TERMS OF REFERENCE (ToR)

NATIONAL INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANCY

For the final evaluation of the project “Supporting Ecosystem Rehabilitation and Protection for Pro-poor Green Growth Programme”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Type:</th>
<th>External national individual consultancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Title:</td>
<td>Evaluation Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category:</td>
<td>Environment, ecosystem management and Green Growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duty Station:</td>
<td>Kigali, Rwanda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Deadline:</td>
<td>8th of March 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of contract:</td>
<td>National/Local Individual Consultancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected starting date:</td>
<td>Immediately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of assignment:</td>
<td>30 working days over a period of 6 weeks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Background and Context
Climate change impacts are adding to the anthropogenic stresses on natural ecosystems. The temperature has increased by 1.4 Celsius degrees since 1970 and an increasingly unpredictable temporal rainfall pattern is observed throughout Rwanda (periods of intense rainfall as well as longer periods of drought) that adversely affects food production and water security (for drinking water supplies, irrigation and hydropower generation\(^1\)). By 2050 rainfall could increase by 20 percent (on 1970 levels). In the mountainous areas of the country, over-cultivation combined with an increasing trend in rainfall intensity has given rise to high levels of run-off, erosion, landslides and flooding during the intense rainfall events that have become more prevalent in the last

\(^1\) More than half of Rwanda’s electricity supply derives from hydropower
decade. In other parts of the country, particularly the Eastern province, droughts have become more frequent impacting on agricultural production and food security. The potential economic costs of climate change in Rwanda are estimated to be around 1 percent of GDP per annum\(^2\).

Going forward in pursuing its ecosystem rehabilitation and protection mandate, Rwanda Environment Management Authority (REMA) has prioritized island and wetland ecosystems as needing urgent and critical attention.

In 2014, the United Nations Development programme UNDP and Rwanda environment Management Authority REMA have designed a five years programme “Supporting Ecosystem Rehabilitation and protection for pro poor green growth” to innovative approaches to restore and conserve fragile islands and wetland ecosystems, promote the sustainable management of natural resources and support livelihood diversification to enhance households income and reduce number of people depending on subsistence agriculture.

The approach includes a geo-referenced assessment of the ecological status of the Bugarama wetland to be used as a baseline for the preparation of a rehabilitation plan. The rehabilitation and improved management of the Bugarama wetland will be achieved through a community-based watershed management approach. The aim is to (i) restore the ecological functions and values; (ii) conserve biodiversity in both natural and modified environments; and (iii) promote sustainable agriculture to minimize negative on and off-site impact. This also requires effective water demand management and use efficiency, with careful balancing of the need to (a) protect the ecological functions of the wetland so that it can effectively regulate flows in the watershed with (b) the needs of the poor for water to sustain livelihoods.

REMA is the main implementing partner for the programme that aims at improving systems for sustainable management of the environment, natural resources and renewable energy resources, energy access and energy security. The programme will support innovative approaches to restore and conserve fragile island and wetland ecosystems, promote the sustainable management of natural resources and support livelihood diversification to enhance household knowledge incomes and reduce the number of people dependent on subsistence agriculture. Knowledge management component of the programme will track progress, assess impacts and capture and disseminate lessons learned to improve the approach, establish good practices and facilitate ups-claling of ecosystem rehabilitation and protection for pro-poor growth.

The UNDAP outcome, which the programme aims at contributing to is “Rwanda has in place improved systems for: sustainable management of the environment, natural resources and renewable energy resources, energy access and energy security”.

The expected outputs are:

**Output 1**: Selected degraded and fragile ecosystems rehabilitated and protected

**Output 2**: Livelihoods of vulnerable households diversified

---

\(^2\) Stockholm Environment Institute (SEI), 2009. Economics of Climate Change in Rwanda.
With six months remain for the project implementation, a lot has been achieved as per the project quarterly and annual progress reports and tangible facts on ground. As matter of fact, the project has relocated 240 low income families from fragile and natural disaster-prone areas and support them to get improved shelter in green village on the safe and main land where access to basic amenities such roads, schools, market, health centers, electricity, improved sanitation system, clear water, biogas for cooking. More than two thousand off farms jobs were created, new farming technics were introduced, and thousands of hectares of fragile ecosystems were protected through radical and progressive terraces. Thousands thees were planted. Education attendance rate was dramatically increased.

2. Purpose and objective of the Final Evaluation
The purpose of the Final Evaluation is to examine the results, achievements and constraints in the implementation of the project “Supporting Ecosystem Rehabilitation for Pro-poor Green Growth Programme”. The programme started in January 2014 and is planned to end in June 2018. The findings and recommendations of the evaluation and lessons learned from its implementation will serve as support in the design of the upcoming project cycle. The evaluation also aims at assessing UNDP’s contribution to the achievement of UNDAP Outcome 3.

The evaluation is intended to assess the project’s achievement and best practices, identify weaknesses and strengths of the project design and implementation, and evaluate the adequacy, efficiency, and effectiveness of implementation, as well as assess the achievement of project outputs and outcomes. The results and recommendations of the evaluation would therefore help UNDP to learn from which worked and not to improve the intervention in these areas of paramount importance and also to inform the way forwards to support the implementation of the national strategy for transformation NST1 and the national green growth and climate resilience strategy GGCRS.

3. Scope and Objective of the Final Evaluation
Objectives
The main objectives of the final evaluation are the following:

- Assess the achievements of the programmes against its stated outputs and its contribution to the achievement of UNDAP and EDPRS 2 outcomes;
- Assess the programme’s implementation strategy;
- Assess the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability, and impact of the interventions;
- Assess the Programme’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 programme activities;
- Identify the underlying causes and issues of non-achievement of some targets;
- Document lessons learnt;
- Make recommendations for the design of future programmes
Scope

The evaluation covers the implementation period of five years from January 2014 up to date. The scope of the final evaluation covers all activities undertaken in the project intervention areas which covers 4 districts (BURERA, MUSANZE, BUGESERA and RUSIZI) as per 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.

The evaluation comprises the following elements:

(i) Assess whether the project design was clear, logical and commensurate with the time and resources available;
(ii) An evaluation of the project’s delivery of achievement of its overall objectives;
(iii) An evaluation of project performance in relation to the indicators, assumptions and risks specified in the logical framework matrix and the Project Document;
(iv) An assessment of the scope, quality and significance of the project outputs produced in relation to expected results;
(v) Identification of any programmatic and financial variance and/or adjustments made during the duration of the project and an assessment of their conformity with decisions of the Project Steering Committee and their appropriateness in terms of the overall objectives of the project;
(vi) An evaluation of the project’s contribution to the achievements of UNDAP’s outcome and outputs;
(vii) Identification and, to the extent possible, quantification of any additional outputs and outcomes beyond those specified in the Project Document;
(viii) An evaluation of project coordination, management and administration. This includes specific reference to:
   a. Organizational/institutional arrangements for collaboration among the different stakeholders involved in project arrangements and execution;
   b. The effectiveness of the monitoring and evaluation framework/mechanisms used by REMA in monitoring on a day to day basis progress in project implementation;
   c. Administrative, operational and/or technical challenges and constraints that influenced the effective implementation of the project;
   d. An assessment of the functionality of the institutional structure established and the role of the Project Steering Committee;
   e. Financial management of the project, including the balance between expenditures on administrative and overhead charges in relation to those on the achievement of substantive outputs.
A prognosis of the degree to which the overall objectives and expected outcomes of the project were met;

Progress towards sustainability and replication of project activities;

Assess the extent to which the design, implementation and results of the project have incorporated a gender equality perspective and human rights-based approach;

Assess of the extent to which the design, implementation and results of the project have incorporated the environmental sustainability concerns and make recommendation accordingly;

Lessons learned during project implementation;

Evaluate the project’s exit strategy in terms of quality and clarity.

**District Ownership:**

- Assess the extent to which the representatives of the Districts concerned (including governmental officials at District and Sector level, etc.) are actively involved in project implementation.

**Stakeholder Participation and benefits accrued:**

- Assess the level of public involvement in the project and comment as to whether the scope of public involvement has been appropriate given the broader goals and objectives of the project;
- Review, characterize (in monetary and/or non-monetary terms) and evaluate the extent to which project benefits have or will reach the intended beneficiaries;
- Review the involvement of implementing partners.

**Sustainability:**

- Assess the likelihood of consolidation an building on the project outcomes/benefits after completion of UNDP funding;
- Judge if the implementation arrangements by cooperatives, potentially allows them to continue income generating projects that contribute to the project’s sustainability;
- Describe the key factors that will require attention in order to improve prospects for sustainability of project outcomes.

**Replication Approach:**

- Describe the main lessons that have emerged in terms of: strengthening District ownership, strengthening stakeholder participation; application of adaptive management strategies; efforts to secure sustainability; knowledge transfer in terms of environmental protection and cooperative management; and the role of M&E in project implementation. In describing all lessons learned, an explicit distinction needs to be made between those lessons applicable only to this project, and lessons that may be of value more broadly;
- Make recommendations on how the lessons and experience can be incorporated into the design of similar initiatives in the future.

---

3 For more guidance on this, the consultants will be requested to use UNEG’s Guidance in Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation” [http://uneval.org/document/detail/1616](http://uneval.org/document/detail/1616)
4. Evaluation Questions

Evaluation criteria

The project will be evaluated on 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 achieved their goal;
- **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**: measures the positive and negative changes produced by the project, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.

Evaluation Questions

More specifically, the final evaluation aims at addressing the following questions for each evaluation criteria:

**Relevance**

- What has been the main focus of the project implementation so far? Who are the main beneficiaries? How were they selected?
- The extent to which the programme activities are suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipient and donor.
- To what extent did the objectives remain valid throughout the project duration?
- Were the activities and outputs of the project consistent with the overall goal and the attainment of its objectives?
- Were the activities and outputs of the project consistent with the intended impacts and effects?
- How was the project aligned to the national development strategy (EDPRS 2, Vision 2020)?

**Effectiveness**

- To what extent were the objectives achieved?
- What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?
- Did the activities contribute to the achievement of the planned outputs?
- Have the different outputs been achieved?
- What progress toward the outcomes has been made?
• To what extend the design, implementation and results of the project have incorporated a gender equality perspective and human rights based approach? What should be done to improve gender and human rights mainstreaming?

• What has been the result of the capacity building/trainings interventions? Were qualified trainers available to conduct training?

• How did UNDP support the achievement of project outcome and outputs?

• How was the partnership strategy conducted by UNDP? Has UNDP partnership strategy been appropriate and effective? What factors contributed to effectiveness or ineffectiveness? What were the synergies with other projects?

Efficiency
• Were activities cost-efficient?

• Were objectives achieved on time?

• Was the project implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives?

• What was the original budget for the project? How have the project funds been spent? Were the funds spent as originally budgeted?

• Are there any management challenges affecting efficient implementation of the project? What are they and how are they being addressed?

Sustainability
• To what extend the design, implementation and results of the project have incorporated environment sustainability? What should be done to improve environmental sustainability mainstreaming?

• To what extent will the benefits of the programme or project continue after donor funding stops?

• What were the major factors which influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the programme or project?

• Does the project have a clear exit strategy?

Impact of interventions
• What are the stated goals of the project? To what extent are these goals shared by stakeholders? What are the primary activities of the programme and expected outputs? To what extent have the activities progressed? How did the project contribute to the achievement of UNDAP outcomes and outputs?

• What has happened as a result of the project?

• How many people have been affected?
• Has the project contributed or is 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?

5. Methodology
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.

The final decision on the specific design and methods for the evaluation will emerge from consultation among programme staff, the evaluators and key stakeholders, based on the inception report prepared by the evaluators, about what is appropriate and feasible to meet the evaluation purpose and objectives and answer the evaluation questions, given limitations of budget, time and data.

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. Data will be collected through surveys of all relevant stakeholders (Government institutions, development partners, etc.) and through focus group discussions. Further data on the project indicators (RRF data) will be used by the evaluation to assess the project progress and achievements.

The evaluation methodology will include the following:

(i) Desk review of project document, monitoring reports (such as minutes of Steering Committee meetings including other relevant meetings, project annual implementation reports, quarterly progress reports, and other internal documents including consultant and financial reports);
(ii) Review of specific products produced so far, including datasets, management and action plans, publications and other material and reports;
(iii) Interviews with the head of SPIU, Project Manager, Technical Assistant/Project Coordinator in MINECOFIN;
(iv) Interviews with UNDP Head of Poverty and Environment Unit and UNDP Programme Analyst
(v) Interviews with other relevant stakeholders involved, including the co-financers;
(vi) Focus group discussions with all stakeholders.

6. Evaluation Products (Deliverables)
This section presents the key evaluation products the evaluation consultant will be accountable for producing. The deliverables are the following:
• **Evaluation inception report**—An inception report should be prepared by the evaluators before going into the full-fledged data collection exercise. It should detail the evaluators’ understanding of what is being evaluated and why, showing how each evaluation question will be answered by way of: proposed methods, proposed sources of data and data collection procedures. The inception report should include a proposed schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables, designating a team member with the lead responsibility for each task or product. An evaluation matrix to be included can be found in Annex 4. The inception report provides the evaluation management team and the evaluators with an opportunity to verify that they share the same understanding about the evaluation and clarify any misunderstanding at the outset. The inception report will be discussed and approved with UNDP.

• **Draft evaluation report**—Submission of draft evaluation report to UNDP and REMA for comments and inputs. The evaluation management team and key stakeholders in the evaluation will review the draft evaluation report to ensure that the evaluation covers the scope and meets the required quality criteria.

• **Presentation of Draft evaluation report** to the Project Steering Committee for inputs and comments.

• **Final evaluation report** with findings and lessons learnt from the evaluation and recommendations for the upcoming project cycle.

7. Evaluation Team Composition and Required Competencies

The Individual consultant should have the following skills/competencies and characteristics:

- At least master’s degree in Environmental Management and Sustainability, Development studies, Project Management;
- At least 7 years accumulated experience in project/programme evaluation;
- At least 10 years accumulated experience in programme management support, programme/project formulation, monitoring and evaluation and RBM implementation;
- Proven expertise, knowledge and experience in aid effectiveness and resource mobilization from multiple sources, evidence-based policy planning and research and M&E;
- Good understanding of gender equality, human-rights based approach and environmental sustainability concepts;
- Strong interpersonal and managerial skills, ability to work with people from different backgrounds and evidence of delivering good quality evaluation and research products in a timely manner;
- Proven understanding of key elements of result-based programme management in international development cooperation;
- Fluent in English and working knowledge of French would be an added advantage;
- Experience working in/from Rwanda an advantage
- Good communication skills
- Good interpersonal and facilitation skills
- Demonstrate professionalism
- Excellent written and verbal communication skills in English.
- Proven expertise in evaluating multifaceted programs/projects and results-oriented monitoring and evaluation;
- Previous experience in evaluating programs/projects for UNDP or other UN/multilateral agencies will be a distinctive advantage;
- Excellent analytical and reporting skills in English as well as working knowledge of French are essential;

Selection criteria

Submissions will be evaluated in consideration of the evaluation criteria as stated below:

The offer will be evaluated by using the best value for money approach. Technical proposal will be evaluated on 70% whereas the financial proposal will be evaluated on 30%. Below is the breakdown for the technical proposal on 1005 which will be brought to 70%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Max. Point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least master’s degree in Environmental Management and Sustainability, Development studies, Project Management;</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 7 years accumulated experience in project/programme evaluation</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proven expertise, knowledge and experience in the field of aid effectiveness and resource mobilization from multiple sources, evidence-based policy planning and research and M&amp;E</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Methodology (clear demonstration of evaluation methodology and understanding of the ToR)</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 10 years accumulated experience in programme management support, programme/project formulation, monitoring and evaluation and RBM implementation;</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluent in English (written and verbal skills) and basic knowledge of French would be a value adding</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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) **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template provided

Applications should be sent to procurement.rw@undp.org, no later than 22 February 2018.

9. Evaluation Ethics
The evaluation in UNDP will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’. The critical issues evaluators must address in the design and implementation of the evaluation include evaluation ethics and procedures to safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, (for example: measures to ensure compliance with legal codes governing areas such as provisions to collect and report data, particularly permissions needed to interview or obtain information about children and young people; provisions to store and maintain security of collected information; and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality.

10. Implementation Arrangements
This section describes the organization and management structure for the evaluation and defines the roles, key responsibilities and lines of authority of all parties involved in the evaluation process. Implementation arrangements are intended to clarify expectations, eliminate ambiguities, and facilitate an efficient and effective evaluation process.

**UNDP**
UNDP is responsible for the management of this final evaluation and will contract independent consultant to conduct the evaluation on behalf of the Government of Rwanda. UNDP will be the focal point for the evaluation and will facilitate the logistical requirements and provide technical assistance during all phases of the evaluation process, including setting up interviews, field visits, and payments for the consultant.

---

4 UNEG, ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’. Available at www.uneval.org/ethicalguidelines
UNDP Programme focal point
Day-to-day management of the Evaluation Team will be provided by UNDP programme analyst overseeing the project. She or he will ensure that all issues pertaining to the contract with the Evaluation Team, including payments are completed on schedule and will be responsible for facilitating the work of the Evaluation Team. She or he will provide all documentation to the team for the desk review, set up interview appointments and field visits and convene focus group meetings.

Steering Committee
The Project Steering Committee (PSC) will oversee the conduct of the evaluation and will be responsible for providing guidance and direction for the evaluation process and inputs and comments on the draft evaluation report as well as for approving the final document.

Evaluation Management Team
An Evaluation Management Team led by UNDP composed of a representative of REMA, UNDP Environment Head of Unit, Programme Analyst, M&E Officer, the Head of UNDP Management Support Unit will oversee the conduct of the evaluation at the technical level. The team will provide quality assurance and guidance to the evaluation to ensure that it meets the UNEG evaluation quality criteria. The technical committee will oversee the implementation of the agreed schedule of consultation activities, ensure wide stakeholder consultations, will be in charge of verifying all facts in the report and oversee the production of the final report and the drafting and implementation of follow up actions.

11. Time Frame for the Evaluation Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Tasks and deliverables</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desk Review and Inception report phase</td>
<td>• Desk review conducted</td>
<td>5 working days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Briefings of evaluators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• An inception report will be prepared by the evaluators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Detailing the evaluators’ understanding of what is being evaluated and why, showing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• How each evaluation question will be answered by way of: proposed methods,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Proposed sources of data and data collection procedures.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The inception report should include a proposed schedule of tasks, activities and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Deliverables, designating a team member with the lead responsibility for each task</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• and product as well as the evaluation matrix (Annex 4).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder consultations and Interviews</td>
<td>• The evaluators will consult with all relevant stakeholders</td>
<td>10 working days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Conduct a series of interviews, focus group discussions, and field visits in order</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• To collect the required data.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of data and drafting report</td>
<td>• Once the data is collected, the evaluators will analyse them and draft the evaluation report.</td>
<td>5 working days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Presentation of draft evaluation report to Stakeholder meeting

- Once the draft final evaluation report submitted, it will be presented to all stakeholders for reviewing. The comments shared by the stakeholders will be incorporated into the final evaluation report. 5 working days

Final Report and policy brief

- The evaluator will revise the final evaluation report based on the comments and inputs provided by all stakeholders and submit the final report to UNDP. 5 working days

| Total number of working days | 30 working days over a period of 6 weeks |

12. Financial 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:

- 30% after presentation and adoption of the inception report
- 40% after presentation and approval of the draft report
- 30% after the approval of the final report

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 equally encouraged to apply. All applicants will be treated with the strictest confidence.

Approved by:

Signature: .................................................................
1. List of Annexes

Annex 1: Resources and Results Framework

RESULT AND RESOURCE FRAMEWORK

UNDAP Result 1: Inclusive economic transformation

UNDAP Outcome 3:
Rwanda has in place improved systems for sustainable management of the environment, natural resources and renewable energy resources.

UNDAP Outcome Indicators:
Outcome 3.1: Percent of ecosystems rehabilitated; 2) Percent increase in population access to modern energy source.
Baseline: 1.10 percent area of ecosystems rehabilitated (2011), 2) 20 percent population access modern energy source.
Targets: 27 percent area of ecosystems rehabilitated.
Outcome 3.4: No of off-farm productive jobs created annually.
Baseline: 91,000 Target: 200,000

Partnership Strategy

Project title and ID (ATLAS Award ID): Supporting Ecosystem Rehabilitation and Protection for Pro-poor Green Growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTENDED OUTPUTS</th>
<th>OUTPUT TARGETS FOR (YEARS)</th>
<th>INDICATIVE ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE PARTIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Output 1: Selected degraded and fragile ecosystems rehabilitated and protected</td>
<td>Targets (year 1)</td>
<td>1. SEA/ESA integrated in preparation of relocation, resettlement, ecosystem restoration and protection plans 2. Relocation, resettlement,</td>
<td>REMA District Authorities CEOs/NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline: 4, degraded ecosystems, exact conditions determined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Targets (year 2)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Activity 1.2</strong>: Restore and to protect the selected sites through a multi-stakeholder approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. REMA Department for Research and Development ensured the integration of various interventions into DPPs including the 59 relocation, resettlement, restoration and protection plans for fragile and degraded ecosystems;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Actions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Development of local support and ownership of the process and agreed interventions;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Relocation and resettlement of target island inhabitants;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Rehabilitation of fragile degraded areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Local support and ownership of the process and agreed interventions secured.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>1000 ha of land used for community-based conservation and management measures are implemented.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>100 staff trained in developing and implementing community-based ecosystem conservation and management plans.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>5 sites where community-based ecosystem management systems have been established.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Targets (year 3)**

| 1. | 29 sites where community-based ecosystem management systems have been established. |
| 2. | 100 identified households relocated and resettled from wetlands and islands. |
| 3. | 1000 ha of land used for community-based conservation and management measures are implemented. |

**Targets (year 4)**

| 1. | 3000 ha of land used for community-based conservation and management measures are... |
### Output 2: Livelihoods of vulnerable households diversified

**Baseline:** More than 50 percent of HHs depend on subsistence agriculture. 12.6 percent of HH income comes from non-farm activities.

**Indicator 2.1:** Number of vulnerable households (by gender) practicing diversified livelihoods.

**Indicator 2.2:** Number of people participating in public works schemes (disaggregated by gender, age and ubedehe category).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Targets (year 1)</th>
<th>Activity 2.1: Identify and implement livelihood diversification opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 5 livelihood opportunities identified and assessed in each area.</td>
<td>Actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 200 people participating in public works schemes (100 women, 100 youth and 100 percent from ubedehe category 1 and 2).</td>
<td>• Identify and assess livelihood diversification opportunities for vulnerable households;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 10 percent increase in annual HH income from diversified livelihoods (disaggregated by FHH/MHH).</td>
<td>• Facilitate and empower vulnerable households to adopt suitable livelihood diversification options.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Targets (year 3)</th>
<th>Activity 2.2: Empower local communities in sustainable ecosystem rehabilitation and protection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 400 people participating in public works schemes (200 women, 200 youth and 100 percent from ubedehe category 1 and 2).</td>
<td>Actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. X women and Y men from target HH adopt an alternative livelihood.</td>
<td>• Promotion of linkages to and/or establish self-help groups and cooperatives;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provision of entrepreneurial and vocational training for green jobs to the most vulnerable people.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output 3: Knowledge</th>
<th>Targets (year 1)</th>
<th>Activity 3.1: Develop and implement knowledge management system on</th>
<th>REMA District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. 400 people participating public works schemes (200 women, 200 youth and 100 percent from unidade category 1 and 2).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. X women and Y men from target HH adopt an alternative livelihood.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. 20 percent increase in annual HH income from diversified livelihoods (disaggregated by FHH/MHH).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. 50 percent of HH income from target HH comes from non-farm activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Actions</td>
<td>Authorities</td>
<td>US$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation system for ecosystem rehabilitation and protection in place and under implementation; 2. 4 media articles, 8 radio broadcasts, 2 briefing notes, 2 guidelines, 2 manuals, 10 community meetings.</td>
<td>Put in place an M&amp;E system for ecosystem rehabilitation and protection; Develop and disseminate knowledge packages on ecosystem rehabilitation and protection through the REMA communication platform.</td>
<td>CBOs/NGOs</td>
<td>227,950</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Targets (Year 1)**

1. Annual assessment report completed communicated and acted on.

**Targets (Year 2)**

1. Annual assessment report completed communicated and acted on.

**Targets (Year 3)**

1. Annual assessment report completed communicated and acted on.
2. 4 media articles, 8 radio broadcasts, 4 videos, 4 briefing notes, 2 guidelines, 2 manuals, 10 community meetings, 4 cross visits.
3. Knowledge management system on ecosystem rehabilitation and protection functioning on REMA’s communication platform.

**Targets (Year 4)**

---
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1. Annual assessment report completed communicated and acted on.
2. 4 media articles, 8 radio broadcasts, 4 videos, 2 briefing notes, 2 guidelines, 4 videos, manuals, 20 community meetings, 8 cross visits.
3. REMA's communication platform disseminating web-based electronic knowledge packages.

**Targets (year 5)**

1. Annual assessment report completed communicated and acted on.
4. 4 media articles, 8 radio broadcasts, 4 videos, 2 briefing notes, 2 guidelines, manuals, 8 community meetings, 16 cross visits.
5. 2 areas outside project area replicating community based ecosystem conservation and management approaches.

---

**Annex 2: Key stakeholders and partners**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coletha U. RUHAMYA</td>
<td>DG REMA</td>
<td>REMA</td>
<td>0788305717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTABANA Alphonsine</td>
<td>SPIU Coordinator</td>
<td>REMA</td>
<td>0788304206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SINDAYIGAYA Charles</td>
<td>SERPG Project Coordinator</td>
<td>REMA</td>
<td>0788771827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUTEHENDA Frank</td>
<td>Projects Monitoring</td>
<td>MINECOFIN</td>
<td>0788362420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUHAMBYAMBUGA Olivier</td>
<td>Planner MINALOC</td>
<td>MINALOC</td>
<td>0788441982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWAGIRAYEZU Emmanuel</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>MINAGRI</td>
<td>0788640537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPAYIMANA Protais</td>
<td>Rural Settlement Division Manager</td>
<td>RHA</td>
<td>0788658551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUZINDANA Eric</td>
<td>Vice Mayor Econ. Development Affairs</td>
<td>BUGESERA District</td>
<td>0788308489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDABEREYE Augustin</td>
<td>Vice Mayor Econ. Development Affairs</td>
<td>MUSANZE District</td>
<td>0788471491</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: figures above do not include execution costs of US$ 945,000
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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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Provided by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNDAP</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERPG Programme Document (PD)</td>
<td>UNDP/REMA&amp;SERPG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERPG addendum to the Project document</td>
<td>UNDP/REMA&amp;SERPG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERPG steering Committee Reports</td>
<td>REMA&amp;SERPG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Monitoring report (Quarterly, annual, etc...)</td>
<td>REMA&amp;SERPG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERPG internal evaluation report</td>
<td>REMA&amp;SERPG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERPG News letter</td>
<td>SERPG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annex 4: Evaluation matrix

The evaluation matrix is a tool that the evaluator create as a map and reference in planning and conducting an evaluation. It also 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.

| Sample evaluation matrix |
Annex 5: Evaluation report format

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

I. **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

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

III. **List of acronyms and abbreviations**

IV. **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.

V. **Introduction**
   - 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.

VI. **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).

**VII. 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.

**VIII. 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.

**IX. 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.

**X. 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.
XI. **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.

XII. **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.

XIII. **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**

*Code of Conduct for Evaluators in the UN System*