**TERMS OF REFERENCE**

**MID-TERM REVIEW OF THE PROJECT " REMOVING BARRIERS TO BIODIVERSITY CONSERVATION, LAND RESTORATION AND SUSTAINABLE FOREST MANAGEMENT THROUGH COMMUNITY-BASED LANDSCAPE MANAGEMENT – COBALAM”**

# Section 1: BACKGROUND AND PROJECT OVERVIEW

## General information about the project

Table 1: Project identification

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Routine** |  |  |  | |
| **Biodiversity** | Expected accomplishment(s): | Removing barriers to biodiversity conservation, land restoration and sustainable forest management through community-based landscape management - COBALAM | |
| **UNEP approval date** | March 2019 | Outcome(s) of the programme of work |  | |
| **GEF Project ID:** | GFF/PMS : 9604 | Type of project | Full-sized project | |
| **GEF Operational Programme #** | BD-1  BD-4: Program 9 LD-2 Program 3 LD-3 Program 4 | Area(s) of focus |  | |
| **Date of approval of the GEF** | February 12, 2020 | GEF Strategic Priority |  | |
| ***Expected*** start date | April 1, 2020 | Actual start date | 06 October 2020 | |
| ***Expected*** completion date | March 30, 2025 | Actual completion date | N/A | |
| **Project budget *for* approval** | USD 23,900,024 | Total expenses reported as of June 30, 2023 | USD 20,157,367 | |
| **Amount of the GEF grant** | USD 3,105,023 | Expenditure declared under the GEF grant as at June 30, 2023 | USD 1,160,140 | |
| **Project Preparation Grant – GEF Funding** | USD 91,325 | Project Preparation Grant - co-financing |  | |
| **Co-financing *expected* for a medium/large project** | USD 20,795,001 | Co-financing provided for a medium/large project | USD 19541067 | |
| **First disbursement** | 550 000 USD | Financial Closing Date | 31 December 2025 | |
| **No. revisions** | 0 | Date of last revision | N/A | |
| **No. meetings of the steering committee** | 2 | Date of last/next meeting of the Steering Committee | Last: 17 November 2021 | Next: November 2023 (extra) |
| **Mid-term review/evaluation *(planned date)*** | September 2023 | Mid-term review/evaluation (effective date) |  | |
| **Final evaluation *(expected date)*** |  | Final evaluation (effective date) |  | |
| **Area of intervention - Country** | 1 | Area of coverage - region(s): | Central Africa | |
| **Dates of previous phases of the project** |  | Status of subsequent phases of the project | N/A | |

## Project/Program Rationale[[1]](#footnote-2)

The project rationale derives from the need and opportunity to develop policy implementation structures and practical field-based implementation to strengthen biodiversity conservation while Cameroon pursues its economic growth strategy. Over 80% of population in the WHC is dependent on natural resources for their livelihoods. In the south of Cameroon, with over 70% of the rural population dependent on healthy forests, sustainable management of forests and land is the only long-term solution to the growing environmental and economic pressures. Cameroon has committed to restoring an ambitious target of over 12 million hectares of deforested and degraded land by 2030, which is the biggest commitment in the Congo Basin under the Bonn Challenge initiative. While close to 46% of Cameroon is covered in forests that are highly valued for their biodiversity, unsustainable use and management of natural resources, increasing internal and external pressures, lack of appropriate coordination mechanisms and stewardship have contributed to the deforestation and degradation at an alarming speed. The uniqueness and richness of biodiversity of both the WHC and the south of Cameroon and the global significance of the country’s biodiversity, the dependence of communities on sustainable use of natural resources, the absence of existing working solutions for CBNRM in the country, require a concerted action and scalable solutions that this project sets out to address.

COBALAM will focus field activities in the montane North-West and West regions of the WHC, as well as in South region, which is home to lowland tropical forest. While these two parts of the country are sharply differentiated (one a highland region that is heavily populated and experiencing continuing processes of land degradation, and the other a sparsely-populated lowland expanse, largely covered with closed canopy natural forest), both are threatened by unsustainable practices that are affecting the entire ecosystem.

The project will integrate CBNRM in these two regions by developing a participatory local governance system for the preservation of biodiversity and sustainable land management, while enhancing the livelihoods of communities. It will also address the legislative and regulatory barriers to improve the protected status of HCVF and KBAs. It will address the pressures on natural resources from competing land uses across landscapes through participatory land use planning that builds commitment to reducing the extension of the agricultural frontier into natural forest lands.

To achieve this, COBALAM will improve agricultural practices and land management around HCVF areas and KBA by promoting sustainable agricultural practices for the most important food crops and, where applicable, cash crops, such as avocado, cocoa and coffee, supporting NTFP enterprise and assisting producers and harvesters with improved access to markets. Local CSOs and municipalities will play a key role in embedding landscape- based approaches into national practices within the decentralization processes currently being strongly backed by the government.

## Project/programme objectives and components

**Objective**: To improve biodiversity conservation and community livelihoods in three landscapes in the Western Highlands and South Region of Cameroon, through participatory community-based landscape management and the development of enterprises based on responsible resource use.

**Component 1: Community Forest protection and institutional alignment for integrated landscape management**

Outcome 1.1 Clear cross-sector coordination mechanisms implemented for integrated landscape management in the WHC

Output 1.1.1 Inter-institutional Landscape Management Boards (LMB) established in two priority landscapes in the WHC, involving multi-sector and multi-scale stakeholder groups.

Output 1.1.2 Inter-institutional Landscape Management Boards operational for improved landscape management

Outcome 1.2: Upgraded Conservation status granted by the government on two Key Biodiversity Areas (KBA) comprising High Conservation Value Forests (HCVF) and stakeholders agreed management options for Sacred Forests in the Western Highlands of Cameroon (WHC)

Output 1.2.1 Technical file to support the status of Priority Management Zones (PMZ) for two KBA developed based on stakeholder consultations and submitted to relevant authorities for approval

Output 1.2.2 Agreed conservation options for Sacred Forest in the WHC developed based on stakeholder consultations

Output 1.2.3 Experience of institutionalizing participatory sustainable landscape management that includes protecting HCVF and incentivizing local environmentally responsible enterprises capitalized and made available to authorities for guiding future PMZ development

**Component 2: Development of capacity and incentives to support the protection of landscapes through KBA/HCVF management and SLM and SFM deployment**

Outcome 2.1 Pressures on natural re- sources from competing land uses on natural forests covering 53,039 ha are reduced through integrated natural re- source management by land users and communities in the WHC and South regions.

Output 2.1.1 Landscape management plans identifying best SLM and SFM practices developed in three priority landscapes covering 7,600 ha the WHC and 24,551 ha in South region and available to stakeholders for their implementation.

Output 2.1.2 Management measures to avoid forest degradation and biodiversity loss in 14,099 ha of protected areas in the WHC identified and available to protected areas managers and users.

Output 2.1.3 Capacities of at least 10 local civil society organizations (CSOs) and/or community-based organizations (CBOs) and 3,000 land users and community members in the WHC and South region strengthened on recognized SLM and SFM practices.

Output 2.1.4 Market and policy incentives identified and leveraged to enable demand for products from sustainably managed farms/forests, and stimulate smallholder rural enterprises in the WHC and South region

Output 2.1.5 Learning is disseminated within and beyond the project areas and stakeholders through exchange visits, communications products, workshops and other events.

**Component 3: Deployment of integrated SLM and SFM practices in the WHC and the South region landscapes**

Outcome 3.1. Landscape level uptake of SLM/SFM prac tices on 53,038 ha including 27,299 ha in the WHC and 25,739 ha in South region, avoids and reduces land degradation and biodiversity loss, and delivers ecosystem services and im- proved socio-eco- nomic benefits for local communities

Output 3.1.1 SLM and SFM practices identified and included in the landscape management plans are implemented in the WHC and South region, primarily through a small-grants approach to local CSOs, CBOs and communes

Output 3.1.2 Women’s access to socio-economic benefits and services is improved through targeted capacity building to CBOs and SMEs lead by women in the WHC and the South region and supporting women to assume management roles

Output 3.1.3 Gender sensitive indicators defined with local stakeholders and applied to assess impacts of project activities on HCVF and KBA protection, good SLM and SFM practices and livelihoods of indigenous people and local communities.

## Implementation modalities

## The UN Environment’s Ecosystem Division is the GEF Implementing Agency (IA) for this project. In this role, it will provide project oversight to ensure that GEF policies and criteria are adhered to and that the project meets its objectives and achieves expected outcomes in an efficient and effective manner. It will also, in partnership with MINEPDED and other key project partners, engage in promoting the project with a view to mobilizing resources and partnerships. The IA is also responsible of drafting the Project Cooperation Agreement (PCA), approve technical and financial reports, review audit reports, and ensure fluid disbursement of funds. Details of the IA function will be included in the PCA.

## Project supervision will be entrusted to the UN-Environment/ Ecosystem Director, who will discharge this responsibility through the assigned TaskManager who represents the UN Environment/ Ecosystem Director on the Project Steering Committee. Project supervision missions by the Task Manager will constitute part of the project supervision plan. UN- Environment/ Ecosystem will perform the liaison function between UN-Environment and the GEF Secretariat and report on the progress against milestones outlined in the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) approval letter to the GEF Secretariat. UN-Environment will inform the GEF Secretariat whenever there is a potentially substantive co-financing change (i.e. one affecting the project objectives, the underlying concept, scale, scope, strategic priority, conformity with GEF criteria, likelihood of project success, or outcome of the project). It will rate, on an annual basis, progress in meeting project objectives, project implementation progress, risk, and quality of project monitoring and evaluation, and report to the GEF Secretariat through the Project Implementation Review (PIR) report prepared by the Executing Agency (EA) and ensure that the Evaluation Office of UN Environment arranges for an independent terminal evaluation and submits its report to the GEF Evaluation Office.

## The Ministry of Environment, Protection of Nature and Sustainable Development of Cameroon is the Executing Agency. The National Director and his support staff (accountant, secretary) shall be designated by MINEPDED from among its staff. The National Director will serve as the institutional anchor of the project. MINEPDED will ensure the contribution of the Government to the project and will be fully accountable for the delivery of project results relevant to the technical administration and the Technical Operation Unit (TOU) involved in accordance with the results framework. UN Environment and MINEPDED will sign a Project Cooperation Agreement (PCA), in which the role of Rainforest Alliance in the COBALAM project execution will be specified. As discussed, and agreed during the PPG phase, the PCA to be signed between MINEPDED and UN Environment will include a clause which will allow UN Environment to transfer funds directly to Rainforest Alliance to execute activities on the ground. This arrangement was concluded to allow fluid execution of the activities with the communities and local partners. MINEPDED is responsible of submitting timely progress and financial reports to UN-Environment. The division of execution roles between MINEPDED and Rainforest Alliance is included in Annex H.

## MINPEDED will facilitate the establishment of and co-chair a multi-stakeholder Project Steering Committee (PSC), together with UN Environment. All project partners will be included in the PSC, so additionally: Rainforest Alliance, MINEPAT, MINFOF, MINEPIA, MINADER, MINDAF as well as representatives from municipalities and other partners. The PSC will provide general oversight of the execution of the project and ensure that results are being achieved. Specifically, the PSC will:

## ensure that all project activities and outputs are in line with the results framework;

## review, suggest amendment (if appropriate) and endorse all annual work plans and budgets of the project;

## review project progress and achievement of planned results as presented in project reports submitted for its appreciation;

## provide inputs to the mid-term review and final evaluation, review findings and provide comments;

## advise on issues and problems arising from project implementation, submitted for consideration by the project management unit or other stakeholders;

## facilitate dissemination and integration of project outcomes into national policies and programs as appropriate; and

## facilitate collaboration amongst stakeholders and support the timely availability of co- financing sources.

## Rainforest Alliance is the technical partner for the project execution and will take responsibility for the field level activities, in accordance with the objectives, planned activities and allocated budget. It will deliver the outputs and demonstrate its best efforts in achieving the project outcomes. It will also coordinate activities with MINEPDED and other relevant partners and address and rectify any issues raised by UN Environment with respect to project execution in a timely manner. MINEPDED will sign a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with Rainforest Alliance to allocate necessary resources for the execution of planned activities, as detailed in Annex H (Project Implementation Arrangements). The MoU will constitute an integral part of the PCA and therefore be submitted for pre-approval from UN Environment Task Manager before its signature.

## A Project Management Unit (PMU) will be created in Rainforest Alliance’s office in Yaoundé. It will be staffed with a Project coordinator to be appointed part-time with project co-financing and a full-time Finance & Administration assistant, based within Rainforest Alliance’s Central Africa leadership team. They will be supported by Rainforest Alliance’s international experts on a part- time basis as required (M&E expert, finance manager, Markets & Value Chains specialist). Overall responsibility for overseeing project execution in the WHC and the South region lies with the Project coordinator.

## A field office will be established in Bafoussam, capital of the West region. The office will be staffed with three full-time positions to be recruited locally: Landscape Management expert, Sustainable Agriculture expert and a driver. They will be supported on a part – time basis by a team of national and international technical experts, as necessary. Operational responsibility for project execution in the WHC will lie with the Landscape Management expert, who will respond directly to the Project coordinator.

## The project will work with a number of sub-executing partners, which will contribute to implementing specific activities through subgrant agreements, using a small-grants approach (Output 3.1.1). These partners will comprise primarily CBOs and SMEs that produce, process and distribute products from the WHC and the South region. Rainforest Alliance has an established procedure for managing sub-grants. This includes the requirement for prospective sub-grantees to complete a pre-award questionnaire, from which potential weaknesses in financial administration capacity can be assessed and steps taken to mitigate them. Sub- grantees are required to complete quarterly narrative and financial reports. It will be the responsibility of the Project Director, Project Coordinator and Finance and Administration Assistant to maintain close monitoring of the performance of the sub-grantees.

## Project cost and funding

The following table summarises the main lines of the budget by year/result and by group of budget lines. expenditure percentages are also shown.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Budget Line** |  |  | **Year 1\*** | **Year 2\*** | **Year 3** | **Year 4** | **Year 5** | **Total** | **%** |
| 10 | PERSONNEL COMPONENT |  | **236741,6** | **199890,8** | **222570,2** | **205108,9** | **199996,8** | **1064308,3** | **34,3** |
|  | 1100 | Project personnel | 89554,6 | 140488,4 | 149857,2 | 148432,4 | 131957,3 | 660289,8 | 21,3 |
|  | 1200 | Consultants | 102535,0 | 16915,4 | 17571,0 | 18252,9 | 18962,0 | 174236,2 | 5,6 |
|  | 1300 | Administrative Support | 14218,0 | 14584,2 | 14965,1 | 15361,2 | 15773,1 | 74901,7 | 2,4 |
|  | 1600 | Travel on official business | 30434,0 | 27902,7 | 40177,0 | 23062,5 | 33304,5 | 154880,6 | 5,0 |
| 20 | SUB-CONTRACT COMPONENT |  | **0,0** | **246250,0** | **262250,0** | **146250,0** | **0,0** | **654750,0** | **21,1** |
|  | 2100 | Sub-contracts (MOUs/LOAs for cooperating agencies) | 0,0 | 246250,0 | 262250,0 | 146250,0 | 0,0 | 654750,0 | 21,1 |
|  | 2300 | Sub-contracts (for commercial purposes) | 0,0 | 0,0 |  |  | 0,0 | 0,0 | 0,0 |
| 30 | TRAINING COMPONENT |  | **119500,0** | **164039,3** | **100539,6** | **83539,6** | **48664,3** | **516282,7** | **16,6** |
|  | 3200 | Group training | 13375,0 | 58375,0 | 65875,0 | 47000,0 | 2500,0 | 187125,0 | 6,0 |
|  | 3300 | Meetings/Conferences | 106125,0 | 105664,3 | 34664,6 | 36539,6 | 46164,3 | 329157,7 | 10,6 |
| 40 | EQUIPMENT AND PREMISES COMPONENT |  | **144106,3** | **75218,8** | **92096,3** | **83530,0** | **39793,8** | **434745,0** | **14,0** |
|  | 4100 | Expendable equipment | 31106,3 | 51218,8 | 68096,3 | 64780,0 | 21043,8 | 236245,0 | 7,6 |
|  | 4200 | Non-expendable equipment | 113000,0 | 24000,0 | 24000,0 | 18750,0 | 18750,0 | 198500,0 | 6,4 |
|  | 4300 | Premises | 0,0 | 0,0 | 0,0 | 0,0 | 0,0 |  | 0,0 |
| 50 | MISCELLANEOUS COMPONENT |  | **94939,4** | **62530,4** | **63125,0** | **30500,0** | **119781,7** | **434937,3** | **14,0** |
|  | 5100 | Operation and maintenance of equipment | 0,0 | 0,0 |  |  | 0,0 | 0,0 | 0,0 |
|  | 5200 | Reporting costs | 77030,4 | 32030,4 |  |  | 32030,4 | 205152,0 | 100,0 |
|  | 5300 | Sundry | 3750,0 | 22500,0 | 28750,0 | 22500,0 | 22500,0 | 100000,0 | 3,2 |
|  | 5400 | Hospitality and entertainment |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0,0 |
|  | 5500 | Evaluation | 14159,0 | 8000,0 | 34375,0 | 8000,0 | 65251,3 | 129785,3 | 4,2 |
| **99** | **GRAND TOTAL** |  | **595287,2** | **747929,2** | **740581,1** | **548928,5** | **408236,5** | **3105023,2** | **100,0** |

## 6. Implementation challenges

* Ongoing socio-political crises, particularly in the Noth-West and South-west regions, could constitute obstacles to the implementation of some project activities at the national level;
* Low mobilization of resources by partners for project implementation due to covid-19 during the first year of implementation ;
* The participatory process for the set-up of landscape management body has taken longer time than expected, leading to some delay in the implementation of related field activities ;

# Section 2: OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE OF THE REVIEW

## 7. Key principles of the review

The project document calls for an independent mid-term evaluation to be conducted during the lifetime of the project and for UNEP to organize the evaluations. UNEP, the Ministry of Environment, Nature Protection and Sustainable Development and Rainforest Alliance have agreed to conduct the mid-term evaluation of the project in the last quarter of 2023.

The purpose of this mid-term evaluation is to determine the level of progress made toward achieving the project's objectives. The review will assess project performance and the implementation of planned outputs and activities against actual results. Risks to the achievement of project outcomes and objectives will also be assessed. The purpose of the evaluation is to identify corrective actions, and to make relevant recommendations for any changes in the project design and overall direction that may be necessary.

The objectives of the evaluation will include:

* Assess of the effectiveness, efficiency, relevance and coherence of the project and progress towards its stated objectives and intended impacts;
* analyze the effectiveness of the implementation of partnership agreements and subcontracting of activities by consultant;
* identify problems requiring decisions and remedial actions.;
* identify lessons learned from project development, implementation, and management;
* propose mid-course corrections and/or adjustments to the project design, particularly to inform the second half of the five years project, as well as potential future interventions.

## 8. Aim of the review

The project review will be conducted according to internationally applied evaluation criteria of relevance, efficiency, and effectiveness, although it is recognized that impact and sustainability will be more difficult to capture at this early stage of implementation.

The objective of the review is also to provide Cameroon (MINEPDED) and the technical and financial partners, with institutional, legal, and technical basis for efficient project implementation, based on lessons learned and best practices internationally for the sustainable management of natural resource according to the principles of the community-based landscape management.

**8.1 Assessment of Project Relevance**

* In relation to the national priorities defined by the Cameroon in its sustainable environmental and resources management policies;
* In relation to national development priorities;
* In relation to GEF focal areas, operational programmes and strategic priorities as identified in the project document;
* In relation to the UNEP programme of work.
* Relevance and appropriateness; context of the project in relation to local and national experience of participatory community-based natural resource management (CBNRM) and local enterprise development to support biodiversity conservation and sustainable landscape and forest management; details of the project’s significance with respect to specific needs and its relevance to the priorities of the communities involved.

**8.2. Assessment of the quality, clarity, and suitability of the project design**

* Clarity and logical coherence between inputs, activities, outputs and expected effects to achieve the project's environmental and development objectives;
* Relevance and adequacy of indicators and means of verification;
* Validity of assumptions and risks;
* Adequacy of the implementation schedule, including delays in project preparation;
* Adequacy of resources of all parties and appropriateness of budget allocations to achieve desired results.

The following questions were identified to guide the evaluation:

* The process of identifying and preparing the project took place over a long period of time. Could the Mission identify any issues that have delayed the process? Do you have any suggestions on how to further streamline the process?
* Was the expected level of co-financing and the ratio of GEF budget to co-financing budget realistic?
* Has the GEF budget been properly allocated among the different components and activities of the project in order to achieve the expected results?
* How realistic were the overall contributions expected from the Cameroon government to the project, not only in terms of financial resources but also in terms of providing qualified and motivated staff?
* Quality and realism in the identification of actors and beneficiaries, including the decision to select for field activities; and
* The quality and realism of external institutional relations, as well as in the institutional structure and management modalities for the implementation of the project.

The institutional structure of the project is a major aspect to be examined in depth by the assessment mission. The mission will assess the extent to which the management arrangements described in the project document were realistic, and whether they were carefully followed, and/or whether project management was able to adapt to changes during the course of the project. The mission will assess the effectiveness, efficiency and adaptability of the project management and the supervision of the activities and modalities of project implementation at all levels: (1) political decisions of the Project Steering Committee; (2) GEF guidance through UNEP; and (3) the day-to-day management of the project by MINEPDED in collaboration with Rainforest Alliance.

The mission will compare the roles and responsibilities of the different institutions involved and the ambitions expressed in the project document and the reality on the ground.

**Role and responsibilities of the Project Steering Committee:** Was its composition adequate to provide effective and efficient guidance for the implementation of the project? What were the outcomes and recommendations of its last meeting held in November 2021, and how was they followed up? Have there been any ad hoc virtual consultations, apart from face-to-face meetings? Have other steering bodies (such as the planned Scientific and Technical Committee) been established and how have they contributed to the effective and efficient implementation of the project?

Review of the Program and project structure to make it simpler and more effective. This structure is in charge of the coordination, monitoring and evaluation, and implementation of the project.

**Role and responsibilities of UNEP/Ecosystem Division** as implementing agency: Have UNEP staff provided adequate oversight and supervision, including project supervision missions, in the field? Did UNEP staff provide quality advisory support to the project, approve changes (e.g. budget revisions) on time, and readjust the project when necessary? Have UNEP staff been actively involved in mobilizing co-financing resources? Did UNEP staff ensure the real-time transfer of funds to the MINEPDED and Rainforest Alliance assisted in reporting, including timely PIRs to the project when necessary?

**8.3. Management of financial resources, including:**

1. Co-financing: What efforts have been made by whom to actually mobilize the announced co-financing? What measures have been taken to remedy the situation? Has a contingency plan been developed?
2. Adequacy of budget allocations to deliver outputs: Have significant transfers of funds been made between budget lines being implemented? Have budget revisions been consistent and streamlined to meet project implementation needs and objectives? and
3. Implementation rate and budgetary balance at the time of evaluation.

**8.4. Effectiveness of project management and implementation, including:**

1. The quality and realism of the work plans, during these first three years of implementation to date.
2. Efficiency and effectiveness of operations management.
3. How did the financial and technical management of the project from UNEP headquarters affect its implementation? What was the response time to requests received from the field, as well as the follow-up? How is the flow of information and decision-making organized between UNEP, MINEPDED and Rainforest Alliance Project Management Unit (PMU) staff? How are funds transferred to the MINEPDED and Rainforest Alliance?
4. Effectiveness in achieving outputs, including assessment of discrepancies and delays between planned and achieved outputs, causes and consequences of delays, and appropriateness of any corrective actions taken. To what extent is the project successful in achieving desired outcomes?

The evaluation mission will take stock of the results achieved to date, including a comprehensive and systematic assessment of the project's performance in terms of the achievement of the outputs planned to date, in relation to the work plan, in terms of quantity and quality, but also in terms of usefulness and timeliness. In particular, the mission will examine the status and quality of work on:

**Logical framework of the COBALAM project.**

1. Effectiveness of internal monitoring and evaluation processes

The evaluation will determine whether the project has met the minimum requirements for the design of the project (M&E) system and M&E plan, including the review of baseline data, indicators and means of verification. The following questions provide guidance in this regard: Does the project have a robust M&E plan to track results and progress towards project objectives? Have regular reports have been produced and used to feed into the Project Implementation Report? Is the information provided by the M&E system used by project management to improve project performance and adapt to changing needs? Is the budget allocation for M&E sufficient? Has training on M&E activities taken place?

1. Efficiency and effectiveness of coordination and steering bodies including the Project Steering Committee
2. Quality and quantity of administrative and technical support provided by COBALAM Cameroon Project Partners.

The evaluation mission will determine the composition of the project technical working group and the frequency and relevance of the working group meetings. It will also assess the readiness of the members of the working group to respond to requests for specific assistance as well as the quality of the technical services provided, including support missions, review and approval of documents, ToRs, etc.

1. Respect for the deadlines, quality and quantity of contributions and support from partners and the Cameroon government through the MINEPDED and Rainforest Alliance.

The evaluation mission will estimate the actual contributions of the project partners in terms of staff time, as well as in-kind and cash contributions, and compare with expected contributions. If there is a discrepancy between the expected level of co-financing and the actual co-financing, what are the reasons? Does the importance of the co-financing have an impact on the results and/or sustainability of the project and, if so, how and what are the causal links?

It will also assess the actual contributions of Cameroon, compare it with the planned co-financing and analyse the consequences of non-implementation of co-financing during the implementation of the project.

**8.5. Evaluation of gender issues, participation and empowerment and equity, including**

* Analysis of the integration of gender issues in the objectives and design of the project during the identification of beneficiaries and the implementation of the project.
* Analysis of possible influences of the project on gender relations.
* The degree of consideration of gender issues by the project managers, in addressing specifically the following questions:
  + To what extent has the project empowered communities to take part in the decision making and policy processes?
  + What are the impacts of the project, positive or negative, on women and gender equality? What are the lessons learned?

**8.6. Evaluation of the sustainability of effects and products**

Sustainability refers to the likelihood of having ongoing long-term project-derived effects and impacts after the end of GEF project funding. The assessment will identify and assess key conditions or factors that may facilitate or hinder the progress of the project towards achieving its objectives. At mid-term, it is particularly important to identify possible obstacles to the sustainability of the project's expected outcomes and outputs. Some of these factors could be effects of the project, such as institutional capacity building or more informed decision-making. Other factors will include contextual conditions or developments that are not effects of the project but relevant to the sustainability of its effects and products.

Four aspects of sustainability need to be examined**:**

1. Financial sustainability: to what extent do the effects and outputs of the project depend on ongoing financial support? What is the likelihood that the Cameroon will provide the necessary financial resources to sustain the effects and outputs of the project once GEF assistance ends?
2. Institutional framework and governance: To what extent are the effects and outputs of the project dependent on their uptake and institutional integration beyond the direct beneficiaries of the project? What is the likelihood that government institutions, legal frameworks, policies and structures will enable the sustainability of project effects and outputs?
3. Technical and economic sustainability: to what extent do the effects and outputs of the project depend on the technical capacity and economic situation of the beneficiaries in adopting the proposed technologies? What is the likelihood that technologies will be replicated on a larger scale in the region?
4. Socio-political sustainability: to what extent do the effects and outputs of the project depend on socio-political factors? What is the probability that the level of ownership of stakeholders will allow the maintenance of project effects and products? Have the public and stakeholders provided sufficient information to support the long-term objectives of the project?

The evaluation will assess the status of the project against internationally accepted criteria for assessing relevance, efficiency, and effectiveness, although it is recognized that impact and sustainability will be more difficult to measure at this early stage of implementation.

## 9. Key strategic issues

1. In addition to the evaluation criteria set out in section 10 below, the review will provide answers to the policy questions listed below. These are issues of interest to the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) to which the project could make a significant contribution:

* To what extent does the project follow a sound theory of change with appropriately formulated products, direct effects, intermediate states, and long-term outcomes? What revisions are needed to ensure that the intervention can be effectively evaluated at the end of its cycle? This will include assessing whether performance indicators are verifiable and appropriate to record progress towards development goals.
* To what extent is the steering component integrated into a process for documenting a "model" that can be replicated and scaled?

Attention should be paid to the lessons that can be drawn from the following issues in the effectiveness evaluation:

* To what extent has the project made the COBALAM model of Integrated Landscape Management?
* To what extent has the project developed an operational Community Forest protection and institutional models’ alignment for an effective integrated landscape management?
* To what extent has the project developed capacity and incentives to support the protection of landscapes through KBA/HCVF management and SLM and SFM deployment?
* To what extent has the project deployed integrated SLM and SFM practices in the WHC and the South region landscapes?
* Progress towards the achievement of the medium-term objectives of the project results framework and GEF monitoring tools, UNEP.

## 10. Evaluation criteria

1. All evaluation criteria will be scored on a six-point scale. **Sections A to I** below specify the scope of the criteria and a link to a table to record ratings is provided in **Annex 1**). A weighting table will be proposed in Excel format (link available in Appendix 1) to facilitate the determination of the overall score of the project. The evaluation criteria are grouped into nine categories: (A) strategic relevance; (B) quality of project design; (C) nature of the external context; (D) effectiveness, which includes assessments of the achievement of outputs, achievement of effects and likelihood of impact; (E) financial management; (F) efficiency; (G) monitoring and reporting; (H) sustainability; and (I) factors affecting project performance. Reviewers may propose alternative evaluation criteria if deemed appropriate.
2. **Strategic relevance**
3. The review will assess, in line with the relevance as defined by the OECD/DAC: "the adaptation of the activity to the priorities and policies of the target group, the recipient and the donor". The review will include an assessment of the project's relevance to UNEP's mandate and its alignment with UNEP policies and strategies at the time of project approval. As part of the strategic relevance, an assessment of the complementarity of the project with other interventions addressing the needs of the same target groups will be carried out. This criterion consists of four elements:
4. *Alignment with UNEP's Medium-Term Strategy (MTS) and Programme of Work (P)[[2]](#footnote-3)*

The review should determine the alignment of the project with the MTS TDP under which the project was approved and consider a reflection on the extent and scope of the contributions made to the expected results recorded in the relevant MTS and TDP.

1. *Alignment with UNEP on /GEF/donor strategic priorities*

The strategic priorities of the donor, including the GEF, will vary from intervention to intervention. UNEP’s strategic priorities include the Bali Strategic Plan for Technology Support and Capacity Building (PSB) and South-South Cooperation (C-SS). The PSB refers to the ability of governments to: comply with international agreements and obligations at the national level; promoting, facilitating and financing environmentally sound technologies and strengthening frameworks for coherent international environmental policy-making. C-SS is considered the exchange of resources, technology and knowledge among developing countries. GEF priorities are specified in the programming priorities and strategies of the published focal areas.[[3]](#footnote-4)

1. *Relevance to regional, subregional and national environmental priorities*

The review will assess the extent to which the intervention is appropriate or responds to the expressed environmental concerns and needs of the countries, subregions or regions where it is implemented. Examples include national or subnational development plans, poverty reduction strategies, nationally tailored mitigation plans (NAMAs) or regional agreements, etc.

1. *Complementarity with existing interventions*

An evaluation will be conducted on whether the project has taken into account ongoing and planned initiatives (under the same subprogramme, other subprogrammes of UNEP or implemented by other agencies) at the design stage or during advocacy and that address similar needs of the same target groups. The review will determine whether the project team, in collaboration with the regional bureaux and subprogramme coordinators, ensured complementarity of its own intervention with other interventions, maximized synergies and avoided duplication. Linkages with other interventions need to be clarified and cases where the comparative advantage of UNEP has been particularly well applied highlighted.

Factors affecting this criterion include: stakeholder participation and cooperation; consideration of human rights and gender equity, as well as country ownership and motivation.

1. **Quality of project design**
2. The quality of the project design is assessed using an agreed template during the start-up phase of the review. Scores are assigned to the defined criteria and an overall score of the quality of the project design is established. This overall rating of the quality of the project design is entered in the scoring table of the final review under heading B. The strengths and weaknesses of the project at the design stage are summarized in the main report of the review.

Factors affecting this criterion include (at the design stage): stakeholder participation and cooperation and sensitivity to human rights and gender equality, including the appropriate level of budgeting of relevant actions.

C. **Nature of the external context**

1. At the start stage of the review, a rating is established for the external working context of the project (taking into account the prevalence of conflicts, natural disasters and political upheavals). This note is entered in the table of notes of the final review under heading C. When a project is recognized as facing an unfavourable or very unfavourable and unexpected external work environment, the overall efficiency rating may be revised upwards at the discretion of the consultant under review in consultation with the Task Manager and this increase is accompanied by a justification.

**D. Effectiveness**

1. The review will determine effectiveness across three dimensions: output achievement, direct impact achievement and likelihood of impact.
2. *Realization of products*

The review will determine the project's ability to generate the programmed outputs (products and services delivered by the project itself) and achieve the key milestones defined in the project design document (DocPro). Any formal changes/revisions made during the implementation of the project will be considered part of the project design. Where project products are presented inappropriately or inaccurately in the DocPro, a table showing the original wording and the amended version should be provided for transparency. The achievement of the products will be evaluated in quantitative and qualitative terms, and the evaluation will examine their usefulness and delivery times. The review will provide a brief explanation of the reasons for the success or weaknesses of the project in achieving the programmed outputs and meeting the expected quality standards.

Factors affecting this criterion include preparation and availability, and quality of project management and supervision.[[4]](#footnote-5)

1. *Realization of direct effects*

The achievement of direct effects is evaluated in terms of performance in relation to direct effects as defined in the reconstructed theory of change. These are the first level effects that are expected to be achieved as immediate outcomes of the project outputs. As in point 1 above, a table may be used if substantive changes to the formulation of direct effects are necessary. The review should provide evidence attributing direct effects to UNEP's intervention. In the case of normative activities or where several actors collaborate to achieve common results, evidence of the nature and extent of UNEP's contribution should be provided.[[5]](#footnote-6)

Factors affecting this criterion include the quality of project management and supervision; stakeholder participation and cooperation; human rights and gender sensitivity, communication and public awareness.

1. *Probability of impact*

Based on the formulation of long-term effects in the theory of change (ToC) (i.e. starting from direct effects, via intermediate states to impact), the review will assess the likelihood that the desired positive impacts will become a reality. Project objectives should be integrated into the ToC, possibly as intermediate states or long-term impacts. The Evaluation Office's approach to the use of CTT in project evaluations is described in a guidance note available on the EOU website (<https://www.unenvironment.org/about-un-environment/evaluation>) and accompanied by an Excel flowchart called Impact Likelihood Assessment (see Appendix 1). The approach essentially follows a "probability tree", from direct effects to impacts, taking into account that the assumptions and factors identified in the reconstructed TDC are well established. Any unintended positive effects must also be identified and their causal link to the intended impact specified.

1. The review will also examine the likelihood that the intervention may lead to or contribute to unintended negative effects. Some of these potential adverse effects may have been identified in the project design as risks or as part of the analysis of environmental, social and economic protections.[[6]](#footnote-7)
2. The review will determine the extent to which the project has acted as a catalyst or fostered scale-up and/or replication as part of its theory of change and as a factor that may contribute to long-term impact. The ultimate goal of UNEP and all its partners is to generate benefits for the environment and human well-being. Few projects are likely to have impact statements that reflect such long-term or large-scale changes. However, the review will determine the likelihood that the project will make a significant contribution to high-level changes such as UNEP's expected accomplishments, the Sustainable Development Goals and/or high-level outcomes prioritized by the funding partner.[[7]](#footnote-8)[[8]](#footnote-9)

Factors affecting this criterion include the quality of project management and supervision, including adaptive project management, stakeholder participation and cooperation; sensitivity to human rights and gender equality; country ownership and motivation, communication and public awareness

**E. Financial Management**

1. Financial management will be assessed under three main themes: completeness of financial information, communication between financial management and project management staff, and compliance with applicable United Nations financial management standards and procedures. The review will establish actual expenditures throughout the project on funds leveraged from all donors.

These expenditures will be recorded, where possible, at the output level and will be compared to the approved budget. The review will determine the level of communication between the Task Manager and the Financial Manager regarding the effective delivery of the planned project and the need for an adapted and flexible management approach. The review will verify the application of appropriate financial management standards and compliance with UNEP's financial management policies. Any financial management issues that affected the timely completion of the project or the quality of its performance will be highlighted.

Factors affecting this criterion include the preparation and quality of project management and supervision.

**F. Efficiency**

1. In accordance with the OECD/DAC definition of efficiency, the review will assess cost-effectiveness and timeliness in project implementation. Cost-effectiveness focuses on translating inputs into outputs and is the extent to which an intervention has achieved, or is expected to achieve, its outcomes at the lowest possible cost. Turnaround times refer to whether or not planned activities are completed within the planned timeframes, as well as whether or not events are effectively sequenced. The review will also determine to what extent an extension of the project could have been avoided through enhanced project management and identify any negative impacts caused by project delays or extensions. The evaluation will identify any cost or time reduction measures put in place to maximize results within the guaranteed budget and agreed project schedule. The review will also determine whether the project was implemented in the most efficient manner compared to other interventions or approaches.

The review will pay particular attention to the efforts of project teams to leverage pre-existing institutions, agreements and partnerships, data sources, synergies and complementarities with other initiatives, programmes and projects, etc., in order to increase the efficiency of the project. The review will also assess the extent to which the management of the project has minimized UNEP's environmental footprint.

Factors affecting this criterion include preparation and availability (e.g. timeliness); quality of project management and supervision; and stakeholder participation and cooperation.

**G. Monitoring and reporting**

1. The review will analyse monitoring and reporting in three subcategories: monitoring design and budgeting, implementation monitoring and project reporting.
2. *Follow-up design and budgeting*

Each project must be supported by a robust monitoring plan designed to track progress against SMART indicators towards the achievement of project outputs and direct impacts, including at the gender level or low-represented groups. The review will analyse the quality of the design of the monitoring plan as well as the funds allocated for its implementation. The adequacy of resources for the mid-term and final evaluation/review should be examined, where appropriate.[[9]](#footnote-10)

1. *Monitoring implementation*

The review will determine whether the monitoring system was operational and facilitated the timely monitoring of results and progress against project objectives throughout the project implementation period. It will also determine how the information generated by the monitoring system during project implementation was used to adapt and improve project execution, achieve impact and ensure sustainability. The review should confirm that monitoring funds have been used to fund this activity.

1. *Project Reports*

UNEP has a centralized Project Information Management System (PIMS) in which project managers upload semi-annual progress reports based on agreed project milestones. The Task Manager will provide this information to the consultant(s). GEF-funded projects have additional requirements for verification of documentation and reporting (i.e. project implementation reviews, tracking tool, and Director General approval template), which will be made available by the Task Manager. The review will assess the extent to which UNEP and donor reporting commitments have been met.[[10]](#footnote-11)

Factors affecting this criterion include: quality of project management and supervision and sensitivity to human rights and gender equity (e.g. sex-disaggregated data and indicators).

**H. Sustainability**

1. Sustainability refers to the likelihood that direct effects will be maintained and improved after the closure of the intervention. The review will identify and determine key conditions or factors that may compromise or contribute to the continuity of the direct effects achieved. Some sustainability factors may be incorporated into project design and implementation approaches, while others may be contextual circumstances or conditions that evolve over the life of the intervention. Where appropriate, an assessment of biophysical factors that may influence the sustainability of direct effects could also be included. The review will ensure that the project has an appropriate exit strategy in place and measures to mitigate sustainability risks.
2. *Socio-political sustainability*

The review will determine the extent to which social or political factors favour the continuation and subsequent improvement of the direct effects of the project. It will take into account the level of ownership, interest and commitment of government and other stakeholders to advance the project's achievements. In particular, the review will assess whether individual capacity development efforts are likely to be sustained.

1. *Financial sustainability*

Some direct effects, once achieved, do not require additional financial inputs; the adoption of a revised policy, for example. However, in order to take advantage of this effect, additional management measures may still be necessary, such as undertaking actions for the implementation of the policy. Other direct outcomes may depend on a continuous flow of actions that must be resourced to be sustained, such as the pursuit of a new approach to resource management. The evaluation will assess the extent to which project results depend on future funding to ensure that the benefits they generate are sustainable. Guaranteed future financing is only about financial viability when the direct effects of a project have been extended to a later phase of the project. It remains to be seen whether the future effects of the project will be financially viable.

1. *Institutional sustainability*

The review will determine the extent to which the sustainability of the project's effects depends on issues related to institutional frameworks and governance. It will also assess whether institutional achievements such as governance structures and processes, policies, sub-regional agreements, legal and accountability frameworks, etc. are robust enough to continue to deliver the benefits associated with the effects of the project after its closure.

Factors affecting this criterion include: stakeholder participation and cooperation; sensitivity to human rights and gender equity (e.g. where interventions are not inclusive, their sustainability may be compromised); communication and public awareness; ownership and motivation of the country.

1. **Factors and processes affecting project performance**
2. These factors are noted in the scoring table, but are discussed as cross-cutting themes depending on the circumstances, relative to the other evaluation criteria above.
3. *Preparation and availability*

This criterion concerns the start-up or mobilization stage of the project. The review will determine whether appropriate action has been taken to address weaknesses in the project design or changes that occurred between project approval, funding and project engagement. In particular, it will examine the nature and quality of the project team's engagement with stakeholder groups, confirmation of partners' capacities and the development of partnership agreements, as well as initial staffing and funding arrangements (project preparation is taken into account in the project design quality assessment model).

1. *Quality of project implementation and execution*

For GEF-funded projects, this factor refers to the performance of the executing agency, technical support and oversight provided by UNEP, as the implementing agency.

The review will assess the effectiveness of project management with respect to: leadership in achieving intended outcomes; management of team structures; maintaining productive partnership relationships (including steering groups, etc.); communication and collaboration with UNEP colleagues; risk management; the use of problem solving; the adaptation of the project and the overall execution of the project. Evidence of adaptive project management should be highlighted.

1. *Stakeholder participation and cooperation*

Here, the term "stakeholder" should be considered in a broad sense, encompassing all project partners, duty holders involved in the delivery of project outputs, target users of project outputs and any other collaborating actors outside UNEP. The review will take into account the quality and effectiveness of all forms of stakeholder communication and consultation throughout the project, as well as the support provided to maximize collaboration and coherence among different stakeholders, including through the sharing of plans, the pooling of resources, and the sharing of learnings and skills. The inclusion and participation of all differentiated groups, including groups of different genders, should be considered.

1. *Sensitivity to human rights and gender equity*

The review will determine the extent to which the project has implemented the Joint UN Convention on the Human Rights-Based Approach (HRCA) and the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. In the context of human rights, the review will assess the extent to which the intervention is consistent with UNEP’s policy and strategy on gender equality and the environment.

The report should indicate the extent to which the intervention, after appropriate gender analysis at the design stage, implemented the identified actions and/or applied adaptive management to ensure that gender equity and human rights are duly taken into account. In particular, the review will examine how project design (section B), implementation underlying effectiveness (section D) and monitoring (section G) have taken into account: (i) possible gender inequalities in access to and control over natural resources; (ii) the specific vulnerabilities of women and children to environmental degradation or disasters; (iii) the role of women in mitigating or adapting to environmental change and their participation in environmental protection and rehabilitation.

1. *Country ownership and motivation*

The review will determine the quality and degree of involvement of government/public sector agencies in the project. The review will take into account the participation not only of those directly involved in the implementation of the project and members of technical or leadership groups, but also of officials whose cooperation is necessary to integrate change into their respective institutions and offices. This factor relates to the level of ownership generated by the project in relation to the outputs and effects and which is necessary to achieve the long-term impact. This ownership must adequately represent the needs and interests of all gender-diverse and marginalized groups.

1. *Communication and public awareness*

The review will determine the effectiveness of: (a) knowledge sharing and experience sharing between project partners and interested groups resulting from the project throughout its existence; and (b) public awareness activities undertaken during the implementation of the project with the aim of influencing attitudes or shaping behaviour within wider communities and civil society in general. The review should assess whether existing communication channels and networks have been used effectively, including to address the differentiated needs of different gender or marginalized groups, and whether feedback channels have been established. In the event that spaces for knowledge sharing have been created as part of a project, the journal will issue an opinion on the sustainability of the communication channel, whether in terms of socio-political, institutional or financial sustainability, as appropriate.

**Section 3. REVIEW APPROACH, METHODS AND DELIVERABLES**

1. The mid-term review will use a participatory approach whereby key stakeholders are informed and consulted throughout the review process. Quantitative and qualitative evaluation methods will be used, where appropriate, to determine project achievements in relation to expected outputs, outcomes and impacts. It is strongly recommended that the consultant(s) maintain close communication with the project team and promote the exchange of information throughout the implementation phase of the review, in order to enable them to take greater ownership (as well as other stakeholders) of the results of the review. Where appropriate, the consultant(s) should provide a geo-referenced map delimiting the area covered by the project and, if possible, provide geo-referenced photographs of the main intervention sites.
2. The conclusions of the review will be based on the following:
   1. Document review of relevant project documents and communications
   2. Interviews (individual or group) with:
      * The UNEP Task Manager (TM);
      * The project management Unit;
      * Project partners, etc;
      * The relevant resource persons;
      * Etc.
   3. Field visits: visits are planned in the Cameroon in the regions of the project: Western Highlands and South Region in Cameroon.
   4. Other data collection tools: to be determined by the consultant based on the information needed to complete the review. This aspect will be discussed when the contract is signed.

## Review deliverables and procedures

1. The review team will prepare:

* **An initial report**: (see Annex 1 for links to all templates, tables and guidance notes) taking stock of the interviews, field visits and key elements of the exchanges with stakeholders and a summary of the diagnosis (institutional, technical and financial) of the project and containing an assessment of the quality of the project design, a draft of the reconstructed Theory of Change, an analysis of project stakeholders, a review framework and a draft review schedule
* **A note on preliminary findings**: usually in the form of a PowerPoint presentation, the sharing of preliminary findings is intended to encourage the participation of the project team, partner organizations and structures. It is a means of ensuring that all sources of information have been accessed. It also verifies emerging findings.

1. **The preliminary report and the final report**: (see links in Annex 1) containing an executive summary that can be used as a stand-alone document; a detailed analysis of the evaluation findings organized according to evaluation criteria and supported by evidence; lessons learned, recommendations and an annotated scorecard. Review of preliminary review report. The review team will submit a preliminary report to the Task Manager and the Acting Program Coordinator for review in response to their comments and suggestions. Once a good quality draft has been peer reviewed and accepted, Task Manager will share the approved draft report with key project stakeholders for review and comment. Stakeholders will be able to comment on factual errors and highlight the importance of such errors in conclusions, as well as on proposed recommendations and lessons. All comments or responses to preliminary reports will be forwarded to Task Manager for consolidation. The latter will forward all comments to the review team for consideration in the preparation of the final report, as well as indications of points of contradiction or issues requiring an institutional response.
2. The Task Manager will prepare a quality assessment of the first and final versions of the main review report, which will serve as a tool to provide structured feedback to the review consultants. The quality of the report will be assessed and scored according to the criteria specified in the template in Annex 1.
3. At the end of the review process, the Task Manager will develop a tabular Implementation Plan for the recommendations, to be completed and updated at regular intervals.

## The journal manager

1. For this review, the work will be carried out by a consultant under the direct supervision and under the overall responsibility of the Task Manager (Andre Toham) in collaboration with MINEPDED and Rainforest Alliance in Yaounde. The consultants will liaise with the Task Manager on all procedural and methodological matters related to the review. However, it is the responsibility of MINEPDED and the Rainforest Alliance project team to make arrangements to facilitate the consultant's travel, obtaining visas, collecting documentary evidence, organizing meetings with stakeholders, organizing online surveys and resolving any other logistical issues related to their mission. The Task Manager and the project team will provide, where possible, logistical support (presentations, meetings, etc.) to enable the consultant to conduct the review as efficiently and independently as possible.
2. The consultant will be engaged for a period of 25 days, over the period from October-December 2023 and must have: an advanced university degree in environmental sciences, international development or any other relevant field of political or social science; a minimum of 10 years of technical/evaluation experience, including evaluation of large/medium-sized, regional or global programs using a theory of change approach; a broad understanding of the conservation of biodiversity and sustainable landscape management and multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs); fluency in time management and excellent writing skills in English, workable knowledge of French; experience in team leadership and, to the extent possible, knowledge of the United Nations system, in particular the work of UNEP. Experience in partnership management, knowledge management and communication are desirable for the evaluation consultant.
3. The consultant will be responsible, in close consultation with MINEPEDD and Rainforest Alliance and in collaboration with the UNEP Task Manager, for the overall management of the review and the timely delivery of its outputs, described above in Section 11 Evaluation Deliverables. The consultant will ensure that all evaluation criteria and questions are properly addressed. Detailed information on the role of the consultant is available on the website of the UNEP’s Evaluation Office: [www.unep.org/evaluation](http://www.unep.org/evaluation). The consultant should have an excellent written and verbal skills in French required, and working knowledge of English.

## Review Timeline

1. The table below presents the provisional timeline for the review.

Table 3. Provisional timeline of the review

| Step | Tentative timetable |
| --- | --- |
| Kick-off meeting (via mission to Yaounde, MINEPDED, Rainforest Alliance and UNEP Task Manager) | 9th October 2023 |
| Data collection and analysis, interviews and office surveys | 10-13 October 2023 |
| Field mission (depending on meeting arrangements and available budget) | 14-24 October 2023 |
| Draft report shared with MINEPDED, Rainforest Alliance, the UNEP Task Manager, and the project team (including national focal points) | 10th November 2023 |
| Draft report shared with broader stakeholder group | 28-29 November 2023 |
| Final Report | 15 Dec 2023 |

## Contractual arrangements

1. The consultant for the review will be selected by UNEP Task Manager, and will be recruited by the Rainforest Alliance in accordance with its internal procedures. The fees will be paid on an instalment basis, following UNEP’s acceptance of the expected key deliverables. The payment schedule is as follows:
2. Payment schedule [Consultant]:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Deliverable | Split payment |
| Approved Startup Report (in French or English) | 30% |
| Approved draft of the main review report (in French or English) | 30% |
| Final approved version of the main review report (in English) | 40% |

1. Fee contracts. The necessary airline tickets, local trips inside Cameroon and DSA will be included in the contract.
2. In the event that the consultant is unable to deliver the deliverables in accordance with these guidelines and the quality standards expected by the UNEP Task Manager, payment may be withheld at UNEP's discretion.
3. In the event that the consultant(s) fails to submit a satisfactory final product to UNEP Task Manager, i.e. before the expiry date of their contract, the Rainforest Alliance, in consultation with UNEP Task Manager, reserves the right to use additional human resources to finalize the report and to reduce the consultants' fees by an amount equal to the additional costs incurred by Rainforest Alliance in submitting the report.

## Annex 1: Tools, Templates and Guidance Notes to be used in the review

The tools, templates and guidance notes listed in the table below and available on the Evaluation Office (<https://www.unenvironment.org/about-un-environment/evaluation>) website are intended to assist Task Managers and review consultants in generating compatible evaluation products that contribute to the communication of UNEP’s results. This series of documents also aims to make the review process as transparent as possible so that everyone involved in the process can participate in an informed manner. It is recognized that project and portfolio review needs vary and that adjustments may be required to achieve the objective of the evaluation process (broadly speaking, accountability and lessons learned). These adjustments should be decided by the Task Manager and the review consultant for the production of review reports that are useful both for project implementers and for the production of credible conclusions.

In case these links do not open, please contact to be completed by UNEP at the Evaluation Office of UNEP and ask her to provide you with these resource materials.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Document | Name | URL link |
| 1 | Evaluation Process Guidelines for Consultants | [Link](http://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/id/71681/21.%20Evaluation%20Process%20Guidelines%20for%20Consultants%2026.10.17.pdf) |
| 2 | Roles of Evaluation Consultant Teams (Team Leader and Junior Consultant) | [Link](http://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/id/71682/22.%20Evaluation%20Consultants%20Team%20Roles%2026.10.17.pdf) |
| 3 | Evaluation criteria (summary of descriptions as in these terms of reference) | [Link](https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/id/71663/1.%20Evaluation%20Criteria.doc) |
| 4 | Evaluation Scores Table | [Link](https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/id/71664/2.%20Evaluation%20Ratings%20Table.docx) |
| 5 | Matrix describing scores by criterion | [Link](http://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/22308/01.%20Criterion%20Rating%20Descriptions.docx?sequence=1&isAllowed=y) |
| 6 | Weighting of notes (Excel) | [Link](http://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/7105/2.%20Evaluation%20Ratings%20Table.docx?sequence=1&isAllowed=y) |
| 7 | Table identification tables (GEF and non-GEF) | [Link](http://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/id/71669/8.%20Project%20Identification%20Table%2026.10.17.docx) |
| 7 | Structure and Summary of the Inception Report | [Link](http://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/id/71670/9.%20Structure%20and%20Contents%20of%20the%20Inception%20Report%2026.10.17.doc) |
| 8 | Model for assessing the quality of project design | [Link](http://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/id/71672/11.%20Template%20for%20the%20Assessment%20of%20the%20Quality%20of%20Project%20Design%2026.10.17.xlsx) |
| 9 | Guidance on stakeholder analysis | [Link](http://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/id/71674/13.%20Guidance%20on%20Stakeholder%20Analysis%2026.10.17.doc) |
| 10 | Use of Theory of Change in Project Evaluations | [Link](http://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/id/71675/14.%20Use%20of%20Theory%20of%20Change%20in%20Project%20Evaluation%2026.10.17.pdf) |
| 11 | Impact Probability Decision Tree Evaluation (Excel) | [Link](http://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/7117/15.%20Assessment%20of%20Likelihood%20of%20Impact%20Decision%20Tree.xlsm?sequence=3&isAllowed=y) |
| 12 | Possible evaluation questions | [Link](http://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/id/71686/23.%20Possible%20Evaluation%20Questions.docx) |
| 13 | Structure and content of the main evaluation report | [Link](https://unitednations-my.sharepoint.com/marimap/OneDrive/Evaluations_To%20Innitiate/Caribbean%20NBF/TOR%20and%20Budget/10.%20Structure%20and%20Contents%20of%20the%20Main%20Eval%20Report%2026.10.17.doc) |
| 14 | Cover, preliminary pages and style sheet of the main evaluation report | [Link](http://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/22306/18.%20Cover%20Pages%20Prelims%20and%20Style%20Sheet%20for%20the%20Main%20Evaluation%20Report%2026.10.17.docx?sequence=1&isAllowed=y) |
| 15 | Financial tables | [Link](http://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/id/71676/16.%20Financial%20Tables%2026.10.17.doc) |
| 16 | Evaluation Report Quality Assessment Template | [Link](http://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/id/71677/17.%20Template%20for%20the%20Assessment%20of%20the%20Quality%20of%20the%20Evaluation%20Report%2026.10.17.docx) |

1. Legend: Grey =Info to complete [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. The Medium-Term Strategy (MTS)e lUN Environment is a document that guides the planning of UN Environment programmes over a four-year period. It identifies UN Environment's thematic priorities called sub-programmes. (SP), and defines the desired results referred to as Expected Accomplishments (ERs) of the sub-programs. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. <http://www.unep.org/GC/GC23/documents/GC23-6-add-1.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. In some cases, "programme management and oversight will refer to the oversight and guidance provided by UN Environment to implementing partners and national governments and in other cases, particularly with respect to GEF-funded projects, this term will refer to the performance of the project executing agency and the technical support provided by UN-Environment.. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. UN Environment staff are currently required to submit a theory of change with all project designs submitted. The level of "replenishment" required during an evaluation will depend on the quality of that TDC, the time that has elapsed between project design and implementation (which may be related to obtaining and using funds) and the level of changes to the project design. In the case of projects prior to 2013, the intervention logic is often represented in a logical framework and a TDC will have to be built at the initial stage of the evaluation. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. More information on environmental, social and economic guarantees (ESES) is available at http://www.unep.org/about/eses/ [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. The *« Scaling* " refers to approaches taken on a much larger scale, but in a very similar context. Updating The scale is often the long-term goal of pilot initiatives. The *replication* refers to repeated approaches or lessons explicitly applied in new/different contexts, e.g. other geographical areas, different target groups, etc. Effective replication usually requires some form of revision or adaptation to the new context. It is possible to replicate at the same scale or another. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. A list of relevant SDGs is available on the EO website at [www.unep.org/evaluation](http://www.unep.org/evaluation) [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
9. SMART refers to indicators that are specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and Time-bound. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
10. The consultan(s)t (s) must verify that the evaluations project implementation reports have been submitted, the monitoring tool is maintained and in Model DApproval of the Director-General, Tables A and E were Filled. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)