- To what extent does the project contribute to gender equality, the empowerment of women and the human rights-based approach?
- To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to political, legal, economic, institutional, etc., changes in the country?

Effectiveness

- To what extent did the project contribute to the country programme outcomes and outputs, the SDGs, the UNDP Strategic Plan and national development priorities?
- To what extent were the project outputs achieved?
- What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving intended country programme outputs and outcomes?
- To what extent has the UNDP partnership strategy been appropriate and effective?
- What factors contributed to effectiveness or ineffectiveness?
- In which areas does the project have the greatest achievements? Why and what have been the supporting factors? How can the project build on or expand these achievements?
- In which areas does the project have the fewest achievements? What have been the constraining factors and why? How can or could they be overcome?
- What, if any, alternative strategies would have been more effective in achieving the project’s objectives?
- Are the projects objectives and outputs clear, practical and feasible within its frame?
- To what extent have stakeholders been involved in project implementation?
- To what extent are project management and implementation participatory and is this participation contributing towards achievement of the project objectives?
- To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to the needs of the national constituents and changing partner priorities?
- To what extent has the project contributed to gender equality, the empowerment of women and the realization of human rights?

Efficiency

- To what extent was the project management structure as outlined in the project document efficient in generating the expected results?
- To what extent have the UNDP project implementation strategy and execution been efficient and cost-effective?
- To what extent has there been an economical use of financial and human resources? Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve outcomes?
- To what extent have resources been used efficiently? Have activities supporting the strategy been cost-effective?
- To what extent have project funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner?
- To what extent do the M&E systems utilized by UNDP ensure effective and efficient project management?

Sustainability

- Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outputs?
- To what extent will financial and economic resources be available to sustain the benefits achieved by the project?
- Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outputs and the project’s contributions to country programme outputs and outcomes?
- Do the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project benefits?
- To what extent did UNDP actions pose an environmental threat to the sustainability of project outputs?
- What is the risk that the level of stakeholders’ ownership will be sufficient to allow for the project benefits to be sustained?
- To what extent do mechanisms, procedures and policies exist to allow primary stakeholders to carry forward the results attained on gender equality, empowerment of women, human rights and human development?
- To what extent do stakeholders support the project’s long-term objectives?
- To what extent are lessons learned being documented by the project team on a continual basis and shared with appropriate parties who could learn from the project?
- To what extent do UNDP interventions have well-designed and well-planned exit strategies?

- What could be done to strengthen exit strategies and sustainability?

Evaluation cross-cutting issues sample questions

Human rights

- To what extent have poor, indigenous and physically challenged, women and other disadvantaged and marginalized groups benefited from the work of UNDP in the country?

Gender equality

- To what extent have gender equality and the empowerment of women been addressed in the design, implementation and monitoring of the project?
- Is the gender marker data assigned to this project representative of reality?
- To what extent has the project promoted positive changes in gender equality and the empowerment of women? Were there any unintended effects?

ToR Annex C: Evaluation Criteria Matrix template

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Relevance: How does the project relate to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national level?			
<i>(include evaluative questions)</i>	<i>(i.e. relationships established, level of coherence between project design and implementation approach, specific activities conducted, quality of risk mitigation strategies, etc.)</i>	<i>(i.e. project documentation, national policies or strategies, websites, project staff, project partners, data collected throughout the TE mission, etc.)</i>	<i>(i.e. document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc.)</i>
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in line with international and national norms and standards?			
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-political, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
Gender equality and women’s empowerment: How did the project contribute to gender equality and women’s empowerment?			

Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
<i>(Expand the table to include questions for all criteria being assessed: Monitoring & Evaluation, UNDP oversight/implementation, Implementing Partner Execution, cross-cutting issues, etc.)</i>			

ToR Annex D: Project Information Package to be reviewed by TE team

#	Item (electronic versions preferred if available)
1	Project Proposal Document
2	Final UNDP Project Document with all annexes
3	UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) and associated management plans (if any)
4	Inception Workshop Report
5	Mid-Term Review report and management response to MTR recommendations
6	Progress reports (quarterly, semi-annual or annual, with associated workplans and financial reports)
7	Oversight mission reports
8	Minutes of Project Board Meetings and of other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
9	Financial data, including actual expenditures by project outcome, including management costs, and including documentation of any significant budget revisions
10	Audit reports
11	Electronic copies of project outputs (booklets, manuals, technical reports, articles, etc.)
12	Sample of project communications materials
13	Summary list of formal meetings, workshops, etc. held, with date, location, topic, and number of participants
14	Any relevant socio-economic monitoring data, such as average incomes / employment levels of stakeholders in the target area, change in revenue related to project activities
15	List of contracts and procurement items over ~US\$5,000 (i.e. organizations or companies contracted for project outputs, etc., except in cases of confidential information)
16	UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD)
17	List/map of project sites, highlighting suggested visits
18	List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Board members, Project Team members, and other partners to be consulted
19	Project deliverables that provide documentary evidence of achievement towards project outcomes
<i>Additional documents, as required</i>	

ToR Annex E: Content of the TE report

- i. Title page
 - Title of UNDP project
 - UNDP PIMS ID

- TE timeframe and date of final TE report
 - Region and countries included in the project
 - Executing Agency, Implementing partner and other project partners
 - TE Team members
- ii. Acknowledgements
- iii. Table of Contents
- iv. Acronyms and Abbreviations
1. Executive Summary (3-4 pages)
- Project Information Table
 - Project Description (brief)
 - Evaluation Ratings Table
 - Concise summary of findings, conclusions and lessons learned
 - Recommendations summary table
2. Introduction (2-3 pages)
- Purpose and objective of the TE
 - Scope
 - Methodology
 - Data Collection & Analysis
 - Ethics
 - Limitations to the evaluation
 - Structure of the TE report
3. Project Description (3-5 pages)
- Project start and duration, including milestones
 - Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope
 - Problems that the project sought to address, threats and barriers targeted
 - Immediate and development objectives of the project
 - Expected results
 - Main stakeholders: summary list
 - Theory of Change
4. Findings
(in addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (*) must be given a rating⁶)
- 4.1 Project Design/Formulation
- Analysis of Results Framework: project logic and strategy, indicators
 - Assumptions and Risks
 - Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g. same focal area) incorporated into project design
 - Planned stakeholder participation
 - Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
- 4.1 Project Implementation
- Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
 - Actual stakeholder participation and partnership arrangements
 - Project Finance and Co-finance
 - Monitoring & Evaluation: design at entry (*), implementation (*), and overall assessment of M&E (*)
 - UNDP implementation/oversight (*) and Implementing Partner execution (*), overall project implementation/execution (*), coordination, and operational issues
 - Risk Management, including Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)
- 4.2 Project Results and Impacts
- Progress towards objective and expected outcomes (*)

⁶ See ToR Annex F for rating scales.

- Relevance (*)
- Effectiveness (*)
- Efficiency (*)
- Overall Outcome (*)
- Sustainability: financial (*), socio-economic (*), institutional framework and governance (*), environmental (*), and overall likelihood (*)
- Country ownership
- Gender equality and women’s empowerment
- Cross-cutting Issues
- Catalytic/Replication Effect
- Progress to Impact

5. Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons

- Main Findings
- Conclusions
- Recommendations
- Lessons Learned

6. Annexes

- TE ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
- TE Mission itinerary, including summary of field visits
- List of persons interviewed
- List of documents reviewed
- Evaluation Question Matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology)
- Questionnaire used and summary of results
- Co-financing tables (if not include in body of report)
- TE Rating scales
- Signed Evaluation Consultant Agreement form
- Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form
- Signed TE Report Clearance form
- *Annexed in a separate file:* TE Audit Trail

ToR Annex F: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators

Independence entails the ability to evaluate without undue influence or pressure by any party (including the hiring unit) and providing evaluators with free access to information on the evaluation subject. Independence provides legitimacy to and ensures an objective perspective on evaluations. An independent evaluation reduces the potential for conflicts of interest which might arise with self-reported ratings by those involved in the management of the project being evaluated. Independence is one of ten general principles for evaluations (together with internationally agreed principles, goals and targets: utility, credibility, impartiality, ethics, transparency, human rights and gender equality, national evaluation capacities, and professionalism).

ToR Annex G: TE Rating Scales

Evaluators/Consultants:

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

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

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

Name of Evaluator: _____

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.

Signed at _____ (Place) on _____ (Date)

Signature: _____

Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, Implementation/Oversight, Execution, Relevance	Sustainability ratings:
6 = Highly Satisfactory (HS): exceeds expectations and/or no shortcomings	4 = Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability
5 = Satisfactory (S): meets expectations and/or no or minor shortcomings	3 = Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks to sustainability
	2 = Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks to sustainability
	1 = Unlikely (U): severe risks to sustainability

4 = Moderately Satisfactory (MS): more or less meets expectations and/or some shortcomings 3 = Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): somewhat below expectations and/or significant shortcomings 2 = Unsatisfactory (U): substantially below expectations and/or major shortcomings 1 = Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe shortcomings Unable to Assess (U/A): available information does not allow an assessment	Unable to Assess (U/A): Unable to assess the expected incidence and magnitude of risks to sustainability
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

ToR Annex G: TE Report Clearance Form

Terminal Evaluation Report for *(Project Title & UNDP PIMS ID)* Reviewed and Cleared By:

Commissioning Unit (M&E Focal Point)

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

ToR Annex H: TE Audit Trail

To the comments received on *(date)* from the Terminal Evaluation *“Environmental Sustainability and Policy” (ESP Phase I) and “Environmentally Sustainable Production Practices in Cocoa Landscapes (ESP Phases II)*

The following comments were provided to the draft TE report; they are referenced by institution/organization (do not include the commentator’s name) and track change comment number (“#” column):

Institution/ Organization	#	Para No./ comment location	Comment/Feedback on the draft TE report	TE team response and actions taken