



**TERMS OF REFERENCE:
“UNDP-UNEP PEI RWANDA PHASE-3: FINAL EVALUATION”**



Contract Type:	Individual Consultancy (International)
Location:	Home Based + mission to Kigali, Rwanda
Languages Required:	English
Initial Duration of Assignment:	25 working days
Expected starting date and timing:	Mid-September – Mid-November 2017 (2 months)

1. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

The Poverty Environment Initiative (PEI) is a joint Global Programme between the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and UN Environment, that supports country-driven efforts to mainstream poverty-environment linkages into national, sectoral and district development plans and budgets. The intended Global Programme Outcome (2013-2017) is: *“Enhanced implementation of development policies, plans and budgets that combine environmental sustainability and poverty reduction to contribute to inclusive and sustainable development goals”*.

PEI, operates in 20 countries, of which 7 in Africa that are supported by the PEI Africa regional team. In Rwanda PEI is in its 3rd Phase, having been established in 2005 and implemented through the Rwanda Environment Management Authority (REMA). The first phase of PEI (until May 2007) focused on the integration of environment into the Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy (EDPRS) and on conducting background studies aimed at building the environmental, social and economic rationale for poverty-environment mainstreaming. The second phase (officially ended in December 2011, but with extension to 2013) aimed at integrating environment into policy formulation, development planning and public sector budgeting at national and local levels. The third phase, which will end by December 2017, tries to consolidate these achievements and ensure that environment and natural resources management are effectively mainstreamed into the sectors’ policies and plans and in the District Development Plans (DDP). The stated Objective of the PEI Rwanda 3rd Phase is: *“Rwanda has in place improved systems for sustainable management of natural resources, clean renewable energy resources and use, human rights and gender equity, environment and climate resilience improved”* (aligned with - UNDAP Outcome 1.3 for 2013-2018).

In 2015/16 the project conducted an Internal Review, which resulted in re-prioritizing PEI Rwanda’s available resources to the following 3 main Outputs:

1. *Strengthened capacity for sustainable environment, natural resources management and climate change mitigation and adaptation.*

2. *Increased awareness and more effective participation of stakeholders in environment and development policy-making and planning processes at both district, national and international level.*
3. *Project coordination and monitoring*

2. EVALUATION PURPOSE

With the current PEI project coming to an end on 31 December 2017, REMA and UNDP are commissioning a final evaluation to draw relevant and pertinent conclusions on the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact of PEI interventions, which can be used to inform a proposal for the prospective UNDP-UN Environment Joint Global Programme (“*Poverty Environment Action on SDGs*”, or “PEAS”), that will run in concurrence with the new Economic Development & Poverty Reduction Strategy (EDPRS-3) currently under development by the Government of Rwanda, and align with a new United Nations Development Assistance Plan (UNDAP) that will run concurrently with the EDPRS.

3. EVALUATION SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES

OBJECTIVES

The objective is to conduct a Final Evaluation of the UNDP-UNEP PEI Phase-3 that will determine the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of the programme, with a view to integrate lessons learned in a new proposed programme for 2018-2023. More specifically, the objectives are:

- Assess the Project’s implementation strategy.
- Assess the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability, and impact of the interventions.
- Assess the mainstreaming of UNDP programming principles (gender, human rights, RBM, environment, capacity building)
- Assess the Project’s processes, including budgetary efficiency
- Assess the extent to which planned activities and outputs have been achieved.
- Identify the main achievements and impacts of the project’s activities
- Identify the underlying causes and issues of non-achievement of some targets
- Assess the project exit strategy
- Document lessons learnt
- Formulate key recommendations for the way forward for the programme

SCOPE

The thorough final evaluation covers the implementation period of the project of the PEI Phase-3, as implemented by REMA and supported by UNDP and UN Environment through the UNDP Country Office (CO) and the PEI Africa team. The analysis should be established through desk studies of relevant programme and other national documents, including from Government, UN, PEI, etc., and should refer to the indicators and targets in the relevant results frameworks. This should also entail in-depth consultations with relevant stakeholders, including from government, UN, PEI management, Sector ministries, Districts, NGOs / CSOs, private sector and others, either through individual or group interviews (list to be established at start of consultancy), following the Tasks and Methodology outlined below. The Final Evaluation should be aligned with the principles established in UNDP’s

[Evaluation Policy](#) and the UN Evaluation Group's [Norms and Standards for Evaluation](#). The scope of the final evaluation covers all activities undertaken in the framework of the project. This refers to:

- Planned outputs of the project compared to actual outputs and the actual results as a contribution to attaining the project objectives.
- Problems and necessary corrections and adjustments to document lessons learnt.
- Efficiency of project management, including the delivery of outputs and activities in terms of quality, quantity, timeliness and cost efficiency.
- Likely outcomes and impact of the project in relation to the specified goals and objectives of the project.

4. EVALUATION

EVALUATION CRITERIA

The programme will be evaluated in the basis of the DAC evaluation criteria:

- **Relevance:** measures whether the project addresses an important development goal and whether its objectives are still valid.
- **Effectiveness:** measures whether the project activities achieve their goals.
- **Efficiency:** measures the cost effectiveness, i.e. the economic use of resources to achieve desired results.
- **Sustainability:** measures whether the benefits of the project are likely to continue after donor funding has been withdrawn. The project needs to be environmentally as well as financially sustainable.
- **Impacts of intervention:** measure the positive and negative changes produced by the project, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.

Moreover, the evaluation should take into consideration the following:

- Assess the relevance and appropriateness of the Project in terms of: achieving the outputs as per the Project Document; meeting the needs of REMA; contributing to UN and Rwanda's relevant outcome level goals
- Evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of the Project in terms of the implementation of activities that achieve outputs and outcomes, following up on lessons learned.
- Establish the impact and sustainability of the Project, and the extent to which the approach and implementation of the Project contributed to sustainable poverty-environment mainstreaming in Rwanda and addressed cross cutting issues including gender
- Review the Project Design and Management structures, in terms of achieving clear objectives and strategies, the use of monitoring and evaluation, the level of coherence and complementarity with cross-sectoral sustainability strategies, and the appropriateness of management structures
- Make clear and focused recommendations that may be required for enhancing the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of a future poverty-environment mainstreaming programming in Rwanda.

EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The Evaluation should be guided by the following **evaluation questions**, which are based on the evaluation criteria mentioned above and that are provided as a general framework:

Relevance and appropriateness

- Was the project relevant, appropriate and strategic to REMA goals and challenges?
- Were the activities and outputs of the project consistent with the intended impacts and effects?
- Was the project relevant and appropriate to contribute to the Global PEI Programme Document outputs and Outcome?
- Was the project relevant, appropriate and strategic to the mandate, strategy, functions, roles, and responsibility of REMA as an institution and to the key actors within that institution?
- Was the project relevant, appropriate and strategic to the national institutional mandate and UN system development goals in Rwanda?
- Was the project relevant, appropriate and strategic to donor policy in Rwanda?
- How was the project aligned with the national development strategies (EDPRS 2, Vision 2020)?

Effectiveness and efficiency

- To what extent were the objectives achieved?
- Were the actions to achieve the outputs and outcomes effective and efficient?
- Were there any lessons learned, failures/lost opportunities? What might have been done better or differently? What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?
- How did the project deal with issues and risks?
- Were the different outputs achieved?
- What progress toward the outcomes has been made?
- Were the resources utilized in the best way possible?
- Were the resources (time, funding, human resources) sufficient?
- Was the programme implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives?
- To what extent the design, implementation and results of the project have incorporated a gender equality perspective and human rights based approach? What should have been done to improve gender and human rights mainstreaming?
- Are there any management challenges affecting efficient implementation of the project? What are they and how are they being addressed?

Impact and sustainability

- Will the outputs/outcomes lead to benefits that are sustainable beyond the life of the existing project?
- Were the actions and result owned by the local partners and stakeholders?
- Was the capacity (individuals, institution, and system) built through the actions of the project?
- What is the level of contribution of the project management arrangements to national ownership of the set objectives, result and outputs?
- Were the modes of deliveries of the outputs appropriate to promote national ownership and sustainability of the result achieved?
- Did the Project contribute to sustainable poverty-environment mainstreaming in Rwanda?
- Did the Project address cross cutting issues including gender and human rights?
- What has happened as a result of the project?
- How many people have been affected?
- Has the project contributed or is it likely to contribute to long-term social, economic, technical,

environmental changes for individuals, communities and institutions related to the project?

- What difference has the project made to beneficiaries?
- Does the programme have a clear exit strategy?

Project design

- To what extent did the design of the project help in achieving its own goals?
- To what extent did the design reflect the priorities, outputs and outcome of the PEI Global Programme Document?
- Were the context, problems, needs and priorities well analyzed while designing the project?
- Were there clear objectives and strategy?
- Were there clear baselines indicators and/or benchmark for performance?
- Was the process of project design sufficiently participatory? Was there any impact of the process?
- Was there coherence and complementarity by the project to other stakeholders engaged in the agenda in Rwanda?

Project management

- Are the project management arrangements appropriate at the team level and project board level?
- Was there appropriate visibility and acknowledgement of the project and donors?

5. METHODOLOGY

Based on UNDP guidelines for evaluations, and in consultations with UNDP Rwanda, the evaluation will be conducted in an inclusive and participatory manner, involving principal stakeholders in the analysis. General guidance on evaluation methodology can be found in the UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results, the UNDP Guidelines for Outcome Evaluators, and UNDP Outcome-Level Evaluation: A Companion Guide to the Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results). UNDP's Evaluation Policy provides information about the role and use of evaluation within the M&E architecture of the organization.

The evaluation should use a mixed methods approach, drawing on both primary and secondary, quantitative and qualitative data to come up with an overall assessment backed by clear evidence.

During the evaluation, the consultant is expected to apply the following minimum **approaches for data collection and analysis**:

- Desk review of relevant documents including progress reports and any records of the various opinion surveys conducted during the life of the Project;
- Review of indicators in relation to baseline and targets and project results;
- Key interviews with the national counterparts, project and CO management;
- Briefing and debriefing sessions with the Project Board;
- Interviews and focus groups with partners and stakeholders, government officials, service providers including NGOs, CSO partners and donor partners, etc.
- Lead a validation workshop to present the main findings to clients and stakeholders

The Draft and Final **Evaluation Reports** should clearly:

- Identify the output and outcome achievements for the period 2014-2017

- Analyze challenges to the project's implementation and achievements;
- Highlight the lessons learnt from the project related to results achieved, the process followed and strategy applied to provide recommendations;
- Include where relevant and available good practices, success stories, anecdotes;
- Analyze added value of project implementation and value for money of interventions.

6. DELIVERABLES

a) Inception Report, including the understanding of the consultant of the TORs, methodology framework to be used, workplan, draft Table of Contents and Outline of the Final Report, and list of documents and stakeholders to consult. To be delivered latest 1 week after start of the assignment.

b) Draft Evaluation Report, including:

- Executive Summary;
- Introduction (including context, scope, methodology);
- Key Findings and Conclusions. Where relevant and possible, specifically outline role, impact and issues of UNDP assistance, as well as an outline of other providers related specifically to project implementation;
- Recommendations (corrective actions for on-going or future work);
- Summary review matrix/project RRF and achievement by objectives and outputs;
- Annexes (mission reports, list of interviewees, list of documents reviewed, etc.)

The Draft Evaluation Report should be delivered latest after 1 month after start of the assignment, with comments to be provided by REMA, PEI, UNDP, and initial findings presented in a Validation Workshop. Full evaluation outline template can be found in the annexes.

c) Final Evaluation Report, following above mentioned structure, and including comments of stakeholders and from the validation workshop, should be delivered latest after 2 months of starting the assignment, to be commented upon by REMA, UNDP and PEI.

7. REQUIRED COMPETENCIES

Consultant requirements

Education:

- Minimum MA / MSc. in Economics, public management, rural development, international relations, sociology or related studies, with specialization in Environment / Natural Resources an advantage.

Experience:

- Minimum of 8 years' post graduate work experience in international development assistance;
- Minimum of 5 years of proven Monitoring and Evaluation experience of international development assistance programmes, including for UN.
- Experience with Environment & Natural Resources assistance programmes;
- Experience with economic or public management support programmes, preferable in developing countries;
- Knowledge of poverty-environment mainstreaming principles and practices;
- Minimum of 5 years' work experience in developing countries, with working experience in Africa and Rwanda in particular an advantage

Competencies:

- Able to work independently and deliver on time with quality
- Experience in working with teams and clients in a multi-cultural environment;
- Excellent oral and written communication skills
- Excellent written and spoken knowledge of English. Knowledge of French an advantage
- Computer literacy, and experience with editing and presenting reports

SELECTION CRITERIA CONSULTANT	WEIGHT	POINTS
Minimum MA / MSc. in Economy, public management, rural development, international relations, sociology or related studies, with specialization in Environment / Natural Resources an advantage.	10	10
Minimum of 8 years' post graduate work experience in international development assistance, with working experience in Africa and Rwanda in particular an advantage	10	10
Minimum of 5 years of proven Monitoring and Evaluation experience of international development assistance programmes, including for UN.	25	25
Experience with Environment & Natural Resources assistance programmes	10	10
Experience with economic or public management support programmes, preferable in developing countries	5	5
Knowledge of Poverty – Environment Mainstreaming principles and practices	5	5
Clear Methodology for undertaking the Evaluation	25	25
Excellent written and spoken knowledge of English. Knowledge of French an advantage	5	5
Computer literacy, and experience with editing and presenting reports	5	5
TOTAL	100	100

8. HOW TO APPLY

Candidates should apply by presenting the following documents:

- (i) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the template provided by UNDP;
- (ii) **Personal CV or P11**, indicating all past experience from similar projects as well as the contact details (e-mail and telephone number) of the candidate and at least three (3) professional references;
- (iii) **Brief description** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment and a methodology, if applicable, on how he/she will approach and complete the assignment
- (iv) **Methodology** that describes the way the evaluation will be undertaken
- (v) **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template provided

Interested consultants are required to submit an expression of interest and relevant Curriculum Vitae that demonstrates the qualifications, skills, experience and track record to deliver the services required and that reflects an understanding of key issues relating to the scope of work. Please also provide three contactable references. In addition to that the consultant shall submit a joint technical and financial proposal.

Submissions are to be made by email to: offers.rw@undp.org by no later than 12h00 on 15th September, 2017. Note that no hard copy submissions will be accepted.

Technical enquiries can be directed to Jan Rijpma at Jan.rijpma@undp.org , operational enquiries to bernardin.uzayisaba@undp.org and janvier.ntalindwa@undp.org, and enquiries about the procurement process to mbasa.rugigana@undp.org

9. EVALUATION ETHICS

The evaluation will be undertaken in-line with the following principles:

- Independence
- Impartiality
- Transparency
- Disclosure
- Ethical
- Partnership
- Competencies and Capacities
- Credibility
- Utility

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the [UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'](#)

10. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

During implementation of the contract, the consultant will report to the UNDP Country Office (Team Leader Poverty Environment Unit), who will provide guidance and ensure satisfactory completion of Final Evaluation deliverables. There will be close coordination with the project team who will assist in providing key project documents, connecting the consultant with senior management, development partners, beneficiaries and key stakeholders, assist in developing a detailed programme, facilitate consultations as requested, and organize a validation workshop as necessary.

Duty station

Home based, with 1 visit of 2 weeks (10 working days) for consultations with stakeholders and presentation and validation of findings in a validation workshop.

11. INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENT

UNDP will contract the best and most competitive individual consultant to undertake the assignment as described in this ToR on behalf of Rwanda Environment Management Authority (REMA). REMA will supervise, provide office space and will facilitate all logistical requirement for the work of the evaluation consultant.

12. TIME FRAME FOR THE EVALUATION PROCESS

The assignment is scheduled to take place between September – October 2017, for a maximum duration of 20 working days for the consultant.

Deliverable	Suggested Time frame	Responsible party
Inception report	1 week after start of assignment	Evaluation consultant

Draft evaluation report	4 weeks after start of assignment	Evaluation consultant
Presentation of main findings (lead a validation workshop)	1 week after submitting Draft report	Evaluation consultant
Final evaluation report, including comments from stakeholders and validation workshop, together with brief (powerpoint) presentation and management response.	8 weeks after start of assignment	Evaluation consultant

13. PRICE PROPOSAL AND SCHEDULE OF PAYMENTS

The consultancy fee will be paid as a lump sum (inclusive of all expenses related to the consultancy), and will be fixed regardless of changes in the cost components of the consultancy. The consultancy fee will be paid upon completion of the following milestones:

%	Milestone
20%	Submission and approval of inception report
40%	Following submission and approval of the 1 st draft terminal evaluation report
40%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report, including brief presentation of the final report and management response

UNDP is committed to achieving workforce diversity in terms of gender, nationality and culture. Individuals from minority groups, indigenous groups and person with disabilities are equality encouraged to apply. All applicants will be treated with the strictest confidence.

14. ANNEXES

ANNEX 1: RRF

Expected Results (Outcomes & outputs)	Indicators (with baselines & indicative timeframe)	Means of verification	Collection methods (with indicative time frame & frequency)	Responsibilities	Risks & assumptions
<p>Outcome: Rwanda has in place improved systems for Sustainable management of natural resources, clean renewable energy resources and use, environment and climate change resilience improved.</p> <p>Outcome Indicator: 1)% of ecosystems rehabilitated through FONERWA; 2) % increase in population access to modern energy source; 3)No of people affected in disaster-prone areas;</p> <p>Baseline: 1)10.1% area of ecosystems rehabilitated (2012); 2)10% population access modern energy source</p>					

<p>1.Strengthened capacity for sustainable environment, natural resources management, and climate change mitigation and adaptation in national and sector policies, plans and budgets.</p>	<p>Indicators:</p> <p>1. No. of sector policies reflecting gender equitable pro-poor environmental management and Climate Change adaptation (sectoral profiles for green growth) and DRR;</p> <p>2. % and/or amount of resources allocated by MINECOFIN, FONERWA and from other sources, to the environment and main development sectors and in district plans to address pro-poor environmental sustainability issues, including gender impacts.</p> <p>Baseline Situation:</p> <p>1. Two (2) sector policies reflecting environment, climate change, disaster risk reduction and gender considerations (source to be confirmed).</p> <p>2. XX % and/or amount currently allocated.</p>	<p>Targets & Means of Verification</p> <p>1) 6 Sector Policies.</p> <p>Sector Policy documents, Joint Sector Review documents;</p> <p>2) 5% increase in financial resources.</p> <p>Budget & project documents</p>	<p>Timing; Method</p> <p>Quarterly and mid-term review meetings as appropriate</p>	<p>Responsibilities</p> <p>REMA, MINECOFIN, UNDP, PEI Africa</p>	<p>Risks & assumptions</p> <p>Assumption: Sector commitment in PPP reforms</p> <p>Risk: 1) Natural disasters; 2) increased population pressure on natural resources</p>
---	--	---	---	---	--

<p>Output 2. National capacities for poverty-environment planning and management at District level and for Green Villages/Cities strengthened</p>	<p>Indicators: 1. No. of District Development Plans including gender equitable pro-poor environment management, Climate Change adaptation and DRR activities; 2, Strategy for Green Village up-scaling with integrated Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Environmental Security Assessment (ESA) approved. 3. Number of Green Villages established.</p> <p>Baseline Situation 1 Seven (7) districts reflecting environment, climate change, disaster risk reduction and gender considerations in their development plans (source to be confirmed) 2. No strategy currently. 3. 1 demonstration village</p>	<p>Means of Verification</p> <p>1). 30 Districts District Development Plans. 2). Green Village strategy Green Village strategy document. 3) 3 Green villages established.</p>	<p>Timing; Method Quarterly and mid-term review meetings as appropriate</p>	<p>Responsibilities REMA, MINECOFIN, UNDP, PEI Africa</p>	<p>Risks & assumptions Assumption: Districts support the integration of PE issues in their strategies and policies Risk: Limited capacity for integration of PE issues in district policies and strategies</p>
--	---	--	---	---	---

<p>Output 3: Increased awareness and more effective participation of stakeholders, including women, in environment and development policymaking and planning processes at district, national and international levels.</p>	<p>Indicators:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.No of radio and television broad casts per month 2. No of media references to p-e issues. 3. No. of sector and district plans that include p-e objectives (see Indicator 1 under Outputs 1 and 2). <p>Baseline Situation:</p> <p>XX radio & television broadcasts</p> <p>XX number of media references</p> <p>XX sector and district plans including p-e objectives.</p>	<p>1. 8 radio & TV broadcasts</p> <p>Radio & TV logs</p> <p>1. 8 sector & 30 district plans including P-E linkages.</p>			
---	---	---	--	--	--

ANNEX 2: Key stakeholders

The following is an indicative list of proposed stakeholders for consultations. To be finalized during Inception Phase

Stakeholder	Function	Institution	Contact
Eng. Coletha U. RUHAMYA, ,	Director General	REMA	cruhamya@rema.gov.rw
Marie-Laetitia BUSOKEYE	Director of Research and Environmental Planning,	REMA	lbusokeye@rema.gov.rw
Alphonsine NTABA	Single Project Implementation Unit Coordinator	REMA	
Rachael TUSHABE,	Director, Environmental Education and Mainstreaming,	REMA	rtushabe@rema.gov.rw
Faustin MUNYAZIKWIYE,	Director, Climate Change and International Obligations	REMA	fmunyazikwiye@rema.gov.rw
Fode NDIAYE	Resident Coordinator	UN / UNDP	Fode.ndiaye@undp.org
Stephen RODRIQUES, ,	Country Director	UNDP	stephen.rodriques@undp.org
Sophie NYIRABAKWIYE,	Head of Unit and Programme Specialist, Poverty and Environment,	UNDP	sophie.nyirabakwiye@undp.org
Janvier NTALINDWA	Programme Analyst, Poverty reduction	UNDP	janvier.ntalindwa@undp.org
David SMITH,	Africa Regional Manager,	UNEP-UNDP PEI	david.smith@unep.org
Janet UMUGWANEZA,	Sector Specialist,	PEI / REMA	j.umugwaneza@gmail.com
Jan RIJPMa,	Technical Specialist,	UNDP-UNEP PEI	jan.rijpma@undp.org
Fred SABITI,	National Technical Adviser	PEI / MINECOFIN	fredsabirwa@gmail.com
Peter KATANISA,	Advisor to the Minister,	MINIRENA	advisor@minirena.gov.rw / katanisapeter@gmail.com
Jacob HODARI	Director Planning	MINIRENA	
Donat NSENGUMUREMYI, ,	Director of Mining and Petroleum Unit	MINIRENA	dnsengumuremyi@minirena.gov.rw
Alex MULISA	Coordinator,	FONERWA	a.mulisa@fonerwa.org
Jonathan NZAYIKORERA,	Acting Director General – National Budget	MINECOFIN	jonathan.nzayikorera@minecofin.gov.rw / jnzayikorera@gmail.com
Godfrey KABERA	Director General National Development Planning and Research	MINECOFIN	Godfrey.kabera@minecofin.gov.rw
Olivier RUHAMYAMBUGA,	Corporate Planning Specialist,	MINALOC	Olivier.ruhamyambuga@minaloc.gov.rw or ruhamyambugao@yahoo.fr
Octave SEMWAGA	Director General Planning	MINAGRI	osemwaga@yahoo.com

Charles MUREKEZI	Director Development	MINAGRI	charlesmurekezi@yahoo.co.uk
	Head of cooperative	Rubaya Green Village	
	Head of Cooperative	Muyebe Green Village	
	Mayor	Gicumbi Dsitric	
	Mayor	Muhanga District	
Arnaud de Vanssay,	Head of Section, Rural Development,	EU Commission	Arnaud.DE-VANSSAY@eeas.europa.eu
Bodo Immink	Country Director	GIZ	bodo.immink@giz.de
Hanane HAFRAOUI	Head Green Growth	DFID	H-Hafraoui@dfid.gov.uk
Theobald MASHINGA,	National Programme Manager	SIDA	theobald.mushinga@gov.se

ANNEX 3: Documents to be consulted

The list below details the important documents that the evaluators should read at the outset of the evaluation and before finalizing the evaluation design and the inception report. The list might include other relevant documents identified during the inception phase and the consultation process.

Documents
UNDP-UNEP Poverty Environment Global Project Document
UNDP-UNEP Poverty Environment Initiative Rwanda Project Document, 2014
PEI Rwanda Internal Review, 2016
UNDAP 2013-2018
PEI Progress Reports, 2014 - 2018
PEI Rwanda Sustainability Concept, 2016
Efficiency and Effectiveness of Fertilizer Use, Green World Consultants, 2016
Concept for new Poverty Environment Action for SDGs, 2017
REMA. 2015. A Toolkit for the Development of Smart Green Villages In Rwanda. Rwanda Environmental Management Agency (REMA) and UNDP – UNEP Poverty-Environment Initiative.
Green World Consult Ltd. 2014. Impact of fertilizer use in Rwanda (Rweru - Mugesera wetland complex). Prepared for the Rwanda Environmental Management Agency (REMA).
Kazooru, Cornelius. 2013. Public Expenditure Review for Environment and Climate Change for Rwanda, 2008-2012. Rwanda Environmental Management Agency (REMA) and United Nations Development Programme (UNDP).
Maradan, D. 2017. Assessment of the economic, social and environment benefits of the Rubaya green village in Gicumbi district, Rwanda, and benefits of project replication. On behalf of PEI, UNDP, UNEP and REMA. ecosys, Nyon, Switzerland
REMA. 2015. Sectors assessment report for environment and climate change mainstreaming, 2013 – 2014, 2014 – 2015. Assessment of Integration and Implementation of Environment and Climate Change Activities into Development Sectors Plans and Programs. Rwanda Environmental Management Agency (REMA) with support from PEI, Kigali. 78p
Policy Briefs on: Gender Gap in Agriculture; Cost Benefit Analysis Rubaya Green Village; Efficiency and Effectiveness of Fertilizer Use, REMA, 2017
Concept for Mainstreaming of Environment & Natural Resources Management into EDPRS-3, MINIRENA, 2017

Other relevant published and unpublished documents
--

ANNEX 4: Sample Evaluation Matrix

The evaluation matrix is a tool that evaluators need to create as a map and reference in planning and conducting an evaluation. It serves as a useful tool for summarizing and visually presenting the evaluation design and methodology for discussions with stakeholders. It details evaluation questions that the evaluation will answer, data sources, data collection, analysis tools or methods appropriate for each data source, and the standard or measure by which each question will be evaluated.

The draft sample evaluation Matrix to be used by the evaluators is presented below.

Table A. Sample evaluation matrix						
Relevant evaluation criteria	Key Questions	Specific Sub-Questions	Data Sources	Data collection Methods/Tools	Indicators/ Success Standard	Methods for Data Analysis

ANNEX 5: Evaluation report outline/template

The final report must include, but not necessarily be limited to, the following elements outlined in the quality criteria for evaluation reports:

Title and opening pages Should provide the following basic information:

- Name of the evaluation intervention
- Time frame of the evaluation and date of the report
- Countries of the evaluation intervention
- Names and organizations of evaluators
- Name of the organization commissioning the evaluation
- Acknowledgements

Table of contents Should always include boxes, figures, tables and annexes with page references.

List of acronyms and abbreviations

Executive summary—A stand-alone section of two to three pages that should:

- Briefly describe the intervention (the project(s), programme(s), policies or other interventions) that was evaluated.
- Explain the purpose and objectives of the evaluation, including the audience for the evaluation and the intended uses.
- Describe key aspect of the evaluation approach and methods.

- Summarize principle findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

Introduction—Should:

- Explain why the evaluation was conducted (the purpose), why the intervention is being evaluated at this point in time, and why it addressed the questions it did.
- Identify the primary audience or users of the evaluation, what they wanted to learn from the evaluation and why, and how they are expected to use the evaluation results.
- Identify the intervention (the project(s) programme(s), policies or other interventions) that was evaluated—see upcoming section on intervention.
- Acquaint the reader with the structure and contents of the report and how the information contained in the report will meet the purposes of the evaluation and satisfy the information needs of the report's intended users.

Description of the intervention—Provides the basis for report users to understand the logic and assess the merits of the evaluation methodology and understand the applicability of the evaluation results. The description needs to provide sufficient detail for the report user to derive meaning from the evaluation. The description should:

- Describe **what is being evaluated, who seeks to benefit**, and the **problem or issue** it seeks to address.
- Explain the **expected results map or results framework, implementation strategies**, and the key **assumptions** underlying the strategy.
- Link the intervention to **national priorities**, UNDAF priorities, corporate multiyear funding frameworks or strategic plan goals, or other **programme or country specific plans and goals**.
- Identify the **phase** in the implementation of the intervention and any **significant changes** (e.g., plans, strategies, logical frameworks) that have occurred over time, and explain the implications of those changes for the evaluation.
- Identify and describe the **key partners** involved in the implementation and their roles.
- Describe the **scale of the intervention**, such as the number of components (e.g., phases of a project) and the size of the target population for each component.
- Indicate the **total resources**, including human resources and budgets.
- Describe the context of the **social, political, economic and institutional factors**, and the **geographical landscape** within which the intervention operates and explain the effects (challenges and opportunities) those factors present for its implementation and outcomes.
- Point out **design weaknesses** (e.g., intervention logic) or other **implementation constraints** (e.g., resource limitations).

Evaluation scope and objectives—The report should provide a clear explanation of the evaluation's scope, primary objectives and main questions.

- **Evaluation scope:** The report should define the parameters of the evaluation, for example, the time period, the segments of the target population included, the geographic area included, and which components, outputs or outcomes were and were not assessed.
- **Evaluation objectives:** The report should spell out the types of decisions evaluation users will make, the issues they will need to consider in making those decisions, and what the evaluation will need to achieve to contribute to those decisions.
- **Evaluation criteria:** The report should define the evaluation criteria or performance standards used. The report should explain the rationale for selecting the particular criteria used in the evaluation.

- Evaluation questions: Evaluation questions define the information that the evaluation will generate. The report should detail the main evaluation questions addressed by the evaluation and explain how the answers to these questions address the information needs of users.

Evaluation approach and methods—The evaluation report should describe in detail the selected methodological approaches, methods and analysis; the rationale for their selection; and how, within the constraints of time and money, the approaches and methods employed yielded data that helped answer the evaluation questions and achieved the evaluation purposes. The description should help the report users judge the merits of the methods used in the evaluation and the credibility of the findings, conclusions and recommendations. The description on methodology should include discussion of each of the following:

- Data sources—The sources of information (documents reviewed and stakeholders), the rationale for their selection and how the information obtained addressed the evaluation questions.
- Sample and sampling frame—If a sample was used: the sample size and characteristics; the sample selection criteria (e.g., single women, under 45); the process for selecting the sample (e.g., random, purposive); if applicable, how comparison and treatment groups were assigned; and the extent to which the sample is representative of the entire target population, including discussion of the limitations of the sample for generalizing results.
- Data collection procedures and instruments—Methods or procedures used to collect data, including discussion of data collection instruments (e.g., interview protocols), their appropriateness for the data source and evidence of their reliability and validity.
- Performance standards—The standard or measure that will be used to evaluate performance relative to the evaluation questions (e.g., national or regional indicators, rating scales).
- Stakeholder engagement—Stakeholders’ engagement in the evaluation and how the level of involvement contributed to the credibility of the evaluation and the results.
- Ethical considerations—The measures taken to protect the rights and confidentiality of informants (see UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluators’ for more information).
- Background information on evaluators—The composition of the evaluation team, the background and skills of team members and the appropriateness of the technical skill mix, gender balance and geographical representation for the evaluation.
- Major limitations of the methodology—Major limitations of the methodology should be identified and openly discussed as to their implications for evaluation, as well as steps taken to mitigate those limitations.

Data analysis—The report should describe the procedures used to analyse the data collected to answer the evaluation questions. It should detail the various steps and stages of analysis that were carried out, including the steps to confirm the accuracy of data and the results. The report also should discuss the appropriateness of the analysis to the evaluation questions. Potential weaknesses in the data analysis and gaps or limitations of the data should be discussed, including their possible influence on the way findings may be interpreted and conclusions drawn.

Findings and conclusions—The report should present the evaluation findings based on the analysis and conclusions drawn from the findings.

- Findings—Should be presented as statements of fact that are based on analysis of the data. They should be structured around the evaluation criteria and questions so that report users can readily make the connection between what was asked and what was found. Variances between planned and actual results should be explained, as well as factors affecting the

achievement of intended results. Assumptions or risks in the project or programme design that subsequently affected implementation should be discussed.

- **Conclusions**—Should be comprehensive and balanced, and highlight the strengths, weaknesses and outcomes of the intervention. They should be well substantiated by the evidence and logically connected to evaluation findings. They should respond to key evaluation questions and provide insights into the identification of and/or solutions to important problems or issues pertinent to the decision making of intended users.

Recommendations—The report should provide practical, feasible recommendations directed to the intended users of the report about what actions to take or decisions to make. The recommendations should be specifically supported by the evidence and linked to the findings and conclusions around key questions addressed by the evaluation. They should address sustainability of the initiative and comment on the adequacy of the project exit strategy, if applicable.

Lessons learned—As appropriate, the report should include discussion of lessons learned from the evaluation, that is, new knowledge gained from the particular circumstance (intervention, context outcomes, even about evaluation methods) that are applicable to a similar context. Lessons should be concise and based on specific evidence presented in the report.

Report annexes—Suggested annexes should include the following to provide the report user with supplemental background and methodological details that enhance the credibility of the report:

- ToR for the evaluation
- Additional methodology-related documentation, such as the evaluation matrix and data collection instruments (questionnaires, interview guides, observation protocols, etc.) as appropriate
- List of individuals or groups interviewed or consulted and sites visited
- List of supporting documents reviewed
- Project or programme results map or results framework
- Summary tables of findings, such as tables displaying progress towards outputs, targets, and goals relative to established indicators
- Short biographies of the evaluators and justification of team composition
- Code of conduct signed by evaluators

ANNEX 6: [Code of Conduct for Evaluators in the UN System](#)