

UN-REDD
PROGRAMME



UN-REDD Programme Evaluation Terms of Reference

29 August 2013

1. Background

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

2. The Programme supports national REDD+ readiness efforts in 46 partner countries, spanning Africa, Asia-Pacific and Latin America, in two ways: (i) direct support to the design and implementation of **UN-REDD National Programmes**; and (ii) complementary support to national REDD+ action through common approaches, analyses, methodologies, tools, data and best practices developed through the **Global Programme**. In accordance to the objectives established in the UN-REDD Strategy 2011-2015, from 2011 the support provided within the Global Programme is threefold - International Support Functions, Country Specific Support, and the work of the Secretariat, as outlined in the "Support to National REDD+ Action- Global Programme Framework Document 2011-2015"

3. Over the past four years, the UN-REDD Programme has grown from supporting nine initial pilot countries, to the current 46 partner countries. Many changes have taken place, both externally and within the Programme. As the REDD+ landscape and countries' needs evolve, the Programme will need to review its objectives and ensure it is meeting the needs of countries as they gradually move beyond the Quick Start and initial readiness phase.

4. As such, it is time to take stock. At the ninth Policy Board meeting in Brazzaville 26-27 October 2012, the Board requested an external evaluation of the UN-REDD Programme be undertaken in 2013, and requested the Secretariat propose a work-plan and process to the Policy Board inter-sessionally. These terms of reference (ToR) have also been developed in response to that request. They were presented and discussed at the tenth Policy Board meeting in Lombok, Indonesia 25-28 June 2013.

1.1 UN-REDD Programme Objective, Expected Outcomes and Outputs

5. As set out in the UN-REDD Programme Strategy 2011-2015¹, the **objective** of the UN-REDD Programme is to 'promote the elaboration and implementation of National REDD+ Strategies to achieve REDD+ readiness, including the transformation of land use and sustainable forest management and performance-based payments'. To achieve this objective, the Programme has identified seven integrated work areas to deliver targeted, in depth and strategic support to partner countries as presented in Table 1:

¹ UN-REDD Programme Strategy 2011-2015, available at: http://www.unredd.net/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_download&gid=4598&Itemid=53

Table 1. UN-REDD work areas with their expected outcome and lead Agency

Work area	Outcome	Lead Agency
1. MRV and Monitoring	REDD+ countries have systems and capacities to develop and implement Measurement, Reporting, Verification (MRV) and monitoring	FAO
2. National REDD+ Governance	Transparency, inclusiveness and effectiveness in national REDD+ governance increased	UNDP
3. Stakeholder engagement	Indigenous Peoples, civil society and other stakeholders participate effectively in national and international REDD+ decision-making, strategy development and implementation	UNDP
4. Multiple benefits	Multiple benefits of forests are realized and ensured in REDD+ strategies and actions	UNEP
5. Transparent, equitable and accountable management	National fund management and equitable benefit sharing systems are operational for REDD+ performance based payments	UNDP
6. Sector transformation ²	Strengthened national and sub-national capacities to develop sustainable REDD+ investment strategies and portfolios	UNEP
7. Knowledge Management and Dissemination ³	UN-REDD programme knowledge is developed, managed, analyzed and shared to support REDD+ efforts at all levels	UN-REDD Programme Secretariat

1.2 Programme Structure and Executing Arrangements

6. The UN-REDD Programme is governed by a **Policy Board**, which provides policy direction and approves financial allocations. It is composed of representatives from member countries (three from each regional constituency – Africa, Asia-Pacific and Latin America and the Caribbean), the three largest donors to the Multi-Donor Trust Fund, representatives of civil society organizations and Indigenous Peoples, and the three UN-REDD Programme Participating Organizations- FAO, UNDP and UNEP. Countries from each regional constituency that are not currently members may participate as observers. The Secretariats of the UNFCCC and GEF as well as the World Bank, representing the FCPF, are permanent observers. The MPTF Office is an ex-officio member of the Policy Board.

7. The Participating UN Organizations, **FAO, UNDP and UNEP** assume full programmatic and financial accountability for the implementation of the Programme in accordance with their expertise and comparative advantages: FAO on technical issues related to forestry, natural resources and supporting specifically the development of REDD+ monitoring, including measurement, reporting and verification (MRV) systems; UNDP on national coordination with its near universal country presence, its focus on governance, socio-economic implications of REDD+ and the engagement of Indigenous Peoples and civil society; and UNEP in convening expertise and decision-makers in the REDD+

² In the UN-REDD Programme SNA-GP Framework 2011-2015, this work area has been renamed 'REDD+ as a catalyst for transformations to a Green Economy' upon request of UNEP, with the expected outcome of 'Green Economy transformation processes catalyzed as a result of REDD+ strategies and investments'.

³ The seventh work area on Knowledge Management and Dissemination was introduced in the UN-REDD Programme SNA-GP Framework 2011-2015

agenda, increasing knowledge and capacity on multiple benefits of REDD+ and facilitating the conditions to move towards a low carbon economy by transforming the forest sector through analysis, scenario development and assessment of options for investments.

8. Internal Programme Governance of the UN-REDD Programme is provided by the Strategy Group, Management Group and UN-REDD Programme Secretariat. The **Strategy Group** ensures clear strategic direction related to the UN agencies contributions to the UN-REDD Programme. The **Management Group**'s main function is to ensure effective programme management to deliver high quality services to participating countries. Effective programmatic coordination, quality assurance, and administrative and logistical support for the key decision-making bodies of the UN-REDD Programme is provided through the **UN-REDD Programme Secretariat**, an inter-agency unit of the three Participating UN Organizations, located in Geneva, Switzerland.

9. The **MPTF Office** serves as the Administrative Agent for the UN-REDD Programme Fund. Its responsibilities include the receipt, administration and management of contributions from donors; disbursement of funds to the Participating Organizations in accordance with instructions from the UN-REDD Programme Policy Board; and consolidation of the annual narrative and financial reports produced by the Participating Organizations. The MPTF Office performs the full range of Administrative Agent functions in accordance with the UNDG-approved 'Protocol on the Administrative Agent for Multi-Partner Trust Funds'.

1.3 Programme Cost and Financing

10. Total deposits to the UN-REDD Programme amounted to US\$167,377,224 as of March 2013, as shown in Table 2. Table 3 presents current donor commitments.

Table 2: Programme Financing: Total Donor Deposits into the UN-REDD Programme Fund, cumulative as of March 2013 (in US dollars thousands)

Donor Name	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Grand Total
EC						11,762	11,762
Denmark		1,917	6,160	-			8,077
Luxemburg						1,336	1,336
Japan				3,046			3,046
Norway	12,000	40,214	32,193	21,411	35,375		141,193
Spain			1,315		648		1,963
Grand Total	12,000	42,131	39,668	24,457	36,023	13,098	167,377

Table 3: Donor Commitments (Pledges) as of March 2013 (in US dollars thousands)

Donor Name	Amount
EC	1,298
Luxemburg	1,326
Total	2,624

Table 4: Interest received by the Fund as of March 2013 (US dollars thousands)*

	Interest					Total
	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	
Fund Interest	187	591	573	335		1,686
Participating Organizations			62	169	200	431
Total	187	591	635	504	200	2,117

* updated as per latest information available on the [MPTF programme page](#) but subject to change

1.4 Programme Implementation Status

11. By the end of 2012, the UN-REDD Programme had 46 partner countries, see table 5 below. 16 countries had funding requests to support their National Programmes approved by the Policy Board, including 2 (Indonesia and Viet Nam) who concluded implementation of activities and operationally closed their National Programmes. A total of US\$67 million has been allocated for these 16 National Programmes.

12. Between 2009 and 2012, US\$98 million has been allocated to the Global Programme for international support to REDD+, as well as support to the UN-REDD Partner countries to advance their REDD+ efforts. As mentioned previously the Global Programme also supports the Secretariat of the UN-REDD Programme.

Table 5. List of UN-REDD Programme partner countries, 1 January 2013 (46 in total)

Africa (17)	Asia-Pacific (15)	Latin America and the Caribbean (14)
Benin	Bangladesh	Argentina
Cameroon	Bhutan	Bolivia (Plurinational State of)*
Central African Republic	Cambodia*	Chile
Congo*	Indonesia*	Colombia
Côte d'Ivoire	Lao People's Democratic Republic	Costa Rica
Democratic Republic of the Congo*	Malaysia	Ecuador*
Ethiopia	Mongolia	Guatemala
Gabon	Myanmar	Guyana
Ghana	Nepal	Honduras
Kenya	Pakistan	Mexico
Morocco	Papua New Guinea*	Panama*
Nigeria*	Philippines*	Paraguay*
South Sudan	Solomon Islands*	Peru
Sudan	Sri Lanka*	Suriname
Uganda	Viet Nam*	
United Republic of Tanzania*		
Zambia*		

* Countries receiving support for National Programmes (16 countries in total).

2. The Evaluation

13. As provided for in the UN-REDD Programme Strategy 2011-2015, the UN-REDD Programme 'will commission independent and rigorous evaluations on completed and on-going activities to determine whether they are achieving stated objectives and contributing to decision making. The overall Programme will be externally evaluated every two to three years'. The Policy Board requested an external evaluation of the UN-REDD Programme be undertaken in 2013 (Policy Board Decision 9/2).

14. An **Evaluation Management Group** (EMG) is set up comprising of the three participating UN Organizations' evaluation departments⁴. It will be chaired by the Evaluation Office of UNEP and supported by the UN-REDD Programme Secretariat. All decisions made regarding the evaluation process, recruitment of consultants, evaluation budgeting, deliverables etc. are made by the EMG in consultation with the Secretariat to ensure full independence of the evaluation process. An approval or objection by the majority (two out of three) evaluation departments will be acceptable for decision making within the EMG if consensus by a deadline is not reached or one of the evaluation office staff is unable to participate. The EMG will, through the UN-REDD Secretariat, regularly consult with the UN-REDD Policy Board.

15. The Evaluation will be conducted by an **independent team of evaluation consultants** who will report to the evaluation departments of UNEP, UNDP and FAO. The UN-REDD Secretariat will facilitate and assist the evaluation process.

16. The Policy Board will provide insights and other inputs into evaluation deliverables, and promote learning and ownership of the evaluation findings and recommendations among UN-REDD partners.

2.1 Evaluation Objective and Scope

17. The **main purpose** of the first external evaluation of the UN-REDD Programme is to make a broad and representative assessment of the programme performance in terms of relevance, effectiveness (outputs and outcomes) and efficiency, and to the extent possible determine impacts (actual and potential) stemming from the programme, including their sustainability.

18. The evaluation has three **primary objectives**: (i) to provide evidence of results to meet accountability requirements, (ii) to promote learning, feedback and knowledge sharing through results and lessons learned among the Policy Board, participating UN Organizations and other partners, and, (iii) to inform revision of the UN-Programme Strategy. Therefore, the evaluation will identify lessons of operational and technical relevance for future programme formulation and implementation, especially future UN-REDD National Programmes, and for the UN-REDD Programme as a whole.

19. The **scope** of the evaluation is the UN-REDD Programme over the five year period from the time of its inception in June 2008 to 30 June 2013. The evaluation will encompass the activities and geographical scope of the UN-REDD Programme as a whole, including both the National Programmes and the SNA-GP.

⁴ The UNEP Evaluation Office, the FAO Office of Evaluation and the UNDP Evaluation Office.

20. The **primary audience** for the evaluation will be the UN-REDD Policy Board, and the three participating UN Organizations of the UN-REDD Programme. The secondary audience for the evaluation will be the relevant institutions of all countries participating in UN-REDD interventions, other REDD+ initiatives, along with the broader REDD+ community. The evaluation will also be made available to the public through the UN-REDD Programme [website](#) and the websites of the evaluation departments of the participating UN agencies among others.

2.2 Evaluation Criteria

21. To focus the evaluation objectives by defining the standards against which the initiative will be assessed, the following six internationally accepted evaluation criteria will be applied:

- i) **Relevance**, concerns the extent to which the UN-REDD Programme and its intended outcomes or outputs are consistent with policies and priorities and the needs of the intended beneficiaries. Relevance also considers the extent to which the initiative is responsive to the UN-REDD Programme Strategy 2011-2015 (or the UN-REDD Programme Framework Document for Programmes approved before November 2010) and the corporate plans of the three participating UN Organizations. Relevance vis-a-vis the international REDD+ agenda and negotiations under the UNFCCC as well as vis-à-vis other REDD+ or REDD+-related programmes should also be examined.
- ii) **Effectiveness**, measures the extent of which the Programme's expected outcomes (Table 1) have been achieved or the extent to which progress towards these outcomes has been made.
- iii) **Likelihood of impact**, measures to what extent the Programme has contributed to, or is likely to contribute to intermediate states towards impact, such as changes in the governance systems and stakeholder behaviour, and to impact on the environment and how it affects human well-being. The evaluation will assess the likelihood of impact by critically reviewing the programme's intervention strategy (Theory of Change) and the presence of the required drivers and assumptions for outcomes to lead to intermediate states and impact.
- iv) **Sustainability and up-scaling**, analyses the likelihood of sustainable outcomes at programme termination, with attention to sustainability of financial resources, the socio-political environment, catalytic or replication effects of the programme, institutional and governance factors, and environmental risks.
- v) **Efficiency**, measures how economically resources or inputs (such as funds, expertise and time) were used to deliver high quality goods and services (outputs), and how timely these outputs have been delivered.
- vi) **Cross-cutting issues** such as gender mainstreaming in the programme, integration of social and environmental safeguards at design and during implementation, and contributions to broader organisational learning of the participating agencies.

22. The basis for the performance assessment will be the **Theory of Change (ToC)** of the UN-REDD Programme⁵. A ToC depicts the logical sequence of desired changes (also called “causal pathways” or “results chains”) to which an intervention, programme, strategy etc. is expected to contribute. It shows the cause-to-effect linkages from project outputs (goods and services delivered by the project) over outcomes (changes resulting from key stakeholders’ use of project outputs) towards impact (changes in living conditions and environmental benefits), including any intermediate changes that need to happen between project outcomes and impact (called intermediate states). A ToC further defines the external factors that affect changes along the pathways, namely:

- **Drivers** – these are external factors partly under control of the programme, such as national stakeholder ownership, that help “drive” change processes along the causal pathways;
- **Assumptions** – these are external factors entirely outside the programme’s control that affect the achievement of outcomes, intermediary states and impact.

23. The timely delivery of quality outputs by the programme and the use of these outputs by stakeholders are also affected by internal **factors affecting performance**. The evaluation will carefully assess those factors, such as preparation and readiness of the programme, stakeholder participation, overall management and adaptation to changing conditions, financial planning, effectiveness of implementing agencies, internal coordination and supervision mechanisms, and coordination with other relevant donors projects/programmes; as to understand why performance has been better on certain aspects than others. This deeper understanding of factors affecting performance will likely generate important lessons.

2.3 Evaluation Questions

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

1.1.1 Strategic relevance of the UN-REDD Programme

25. The evaluation will assess, in retrospect, whether the programme’s objectives and implementation strategies were consistent with:

- The international REDD+ agenda and negotiations under UNFCCC;
- Countries’ needs and development priorities as expressed in national policies and plans as well as in sector development frameworks;
- UN Country Programmes or other donor assistance frameworks approved by the governments of the partner countries;
- The corporate mandate, strategies and programmes of work of the 3 participating UN agencies;
- The One UN Plans between the Government and the UN Organizations;
- Other REDD+ related programmes, payment for ecosystem services schemes and livelihood programmes for forest-dependent and indigenous peoples in the countries.

⁵ GEF Evaluation Office, (OPS4) Progress towards Impacts: The ROTI Handbook: Towards enhancing the impacts of environmental projects – Methodological paper 2:

http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/M2_ROTI%20Handbook.pdf

- How well were existing policies, programmes, mechanisms and experiences taken into consideration in partner countries and at the global/regional level so that REDD+ readiness could be built as much as possible on improving those rather than on the creation of new, parallel ones?

26. The evaluation will also assess whether the programme objectives were realistic, in light of the programme duration, its geographical scope and its allocated funding, and considering the baseline situation and the global, regional and national political, institutional and economic contexts in which the programme is operating.

1.1.2 Results and contribution to stated objectives

Delivery of Outputs

27. The evaluation will assess, for each component, the extent to which the expected outputs have been produced, their quality and timeliness, and any gaps and delays incurred in output delivery and their causes and consequences.

28. Ideally, the evaluation team should directly assess all outputs, but this is not always feasible due to time and resource constraints. Therefore, a detailed analysis should be done on a representative sample of outputs that were assessed directly, while a complete list of outputs and their delivery rate and quality, prepared by the programme team, should be included as annex.

Effectiveness

29. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the programme's objectives were effectively achieved or are expected to be achieved.

30. For this, the evaluation will reconstruct the Theory of Change (ToC) of the UN-REDD programme (see paragraph 22 above) based on a review of project documentation and stakeholder interviews. The assessment of effectiveness will then focus on the following questions:

- Extent to which the immediate outcomes, as defined in the reconstructed Theory of Change, have been achieved by the programme;
- Extent to which the formal component outcomes (see Table 1 above) have been achieved, referring as much as possible to the assessment made under the previous point to avoid repetition;
- The contribution of the three participating UN agencies, the UN-REDD Programme Secretariat and partner countries to the achievement of those ToC and formal outcomes.
- A summary of the main factors influencing the achievement of outcomes (with reference to the more detailed analysis that will follow under the "Factors affecting performance").

31. A key question under effectiveness will be what the current status of REDD+ readiness is in the supported countries, considering the most currently agreed REDD+ readiness criteria, and to which extent the UN-REDD Programme has contributed to meeting each criterion.

Likelihood of Impact

32. The evaluation will assess actual and potential, positive and negative impacts produced by the initiative, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended. Since impact is a result of long term change, and requires specialised tools to be measured, this evaluation will only assess the likelihood of impact, and the processes in place and progress made towards it.

33. The evaluation will use a Review of Outcomes towards Impact (ROtI) approach to assess the likelihood that results achieved by the UN-REDD programme (will) contribute to long-term impact on environmental benefits and sustainable development. This theoretical approach is warranted because there is likely to be a significant time lag between the programme's outputs such as "Tools, methods and guidance to encourage the capture of multiple benefits" and outcomes in terms of behavioural change such as "Multiple benefits of forests are realized and safeguarded in REDD+ strategies and actions", over intermediate states such as "Sustainable forest management" towards impact such as "Climate change mitigation and improved human well-being". In addition to the time lag, the UN-REDD programme's contribution to impact becomes much harder to assess the further along the causal pathways the assessment is conducted. It is, however, possible to enhance the reliability of the assessment of likelihood of impact and of the extent of the programme's contribution, through a rigorous review of progress along the pathways from output to outcome to impact set out in the Theory of Change of the programme. The ROtI will also assess to what extent the drivers and assumptions are present, that are deemed necessary for UN-REDD outputs to lead to outcomes, and those outcomes to yield impact.

Sustainability and Up-scaling

34. **Sustainability** is understood as the probability of continued long-term programme-derived results and impacts after the external programme funding and assistance has ended. The evaluation will identify and assess the key conditions or factors that are likely to undermine or contribute to the persistence of benefits. The reconstructed ToC will assist in the evaluation of sustainability.

35. Four aspects of sustainability will be addressed:

- (a) *Socio-political sustainability*. Are there any social or political factors that may influence positively or negatively the sustenance of programme results and progress towards impacts? Is the level of ownership by the main national, regional and global stakeholders sufficient to allow for programme results to be sustained? Are there sufficient government and stakeholder awareness, interests, commitment and incentives to execute, enforce and pursue the programmes, plans, agreements, monitoring systems etc. prepared and agreed upon under the programme?
- (b) *Financial resources*. To what extent are the continuation of programme results and the eventual impact of the programme dependent on continued (external) financial support? What is the likelihood that adequate financial resources⁶ will be available to implement the programmes, plans, agreements, monitoring systems etc. prepared and agreed upon under the project? Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize sustenance of programme results and onward progress towards impact?
- (c) *Institutional framework*. To what extent is the sustenance of the results and onward progress towards impact dependent on issues relating to institutional frameworks and governance? How robust are the institutional achievements such as governance structures and processes, policies, global and regional agreements, legal and accountability frameworks etc. required to sustaining programme results and to lead those to impact on human behaviour and environmental resources?
- (d) *Environmental sustainability*. Are there any environmental factors, positive or negative, that can influence the future flow of programme benefits? Are there any programme outputs or higher level results that are likely to affect the environment, which, in turn, might affect sustainability of programme benefits? Are there any foreseeable negative environmental impacts that may occur as the programme results are being up-scaled?

⁶ Those resources can be from multiple sources, such as a global REDD financing mechanism, the public and private sectors, income generating activities, other development projects etc.

36. **Up-scaling** is defined as up-take and application of practices, approaches and lessons emerging from the programme on a much larger scale and funded by other sources. The evaluation will assess the approaches adopted by the programme to promote up-scaling and appreciate to what extent actual up-scaling has already occurred or is likely to occur in the near future. The reconstructed ToC will assist in determining and assessing the factors that influence up-scaling of programme results.

Efficiency

37. The evaluation will assess:

- The cost and timeliness of key outputs delivered compared to national and regional benchmarks
- Administrative costs (including costs for supervision and coordination between participating UN agencies) compared to operational costs
- Any time and cost-saving measures taken by the programme
- Any significant delays or cost-overruns incurred, reason why and appropriateness of any remedial measures taken
- Any explicit efforts at global and national level to make use of pre-existing results, partnerships and approaches, as well as to exploit complementarities and synergies between related internal and external initiatives.

1.1.3 Cross-cutting issues

Gender mainstreaming

- Analysis of how gender issues were reflected in Programme objectives, design, identification of beneficiaries and implementation;
- Analysis of how gender relations and equality are likely to be affected by the initiative;
- Extent to which gender issues were taken into account in Programme management.
- Assessment of likely distribution of benefits and costs between stakeholders.
- Actual and potential contribution of the Programme to the normative work of the three participating UN Organizations, e.g. contribution towards the “Delivering as One” initiative and lessons learned incorporated into broader organizational strategies.

Participation of forest dependent communities

- To what extent are forest communities and, in particular, indigenous peoples participating in decision making in the UN-REDD programme?
- Are appropriate policies, tools, methods and approaches being promoted by UN-REDD to ensure that the views of forest communities are fully taken into account in decision making processes at national and local level?
- How credible are the efforts by UN-REDD to introduce Free Prior Informed Consent by forest communities both for national policy setting and for local projects?

Capacity Development

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

Norms, guidelines and safeguards

- Alignment of the National Programmes with the UN-REDD Programme’s normative products, guidelines and safeguards, e.g. the UN-REDD Programme Guidelines on Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) and Guidelines on Stakeholder Engagement in REDD+ Readiness;
- Influence of the UN-REDD programme on the UNFCCC negotiation processes and agreements regarding REDD+.

1.1.4 Factors affecting performance

Programme Design and Structure

38. The Evaluation will assess the extent to which the overall performance of the UN-REDD Programme has been affected by the way it has been designed and structured. It will look at whether the establishment of a dedicated programme on REDD among UN agencies has helped to better define and coordinate activities among the 3 participating UN agencies and lead to more effective country assistance. The evaluation will consider the internal coherence and logic between Programme vision, mission, outcomes and outputs. It will seek to answer the following questions:

- Comparing the programme's formal results framework and the reconstructed Theory of Change of the programme, how clear and logic is the programme's formal results framework, including the appropriateness of stated development goals and outcomes (immediate objectives) and the evolution of outputs and outcomes since programme formulation? Is the formal Theory of Change underpinning the overall programme results' framework robust and realistic? Are causal relationship between inputs, activities, expected outputs, outcomes and impacts logical and is adequate consideration given to drivers and assumptions?
- Is the proposed implementation strategy and intervention approach under each work area the most adequate?
- Was the design process of the NPs and the SNA-GP appropriate and were resources set aside for design adequate both for the NPs and the SNA Global Programme?
- The quality of the stakeholders' and beneficiaries identification;
- The appropriateness of selection criteria for national programmes, other supported countries and pilot areas.

Programme Organisation and Management

39. The Evaluation will look at programme organization, coordination and management arrangements, by addressing the following questions:

- Have programme coordination arrangements (roles and responsibilities) in and across participating UN agencies and the UN-REDD Programme Secretariat been clearly defined? How effective are these arrangements towards the achievement of UN-REDD objectives?
- Is the distribution of roles and responsibilities between participating UN agencies optimally aligned with the respective mandates and comparative advantages of the agencies?
- How effective are the current management and supervision arrangements of the programme, both at national and global level?
- Role of the Policy Board and its guidance and decisions on the REDD Programme themselves
- What is the timeliness and quality of administrative and technical support given by the three participating UN Organizations to National Programmes and other partner countries?

Financial and Human Resources Administration

40. The Evaluation will consider the adequacy of financial and human resources planned and available both at the global and national level for the design and implementation of programme activities by assessing, among other things:

- Distribution of funding according to funding source and the adequacy and stability of the funding base for the achievement of programme objectives;
- Coherence and soundness of budget revisions in matching implementation needs and programme objectives;
- Allocation of funds towards and expenditure rate by each type of intervention and by the different partners;

- Quality, transparency and effectiveness of the systems and processes used for financial management;
- Any other administrative processes facilitating or inhibiting fluid execution of programme activities;
- The adequacy in terms of number and competencies of staff managing programme activities, including personnel turn-over rates.

Cooperation and Partnerships

41. The Evaluation will assess the effectiveness of mechanisms for information sharing and cooperation between the UN-REDD Programme, governments and external partners, by addressing the following questions:

- Have key partners been identified and has their commitment at critical stages of programme implementation been secured?
- How is the overall collaboration with and between the different partners involved in the UN-REDD programme?
- How effective are the coordination mechanisms in place between the programme and these partners, within and between Government ministries, and between the National Programme and other bilateral and multilateral REDD+ initiatives. Are the incentives for collaboration adequate?
- What is the timeliness and quality of inputs and support by governments and other partners?
- To what extent have target stakeholder groups and external partners been involved in the planning and implementation of programme activities? Were there any benefits that stemmed from their involvement, e.g. in terms of programme performance, for themselves, for the participating UN agencies etc.?
- To what extent has the programme been able to take up opportunities for joint activities and pooling of resources with other organizations and networks? Has the UN-REDD Programme made full use of opportunities for collaboration with other relevant development programmes? Have complementarities been sought, synergies been optimized and duplications avoided?

Monitoring, Evaluation and Reporting

42. The Evaluation will examine arrangements for reporting, monitoring and evaluating the UN-REDD programme activities and will assess:

- The quality, comprehensiveness and regularity of reporting on programme outputs, outcomes and impact. What quality assurance processes are in place to ensure the reliability and accuracy of reporting?
- The effectiveness of programme monitoring and internal review systems, including clear definition of roles and responsibilities for data collection, analysis and sharing and adequate resources for monitoring.
- How monitoring information is used for programme steering and management. What mechanisms are in place to ensure that monitoring results are used to enhance programme performance?
- The appropriateness of performance indicators to measure progress towards the achievement of outputs, outcomes and impact;
- The extent to which programme activities have been independently evaluated, and whether adequate resources have been allocated to this purpose.

2.4 Evaluation Methodology

43. The UN-REDD Programme evaluation will adhere to the UNEG Norms & Standards⁷. Evaluation findings and judgements should be based on sound evidence and analysis, clearly documented in the evaluation report. Information will be triangulated (i.e. verified from different sources) to the extent

⁷UNEG Norms & Standards: <http://uneval.org/normsandstandards>

possible, and when verification is not possible, the single source will be mentioned⁸. Analysis leading to evaluative judgements should always be clearly spelled out. The limitations of the methodological framework should also be spelled out in the evaluation reports.

44. The evaluation will rate the different evaluation criteria on a six-point scale as detailed in Annex 5.

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

46. As this is the first external UN-REDD Programme evaluation, particular attention should be given to learning from experience, to inform revision of the UN-REDD Programme Strategy. This should be at the front of the evaluation consultants' minds throughout the evaluation exercise. This means that the consultants need to go beyond the assessment of "where things stand" today, and explore processes affecting attainment of programme results, which should provide the basis for the lessons that can be drawn from the Programme. The consultants should also provide recommendations for the way forward.

2.5 Data sources and Tools

47. The UN-REDD Programme evaluation will make use of the following tools and data sources:

- a) A **desk review** of project documents including, but not limited to:
 - General background documentation on REDD, including REDD-related websites, evaluations conducted by international agencies and donors, books and scientific articles pertaining to REDD etc.;
 - Strategy documents of UN-REDD, including the UN-REDD Programme Framework Document and the UN-REDD Programme Strategy 2011-2015;
 - Relevant reports, such as Programme Annual and Semi-Annual Reports, Year in Review publication, external evaluations by donors, partners etc.;
 - UN-REDD Programme Management Note for Improved delivery of the Programme;
 - Project design documents, including approved Global Programme and individual National Programme Documents, annual work plans and budgets, revisions to the logical framework and project financing;
 - Documentation related to National Programme outputs and relevant materials published on the programme website;

⁸ Individuals should not be mentioned by name if anonymity needs to be preserved. In such cases sources can be expressed in generic term (Government, NGO, donor etc.).

- Evaluations of National Programmes (final report of the Vietnam NP evaluation, draft report of the Panama NP mid-term review, and possibly early drafts of the Indonesia, DRC and Tanzania NP evaluations);
 - The recently completed Country Needs Assessment undertaken jointly with the FCPF;
 - The Review of the Policy Board structure;
 - Other relevant documents, such as possible new national policy documents, sector plans etc. bearing relevance for UN-REDD.
- b) **Semi-structured interviews**⁹ with a sample of key informants, stakeholders and participants, drawn from:
- PB members, alternates and observers;
 - Government stakeholders including ministries participating in national coordinating bodies or steering committees;
 - Civil Society Organizations;
 - Indigenous Peoples Organizations;
 - Current and potential donors;
 - Country, regional and headquarter personnel from the three UN-Agencies involved in the National Programme, e.g. the Programme Management Unit, Resident Coordination and Regional Technical Advisers;
 - UN-REDD Programme Secretariat, Strategy Group and Management Group;
 - Representatives from other bi-lateral or multi-lateral initiatives, including but not limited to FCPF, FIP, GEF, UNFCCC Secretariat.
- c) **Surveys**¹⁰
- A survey of supported countries (where NPs have taken/are taking place and others), including government, civil society, private sector etc. to collect views from countries on UN-REDD relevance, quality of support provided and outcomes achieved to date.
 - A survey of UN-REDD partner agency staff (not only in the 3 participating UN agencies but also in the various international and national organisations that have partnership agreements or are sub-contracted by the programme) to collect their views on UN-REDD relevance, outcomes achieved to date and internal factors affecting performance.
- d) **Participation in key events**, such as Policy Board meetings
- e) **Missions to selected partner countries**. Meeting in-country partners and Programme staff on the ground will be vital to acquiring a comprehensive understanding of the work conducted at the country level. The evaluators will study the different types of country-level reviews already available and propose on that basis which countries best to visit in order to fill information gaps. Countries whose National Programme has recently been evaluated (e.g. Viet Nam and Panama) will not be visited. Seven (07) countries, with at least 2 countries per region and 4 countries with a National Programme, would provide a suitable sample. The

⁹ Face-to-face or through any other appropriate means of communications

¹⁰ These surveys can be conducted online or through Email, as deemed most effective by the team. In preparation of the questionnaires, duplication with the Policy Board Review should be avoided.

evaluation team will visit the first country together. Tentative country selection criteria could be:

- Variety of duration and intensity of support provided by UN-REDD, including an adequate representation of partner countries without an NP;
- Global significance of the forest ecosystems in the country;
- UN partner agency that leads the NP;
- Adequate regional diversity of the sample.

2.6 Consultation process

48. While fully independent in its judgements, the Evaluation Team will adopt a consultative and transparent approach with internal and external stakeholders. Throughout the process the evaluation team will liaise closely with: the Evaluation Management Group, relevant Programme staff of the participating UN Agencies, the Policy Board, and other key stakeholders. Although the evaluation team is free to discuss with relevant government authorities anything pertaining to its assignment, the team is not authorized to make any commitments on behalf of the Programme or the participating UN Organizations.

49. The inception and draft evaluation reports will be shared first with the EMG, then with the Policy Board, relevant Programme staff of the participating UN Agencies and other key stakeholders for comments before finalisation. Comments will be incorporated as deemed appropriate by the evaluation team.

2.7 The Evaluation Team

50. The Evaluation Team should consist of three independent evaluators, including one Team Leader. The Team Leader will have sound experience in leading evaluations of large programmes and excellent English writing skills. To the extent possible the Evaluation Team will be balanced in terms of geographical and gender representation to ensure diversity and complementarity of perspectives. The evaluation team should comprise the best available mix of skills and expertise required to assess the UN-REDD Programme:

- a) Extensive evaluation experience, including using a Theory of Change approach;
- b) Good technical understanding of the REDD+ field, and of sustainable forestry and Climate Change issues;
- c) Knowledge of the UN, in particular of FAO, UNDP and UNEP;
- d) First-hand experience in large, global programme coordination and management;
- e) Knowledge management and communication;
- f) Partnerships; and
- g) Gender equity, minorities and other social and cultural issues.

51. The Evaluation Team members will have had no previous direct involvement in the formulation, implementation or backstopping of the Programme. All members of the Evaluation Team will sign the Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct Agreement Form (Annex 3).

52. The Evaluation Team is responsible for conducting the evaluation as set out in these TORs and applying the approach and methods proposed in the inception report they will prepare. All team members, including the Team Leader, will participate in briefing and debriefing meetings, discussions and field visits, and will contribute to the evaluation with written inputs. The Team Leader will determine the distribution of data collection, analysis and reporting responsibilities within the team, in consultation with the other team members. The Inception Report will specify how responsibilities will be shared among evaluation team members.

2.8 Evaluation Team Deliverables

Inception Report

53. Before going into data collection the Evaluation Team shall prepare an *Inception Report* which should detail the evaluators' understanding of what is being evaluated, showing how the evaluation questions can be answered by way of proposed methods and sources of data. It will contain:

- A thorough review of the programme context
- A thorough review of the programme design
- A desk-based reconstructed Theory of Change of the programme, identifying immediate outcomes, intermediate states towards impact, drivers and assumptions for evaluation
- The evaluation framework. It should present in further detail the evaluation questions under each criterion with their respective indicators and data sources, and summarize the information available from programme documentation against each of the main evaluation parameters. Any gaps in information should be identified and methods for additional data collection, verification and analysis should be specified.
- A proposed schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables –and how these are distributed over the different Team Members
- A list of key stakeholders and other individuals who should be consulted, developed with the assistance of the Secretariat.
- A preliminary list of documents to be reviewed by the evaluation team. A list of important documents and web pages that the evaluators should read at the outset of the evaluation and before finalizing the inception report is included in Annex 4.

54. The Inception Report will be shared with the EMG, relevant Programme staff of the participating UN Agencies, the Policy Board, and other relevant stakeholders for comments. The EMG must clear the Inception Report.

Evaluation Reporting

55. Each evaluation consultant will provide written inputs to the evaluation. They will prepare country case study reports and contribute to the main report by writing sections of the main report. The Team Leader, in consultation with the other evaluation team members, will determine the specific inputs and format of the inputs expected from the other team members during the inception phase.

56. After data collection and analysis has been completed, before drafting the main report, the evaluation team will jointly prepare a *preliminary findings report*, showing the most important findings emerging from the evaluation on which the main report will be focused. This document will

be shared with the EMG, the UN-REDD Secretariat and members of the Policy Board to obtain their feedback on the emerging findings, to make sure that the most important issues have been captured by the evaluators.

57. Then, the evaluation team shall prepare a *Draft Evaluation Report* meeting the required criteria as described in the Terms of Reference. The Team Leader bears responsibility for submitting the draft report within four weeks from the conclusion of the country visits. The report will present the evidence found on the evaluation issues, questions and criteria listed in the Terms of Reference. The length of the report should be 15-18,000 words, excluding executive summary and annexes. Supporting data and analysis should be annexed to the report when considered important to complement the main report. The recommendations will be addressed to the different stakeholders and prioritized: they will be evidence-based (with references to the relevant findings in the report), relevant, focused, clearly formulated and actionable. The Evaluation Team shall agree on the outline of the report at the inception phase, based on the template provided in Annex 2 of this Terms of Reference. The report shall be drafted in English.

58. The *Draft Evaluation Report* will immediately be circulated among the evaluation departments, who will verify that the draft report meets evaluation quality standards, and may request a revision of the draft report by the consultants before it is shared with a wider audience. The revised draft report will then be circulated among relevant Programme staff of the participating UN Agencies, the full Policy Board, and other key stakeholders for comments. Comments will be incorporated as deemed appropriate by the evaluation team. A “Response to comments matrix” will be prepared by the evaluation team to show how comments received have been dealt with in the *Final Evaluation Report*.

59. The Evaluation Team is fully responsible for its independent report, which may not necessarily reflect the views of the three participating UN Organizations or the Policy Board. An evaluation report is not subject to technical clearance by the evaluation departments of the three participating UN Organizations, although they are responsible for ensuring conformity of the evaluation report with quality standards for programme evaluation in the three Organizations.

60. The *Final Evaluation Report* will be translated into French and Spanish by the UN-REDD Programme Secretariat. It will be published on the UN-REDD Programme website (www.un-redd.org) and the websites of the evaluation departments of the participating UN agencies among others.

2.9 Management Response

61. Following completion of the evaluation and delivery of the final Evaluation Report, a Management Response will be prepared. The Policy Board, assisted by the UN-REDD Programme Secretariat, will track implementation of evaluation recommendations.

2.10 Evaluation timetable

62. Table 6 outlines the provisional timetable and roles and responsibilities at each stage of the evaluation process. The timetable will be adjusted according to the availability of the selected evaluation team.

Table 6: Provisional UN-REDD Programme Evaluation Timeline

Phase	Activity	Responsibility	2013										2014					
			Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	
Preparation	Prepare draft Evaluation ToR	Secretariat & EMG	■															
	Circulate workplan and process to PB	Secretariat		■														
	PB10 (26-27 June): Presentation of workplan and process	EMG			■													
	ToR finalised and sent to PB for information	EMG & Secretariat				■	■											
	Recruit evaluation team	EMG					■	■										
	Inception mission	Evaluation Team, MG, EMG								■	■							
	Inception report	Evaluation Team							■	■								
	Review inception report	PB, EMG, Secretariat, 3 Agencies via SG & MG								■	■							
Evaluation	Data collection: Doc review, interviews, surveys and country visits	Evaluation Team								■	■							
	Data analysis	Evaluation Team								■	■							
	Presentation of evaluation status at PB11 (week of 9 December)	Evaluation team									■							
	Preparation of a preliminary findings report	Evaluation team in consultation with EMG									■							
	Comments on preliminary findings by evaluation stakeholders	PB, Secretariat, 3 Agencies via SG & MG, and other stakeholders									■	■						
	Preparation of draft evaluation report	Evaluation Team										■	■					
	Review draft evaluation report by EMG (Evaluation quality assurance)	EMG & Evaluation Team												■				
	Review draft evaluation report by stakeholders	PB, Secretariat, 3 Agencies via SG & MG, and other stakeholders												■	■			
	Submission of final report	Evaluation Team														■		
Response	Preparation of management response addressing the recommendations	Programme Management														■		
	PB12: presentation & dissemination of report and response	Team Leader or EMG															■	

Annex 1: UN-REDD Programme Evaluation – Consultants Terms of Reference

Team Leader

The Team Leader will be responsible for overall management of the evaluation and timely delivery of its outputs as described in the overall TORs of the evaluation, under supervision of and in consultation with the Evaluation Management Group comprising of the evaluation departments of the participating UN agencies (UNDP, FAO and UNEP). (S)He will lead the evaluation design, document analysis, fieldwork and report-writing with full support and substantive inputs from the other team members. More specifically:

Coordination of the inception phase of the evaluation, including:

- conduct a preliminary desk review and introductory interviews with UN-REDD programme staff,
- draft the reconstructed Theory of Change of the programme,
- prepare the evaluation framework,
- develop the desk review and interview protocols,
- plan the evaluation schedule,
- distribute tasks and responsibilities among the evaluation team members, and
- prepare the inception report, including comments received from the EMG;

Coordination of the data collection and analysis phase of the evaluation, including:

- conduct further desk review and in-depth interviews with global and regional partners of the programme;
- provide technical support to the evaluation team regarding information collection, data analysis, surveys etc.
- regularly monitor progress of the team in information gathering and analysis,
- prepare a country case study report template and coach team members during the first joint country visit,
- conduct two additional country visits and prepare two country case studies,
- review the country case studies prepared by the other team members and provide feedback,
- discuss preliminary findings of the evaluation with the team,
- present an update of the status of the evaluation to the eleventh meeting of the Policy Board (December 2013),
- prepare a preliminary findings report to solicit first comments from evaluation stakeholders including the PB;

Coordination of the reporting phase, including:

- assign writing responsibilities among the team members for the main report,
- write key section of the main report,
- review/edit sections written by the other team members, ensuring a coherent report both in substance and style, and
- liaise with the EMG on comments received and ensuring that comments are taken into account during finalization of the main report, and
- present the evaluation findings and recommendations at the twelfth Policy Board meeting (mid-2014);

Managing internal and external relations of the evaluation team, 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,
- avoid and resolve any misunderstandings, tensions and performance issues within the team, and
- communicate in a timely manner with the EMG on any issues requiring its attention and intervention.

The Evaluation Team will be supported by the EMG, the UN-REDD Secretariat and National Programme Teams for logistical arrangements as much as possible, but will be required to make appointments with stakeholders directly and acquire their own country visas and health/repatriation coverage.

The Team Leader shall have had no prior involvement in the formulation or implementation of the UN-REDD Programme and will be independent from the participating UN Organizations and other global, regional and national partners to the programme. (S)He will sign the Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct Agreement Form (Annex 3).

The Team Leader will be selected jointly by the EMG and recruited by the UNEP Evaluation Office through an individual consultancy contract.

Key selection criteria

- Advanced university degree in international development, Forestry, Environmental sciences or other relevant social science areas.
- Extensive evaluation experience, including of large, regional or global programmes and using a Theory of Change approach;
- Extensive team leadership experience;
- In-depth knowledge of sustainable forest management, REDD+ and Climate Change issues;
- Knowledge of results-based management orientation and practices;
- Experience from or knowledge of the UN system, FAO, UNDP and UNEP in particular;
- Excellent writing skills in English and working level knowledge of at least one among the following languages: French or Spanish.;
- Attention to detail and respect for deadlines.
- Minimum 10 years of professional experience, longer professional experience is an advantage, including proven experience in developing countries.

The fee of the Team Leader will be agreed on a deliverable basis and paid upon acceptance of expected key deliverables by the EMG.

Deliverables:

- Inception report
- 7 country case studies (1 prepared jointly with the team, 2 prepared by the team leader and 4 prepared by the other team members)
- Preliminary findings report
- Draft main report and revised draft report incorporating EMG comments as required
- Revise main report incorporating – as appropriate – comments received from evaluation stakeholders and response to comments received from stakeholders on the draft report

- Final main report
- Presentation of findings and recommendations of the evaluation for discussion at the twelfth Policy Board meeting

Schedule of Payment:

Deliverables	Percentage payment
Inception report	20
Final country case studies and preliminary findings report	20
Submission and approval of the draft evaluation report	30
Submission and approval of the final evaluation report <u>and</u> presentation of findings and recommendations at the twelfth Policy Board meeting	30

Supporting Consultants

The evaluation team will comprise two Supporting Consultants in addition to the evaluation Team Leader. The Supporting Consultants will be responsible for delivering timely and high quality contributions to the evaluation process and outputs as described in the overall TORs of the evaluation under the leadership and supervision of the Team Leader. They will participate actively in evaluation design, document analysis, fieldwork and report-writing. Each Supporting Consultant will specifically provide:

Substantive contributions to the inception of the evaluation, including:

- conduct a preliminary desk review and introductory interviews with UN-REDD programme staff,
- support the Team Leader in drafting the reconstructed Theory of Change of the programme,
- assist in the preparation of the evaluation framework,
- contribute to the desk review and interview protocols,
- draft one of the two survey protocols (country survey or partner agency staff survey),
- contribute to sections of the inception report as agreed with the Team Leader, and
- any other tasks during the inception phase as requested by the Team Leader;

Substantive contributions to data collection and analysis, including:

- conduct further desk review and in-depth interviews with global and regional partners of the programme as assigned by the Team Leader;
- conduct one joint country visit and draft sections of the first country visit report, incorporating feedback received from the Team Leader,
- conduct two additional country visits and prepare two country case studies, incorporating feedback received from the Team Leader and the other Supporting Consultant,
- review the country case studies prepared by the other team members and provide feedback,
- discuss preliminary findings of the evaluation within the team, and
- support the Team Leader with the preparation of a preliminary findings report, and
- any other tasks related to data collection and analysis as requested by the Team Leader;

Substantive contributions to the main report, including:

- write key section of the main report, as assigned by the Team Leader,
- review/edit sections written by the other team members, ensuring a coherent report both in substance and style,
- assist the Team Leader with reviewing comments received from the EMG and other stakeholders and with finalizing the main report, and
- any other tasks related to reporting as requested by the Team Leader;

Ensure good team work and external 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,
- be a team player, avoid and help resolve any misunderstandings, tensions and performance issues within the team, and
- communicate in a timely manner with the EMG on any issues requiring its attention and intervention.

The Evaluation Team will be supported by the EMG, the UN-REDD Secretariat and National Programme Teams for logistical arrangements as much as possible, but will be required to make appointments with stakeholders directly and acquire their own country visas and health/repatriation coverage.

The Supporting Consultants shall have had no prior involvement in the formulation or implementation of the UN-REDD Programme and will be independent from the participating UN Organizations and other global, regional and national partners to the programme. They will sign the Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct Agreement Form (Annex 3).

The Supporting Consultants will be selected jointly by the EMG and recruited by the UNEP Evaluation Office through individual consultancy contracts.

Key selection criteria

One Supporting consultant will be a forest governance expert and the other will be a social scientist. Both consultants will have:

- Advanced university degree in international development, Forestry, Environmental sciences, Social sciences or other relevant disciplines;
- Significant evaluation experience including using a Theory of Change approach;
- Reasonable knowledge of the UN system, FAO, UNDP and UNEP in particular;
- Minimum 7 years of professional experience, longer professional experience is an advantage, including proven experience in developing countries;
- Excellent writing skills in English.

The *forestry expert* will have in-depth expertise on REDD+ policies and strategies, sustainable forestry practices, drivers of deforestation, MRV, and multiple forest conservation benefits.

The *social scientist* will have in-depth understanding of forest and REDD-related gender, indigenous peoples, minorities and other socio-cultural issues. (S)He will also have experience in assessing partnerships, knowledge management and communication.

The fee of the Supporting Consultants will be agreed on a deliverable basis and paid upon acceptance of key evaluation deliverables by the EMG.

The Team Leader will assign data collection, analysis and writing responsibilities within the team. The Team Leader will also advise the EMG whether the Supporting Consultants have contributed their fair share to the evaluation process and deliverables, and take part in their performance assessment.

Deliverables:

- Inception report
- 3 country case studies (1 prepared jointly with the team, 2 prepared individually)
- Feedback on country case studies prepared by other team members
- Preliminary findings for key internal programme stakeholders (i.e. EMG, UN-REDD Secretariat and the Policy Board)
- Draft main report and revised draft report incorporating EMG comments if necessary
- Feedback on sections of the main report written by other team members
- Response to comments received from stakeholders on the draft report
- Final main report

Schedule of Payment:

Deliverables	Percentage payment
Final country case studies	30
EMG approved draft evaluation report	40
EMG approved final evaluation report	30

Annex 2: Annotated evaluation report outline

In consultation with the EMG, The Evaluation Team can modify the structure of the report outline below, as long as the key contents are maintained in the report and the flow of information and analysis is coherent and clear. The length of the UN-REDD Programme final evaluation report should not exceed 18,000 words, excluding executive summary and annexes. The report will use numbered paragraphs for easy cross-referencing.

Acknowledgements

Table of Contents

Acronyms

Maximum 1 page and only for terms used more than 3 times in the report. When an acronym is used for the first time in the text, it should be written out in full.

Executive Summary

A 'stand alone' Executive Summary which should:

- Maximum 2,000 words;
- Provide key information on the evaluation process and methodology;
- Illustrate key findings and conclusions;
- List all recommendations: this will facilitate the drafting of the Management Response to the evaluation.

1. Introduction

1.1 Background and purposes of the evaluation

This section will include:

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

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

1.2 Methodology of the evaluation

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

2. Programme and context

This section will describe the UN-REDD Programme (starting and closing dates, expected outcomes and outputs, initial and current total budget, implementation arrangements etc.).

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

3. Strategic relevance

4. Results and contribution to stated objectives

4.1 Delivery of outputs

4.2 Effectiveness

4.3 Likelihood of impact

4.4 Sustainability and up-scaling

4.5 Efficiency

4.6 Cross-cutting issues: Gender, capacity development, norms, guidelines and safeguards

5. Factors affecting performance

5.1 Programme design and structure

5.2 Programme organization and management

5.3 Financial and human resources administration

5.4 Cooperation and partnerships

5.5 Monitoring, evaluation and reporting

6. Conclusions and recommendations

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

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

Recommendations should be firmly based on evidence and analysis, be relevant and realistic, with priorities for action made clear. They can tackle strategic, thematic or operational issues. Each recommendation should each be introduced by the rationale for it; alternatively, it should be referenced to the paragraphs in the report to which it is linked.

Each recommendation should be clearly addressed to the appropriate party, i.e. the Policy Board, the UN-REDD Programme Secretariat and the three participating UN organizations at different levels (headquarter, regional, and national). Responsibilities and the time frame for their implementation should be stated, to the extent possible. Although it is not possible to identify a 'correct' number of recommendations in an evaluation report, the evaluation team should consider that each recommendation must receive a response.

7. Lessons learned

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

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

- I. Evaluation Terms of Reference
- II. Evaluation Framework
- III. Additional methodology-related documentation and evaluation tools;
- IV. Detailed output matrix
- V. Detailed ROTI analysis

- VI. Brief profile of evaluation team members
- VII. List of documents reviewed
- VIII. List of institutions and stakeholders met during the evaluation process. (The team will decide whether to report the full name and/or the function of the people who were interviewed in this list.)

Annex 3: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct¹¹ Agreement Form

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

<p style="text-align: center;">Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form</p> <p>Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System</p> <p>Name of Consultant: _____</p> <p>I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.</p> <p>Signed at (place) on (date)</p> <p>Signature: _____</p>
--

¹¹ Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System: www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

Annex 4: Documents to be consulted

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

- The UN-REDD Programme Framework Document:
http://www.unredd.net/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_download&gid=4&Itemid=53
- UN-REDD Programme Strategy 2011-2015:
http://www.unredd.net/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_download&gid=4598&Itemid=53
- The UN-REDD Programme SNA Global Programme Framework 2011-2015:
http://www.unredd.net/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_download&gid=5534&Itemid=53
- The UN-REDD Programme Rules of Procedure and Operational Guidance:
http://www.unredd.net/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_download&gid=362&Itemid=53
- The UN-REDD Programme Strategy Group, Management Group and Secretariat Terms of Reference:
http://www.unredd.net/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_download&gid=10101&Itemid=53
- The UN-REDD Programme Policy Board Terms of Reference:
http://www.unredd.net/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_download&gid=487&Itemid=53
- The Review of the Policy Board Structure
- Vietnam National Programme Terminal Evaluation
- Panama National Programme Mid-Term Review

Annex 5: Rating Programme Performance

The evaluation will provide individual ratings for the evaluation criteria described in section 2.3 of these TORs.

All criteria will be rated on a six-point scale as follows: Highly Satisfactory (HS); Satisfactory (S); Moderately Satisfactory (MS); Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU); Unsatisfactory (U); Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). Sustainability is rated from Highly Likely (HL) down to Highly Unlikely (HU).

An aggregated rating (on a six-point scale) will be provided for Results and Contribution to stated objectives, and Overall Programme Performance. These ratings are not the average of the ratings of sub-criteria but should be based on sound weighting of the sub-criteria by the Evaluation Team. All ratings should use letters (not numbers).

In the conclusions section of the report, ratings will be presented together in a table, with a brief justification cross-referenced to the findings in the main body of the report.

Criterion	Rating	Summary assessment
Strategic relevance of the UN-REDD Programme		
Results and contribution to stated objectives		
Delivery of Outputs		
Effectiveness		
Likelihood of Impact		
Sustainability		
Up-scaling		
Efficiency		
Cross-cutting issues:		
Gender		
Participation of local stakeholders		
Capacity Development		
Normative Products		
Factors affecting performance		
Programme Design and Structure		
Programme Organization and Management		

Human and Financial Resources Administration		
Cooperation and Partnerships		
Monitoring, reporting and evaluation		
Overall Programme Performance		