

DRAFT TERMS OF REFERENCE (TORs)

Terminal Evaluation

of IFAD/GEF Rehabilitation and Sustainable Use of Peatland Forests in South East Asia

1. Objective and Scope of the Evaluation

The objectives of the Terminal Evaluation (TE) are:

- To examine the extent and magnitude of any project impacts to date and determine the likelihood of future impacts
- To provide an assessment of the project performance, gender disaggregated achievements, and the implementation of planned project activities and planned outputs against actual results
- To synthesize lessons learned that may help in the design and implementation of future IFAD, IFAD-GEF or peatland management related initiatives

The specific tasks of the TE are:

- To assess the technical and financial progress of the project since the approval of the Grant Agreement, including alignment with GEF policies and strategies, attainment and measurement of global environmental benefits and co-financing.
- To assess the progress made on each project component in each country and at regional level, against the project objectives, logical framework, Annual Workplans and Budget (AWPBs), Procurement Plans and to synthesize lessons learned.
- To assess stakeholder engagement to the project and to the specific interventions, and their level of satisfaction with implementation when applicable.
- To identify strengths and weaknesses, as well as challenges and opportunities associated with implementation. This will include a review of project delivery mechanism of the project, including the functioning of counterparts.
- To identify implementation difficulties, operational issues and bottlenecks faced by the project
- To review the performance of financial management and flow of funds arrangements, and procurement and contract management.
- To review compliance with Grant Agreement Covenants

2. Methods

The evaluation will follow IFAD and GEF evaluation guidelines and policies. The methodology of the TER will adopt the following:

- A desk review of project and other relevant documents including, but not limited to:
 - a) The project documents, outputs, monitoring reports (such as progress and financial reports to IFAD, MTR, GEF annual Project Implementation Review reports and M&E data) and relevant correspondence;
 - b) External sources and other relevant documents with up-to-date information on peatland management and country/regional conditions;
 - c) Project Completion Report submitted by ASEC/GEC through IFAD;
 - d) Decisions and notes from the Project Management and Project Steering Committee meetings;

- e) Other project-related material produced by the project staff or partners;
- f) Relevant materials published about the project; and
- g) The evaluator shall determine whether to seek additional information and opinions from representatives of donor or government agencies and other organizations.
- Interviews with project management and technical support teams to review experiences in project implementation, progress and achievements at country level
- Field visits to the project sites to view the progress in measures at the local level including meetings with project related stakeholders
- Focused group discussions in-country and in the field with the target communities

3. Evaluation Report Format and Review Procedures

Report Format

- a) The TER should not exceed 60 pages including Annexes (see outline in Annex I).
- b) Evidence, findings, conclusions and recommendations should be presented in a complete and balanced manner.
- c) The TER shall be written in English, and use numbered paragraphs.
- d) The evaluation will rate the overall implementation success of the project and provide individual ratings of the eleven implementation aspects as described in this TOR.

TER will also include any formal response/ comments from the project management team and/ or the country focal point regarding the evaluation findings or conclusions as an annex to the report, however, such will be appended to the report by IFAD Evaluation Office.

Examples of IFAD GEF Terminal Evaluation Reports are available at: <http://www.ifad.org/evaluation>.

Review of the Draft Evaluation Report

Draft reports shall be submitted to the IFAD Regional Climate and Environment Specialist (RCES) and Director of IFAD Evaluation Office. RCES will distribute the report to the relevant Country Programme Managers (CPMs), ASEAN Secretariat and Global Environment Centre (GEC) for initial review and comments. The feedback should focus on any errors of fact. RCES collates all review comments and provides them to the evaluator(s) for their consideration in preparing the final version of the report.

4. Submission of Final Terminal Evaluation Reports

The final report shall be submitted in electronic form in MS Word format and should be sent directly to:

Elwyn Grainger-Jones
 Director, Environment and Climate Division (ECD)
 International Fund for Agricultural Development
 Via Paolo di Dono 44 00142 Rome, Italy
 E.mail: E.Grainger-Jones@ifad.org

The Director of ECD will share the final report with the IFAD IOE, APR, RCE and relevant CPMs.

The final Terminal Evaluation report will be published on the ECD website <https://xdesk.ifad.org/sites/gef/> and may be printed in hard copy. Subsequently, the report will be sent to the GEF Office of Evaluation for their review, appraisal and inclusion on the GEF website.

5. Evaluation Mission Team Composition and Qualifications

The evaluators will be contracted by RCES, IFAD in Rome, Italy. The evaluator will work under the overall supervision of the Chief, Evaluation Office, IFAD.

The TER mission team will comprise of the following three members (to be confirmed) :

- GEF evaluation mission team leader
- Peatland management expert
- Financial management and fiduciary expert

The evaluators should have the following common qualifications:

- No previous associated with the policy-making process and the design, delivery, supervision and management of the project.
- Knowledge of IFAD country programmes and GEF operational programmes, strategies and relevant policies.
- Fluency in oral and written English is a must.

The mission team leader:

(to be filled)

Peatland Management Expert:

Financial management and fiduciary expert:

6. Timeframe of the TER mission

The period of contract will be 40 days spread over the period from 3 September to 1 November 2014.

The period for the financial expert to be decided.

ANNEXES

Annex 1. Terminal Evaluation Report Outline

Annex 2. Project background and overview (to be provided later)

Annex 1

Terminal Evaluation Report Outline

- I. **Project Identification Table:** Identify: (1) Project ID, (2) Title, (3) Location, (4) Start and End Date, (5) Mid-Term Evaluation (if applicable), (6) Executing and Implementing Agencies, and Partners, and (7) Budget;
- II. **Executive Summary** (no more than 3 pages): providing a brief overview of the main conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation;
- III. **Background:** giving a brief overview of the evaluated project, for example, the objective and status of activities;
- IV. **Scope, Objective and Methods:** The GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy, 2006, requires that a TE report will provide summary information on when the evaluation took place; places visited; who was involved; the evaluation criteria used and questions to be addressed, the key questions and the methodology;
- V. **Project Performance and Impact:** providing *factual evidence* relevant to the questions asked by the evaluator and interpretations of such evidence. This is the main substantive section of the report. The evaluator should provide a commentary and analysis on the following six evaluation aspects:
 - a. Project results: focusing on achievements in terms of outputs, outcomes and impacts according to three criteria of **relevance, effectiveness and efficiency**. This part will be rated as follows:
 - i. Highly satisfactory (HS) – no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency
 - ii. Satisfactory (S) – minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives
 - iii. Moderately Satisfactory (MS) – Moderate shortcomings
 - iv. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU) – Significant shortcomings
 - v. Unsatisfactory (U) – Major shortcomings
 - vi. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) – Severe shortcomings
 - b. Risk to sustainability: assessing the likelihood of sustainability of outcomes at project termination. Given the uncertainties involved, special attention will be paid to analysis of the risks that are likely to affect the persistence of project outcomes and in four dimensions of **financial risks, Sociopolitical risks, Institutional framework and governance risks and environmental risks**. For this, the following ratings will be provided:
 - i. Likely (L) – no or negligible risks that affect this dimension of sustainability
 - ii. Moderately Likely (ML) – moderate risks
 - iii. Moderately Unlikely (MU) – significant risks
 - iv. Unlikely (U) – severe risks
 - c. Catalytic role: describing any catalytic or replication effect of the project.
 - d. Assessment of M&E system: analyzing whether the project met the minimum requirements for the **M&E design** and the **M&E plan implementation**. The evaluation will also review whether sufficient budget was allocated for the M&E and in a timely manner. M&E systems will be rated as follows:
 - i. Highly satisfactory (HS) – No shortcomings in the project M&E system
 - ii. Satisfactory (S) – Minor shortcomings
 - iii. Moderately Satisfactory (MS) – Moderate shortcomings
 - iv. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU) – Significant shortcomings
 - v. Unsatisfactory (U) – Major shortcomings
 - vi. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) – No M&E system

- e. Monitoring and evaluation of long-term changes: describing project actions and accomplishments toward establishing a long-term monitoring system and addressing whether the project contribute to the establishment of a long-term monitoring system, the accomplishments and shortcomings in the establishment of the system, and the sustainability of the system.
 - f. Processes affecting project results: when relevant, the evaluation team addresses preparation and readiness, country ownership and drivenness; stakeholder involvement; financial planning; GEF agency supervision; cofinancing and project outcomes and sustainability; and delays and project outcomes and sustainability.
- VI. **Conclusions and Rating**: of project implementation success giving the evaluator's concluding assessments and ratings of the project against given evaluation criteria and standards of performance. The ratings should be provided with a brief narrative comment;
- VII. **Lessons (to be) Learned**: presenting general conclusions from the standpoint of the design and implementation of the project, based on good practices and successes or problems and mistakes. Special attention to be given to the factors that contributed or hindered attainment of project objectives, sustainability of project benefits, innovation, catalytic effect, replication, and project M&E. Evaluators should refrain from providing recommendations to improve the project but include examples of good practices.
- VIII. **Recommendations**: suggesting *actionable* proposals for improvement addressing IFAD and other development partners. *Prior to each recommendation*, the issue(s) or problem(s) to be addressed by the recommendation should be clearly stated.
- IX. **Annexes** should include:
1. The Evaluation Terms of Reference (**TOR**);
 2. A **list of interviewees**, and evaluation timeline;
 3. A **list of documents** reviewed/ consulted;
 4. Summary of **co-finance information** and a **statement of project expenditure by activity**;
 5. Details of the project's 'impact pathways'; and
 6. The expertise of the evaluator (**brief CV**).