

Project Evaluation Series

**Terminal evaluation of the project
“Strengthening capacity for climate change
adaptation through support to
integrated watershed management in
Lesotho”**

**Project symbol: GCP/LES/049/LDF
GEF ID: 5124**

Annex 1. Terms of reference

Contents

Abbreviations and acronyms	iii
1. Background and context of the project.....	1
1.2 Description of project, its objectives and components	2
1.3 Project stakeholders and their role.....	5
1.4 Theory of change.....	7
2. Evaluation objectives and questions	8
3. Methodology.....	10
4. Roles and responsibilities.....	12
5. Evaluation team composition and profile	14
6. Evaluation products (deliverables).....	15
7. Evaluation timeframe	17
Annexes.....	18

Abbreviations and acronyms

FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
GEF	Global Environment Facility
MTR	Mid-term review
OED	FAO Office of Evaluation
SLM/W	Sustainable land and water management
TOR	Terms of reference

1. Background and context of the project

1. These terms of reference (TOR) provide a framework for the terminal evaluation of the project entitled “Strengthening capacity for climate change adaptation through support to Integrated Watershed Management in Lesotho (GCP/LES/049/LDF)”. It briefly describes the project and its key areas of work, and sets out the purpose, scope, methodological approach and work-plan of the evaluation.
2. The project has an implementation period of five years. It aims to *strengthen capacity for climate change adaptation through support to Integrated Watershed Management*. Its objectives are: i) to implement sustainable land and water management (SLM/W) practices and resource conservation in selected watersheds to reduce vulnerability and enhance adaptive capacity at community level and ii) to strengthen diversified livelihood strategies focusing on crop, livestock and agro-forestry systems at community level.
3. It has a total budget of USD 12 089 694 of which USD 3 592 694 is Global Environment Facility (GEF) resources and USD 8 437 000 is co-financing by Government counterparts and service providers. The project was approved by GEF in 27 Feb 2015 and the financing agreement was signed between FAO and Government on 15 June 2015.
4. This project was executed under the direct execution modality - so FAO implements and executes the project and provides most of the services to national institutions under the guidance of the Project Steering Committee (PSC), chaired by the lead ministry or main national executing partner. For this project FAO had therefore the double role of implementing and executing the project

Box 1 – Basic project information

- | |
|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none">i. GEF project ID number: 5124ii. Recipient country: Lesothoiii. Implementing agency: FAOiv. Executing agency: FAOv. Implementing partners: Ministry of Forestry, Range and Soil Conservation,¹ Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security, Ministry of Energy and Meteorology, Ministry of Water, Ministry of Local Government, Department of Environment and National University of Lesotho (NUL)vi. GEF Focal Area: Climate change – Least Developed Country Fund (LDCF)vii. PIF approved: 25 January 2013viii. Date of CEO endorsement: 11 March 2015ix. Date of project start: 1 September 2015x. Execution Agreement signed: 15 June 2015xi. Initial date of project completion (original NTE): 31 October 2019xii. Revised project implementation end date: 31 December 2020xiii. Date of mid-term review: October 2018 |
|---|

¹ Formerly known as Ministry of Forestry and Land Reclamation.

1.2 Description of project, its objectives and components

5. The project plan was to be implemented in three vulnerable livelihood zones in three districts: Lowlands (Mafeteng), Senqu River Valley (Quthing) and Mountains (Thaba Tseka) in 24 selected watersheds. Direct project beneficiaries are 24 selected villages in the Quthing, Thaba-Tseka and Mafeteng districts comprising 24 farmer groups (1 200 farm households). Second level of beneficiaries are the national and district level staff of the Government ministries), community-based organizations and the non-governmental organizations (NGOs) involved in project implementation.
6. At the time of project design, the most important challenge foreseen was the conflicting interest on the communal use of natural resources. There was thus a need for conflict management in community-based natural resource management by engaging local authorities such as chiefs and local councillors.
7. The project started in November 2015 with a duration of 48 months till August 2019; however, it received a no-cost extension till 31 December 2020. A mid-term review was undertaken in October 2018 just over two and half years into implementation of the project.
8. The project's major focus is to implement climate change adaptation measures at local level to reduce vulnerability of local communities and improve their livelihoods and adaptive capacity. Scaling-up and transfer of climate resilient measures, with consideration of all major ongoing and pipeline initiatives of the Government, development partners to enhance synergies and avoid potential duplications.
9. The project was initiated after the implementation of a Technical Cooperation Programme (TCP) project "Strengthening capacity for climate change adaptation in the agriculture sector" from 2009 to 2011, which was developed as an effort to contribute to addressing the technical shortcomings cited in the National Adaptation Programmes of Action (NAPA). The goal of that project was to contribute to the reduction of risks associated with climate change and variability among smallholder and subsistence farmers in three selected watersheds in Lesotho. The current project was therefore designed to upscale the adaptation practices that were identified in the TCP project.
10. The overall project objective is linked to the project's five components and associated outcomes. These are detailed below:

Component 1: Strengthening technical capacity of national and district level staff and institutions on sustainable land and water management and climate-resilient livelihood strategies.

Outcome 1.1 Strengthened technical capacity in MFLR, Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security, MNR, Ministry of Local Government & Chieftainship, Disaster Management Authority and NUL at national, district levels, and community representatives on climate change adaptation and integrated watershed management.

Component 2: Assessing vulnerability of livelihoods and impacts of climate change on land suitability and use at watershed scale.

Outcome 2.1 Improved data, tools and methods for assessment of impact of climate change on land suitability and land use, vulnerability and risk at the national/district level implemented focusing on most vulnerable watersheds

Component 3: Promoting tested SLM/W practices to build resilience to climate risks in vulnerable sub-catchments and watersheds.

Outcome 3.1: SLM/W practices (soil erosion control, soil and water conservation, water harvesting, run-off reduction, vegetative cover, range resource management) successfully adopted in selected 24 watershed and catchments.

Component 4: Strengthening diversified livelihood strategies and implementation of improved income generating activities at the community level.

Outcome 4.1: Diversified livelihood strategies, small scale, and household level income generating activities successfully demonstrated and adopted by target 24 communities, including women headed households.

Component 5: Dissemination of best practices, project monitoring and evaluation.

Outcome 5.1: Stakeholders and communities aware of improved SLM/W practices, livelihood diversification and household level income generation practices through wide dissemination.

11. A Mid-Term Review was conducted in 2018. Table 1, below presents a summary of the main conclusions and recommendations as well as any major adjustment made by the project team following the mid-term review (MTR).

Table 1. Summary of MTR conclusions and recommendations

Conclusions	Recommendations
<p>Project outcomes are highly relevant: All five outcomes of the project are highly relevant considering the challenges that Lesotho faces with regards to risks. Nevertheless the project design has some constraints that could be improved.</p>	<p>The MTR recommended for the Government and FAO to carry out needs assessments/baseline assessments that can identify priorities of each targeted community in particular to water-shed management As the lack of baseline assessments seems to have contributed to the inability to identify communities that have acute water shortages. There is a requirement to identify options to reduce procurement complexity of activities, such as beekeeping and other small livestock. Options could include sourcing locally or developing partnerships with local suppliers.</p>
<p>The project is contributing to building the resilience of beneficiaries: The institutional and community capacity building under Component 1 has improved the understanding of the El Niño impacts of 2016/17 and contributed to improved community preparedness to respond to future droughts and extreme weather events.</p>	<p>The Programme Management Unit/PMU, has to consider options for improving further participation of women Relying on partner agencies and non-explicit forms of gender mainstreaming is insufficient and difficult to replicate. Instead, an elaborate strategy, supported by guidance and replicable measures will ensure project effectiveness beyond the demonstration activities.</p>
<p>Despite the Project Document not having an explicit section outlining how gender issues would be addressed at every stage in the project cycle, and the lack of explicit gender analysis at the inception phase of the project The project has relied on community initiatives and institutional policies of project partners, and is to a large extent, provided the opportunities and options for empowering women in decision-making and ensuring women’s roles and interests in resource use and management are recognized and mainstreamed. Women are included in workshops and trainings and the project is enabling women to access information and is promoting the notion that natural resources management is not gender biased.</p>	<p>PMU, in order to improve the utility of the Monitoring & Evaluation framework and enable assessment of project impact, especially in relation to sustainable land and watershed management, it is necessary to have baseline data where practical. a. Specifically, the baseline status of</p>

	<p>Component 2 should be stated by listing the specific types of databases that exist, outline user needs and the gaps to identified priority actions. This will enable specific strategies and investment plans to be prepared for database development and the necessary infrastructure. b. For Component 3, spatial analysis could be used to establish the extent of the land area where sustainable land use practices could be applied. This will allow the development of guidelines and approaches to identifying priority areas linked with the vulnerability assessment.</p>
<p>While there is a good management structure in place, the effectiveness of the overall project management could be improved taking note of the delays that the project has experienced: However, the effectiveness of the overall project management could be improved, taking note of the delays the project has experienced despite having good management structures in place</p>	<p>FAO, PMU and PSC, Despite having good management structures in place, the project implementation has been ineffective and inefficient in addressing project risks. The MTR recommends the PMU assesses the list of remaining activities presented in Appendix II and discontinues some activities. Furthermore, resources are required for to priorities such as water infrastructure in communities with acute water shortages. c. To improve PSC meetings attendance, considerations need to be made to ensure the role of the PSC is effective by enabling quick and strategic decision-making when project issues arise as well as managing risks and opportunities. Two options that could be considered are i) creating a PSC comprising of Deputy Principal Secretaries and departmental heads (decision making powers could be assigned under GEF rules), and ii) consider options for convening virtual short regular meetings when it is not practical for PSC members to attend in person. d. The MTR further recommends that the PMU ensures project implementation reports (PIRs) have adequate information to enable the PSC to identify potential risks, including provision of reasonable summary of project expenditure.</p>
<p>The institutional arrangements are adequate and demonstrate the necessary ownership and there is observable intersectoral coordination and collaboration, but gaps seem to exist in the expedience in decision-making when the project encounters challenges:</p>	<p>The project is running behind, and remaining activities will not be completed within the remaining timeframe. A one year no-cost extension is necessary, but it should be based on addressing the recommendations and shortcomings presented in this MTR report.</p>
<p>The MTR suggested actions are: A reconstructed theory of change (TOC) that suggested the decoupling of Component 2 and a minor revision to Component 5. The report defined Component 2 as a “loaded component” meaning that it requires significant unpacking. It is in fact a potentially large standalone multi-sector project, especially Output 2.1.1. But more importantly, Component 2 is the necessary pre-condition for evidence-based policy making and prioritization of resource allocation through the use of spatio-temporal data to assess vulnerability. A national data infrastructure framework is necessary, but it also requires significant upfront investment and a long-term roadmap. This project had rightly identified the need for a framework but falls short in elaborating the value of Component 2. These adjustments entail renumbering of outputs with original output numbers given in parenthesis.</p>	

Source: MTR, 2018.

1.3 Project stakeholders and their role

12. The table below lists the key partners and stakeholders involved in the project, including the implementing agencies, local groups and beneficiaries.

Table 2. Project stakeholders

List of stakeholders	Category	Engagement mechanism
Ministry of Forestry & Land Reclamation (MFLR)	Government	National focal point & facilitator of project implementation; overall coordination and hosting of the project; recipient of capacity building efforts; responsible for the protection and rehabilitation of the physical environment through management of rangeland resources, control of soil erosion, water harvesting, small dam development, rangeland assessment and community sensitization.
Ministry of Local Government & Chieftainship	Government	Sensitization at district and community level, implementation of grazing plans; Support and strengthening of decentralized planning and implementation of sustainable land and natural resource management and administration, including protection of grazing land and agro-forestry initiatives & integration of climate change issues into district development plans, capacity building of district and community councils.
Ministry of Agriculture & Food Security	Government	Knowledge management on crop, livestock, and irrigation planning and design; support on agricultural research, information and extension services / community mobilization including LENAUFU; capacity building on crop modelling and agro-climatology (planning cropping season).
Department of Livestock	Government	Livestock training activities & veterinary services, share lessons learned (resilient livestock species).
Lesotho Meteorological Services	Government	Provide climate & weather data & training, climate scenarios for pilot sites, capacity building on climate change adaptation and mitigation, share lessons learned from previous adaptation projects.
Department of Environment	Government	Spatial database, knowledge management and awareness raising on environmental issues, capacity building on environmental policy
Disaster Management Authority	Government	Provide early warning information, conduct crop forecasts to assess vulnerable areas/ food insecurity, management of early warning system and response to potential disaster situations resulting from natural hazards and climate change, coordinate and mainstream disaster risk reduction actions, through Disaster Management Teams (district & village), capacity building in vulnerability mapping and development of disaster management plans.
UNDP	UN-Org	Share lessons and best practices from relevant UNDP-supported activities and projects; Member of Project Steering Committee, technical expertise on adaptation and integrated watershed management approach.
FAO	GEF agency, Implementing and executing agency	Overall supervision role involved activities related to a project's identification, concept preparation, appraisal, preparation of detailed proposal, approval and start-up, oversight, supervision, completion, and evaluation. This role is assumed by the lead technical officer and the FAO-GEF Coordination Unit.

List of stakeholders	Category	Engagement mechanism
		While the management and administration responsibility of the project's day-to-day activities is with the Budget Holder at the country level.
IFAD	UN- Org	Key partner through small holder agricultural development program in support of commercialization of agriculture and diversified livelihoods, capacity building in market-oriented production, share lessons and best practices from relevant IFAD-supported programs, technical expertise.
Project beneficiaries (Range management committee, farmers groups, women groups)	Local communities	Safeguard community projects during and after project completion, custodians of household project activities, to safeguard all activities for their maintenance and sustainability after project completion, identify appropriate adaptation activities that will address their vulnerabilities & risks to climate change
NUL	Academic	Conduct climate change-related research, capacity building on agriculture, climatology, hydrology, water resources analysis, management and conservation of soil and range resources.
Community councils & traditional leaders	Local Authorities	Custodians of SLM/W projects, to supervise and guide resource user groups acting on their behalf. Assist in identifying earmarked sites for community activities (e.g. identifying grazing zones), committed to fulfilling their natural resource management (NRM) responsibilities, locus of legal authority for SLM/W and supervise government field staff who, under the newly decentralized system, are administratively answerable to Community Councils, supervise and guide resource user groups acting on their behalf and provide modest levels of resourcing to these groups for their daily operations.
Grazing associations, farmers, livestock herders, resource user groups	Community based Organization	Identify appropriate activities for their specific areas, extensive indigenous technical knowledge and familiarity with concepts of group action, committee operations, etc. commitment to SLM/W because of livelihood interests in a sustainable environment, strong potential interest in achieving SLM/W and different resource users may have different SLM/W priorities, gender differences may arise in SLM/W decision making, political and other factional differences may hinder consensus and decision making in some local contexts, leading agents of SLM/W through user groups or associations.
Lesotho Council of NGOs	Non-Governmental Organization	Technical and institutional expertise in climate smart agriculture, SLM/W & climate change adaptation options, training, sensitization, strong technical and institutional expertise in SLM/W and related fields, detailed understanding of local development needs, opportunities, constraints, currently engaged in various SLM/W-related activities, notably on-farm, long standing interest in the environmental and SLM/W sectors, members of project Steering Committee, potential collaborator in SLM/W model development, training and knowledge management/ networking activities.

Source: PIR, 2020.

1.4 Theory of change

13. The project document does not propose any TOC but has a detailed results matrix (see Annex 1). The workplan of this project also links activities to outputs. The MTR has proposed a TOC, if needed, the TOC will be revisited/assessed by the evaluation team during the inception or main phase. The revised TOC will be included in the evaluation report. Evaluation purpose and scope
14. This evaluation is intended to serve a dual purpose of accountability and learning. It will analyse the project's design, implementation process, as well as its outcomes and relevance for the beneficiaries and for the national needs and priorities. It will also attempt to analyse the factors that may contribute to the sustainability of the outcomes. It aims to present strategic recommendations with the intention of, inter alia, maximizing the institutionalization of outcomes and appropriation by the different stakeholders, and disseminating information to other institutions that can give sustainability to this intervention.
15. The evaluation will also document lessons to inform future actions and will serve as an input to improve formulation of projects that may use similar approaches, methods and tools. Likewise, it will present strategic recommendations in order to maximize the institutionalization and appropriation of the project's results by stakeholders and disseminate information to authorities that could benefit from it.
16. The users of this evaluation will be:
 - i. The FAO Country Office, Project Management Team, members of Project Task Force in the FAO Headquarters and regional offices who will use the findings and lessons identified in the evaluation to finalize project activities; plan for sustainability of results achieved; improve formulation and implementation of similar projects.
 - ii. The GEF (project donor) will use the findings to track progress in fulfilling its mission of delivering global environmental benefits and. inform strategic investment decisions in the future. The Independent Evaluation Office of the GEF (IEO) is directly accountable to the GEF Council and has the mandate to report on the performance and effectiveness of GEF projects and programs.
 - iii. The National Government counterparts who will use the evaluation findings and conclusions for future planning.
 - iv. The service providers (community-based organizations and NGOs).
 - v. The FAO-GEF Coordination Unit will use the findings to track the project achievements and draw lessons to be shared in order to improve the performance of the FAO-GEF portfolio.
 - vi. Other donors, organizations and institutions interested in supporting and/or implementing similar projects could equally benefit from the evaluation report.
17. The scope of this evaluation will cover the entire project implementation period (2015 – 30 November 2020), with a focus particularly on the period following the Mid-term Review (October 2018),² the recommendations of which are detailed in table1 as well as the respective proposal of adjustment of activities and outputs detailed in MTR report.
18. The analysis and findings will use the internationally recognized evaluation criteria as a reference: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability. Other evaluation criteria include appropriation, involvement of stakeholders, gender issues and financial, social, political and environmental risks, as requested by GEF.

² The geographic scope of the evaluation covers Lowlands (Mafeteng), Senqu River Valley (Quthing) and Mountains (Thaba Tseka), where the project has been implemented.

2. Evaluation objectives and questions

19. The objectives of the evaluation are to:

- i. assess the extent to which the project achieved its stated objective and outcomes to date, and determine the likelihood of future impacts especially relating to environmental sustainability;
- ii. provide an assessment of the project performance, collect:³ i) socio-economic co-benefits data, ii) sex-disaggregated and gender sensitive data, and iii) geographic coordinates of project sites whenever available/possible, and the implementation of planned project activities and planned outputs against actual results; and
- iii. formulate lessons learned that may help in the design and implementation of future FAO, FAO-GEF or climate change adaptation and to Integrated Watershed Management related initiatives.

20. The main evaluation questions are the following:

Table 3. Evaluation questions

<p>Relevance (rating required)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. How relevant were the project objective (<i>implement SLM/W practices</i>) and outcomes with the operational strategies of the GEF programme, the national priorities and the Country Programming Framework? ii. Was the project design adequate for delivering the expected outcomes? iii. Has there been any change in the relevance of the project since its design, such as new national policies, plans or programs that affect the relevance of the project objectives and goals?
<p>Effectiveness (rating required)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. To what extent have the project objectives been achieved? ii. To what extent was the integrated watershed management model, focused on SLM/W, been effective? Which factors were promoters or obstacles? iii. To what extent are the stakeholders trained in SLM/W implementing new practices? To what extent have the capacities generated been useful in preventing or reversing land degradation? iv. To what extent has the topic been included in public policies and strategies in the responsible institutions?
<p>Efficiency (rating required)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. To what extent has FAO fulfilled its role as an implementing agency with regard to identifying the project, preparing the concept, forecasting, preparation, approval and launch, monitoring and supervision? ii. How well have the risks been identified and managed? iii. To what extent has FAO fulfilled its executing role: with regard to cost-efficiency? iv. Has management been able to adapt to the changing conditions to guarantee the efficiency of the project?
<p>Co-financing</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. To what extent has the co-financing materialised and how has lower than expected co-financing affected the project outcomes, particularly with regard to the replication of SLM/W practices?

³ Per the GEF revised terminal evaluation policy.

Involvement of the stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. To what extent has effective participation and involvement of the key project stakeholders been achieved (for example, women, disables, non-governmental agencies and local authorities)?
Gender equality⁴	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. What did the project contribute to the GEF Policy on Gender Equality and FAO policy on gender equality objectives? ii. To what extent was the strategy for involving vulnerable groups (women, youth and disable) in the project activities effective? iii. Has the project made specific contributions to the wellbeing of vulnerable groups (empowerment, reduced vulnerability)? iv. What were the results achieved or likely to be achieved? v. What are the lessons learned that could be used for future interventions?
Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Is there any evidence of integrated watershed management, or any change in the political/legislative/regulatory frameworks? ii. To what extent can the progress made towards in the long term be attributed to the project? iii. To what extent has the project supported financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental improvements to sustain long-term project results?
Monitoring and evaluation (M&E)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Has the M&E system worked according to the M&E plan?⁵ ii. How was the information from M&E system used during the project implementation? iii. Has the information been gathered in a systematic manner, using appropriate methodologies? iv. Has the information from the M&E system been used to make relevant decisions about the implementation of the project?
Knowledge management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Were there mechanisms and platforms that enabled the systematization of knowledge and the communication of good practices and lessons learned? ii. Has the project promoted the strengthening and replicability of said practices and lessons? Which and how?
Social and environmental safeguards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. To what extent do, or did, the demonstration reference sites (DRS)⁶ and their replication in other areas fulfil the SLM/W criteria?

⁴ Evaluations must assess whether and how men and women are affected by changes to natural resource use and decision making resulting from GEF outcomes. Wherever feasible, evaluations should provide sex-disaggregated and gender-sensitive data. Units commissioning evaluations should strive for gender balance in the composition of evaluation teams.

⁵ Two aspects will need to be assessed; i) the M&E Design (*Was the M&E plan at the point of CEO Endorsement practical and sufficient? Did it include baseline data? Did it: specify clear targets and appropriate (SMART9) indicators to track environmental, gender, and socio-economic results; a proper methodological approach etc;* and ii) M&E Implementation (*Whether the M&E system operated as per the M&E plan? Where necessary, whether the M&E plan was revised in a timely manner? etc.*

⁶ The project coordinate of the sits are: 29.3146/28.4750 Linakeng, Thaba Tseka; 29.7792/27.1283 Qibing, Mafeteng; and [30.285 / 27.9619](#) Mt Moorosi, Quthing.

3. Methodology

21. The evaluation will adhere to the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms & Standards⁷ and will be conducted in line with FAO's Evaluation manual and related guidelines and practices. The evaluation will adopt a consultative and transparent approach with internal and external stakeholders throughout the process. Triangulation of evidence and information gathered will underpin its validation and analysis and will support conclusions and recommendations.
22. Considering the evolving COVID-19 pandemic and the travel restrictions put in place by the Government in Lesotho,⁸ the evaluation will be carried out remotely. Therefore, in answering evaluation questions related to the achievement of results, efficiency, sustainability, progress to impact and the project's implementation and execution, the evaluation team will utilize as a starting point project documentation (such as progress reports, mid-term review etc.). In addition, it will conduct very limited qualitative data collection, using key informant, skype and phone interviews with stakeholders. On the other hand, the evaluation questions related to the project's relevance, M&E, environmental and social safeguards, knowledge management, and co-financing will be answered primarily through a desk review.
23. The evaluation will be conducted in three steps, as follows:

Step 1: Preparation (deliverable: inception report)

- i. Review and assess the quality of the project design documents;
- ii. review and validate the project progress report, including the PIRs, MTR, monthly reports, etc. The (draft) terminal report will be shared with the evaluation team as appropriate;
- iii. prepare an inception report which identifies key evaluation partners, specific evaluation questions, methods and techniques for data collection; and
- iv. the inception report will provide the following aspects:
 - as relevant, a reconstructed theory of change (use the TOC suggested by the MTR, if needed an updated version should be provided by the evaluation team) of the project showing the causal relationships between project outputs, objectives and impact as well as the assumptions made for one level of change to lead to the next;
 - evaluation matrix: can present the specific evaluation questions under each evaluation criterion and the sources for data collection;
 - details on the stakeholders to be contacted (criteria for selection, etc.); and
 - timetable: Deadlines are already provided in this TOR. Any suggested changes will be discussed with the FAO Office of Evaluation (OED), Project Coordinator and National Implementation partners when the inception report is finalized.

24. Step 2: Desk review

- i. A desk review of project and other relevant documents including, but not limited to:
 - the project documents, key outputs, monitoring reports (such as progress and financial reports to FAO, GEF annual PIRs and M&E data) and relevant correspondence;
 - external sources and other relevant documents with up-to-date information on the approaches introduced by the project;

⁷ <http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/21>

⁸ <https://www.gov.ls/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/Risk-Determination-and-Mitigating-Measures-for-Social-Activities-1.pdf>

- minutes, decisions and notes from the Project Management meetings;
- other project-related material produced by the project staff or partners;
- relevant materials published about the project; and
- additional information and opinions from representatives of donor or government agencies and other organizations as required.

ii. A detailed list of documents to be consulted is included in Annex 2.

25. **Step 3: Data collection**

26. Considering COVID-19, the evaluation will rely primarily on desk review and qualitative methods for remote data collection. Should the restriction permits the Team leader and Team member will held, focus group discussions with beneficiary communities and local authorities, particularly with regard to assessing the relevance, effectiveness and sustainability of activities, especially under components 2, 3 and 4 of the project. All such field visits will be subject to UN travel regulations and clearance by the Project Coordinator prior to the visits. However, in case of the travel restrictions are not lifted only the team member (local consultant will carry the in-country interviews. The sites for field visits will be selected based on i) safety and Government regulations; ii) breadth of project activities; iii) accessibility by the evaluation team; and iv) security considerations. These visits may include:
- i. review and assessment of project's implementation, results achieved, outcomes at district (Quthing, Thaba Tseka and Mafeteng) and national levels, and challenges experienced and solutions adopted;
 - ii. meeting with the project authorities (i.e. Project Coordinator/budget holder) and key stakeholders to discuss project results, implementation modalities and agency support to project implementation; and
 - iii. visits to selected communities in Quthing, Thaba Tseka and Mafeteng districts to assess the results achieved, outcomes at the local level, and barriers to implementation experienced.
27. Semi-structured interviews (in-person or remote) with key stakeholders and other informants that were involved in - or affected by - the project design and/or implementation will serve to collect primary data to answer the evaluation questions. Face-to-face interviews will be carried out during the field visits, while phone or Skype interviews will be undertaken for the institutions not visited by the evaluation team. Interviews will be supported by checklists and/or interview protocols to be developed by the evaluation team at the beginning of the evaluation.

4. Roles and responsibilities

28. This section describes the different roles that key stakeholders play in the design and implementation of the evaluation.
29. **OED**, in particular the Evaluation Manager develops the first draft TOR *with inputs from the Project Task Force (PTF) (including the budget holder and Lead Technical Officer [LTO]), the Funding Liaison Officer and the FAO-GEF Coordination Unit*.⁹ The Evaluation Manager is responsible for the finalization of the TOR and for the selection of the evaluation team members.¹⁰ OED has the responsibility of following up with the budget holder for the timely preparation of the management response and the Follow-up report to the management response.
30. The **Budget Holder** is responsible for initiating the evaluation process. Together with the project **Lead Technical Officer and other PTF members**, they assist the Evaluation Manager in drafting the TOR, in the identification of potential consultants and in the organization of the missions/interviews. The budget holder will provide the evaluation team with all project documents (see *Annex 2*) needed for the evaluation. The budget holder is also responsible for sharing the report with the GEF Operational Focal Point, the Execution Partner, the project team and national partners and for leading and coordinating the preparation of the management response and the Follow-up Report, fully supported in this task by the LTO and others members of the PTF. OED guidelines for the Management Response and the Follow-up Report provide necessary details on this process. Involvement of different members of the PTF will depend on respective roles and participation in the project.
31. The **GEF Coordination Unit (in particular the Funding Liaison Officer)** is responsible for being available during the evaluation process, providing inputs to the first version of the Terms of Reference, especially the description of the background and context chapter, and supporting the evaluation team during its work. They are required to meet (virtually) with the evaluation team, make available information and documentation as necessary (see *Annex 2*), and comment on the terms of reference and draft reports and participate in the debriefing session after the data collection when the evaluation team will share its initial findings and preliminary conclusions/recommendations.
32. The country level **GEF Operational Focal Point** (OPF). According to the GEF Evaluation Policy (2019), Minimum Requirement 4 (Engagement of Operational Focal Points), "the OPF will be informed of midterm reviews and terminal evaluations and will, where applicable and feasible, be briefed and debriefed at the start and at the end of evaluation missions. They will receive a draft report for comment and will be invited to contribute to the management response (where applicable), and will receive the terminal evaluation report within 12 months of project or programme completion". "The GEF OFPs play a key role in facilitating access to staff members of government institutions involved in GEF projects during evaluations. They may promote the use of, follow-up to, and action on evaluation recommendations related to GEF matters and directed at the regional, national, and project levels. They also play an important role in keeping national stakeholders (including the civil society organizations involved in GEF activities) fully consulted with, informed on, and involved in the plans, conduct, and results of country-related GEF evaluation activities".

⁹ And the OPIM team at headquarters if the project is executed under the OPIM modality (OPIM-MS701@fao.org).

¹⁰ The responsibility for the administrative procedures for recruitment of the team, will be decided on a case-by-case basis.

33. The **Evaluation Manager** shall brief the evaluation team on the evaluation methodology and process and will review the terminal draft report for Quality Assurance purposes in terms of presentation, compliance with the TORs and timely delivery, quality, clarity and soundness of evidence provided and of the analysis supporting conclusions and recommendations in the evaluation report.
34. The **evaluation team** is responsible for further developing and applying the methodology for conducting the evaluation, and for producing the evaluation report. All team members will participate in briefing and debriefing meetings & discussions and will contribute to the evaluation with written inputs for the final draft and terminal report. The evaluation team will agree on the outline of the report early in the evaluation process, based on the reporting outline provided in *Annex 1* of this TOR. The evaluation team will also be free to expand the scope, criteria, questions and issues listed above, as well as develop its own evaluation tools and framework, within time and resources available and based on discussions with the Evaluation Manager, and consultations with the budget holder and PTF where necessary. The evaluation team is fully responsible for its report which may not reflect the views of the Government or of FAO. An evaluation report is not subject to technical clearance by FAO although OED is responsible for Quality Assurance of all evaluation reports.
35. The **Evaluation Team Leader** guides and coordinates the evaluation team members in their specific work, discusses their findings, conclusions and recommendations and prepares the final draft and the terminal report, consolidating the inputs from the team members with his/her own.
36. For further details related to the tasks of the Evaluation Team Leader and evaluation team members, please refer to their specific job descriptions prepared at the time of their recruitment.

5. Evaluation team composition and profile

37. The evaluation will be conducted by a team composed of a senior team leader and a team member (local consultant).
38. The evaluation team should have the following qualifications:
- i. no previous association with the policy-making process and the design, delivery, supervision, technical backstopping and management of the project;
 - ii. knowledge of FAO country programmes and GEF operational programmes, strategies and relevant policies; and
 - iii. requisite technical knowledge, academic qualifications and experience in line with the responsibilities of respective team members as outlined in the following section.
39. In addition, each team member should meet the following specific qualifications:
- i. **Team Leader**
 - advanced university degree in climate change, SLM/W, capacity development, development studies, institutional development or related disciplines;
 - at least ten years of relevant experience in conducting evaluations on subjects related to climate change, natural resources management, and capacity development;
 - work experience in developing countries in Southern Africa is preferred; and
 - fluency in oral and written English.
 - ii. **Team member (Natural Resources Management Specialist)**
 - advanced university degree in climate change, natural resources management, development studies, institutional development, capacity development or related disciplines;
 - at least seven years of relevant experience in conducting evaluations on subjects related to climate change, a natural resources management;
 - work experience at national, provincial and community levels in Lesotho is preferred, and
 - working knowledge of English.

6. Evaluation products (deliverables)

40. This section describes the key deliverables of the evaluation team.
- i. Inception report: an inception report should be prepared by the evaluation team before going into the fully-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, a stakeholder analysis and the terminal evaluation matrix.
 - ii. ZERO draft evaluation report: a clear, concise (30-40 pages excluding appendices and annexes), professionally-written and high-quality draft evaluation report is expected. It should be written in English or another official UN language, and composed in accordance with the FAO Style of Writing. For reference, samples of FAO evaluation reports can also be accessed at <http://www.fao.org/evaluation/library/>. The Zero draft should be sent by the evaluation team to OED for comments, peer review and clearance, and will then be circulated by OED for comments to internal and external stakeholders (budget holder, Funding Liaison Officer, LTO, FAO-GEF Coordination Unit, project team, OPIM team,¹¹ executing partner, PSC members, key project partners).
 - iii. Terminal evaluation report: this is the result of the incorporation of comments received on the zero draft. The final report will be submitted by OED to all the stakeholders and will be revised by an editor and graphic designer, before publication on OED website.
41. The evaluation report should be prepared in MS Word Format and submitted electronically by the Evaluation Team Leader to OED. As the main author of the report, OED will have the final decision as to how the report should be composed.
42. Supporting Evidence – Electronic or hard copies of the survey data and report, minutes or notes of interviews and discussions, and other sources of the primary data/information collected by the evaluation team and used in the report should be sent to OED. Sources of secondary data/information used in the report should be cited in the footnotes and included in the list of documents reviewed which is appended in the evaluation report.
43. The evaluation report should include an Executive Summary and illustrate the evidence found that responds to the evaluation questions listed in the TOR. The executive summary should include the following paragraphs, in order to update the GEF Portal: i) information on progress, challenges and outcomes on stakeholder engagement; ii) information on progress on gender-responsive measures; iii) information on knowledge activities/products.
44. All GEF evaluation reports should have a full translation in English when they were prepared in another UN language. This is under FAO responsibility.
45. Evaluation reports should have numbered paragraphs, following the GEF OED reporting outline (see *Annex 1*). Supporting data and analysis should be annexed to the report when considered important to complement the main report.

¹¹ When relevant.

47. The evaluation report should include the GEF Rating table:¹²

GEF Rating Scheme	Rating	Summary Comments ¹³
1) RELEVANCE		
Overall relevance of the project	HS→HU	
2) EFFECTIVENESS		
Overall assessment of project results	HS→HU	
Outcome 1	HS→HU	
Outcome 2	HS→HU	
Outcome 3	HS→HU	
3) EFFICIENCY, PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION & EXECUTION		
Overall quality of project implementation & adaptive management (implementing agency)	HS→HU	
Quality of execution (executing agencies)	HS→HU	
Efficiency (incl. cost effectiveness and timeliness)	HS→HU	
4) SUSTAINABILITY		
Overall sustainability	L→U	
5) FACTORS AFFECTING PERFORMANCE (M&E and Stakeholder engagement)		
Overall quality of stakeholder engagement	HS→HU	
Overall quality of M&E	HS→HU	
M&E design at project start up	HS→HU	
M&E plan implementation	HS→HU	

48. Evaluation briefs and other knowledge products or participation in knowledge sharing events, if relevant.

¹² See Annex 5 for more information on GEF ratings

¹³ Include hyperlink to relevant sections in the report

7. Evaluation timeframe

49. This section lists and describes all tasks and deliverables for which evaluators or the evaluation team will be responsible and accountable, as well as those involving the evaluation manager, indicating for each the due date or time-frame, as well as who is responsible for its completion.

Task	Period	Responsibility
Team identification and recruitment	September 2020	Evaluation Manager
TOR preparation	By mid-September	Evaluation Manager, LTO, Funding Liaison Officer and FAO-GEF Coordination Unit
TOR finalization	21 September 2020	Evaluation Manager
Travel arrangements and organization of the agenda/travel itinerary in the country for the field mission	In-country travel 5-15 October 2020	Evaluation Manager, project team/Country Office and evaluation team
Reading background documentation	September 2020	Evaluation team
Briefing of evaluation team	End September - October 2020	Evaluation Manager, FAO-GEF Coordination Unit, LTO, Funding Liaison Officer, OPIM team ¹⁴
Inception report	15 October 2020	Evaluation team
Data collection	19 October - 8 November 2020	Evaluation team with support of Evaluation Manager and PMU/Country Office
Production of first draft for OED review	22 November 2020	Evaluation team
Circulation of first draft for comments (budget holder, LTO, Funding Liaison Officer, project team, FAO-GEF Coordination Unit, key national partners, PSC members, EP)	3 December 2020	Evaluation Manager
Integration of comments and production of the terminal report	10 December 2020	Evaluation team
Circulation of terminal report and publication	15 January 2021	Evaluation Manager
Management response	One month after the terminal evaluation is issued	Budget holder
Follow-up report	Six months after the management response is issued	Budget holder

¹⁴ When relevant.

Annexes

Annexes can be used to provide additional details about evaluation background and requirements to facilitate the work of evaluators. Some examples include:

Annex 1 - FAO-GEF terminal evaluation reporting outline

Annex 2 - Overview of the available documents. A list of important documents and webpages that the evaluators should read at the outset of the evaluation and before finalizing the evaluation design and the inception report. This list should include all GEF M&E and evaluation guidelines. The list should include the documents that have been provided to the evaluation team, such as:

1. Project Identification Form (PIF)
 2. Comments received from GEF Secretariat, the GEF Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel (STAP) and the GEF Council members on the project's design and FAO's responses
 3. FAO Concept Note, and FAO Project Review Committee report
 4. Request for GEF CEO Endorsement
 5. FAO-GEF Project Preparation Grant (PPG) document¹⁵
 6. Project Document
 7. Project Inception Report
 8. Six-monthly FAO project progress reports (PPR)
 9. Annual work plans and budgets (including budget revisions)
 10. All annual GEF PIRs¹⁶
 11. Any documentation detailing any changes to the project framework and project components, e.g. changes to outcomes and outputs as originally designed
 12. List of stakeholders
 13. List of project sites and site location maps (for planning the mission itineraries and fieldwork)
 14. Execution Agreements in case under Operational Partners Implementation Modality (OPIM) and letters of agreement (LOA)
 15. Relevant technical, backstopping, and project supervision mission reports, including Back to the Office Reports (BTOR) of relevant project and FAO staff, including any reports on technical support provided by FAO HQ or regional office staff
 16. Minutes of the meetings of the Project Steering Committee (PSC), FAO PTF and other relevant meetings
 17. Any Environmental and Social Safeguards analysis and mitigation plan produced during project design period and online records on the Field Project Management Information System (FPMIS)
 18. Any awareness raising and communications materials produced by the project, such as brochures, leaflets, presentations given at meeting, address of project website, etc.
 19. FAO policy documents e.g. related to FAO Strategic Objectives and Gender
 20. All other monitoring reports prepared by the project
 21. Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools (TT) at CEO endorsement and updated TT at midterm for GEF-5 projects or review of contribution to GEF-7 core indicators (retrofitted) for GEF-6 projects, and GEF-7 core indicators for GEF-7 approved projects
 22. Financial management information including: an up-to-date co-financing table; summary report on the project's financial management and expenditures to date; a summary of any financial revisions made to the project and their purpose; and copies of any completed audits for comment (as appropriate).
 23. GEF Gender Policy, GEF Gender Implementation Strategy, GEF Guidelines on Gender Equality, and GEF Guide to advance Gender Equality in GEF projects and Programmes
 24. Mid-Term Review/Evaluation report and Management Response
 25. FAO Country/Countries Programme Framework document; FAO Guide to the Project Cycle; FAO Environment and Social Management Guidelines and Policy; FAO Policy on Gender Equity; Guide to mainstreaming gender in FAO's Project Cycle; and Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) Manual
- In the case of Programmes*
26. CEO endorsement/approval of Child Projects under the Programme
 27. Programme Framework Document (PFD) and Child Projects titles or concepts

¹⁵ Applicable to full-sized projects, medium-sized projects, and projects under Programmes for which Project Preparation Grant (PPG) was approved by the GEF.

¹⁶ A Project Progress Report (PPR) is an FAO requirement, due every six months, with deadlines on 31 July for a reporting period from 1 January to 30 June, and on 31 January for a reporting period from 1 July to 31 December every year. The PIR is a GEF requirement, due every year (usually from July) until project closure for projects that have been under implementation for one year or longer.

Annex 3 - Project Results Framework.

Outcome/output/objective
Component 1. Strengthening technical capacity of national and district level staff and institutions on sustainable land and water management and climate-resilient livelihood strategies
Outcome 1.1. Strengthened technical capacity in Ministry of Forestry, Range and Soil Conservation, Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security MNR, Ministry of Local Government & Chieftainship, Disaster Management Authority and NUL at national and district levels and community representatives on climate change adaptation and integrated watershed management.
Output 1.1.1. National level Ministry of Forestry, Range and Soil Conservation, Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security, MNR, Ministry of Local Government & Chieftainship, Disaster Management Authority and NUL staff and district level forestry and natural resources staff trained on climate change adaptation, integrated watershed management and community mobilization.
Output 1.1.2. Training to the local representatives from community-based organizations on good practice examples of sustainable land and water management, water harvesting, diversified livelihood strategies (at least 24 farmer groups (1 200 farm households) in three livelihood zones will be trained).
Component 2. Assessing vulnerability of livelihoods and impacts of climate change on land suitability and use at watershed scale
Outcome 2.1. Improved data, tools and methods for assessment of impact of climate change on land suitability and land use, vulnerability and risk at the national/district level implemented focusing on most vulnerable watersheds.
Output 2.1.1. Livelihood and land use (crop, livestock, agro-forestry) data base developed for most vulnerable watersheds (database will be established in Ministry of Forestry and Land Reclamation and linked to potential users at the national level) and relevant staff trained (at least 30 core staff).
Output 2.1.2. Vulnerabilities and risks (current and future) assessed for the selected watersheds in 3 livelihood zones and spatial information on vulnerability available (at Disaster Management Authority) to facilitate adaptation planning by the Government and relevant staff trained (total 30 staff – ten staff from each district).
Component 3. Promoting tested SLM/W practices to build resilience to climate risks in vulnerable sub-catchments and watersheds
Outcome 3.1. SLM/W practices (soil erosion control, soil and water conservation, water harvesting, run-off reduction, vegetative cover, range resource management) successfully adopted in selected watershed and catchments. (Total beneficiaries – 1 200 households and 4 800 individuals and total area covered will be 2 400 hectares).
Output 3.1.1. Adaptive land use and SLM/W practices implemented in at least 24 communities in three livelihood zones (1 200 households and 1 200 hectares of arable land – approximately one hectare of arable land per household). The crops and cropping systems will be selected based on the detailed land suitability analysis to be conducted under Component 2.
Output 3.1.2. Improved water harvesting structures at the household level implemented in 3 livelihood zones (At least 150 households possess water harvesting structures, which will also include women headed households).
Output 3.1.3. Improved vegetative cover and range resource management measures adopted in 24 communities to improve productive use of marginal lands (This will cover 600 households and 2 400 individuals and cover a total area of 1 200 hectares [approximately 50 hectares per community]).
Component 4. Strengthening diversified livelihood strategies and implementation of improved income generating activities at the community level
Outcome 4.1. Diversified livelihood strategies and small scale and household level income generating activities successfully demonstrated and adopted by 24 target communities. [benefit 750 households (3 000 individuals). Area covered under this investment 375 hectares].

Outcome/output/objective
Output 4.1.1. Community participation ensured in 24 community groups in selected watersheds of three livelihood zones and introductory sessions conducted and small-scale household level income generating and food and nutrition activities (e.g. horticulture, small ruminants, beekeeping) introduced to 750 households.
Output 4.1.2. Field demonstration of locally relevant multi-purpose agro-forestry to protect and improve livelihood systems conducted in 24 locations and adopted by the stakeholders covering 375 hectares.
Component 5. Dissemination of best practices, project monitoring and review
Outcome 5.1. Stakeholders and communities aware of improved SLM/W practices, livelihood diversification and household level income generating practices through wide dissemination.
Output 5.1.1. A communication strategy established in close collaboration with the MOFLR, Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security, MNR, Ministry of Local Government and Chieftainship and NUL and implemented.
Outcome 5.2. Project implementation based on results-based management and dissemination of best practices and lessons learned for future operations.
Output 5.2.1. Systematic collection of field-based data to monitor project outcome indicators at all levels and reviews.

Annex 4 – GLOSSARY (Source: GEF Evaluation Policy, 2019)

Agency fee: the financing provided to a GEF partner Agency in connection with a GEF project or programme.

CEO Approval: the approval of a fully developed medium-sized project or enabling activity by the GEF CEO.

CEO Endorsement: the endorsement of a fully developed full-sized project by the GEF CEO.

Child project: a project that forms part of a programme, as set out in a programme framework document.

Co-financing: financing additional to GEF project financing, and that supports implementation of a GEF-financed project or programme and the achievement of its objectives.

Evaluation: Evaluation is the systematic and impartial assessment of planned, ongoing, or completed activities, projects, programmes in specific focal areas or sectors, policies, strategies and their implementation, or other topics relevant to the GEF partnership and organization.

Full-sized project: a project with GEF project financing exceeding USD 2 million.

GEF additionally: the additional effects (both environmental and otherwise) that can be directly associated with a GEF-supported project or programme

GEF Agency: an agency eligible to request and receive GEF resources directly for the design, implementation, and supervision of GEF projects and programmes

GEF-financed activity (or intervention): any programmatic approach, full-sized project, medium-sized project, or enabling activity financed from any GEF-managed trust fund, as well as regional and national outreach activities

GEF Operational Focal Point¹⁷: nominated by the recipient country, the GEF Operational Focal Point ensures that GEF proposals and activities in the country are consistent with country priorities and the country commitments under global environmental conventions; identifies project ideas to meet country

¹⁷ See <https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meeting-documents/C.8.Inf..5.5.pdf>.

priorities; endorses project proposals; facilitates broad based in-country consultations on GEF operational matters; and provides feedback on GEF activities, including implementation of projects.

Global Environmental Benefits: these relate to international conventions and commitments the GEF is mandated to serve. GEF projects must demonstrate that the project activities are delivering global environmental benefits.

Goal: a higher-order objective to which a GEF-financed project or programme is intended to contribute.

Knowledge Management: the process by which organizations within the GEF partnership generate value and improve performance from their intellectual and knowledge-based assets.

Impact: the positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by a project or programme, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.

Indicator: a quantitative or qualitative factor or variable that provides a simple and reliable means to measure achievement, to reflect the changes connected to a project or programme, or to help assess the performance of an organization.

Lead Agency: The Agency that coordinates all activities under a programme.

Medium-sized project: a project with GEF project financing of up to USD 2 million.

Midterm review: an assessment of a project or programme's performance and results carried out for adaptive management purposes at the midpoint of a project or programme's intended duration.

Monitoring: a continuous or periodic function, carried out by project or programme management, that uses a standardized and systematic process of collecting and analyzing data on specific indicators to provide decision-makers and management of a GEF-financed activity with information on progress in the achievement of objectives and in the use of allocated funds.

Outcome: an intended or achieved short- or medium-term effect of a project or programme's outputs.

Output: a product or service that results from the completion of activities implemented within a project or programme.

Portfolio: a subset of projects focusing on a specific theme, GEF focal area, geographic region, country, or GEF Agency.

Programme: a coherent set of interventions designed to attain specific global, regional, country, or sector objectives, consisting of a variable number of child projects.

Programme's added value: the additional results brought in by the GEF funding delivered as a programme compared with either a pre-existing or a hypothetical set of stand-alone full- and/or medium-sized projects or other comparable alternatives.

Programme framework document: the document that sets forth the concept of a programme that is proposed for GEF financing.

Result: Include intervention outputs, outcomes, progress toward longer-term impact including global environmental benefits, and should be discernible/measurable.

Stakeholder: an individual or group that has an interest in the outcome of a GEF project or programme or is likely to be affected by it, such as local communities, indigenous peoples, civil society organizations,

and private sector entities; stakeholders may include national project or programme executing agencies, or groups contracted to conduct activities at various stages of the project or programme.

Stakeholder engagement: a process that begins with stakeholder identification and analysis and includes planning; disclosure of information; consultation and participation; monitoring, evaluation, and learning throughout the project cycle; addressing grievances; and ongoing reporting to stakeholders.

Terminal evaluation: evaluation of a project or programme's design, performance, and results carried out at the end of implementation.

Annex 5 – GEF ratings

PROJECT RESULTS AND OUTCOMES

Project outcomes are rated based on the extent to which project objectives were achieved. A six-point rating scale is used to assess overall outcomes:

Rating	Description
Highly Satisfactory (HS)	<i>"Level of outcomes achieved clearly exceeds expectations and/or there were no short comings."</i>
Satisfactory (S)	<i>"Level of outcomes achieved was as expected and/or there were no or minor short comings."</i>
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	<i>"Level of outcomes achieved more or less as expected and/or there were moderate short comings."</i>
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	<i>"Level of outcomes achieved somewhat lower than expected and/or there were significant shortcomings."</i>
Unsatisfactory (U)	<i>"Level of outcomes achieved substantially lower than expected and/or there were major short comings."</i>
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	<i>"Only a negligible level of outcomes achieved and/or there were severe short comings."</i>
Unable to Assess (UA)	<i>The available information does not allow an assessment of the level of outcome achievements.</i>

During project implementation, the results framework of some projects may have been modified. In cases where modifications in the project impact, outcomes and outputs have not scaled down their overall scope, the evaluator should assess outcome achievements based on the revised results framework. In instances where the scope of the project objectives and outcomes has been scaled down, the magnitude of and necessity for downscaling is taken into account and despite achievement of results as per the revised results framework, where appropriate, a lower outcome effectiveness rating may be given.

PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION AND EXECUTION

Quality of implementation and of execution will be rated separately. Quality of implementation pertains to the role and responsibilities discharged by the GEF Agencies that have direct access to GEF resources. Quality of Execution pertains to the roles and responsibilities discharged by the country or regional counterparts that received GEF funds from the GEF Agencies and executed the funded activities on ground. The performance will be rated on a six-point scale:

Rating	Description
Highly satisfactory (HS)	<i>There were no shortcomings and quality of implementation or execution exceeded expectations.</i>
Satisfactory (S)	<i>There were no or minor shortcomings and quality of implementation or execution meets expectations.</i>
Moderately satisfactory (MS)	<i>There were some shortcomings and quality of implementation or execution more or less meets expectations.</i>
Moderately unsatisfactory (MU)	<i>There were significant shortcomings and quality of implementation or execution somewhat lower than expected.</i>
Unsatisfactory (U)	<i>There were major shortcomings and quality of implementation substantially lower than expected.</i>
Highly unsatisfactory (HU)	<i>There were severe shortcomings in quality of implementation or execution.</i>
Unable to assess (UA)	<i>The available information does not allow an assessment of the quality of implementation or execution.</i>

MONITORING AND EVALUATION

1. Quality of project M&E will be assessed in terms of:
 - i. design
 - ii. implementation

SUSTAINABILITY

The sustainability will be assessed taking into account the risks related to financial, socio-political, institutional, and environmental sustainability of project outcomes. The evaluator may also take other risks into account that may affect sustainability. The overall sustainability will be assessed using a four-point scale:

Rating	Description
Likely (L)	<i>There is little or no risk to sustainability.</i>
Moderately likely (ML)	<i>There are moderate risks to sustainability.</i>
Moderately unlikely (MU)	<i>There are significant risks to sustainability.</i>
Unlikely (U)	<i>There are severe risks to sustainability.</i>
Unable to assess (UA)	<i>Unable to assess the expected incidence and magnitude of risks to sustainability.</i>

Office of Evaluation
evaluation@fao.org
www.fao.org/evaluation

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
Rome, Italy



Some rights reserved. This work is available
under a CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO licence.