



UN-REDD Programme Evaluation Terms of Reference – **DRAFT**

UN-REDD PROGRAMME TENTH
POLICY BOARD MEETING

25-28 June 2013

Lombok, Indonesia

In accordance with the decision of the Policy Board, hard copies of this document will not be printed to minimize the environmental impact of the UN-REDD Programme processes and contribute to climate neutrality. The UN-REDD Programme's meeting documents are available on the internet at: www.unredd.net or www.un-redd.org.

1. Background and Context

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.

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”

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.

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.

1.1 UN-REDD Programme Objective, Expected Outcomes and Outputs

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

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.

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.

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.

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

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)*

	2008	2009	Interest			Total
			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

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.

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.

Further information on the implementation of the UN-REDD Programme can be found in the Annual and Semi-Annual Programme Reports.

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

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).

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.

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.

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

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.

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.

The scope of the evaluation is the UN-REDD Programme over the five year period from the time of its inception, 20 June 2008, to the time of evaluation, mid-2013. The evaluation will encompass the

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

activities and geographical scope of the UN-REDD Programme as a whole, including both the National Programmes and the SNA-GP.

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 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

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) **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.
- iv) **Sustainability**, 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) **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 programmes intervention strategy (Theory of Change) and the presence of the required drivers and assumptions for outcomes to lead to intermediate states and impact.
- 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.

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 between changes at different results levels (outputs, outcomes, intermediate states and impact), and the actors and factors influencing those changes, namely:

- **Internal factors affecting performance**, such as preparation and readiness of the programme, country ownership, stakeholder involvement, 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;
- **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.

2.3 Evaluation Questions

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, efficiency, effectiveness, 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:

i) Relevance of the UN-REDD Programme

The relevance of the UN-REDD Programme’s objectives and strategy to:

- 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.
- 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?

ii) Results and contribution to stated objectives

Delivery of Outputs

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_ROT%20Handbook.pdf

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.

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

Effectiveness

- Extent to which the expected outcomes (please see Table 1) have been achieved; The contribution of the three participating UN agencies, the UN-REDD Programme Secretariat and partner countries to the achievement of those outcomes.
- Main factors influencing the achievement of outcomes (with reference as needed to more detailed analysis under the "Factors affecting performance").
- What is the status of REDD+ readiness in the supported countries, looking at the typical REDD+ readiness components, and to which extent has the UN-REDD Programme contributed to each?

Efficiency

- 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.

Sustainability

- Major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the programme.
- Adequacy of the exit strategy of the UN-REDD Programme;
- The prospects for sustaining and up-scaling the Programme's results by the beneficiaries after the termination of the initiative. The assessment of sustainability will include, as appropriate:
- Institutional, technical, economic and social sustainability of proposed technologies, innovations and/or processes;
- Perspectives for institutional uptake and mainstreaming of the newly acquired capacities, or diffusion beyond the beneficiaries of the Programme.

Likelihood of Impact

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. 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.

iii) Factors affecting performance

Programme Design and Structure

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:

- The clarity and logic of the programme’s 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 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 was adequate consideration given to drivers and assumptions?
- What was the realism of the programme design, including programme duration, geographical scope and programme cost estimates?
- 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

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

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

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

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.

iv) 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.

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.

2.4 Evaluation Methodology

The UN-REDD Programme evaluation will adhere to the UNEG Norms & Standards⁶.

Evaluation findings and judgements should be based on sound evidence and analysis, clearly documented in the evaluation report. Information will be triangulated (i.e. verified from different sources) to the extent possible, and when verification is not possible, the single source will be mentioned⁷. Analysis leading to evaluative judgements should always be clearly spelled out. The limitations of the methodological framework should also be spelled out in the evaluation reports.

The evaluation will rate the different evaluation criteria as detailed in Annex 5.

⁶UNEG Norms & Standards: <http://uneval.org/normsandstandards>

⁷ 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.).

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

As this is 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

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:
 - Relevant background documentation, 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;
 - Evaluations of National Programmes (Vietnam, Indonesia and possibly DRC and Tanzania NP evaluations);
 - The recently completed Country Needs Assessment undertaken jointly with the FCPF;
 - The Review of the Policy Board structure (due mid 2013);
 - Other relevant documents, such as possible new national policy documents, sector plans and available evaluations bearing relevance for UN-REDD.
- b) **Semi-structured interviews**⁸ 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;

⁸ Face-to-face or through any other appropriate means of communications

- 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) **An e-mail survey of partner countries** (where NPs have taken/are taking place and others), to collect views from countries on UNREDD relevance, quality of support provided and outcomes achieved to date. In preparation of the semi structured interviews and e-mail questionnaire, duplication with the Policy Board Review should be avoided.
- 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 review 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 previously been evaluated (e.g. Viet Nam) will not be visited. It is anticipated that up to 2 countries per region (6 in total), including 3 with National Programme's, would provide a suitable sample. 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

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 (consisting of representatives of the evaluation departments of the three participating UN Organizations, assisted by the UN-REDD Secretariat), 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.

The inception and draft evaluation reports will be shared first with the Evaluation Management Group, 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

The Evaluation Team should consist of three evaluators (independent consultants or a team within a consulting practice), 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.

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).

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

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 project design
- A desk-based Theory of Change of the programme, identifying 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.

The Inception Report will be shared with the Evaluation Management Group (Consisting of representatives of the evaluation departments of the three participating UN Organizations assisted by the UN-REDD Secretariat), 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

Each evaluation consultant will provide written inputs to the evaluation. They will prepare country visit reports and contribute to the main report through a working paper and/or by writing sections of the main report. The Team Leader will determine the specific inputs and format of the inputs expected from the other team members during the inception phase.

Before drafting the main report, the evaluation team will jointly prepare a presentation of preliminary findings, showing the most important findings emerging from the evaluation on which the main report will be focused. This presentation will be presented to (or shared with –as practicable) 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.

After data collection and analysis has been completed, 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.

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*.

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.

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

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

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					
			Mar	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun		
I. P R E P A R A T I O N	Prepare draft Evaluation ToR	Secretariat & Evaluation Departments																		
	Circulate workplan and process to PB	Secretariat																		
	PB10 (26-27 June): Presentation of workplan and process	Evaluation Departments																		
	ToR finalised and sent to PB for information	Evaluation Departments																		
	Vacancy announcement issued	Evaluation Departments																		
	Appoint Team Leader	Evaluation Departments																		
	Appoint other team members	Evaluation Departments																		
II. E V	Inception report	Evaluation Team (consultants) Logistical support provided by Evaluation Departments and Secretariat																		
	Review inception report (2 wks)	PB, Evaluation Departments, Secretariat, 3 Agencies via SG & MG																		
	Data collection: Doc review, consultations/ country visits	Evaluation Team (consultants)																		
	PB11 (dates tbc)																			

A L U A T I O N	Presentation of preliminary findings (presented or shared – as practicable)	Evaluation team (consultants)																
	Data analysis	Evaluation Team (consultants)																
	Preparation of draft evaluation report	Evaluation Team (consultants)																
	Review draft evaluation report by Evaluation Management Group	Evaluation Departments (Review of draft from the point of view of evaluation quality. Revised by Evaluation team if required)																
	Review draft evaluation report	PB, Evaluation Departments, Secretariat, 3 Agencies via SG & MG, and other stakeholders (review of draft report for information and any feedback)																
	Submission of final report	Evaluation Team (consultants)																
III.	Preparation of management response addressing the recommendations	Programme Management																
S P O N S E	PB12: presentation & dissemination of report and response																	

Annex 1: UN-REDD Programme Evaluation Consultancy Terms of Reference

The Evaluation Team should consist of three evaluators (independent consultants or a team within a consulting practice), including one team leader. The Evaluation Team is responsible for conducting the evaluation as described in the overall TORs of the evaluation, and applying the approach and methods they will propose in the inception report, 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).

All team members, including the Team Leader, will participate in briefing and debriefing meetings, and will contribute to the evaluation with written inputs. Discussion of the overall evaluation approach, and in particular the field visit approach, will be essential prior to the country visits. The Evaluation Team shall collaborate on a single document for each of the three main deliverables (inception report, draft report and final report), while the Team Leader is responsible for consolidating the reports and ensuring all deadlines are met.

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

Consultancy fees for this assignment will be determined by level of experience and the commensurate UN remuneration rate for consultants at this level. It is expected that consultants will be recruited on individual consultancy contracts.

The Evaluation Team will be supported by the Evaluation Departments, 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.

All team members will have extensive evaluation experience. The evaluation team should comprise the best available mix of skills that are required to assess the UN-REDD Programme, and ideally include experience within the UN system, in-depth knowledge and good technical understanding of REDD+, as well as competence and skills in evaluation. To the extent possible, the Evaluation Team will be balanced in terms of geographical and gender representation to ensure diversity and complementarity of perspectives.

Competencies:

- Independent from the UN-REDD Programme and the participating UN Organizations, FAO, UNEP and UNDP;
- The evaluation team should comprise the best available mix of skills that are required to assess the UN-REDD Programme, including in-depth knowledge and good technical understanding of REDD+, forestry and Climate Change issues;
- Demonstrate experience from evaluations of similar types of programmes, including using a Theory of Change approach;
- Knowledge of results-based management orientation and practices;
- Experience from or knowledge of the UN system, FAO, UNDP and UNEP in particular;
- First hand experience in large, global programme coordination and management;
- Knowledge management and communication;

- Partnerships;
- Gender equity, minorities and other social and cultural issues;
- Excellent writing and editing skills;
- Attention to detail and respect for timelines.

Qualifications:

- Advanced university degree in international development, Forestry, Environmental sciences or other relevant social science areas.
- Minimum 10 (team leader)/7 (team leader assistant) years of professional experience is required, longer professional experience is an advantage, including proven experience from developing countries.
- Fluency in English language, both written and spoken is a requirement. Working level of at least one among the following languages required: French or Spanish.

Deliverables:

- Inception report
- Intermediate inputs by the evaluation team members as agreed with the Team Leader: country visit reports and working papers and/or inputs for the main report
- Draft findings presentation to be given to key internal programme stakeholders (i.e. UN-REDD Secretariat, the Policy Board, EMG)
- Draft main report and revised draft report incorporating EMG comments if necessary
- Response to comments received from stakeholders on the draft report
- Final main report
- PowerPoint presentation of findings and recommendations of the evaluation for discussion at the Policy Board
-
-

Application:

- Applications to be sent as per instructions. The assignment will be recruited through UNEP.

Provisional Schedule of Payment:

Deliverables	Percentage payment to Team leader	Percentage payment to Supporting Consultants
Inception report	20	
Submission and approval of the draft evaluation report	20	50
Submission and approval of the final evaluation report	60	50

Annex 2: Annotated UN-REDD Programme evaluation report outline

The Evaluation Team can modify the structure of the report outline below, as long as the key contents are maintained in the report and the flow of information and analysis is coherent and clear. The length of the UN-REDD Programme final evaluation report should not exceed 18,000 words, excluding executive summary and annexes.

Acknowledgements

Table of Contents

Acronyms

Maximum 1 page and only for acronyms used more than 3 times in the report. When an acronym is used for the first time in the text, it should be explained 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. Relevance

4. Results and contribution to stated objectives

4.1 Delivery of Outputs

4.2 Effectiveness

4.3 Efficiency

4.4 Cross-cutting issues: Gender, capacity development, norms, guidelines and safeguards4.5 Sustainability and Up-scaling

4.6 Likelihood of impact

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 Conduct⁹ Agreement Form

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

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System Name of Consultant: _____ I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation. Signed at (place) on (date) Signature: _____
--

⁹ 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 (to be delivered in 2013)

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
Relevance of the UN-REDD Programme		
Results and contribution to stated objectives		
Delivery of Outputs		
Effectiveness		
Efficiency		
Cross-cutting issues:		
Gender		
Capacity Development		
Normative Products		
Sustainability		
Up-scaling		
Likelihood of Impact		
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		