***Terms of Reference***

International Consultant – Terminal Evaluation of the UNDP/GEF “Improving the Coverage and Management Efficiency of Protected Areas in the Steppe Biome of Russia” Project (PIMS 4194).

**Type of Contract:** IC (International Consultant)

**Location:** Home-based, one field trip to the Russian Federation, including Moscow (3 working days), Orenburg (4 working days) and Chita (5 working days)

**Duration**: Estimated September-October 2016 (30 working days)

**Languages Required:** English

**Application Deadline:** 31 May 2016

**Background**

In accordance with UNDP and GEF monitoring and evaluation policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP-supported GEF-financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) set out the expectations for a terminal evaluation (TE) of the “Improving the Coverage and Management Efficiency of Protected Areas in the Steppe Biome of Russia” Project (PIMS 4194).

The essentials of the project to be evaluated are as follows:

**Project Summary Table:**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Title: | Improving the Coverage and Management Efficiency of Protected Areas in the Steppe Biome of Russia | | | |
| GEF Project ID: | 3745 |  | *At endorsement (million US$)* | *At completion (million US$)* |
| UNDP Project ID: | 4194 | GEF financing: | 5.31 | N/A |
| Country: | Russian Federation | IA/EA own: | 0.01 | N/A |
| Region: | ECA | Government: | 14.20 | N/A |
| Focal Area: | Biodiversity | Other: | 0.69 | N/A |
| FA Objectives: | GEF-4: SO-1, SP-3  GEF-5: SO-1, Outcome 1.1 | Total co-financing: | 14.90 | N/A |
| Executing Agency: | Federal Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment | Total Project Cost: | 20.21 | N/A |
| Other Partners Involved: | Implementing entity (for financial management): Non-commercial Partnership for Zapovedniks (Partnyorstvo dlya Zapovednikov) | ProDoc Signature (date project began): | | February 27, 2010 |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | Proposed: February 28, 2017 | Actual: N/A |

The project objective is to develop the capacity and ecologically based enabling tools and mechanisms for the consolidation, expansion and disturbance based integrated management of a system of protected areas (PA) at the landscape level within the steppe biome. The three main outcomes of the project are:

* consolidation and expansion of the system of steppe protected areas (SPA);
* strengthened operational management capacities for PA site management; and
* strengthened institutional management capacities for managing an expanded PA system.

The project is designed to improve management effectiveness of a network of 15 SPA across Russia covering over 1.8 million hectares. The project will expand this system and its coverage of steppe ecosystems by nearly 50% or 867,400 hectares through:

* consolidating three zakazniks into Chernye Zemli Zapovednik in Kalmykia, expanding the zapovednik by 496,200 hectares;
* facilitating the expansion or establishment of five SPA in Kursk, Orenburg and Dauria regions covering additional 305,200 hectares; and
* creating the enabling environment for the protection of additional 30,000 hectares of steppe ecosystems in the Orenburg steppe.

Cumulatively, these results represent an important step in securing the long-term conservation of globally significant northern temperate grassland/steppe ecosystems, one of the least protected biomes in the world.

Project location: Russian Federation

Project pilot sites: Kursk Oblast, Orenburg Region, Zabaykalsky Krai (Dauria), Republic of Kalmykia

The implementation of project activities is coordinated by the Project implementation Unit based in Moscow. The overall management of the project is the responsibility of Project Manager, who is a full time employee of the project.

The project was launched in 2010 and was supposed to be implemented within five years. Given the late start and funds availability, the project was recommended for an extension until February 28th 2017. The project funding provided by the GEF amounts to USD US$ 5,304,545. Pledged co-financing is estimated at USD 14,900,000.

The project is implemented by the Government of Russia (GOR) represented by the federal Ministry of Natural Resources & Environment (MNRE) and operates according to UNDP National Implementation Modality (NIM).

Project website: <http://savesteppe.org/>

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP evaluation guidance for GEF financed projects. The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

**Evaluation approach and methodology**

An overall approach and methodology for conducting project TEs of UNDP- supported GEF-financed projects has developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact,** as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR ([*Annex C*](#_TOR_Annex_C:)) The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP project support office, project team, UNDP/GEF technical adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Moscow and project pilot sites, tentatively Orenburg State Nature Reserve and Daurian State Nature Reserve in Zabaykalsky Krai. Interviews will be held with the Federal Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment and all major stakeholders.

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in [Annex B](#_TOR_Annex_B:) of this Terms of Reference.

**Evaluation criteria and ratings**

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see  [Annex A](#AnnexA)), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact.** Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in  [Annex D](#_TOR_Annex_D:).

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Ratings:** | | | |
| **1. Monitoring and Evaluation** | ***rating*** | **2. IA& EA Execution** | ***rating*** |
| M&E design at entry |  | Quality of UNDP Implementation |  |
| M&E Plan Implementation |  | Quality of Execution - Executing Agency |  |
| Overall quality of M&E |  | Overall quality of Implementation / Execution |  |
| **3. Assessment of Outcomes** | ***rating*** | **4. Sustainability** | ***rating*** |
| Relevance |  | Financial resources: |  |
| Effectiveness |  | Socio-political: |  |
| Efficiency |  | Institutional framework and governance: |  |
| Overall Project Outcome Rating |  | Environmental : |  |
|  |  | Overall likelihood of sustainability: |  |

**Project Financing / Co-financing**

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Project Support Office (PSO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

**Impact**

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impact or progressing towards the achievement of impact. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.[[1]](#footnote-1)

**Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons**

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions**, **recommendations** and **lessons**.

**Implementation Arrangements**

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP Project Support Office (PSO) in the Russian Federation. The UNDP PSO will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

**Evaluation timeframe**

The total duration of the evaluation will be up to two months, with up to 30 working days, distributed according to the following plan:

* Preparation: 4 working days (tentatively, 14-17 September 2016);
* Field mission to the Russian Federation: 12 working days, excluding travel (tentatively, 19 September – 1 October 2016);
* Development of draft evaluation report: 10 working days (tentatively, 3 - 12 October 2016);
* Finalization of terminal evaluation report: 4 working days (tentatively, 27-30 October 2016).

The assignment envisages international travel to Moscow, Russian Federation and two domestic field visits to the project sites in Orenburg and Chita.

**Evaluation deliverables**

The evaluator is expected to submit 3 key deliverables:

* Presentation of the initial findings by 2 October 2016 (tentatively);
* Draft evaluation report (see [Annex F](#AnnexF) for template) by 13 October 2016 (tentatively);
* Final report by 31 October 2016 (tentatively), provided that all comments to draft evaluation report are submitted by UNDP within two weeks.

When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluator is also required to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report.

**Duty Station**

The consultant’s duty station/location: home-based, with the following travel arrangements:

**Travel:**

* International travel to Russia (Moscow) and domestic to Orenburg and Chita during the mission;
* The Basic Security in the Field II and Advanced Security in the Field courses must be successfully completed prior to commencement of travel;
* Individual Consultants are responsible for ensuring they have vaccinations/inoculations when travelling to certain countries, as designated by the UN Medical Director.
* Consultants are required to comply with the UN security directives set forth under <https://dss.un.org/dssweb/>

**Competencies**

Corporate Competencies:

* Demonstrates integrity by modeling the UN’s values and ethical standards;
* Promotes the vision, mission, and strategic goals of UNDP;
* Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability.

Functional competencies:

* Strong interpersonal skills, communication skills and ability to work in a team;
* Ability to plan and organize work, efficiency in meeting commitments, observing deadlines and achieving results;
* Openness to change and ability to receive/integrate feedback;
* Ability to work under pressure and stressful situations;
* Strong analytical, research, reporting and writing abilities.

**Required skills and experience**

***Education***

A Master’s degree in environmental science, or other closely related field; PhD will be considered as an advantage.

***Relevant experience:***

* Minimum 10 years of professional experience in biodiversity conservation and protected areas management;
* Previous experience in results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies application to GEF projects.

***Language skills***

Excellent English (both oral and written).

***Conflict of interest:***

To ensure impartiality and objectivity of the evaluation, as well as to avoid the conflict of interest, UNDP will not consider the applications from the candidates that have had prior involvement in the design, formulation, implementation or evaluation of the above-indicated project.

**Evaluation procedure**

Individual consultants will be evaluated based on a cumulative analysis taking into consideration the combination of the applicants’ qualifications and financial proposal. The award of the contract shall be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

* Responsive, compliant, acceptable;
* Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation.

***Technical criteria*** - ***70% of total evaluation – max. 70 points:***

* A Master’s degree in environmental science, or other closely related field; PhD will be considered as an advantage (maximum 15 points);
* Minimum 10years of professional experience in biodiversity conservation and protected areas management (maximum 20 points);
* Previous experience in results‐based monitoring and evaluation methodologies application to GEF-financed projects (maximum 30 points);
* Excellent English (maximum 5 points).

***Financial criteria*** ***- 30% of total evaluation – max 30 points***.

Only candidates passing the 70% threshold for the technical proposal will be considered for the financial evaluation.

The candidate with the highest score from technical criteria + financial criteria will be selected with the maximum score possible being 100 points.

**Application procedure**

Recommended presentation of offer:

1. Completed letter of confirmation of interest and availabilityusing the [template](https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx) provided by UNDP. Please paste the letter into the "Resume and Motivation" section of the electronic application;
2. CV or a UNDP Personal History form (P11)available athttp://europeandcis.undp.org/files/hrforms/P11\_modified\_for\_SCs\_and\_ICs.doc, indicating all past experience, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the candidate and three professional references;
3. Financial proposal that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price, supported by a breakdown of costs. The breakdown should contain: professional fee for home-based work (number of working days), professional fee for work on mission (number of working days), travel costs (international and local travel and per diems). Per diems cannot exceed maximum UN daily allowance rates and consultants are encouraged to bid lower amount to make their offers more competitive.

Please note that the professional fee is all-inclusive and shall take into account various expenses incurred by the consultant/contractor during the contract period (e.g. fee, health insurance, vaccination and any other relevant expenses related to the performance of service, etc.). All envisaged international travel costs must be included in the financial proposal.

If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under reimbursable loan agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

Incomplete applications will not be considered. Please make sure you have provided all requested materials.

Payments will be made only upon confirmation of UNDP on delivering on the contract obligations in a satisfactory manner.

Individual consultants are responsible for ensuring they have vaccinations/inoculations when travelling to certain countries, as designated by the UN Medical Director. Consultants are also required to comply with the UN security directives set forth under dss.un.org

General terms and conditions as well as other related documents can be found under: http://on.undp.org/t7fJs

Qualified women and members of minorities are encouraged to apply.

Due to large number of applications we receive, we are able to inform only the successful candidates about the outcome or status of the selection process.

**Evaluation Ethics**

Evaluation consultant will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct ([Annex E](#AnnexE)) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the [UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'](http://www.unevaluation.org/ethicalguidelines)

**Annex A: Logical Framework Matrix**

| **Description** | **Description of Indicator** | **Baseline Level** | **Target Level at end of project** | **Sources of verification and comments** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Objective: To develop the capacity and ecologically based enabling, tools and mechanisms for the consolidation, expansion and disturbance based integrated management of a system of protected natural areas at the landscape level within the steppe biome | Steppe area under protection expanded: | 1,605,529 ha | 2,472,929 ha | The baseline figure is corrected as during the calculations at the PPG stage some PAs were assessed with buffer zones and some without ones. The correct baseline figure is 1,605,529 ha (including buffer zones and excluding three consolidated SPAs to avoid double-counting of the latter). Consequently, the end-of-project target value should be 2,472,929 ha to reflect the same desired increase in PA coverage as declared in the Prodoc. |
|  |  | (+ 867,400 ha) |  |
| (1.a) Area of consolidated new SPA: |  | 496,200 ha | The project PPG stage initiated and played major catalytic role for the process of consolidation of the three federal zakazniks in Kalmykia under the management authority of the Chernye Zemli reserve. There are doubts that without pledges given at the PPG stage to support the reserve’s capacity to patrol the extended territory, the consolidation would have taken place, and in such a short timeframe. Therefore, consolidation of these PAs is considered among key project results.  “Dolina Dzerena” federal refuge (under management authority with the Daursky reserve) is shown only as a newly created PA under 1b, to avoid double counting as both new and consolidated PA. Therefore, technically, the target value for the consolidated PAs is achieved. |
| (1.b) Additional area new SPA created |  | 335,200 ha | 30,000 ha is added to the target figure. It is transferred from former “Enabling environment” category as recommended by the MTR |
| - Enabling environment created for new SPA: | 0 | 30,000 ha. | This category should be dropped while the figure is added to the category (1b). |
| - SMSA covering | 0 | 36,000 ha | This category is dropped. |
| Threat Reduction Assessment (TRA), % (the first figure is for the region, second one for the pilot SPA) | Kalmykia – 0 (0) Kursk – 0 (0) Orenburg – 0 (0) Dauria – 0 (0) | Positive trends towards the end of the project | The indicator is added as it was recommended after the MTR |
| a) Number of SPA in Kursk pilot where feathergrass dominates.  b) Coverage of feathergrass on sampling sites | a)1 Federal PA (Central-Chernozem Reserve) consisting of 6 plots in 4 of which feathergrass dominates.   No regional PAs.  b)Baseline on 4 sampling sites: Streletskaya steppe – 5% Kazatskaya steppe fallow land – 7% Bukreevy Barmy – 15% Barkalovka – 9%. | a) Same or increased number of SPAs.     b)Same level of coverage in sampling sites. | Reference to Orenburg in the description of the indicator is deleted as confirmed by MTR (domination of feathergrass in Orenburg is not indicative for the assessment of steppe ecosystem health)  The indicator is intended to show maintenance of or increase in ecosystem quality and quantity for feathergrass species in Kursk, which are typical of the project-targeted meadow steppe ecosystem in Kursk.  The term “dominates” means here a species (or a group of ones, “feathergrass” is actually group of several species) forms more than 5% of the total vegetation coverage  The target refers to the number of sites, as well as maintenance of the feathergrass coverage % at the sampling sites. Maintaining or increasing the baseline coverage is indicative of proper management (mowing, appropriate grazing levels, etc.) for the PAs specified.  The area of each sampling site was 100 sq.m and the reserve plots areas are: Streletskaya steppe – 2046 ha Kazatskaya steppe fallow land – 1638 ha Bukreevy Barmy – 259 ha Barkalovka – 368 ha |
| a)The number of sites where Spring Adonis occurs (Kursk)  b)Density of Adonis on sampling sites (Kursk) | a)4 sites within Central-Chernozem Reserve; also sporadically occurs outside the PAs    b)Optimal average density registered at ‘Streletskaya steppe’ plot (in areas used as pastures): 0.52 per 1 m2 (sampling areas are 100 m2 taking as 100 m \* 0,2 m \* 5 repeats);  For other areas does not exceed 0.28 per 1 m2 | Stable pop or within +/- 20% of Long-Term Mean (LTM). | This indicator is for assessment of management effectiveness on 4,311 hectares of 4 (out of 6) plots of CCZ reserve. The Adonis target density (0.5 per m2) is achieved under optimal grazing pressure.  The timeframe for the “long-term” mean 40 years prior the project started (since 1970). Adonis density is regularly assessed under four management regimes. It varies from 10 to 134 plants per 100 m2  Baseline figure corrected taking into account MTR recommendation to reflect the LTM as a baseline and not the year 1 data: the LTM is a 5 year period when the density was relatively unchanging |
| Population # of little bustard and density/km2 during nesting season (Orenburg) and migration (Kalmykia) | Orenburg 2,000 Kalmykia 4,000 Density to be identified in year 1  Population data reassessed in year 1:  Orenburg 14,000-17,000  Kalmykia 609 (390-828)  Density identified in year 1:  Orenburg 0.1975 unit/km2 during nesting  Kalmykia 0.134 unit/km2 during migration | Stable or increasing population relative to year 1, as assessed over a minimum 3 year period (three last years of the project) | This refers to the population in the entire area surrounding the zapovedniks in these two regions, not just within the boundaries of the zapovedniks  MTR recommended clarifying that the population is stable or increasing over at least a 3-5 year period, not just the population in the final year of the project. |
| Steppe Eagle - # and density/km2 during nesting season (Kalmykia / Orenburg / Dauria) and in migration (Kalmykia). | Kalmykia 500 pairs Orenburg 250 Dauria 125 Density to be identified in year 1.  Data from year 1:  Density during nesting  Kalmykia – 1.277 unit/100km2  Orenburg – 2.88/100km2 (2,26-3,68)  Dauria – 1.14/100km2 (0,83-1,56) | Stable or increasing population relative to year 1, as assessed over a minimum 3 year period (three last years of the project) | MTR recommended to revise the target value as “stable population relative to year 1, as assessed over a minimum 3 year period” |
| Number of avoided bird death resulting from installation of bird protection equipment on powerlines | Death rate on powerlines:  Orenburg – not less than 0.7 dead eagles per km per year;  Kalmykia – not less than 1.13 and 0.78 dead eagles and buzzards per km per year  Dauria - not less than 0.24 dead buzzards and sakers (together) per km per year | Death rate reduction 90% | The indicator is added as it was recommended after the MTR  Death rate was assessed for the only powerlines which are situated near SPAs and had to be protected in the first place |
| Mongolian antelope in Daursky Zapovednik - population # and share of young in population. | 2,500 animals  35% young | 5,000 Stable pop or within +/- 20% of LTM. | “Long-term mean” baseline value is based on the censuses conducted yearly 5 years prior to the project.  Project goal is an increasing population from project start to the minimal viable population level. Experts assess it as 5000 individuals with the high birth rate (that means further increase to the optimal number corresponding with the currying capacity of suitable habitats). |
| Saiga antelope in CZZ / Kalmykia – population # and share of males in population. | 15,000 animals 6% males | Population stable or within +/- 20% of LTM.  15-20% males | Project goal is an increasing (or at least ~stable) population from project start, not necessarily achievement of a return to historical population (at least not by the end of the project).  The baseline value is an expert assessments during 2005-2009, as there was no census in that period. Therefore, the reliable LTM value is difficult to recover. Census conducted in 2011 and also 2013 both show 10,000-12,000 animals which is an indication of a stable population.  According to MTE comments, below is clarification of the census timing and methodology, which explains the shifts in male % of population during the year. The data is provided based on summer season census. Share of males in population is decreasing during autumn-winter seasons due to (1) shooting of males, and (2) males natural mortality to 1-1,5% after estrum during winter season.  It should also be clarified that even though mainly males are being killed, the natural recruitment of males is adequate to increase the % of males in the population even though the overall population is decreasing. Small share of males preconditions 75% of females not being involved in breeding process. Hence population size is constantly decreasing. Meanwhile, share of males is unlikely to decrease down to less than 6% through shooting as they are very hard to detect due to the scarce abundance.  It should also be specified that the natural % of males in the population is 25-30%, and this would be the desired normative status long-term goal for this indicator. However, even the ratio of 15-20% is enough for population size to be considered stable. The target value for male ratio is adjusted accordingly. |
| Manul in Zabaikalsky Krai | - 2500 animals in all the region  - 200 animals in the Daursky reserve | Stable or increasing long-term population trend (over at least 3 years), and/or + / - 50% of the LTM at project completion | The baseline level for the indicator was revised to include both the population in the region overall, and the population inside the Daurian reserve (200 animals)  Target clarified as suggested by MTR. |
|  | Direct impact on improved effectiveness in pilot sites = improved management in 489,782 ha through METT Score. | Centralno- Chernozem -53 | Centralno- Chernozem - 74 | According to the MTR recommendations:  a) this indicator is upscaled to the level of Objective;  b) Three federal zakazniks in Kalmykia, as well as newly established regional PAs are moved here from the indicator on the indirect impact on PA management effectiveness, as the proect is providing direct impact on raising management effectiveness for these PAs  с) The METT score target for Orenburg is revised to be inline with the 40%-50% range increase for the other PAs, which would equate to a target of approximately 75 (instead of 90 previously indicated).  d) it was agreed with MTR that the target is set based on a rationalized analysis of the METT for each PA to assess reasonable and achievable goals by the end of the project (this actually appears to be the case for the original target METT scores, as the target scores do not conform to a single % increase calculation). As recommended, targets were re-calculated |
| Chernye Zemli - 42 | Chernye Zemli - 67 |
| Orenburgskiy - 52 | Orenburgskiy - 75 |
| Daurskiy - 49 | Daurskiy - 75 |
|  |  |
| Outcome 1: Consolidation and expansion of SPA system. | Area of SPA in the process of establishment. | 0 | 50,400 hectares | As recommended by the MTR, in reporting on this indicator the project should clearly distinguish between hectares of PAs “established” and those still in the process of establishment. Therefore, here only the PA in the process of establishment are calculated. Target value is revised accordingly. |
| Area/share (# ha) of PA correctly documented per the Land Code (surveyed, PA regime entered in the Property Register & State Register of Immovable Property Rights and Transactions). | Kursk: 0 ha | Kursk: at least 3,000 ha |  |
| Kalmykia: 0 | Kalmykia: at least 200,000 ha (not regional) |  |
| Orenburg: 0 | Orenburg: at least 20,000 ha |  |
| Dauria: 0 | Dauria: at least 500,000 ha |  |
| # of ha of steppe ecosystems conserved under contractual conditions or other obligations, without direct government involvement. | 0 | 36000 | As recommended ин the MTR the indicator is dropped |
| # of possessors of land ownership rights (farmers and/or subsurface users) that have undertaken voluntary obligations to conserve steppe | 0 | At least 5 by EoP | As recommended ин the MTR the indicator is dropped |
| # of draft regulatory acts submitted to a legislative branch and # of standard-setting initiatives formally entered on govt agenda. | 0 | 4 | These are amendments to legislation, not full original laws |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Outcome 2: SPA know how for critical ecologically-based site management is strengthened. | Indirect impact on improved management effectiveness in 1.9 million hectares of SPA through METT Score. | (see scores below) | +20% (see scores below) | The target values were identified based on UNDP and the MNRE’s previous years of experience using the METT in GEF projects in Russia, and is based on the project’s feasible contribution to reaching the level of METT score necessary for steppe PAs to achieve their biodiversity conservation objectives.  MTR is recommended to be reset as +40 -50%. However, we believe that for the PAs receiving only indirect support from the project (as oppose to the pilot PAs listed above) the realistic target is +20% |
|  | Zapovedniks -  Belogorye - 52 Galichya Gora - 45  Privolzhskaya Lesostep - 56 Rostovskiy - 67 Ubsunurskaya Kotlovina - 51 | Zapovedniks - Belogorye - 62 Galichya Gora - 54 Privolzhskaya Lesostep - 67 Rostovskiy - 80  Ubsunurskaya Kotlovina - 61 |
|  | National Parks Pribaikalskiy - 34 | National Parks: Pribaikalskiy - 40 |
| IFM demonstration through full implementation  Number of steppe PA management authorities that have formally discussed the potential use and development of an IFM | 0  0 | 1 IFM  3 pilots plus 3 other SPA = 6. | The indicator is reformulated as was recommended by the MTR. A replication dimension to the indicator is added. |
| % reduction in area swept by ecologically & economically destructive grassland fires within pilot PA during hazardous seasons April/May– Sept/Oct. | Centralno-Chernozem –100 ha/yr (2.1%)  Chernye Zemli – 17500 ha/yr (15%)  Orenburgskiy –3200 ha/yr (15%) Daurskiy – 2300 ha/yr (15% of terrestrial area) | 50% reduction by EoP |  |
| # of SPA incorporating sustainable grazing best practice into their management regime for steppe areas. | 1 | At least three pilots. | For many SPAs managers and experts grazing is still very complicated and controversial management practice. We can see it from the sharp public discussion organized in the last issues of the Steppe Bulletin. The project is preparing a manual on grazing as a management instrument and master-plan for implementation it. The manual and master-plan will be presented in November 2014. But we have no possibility (and no intention) to impose anybody to implement it. |
| # of hectares involved in rehabilitation and restoration activities in/around SPA | 0 | At least 10,000 ha of grassland habitat under rehabilitation in selected sites | As recommended after the MTR the indicator is dropped |
| Outcome 3. Strengthened SPA system effectively captures knowledge and enables replication of best practice. | Steppe PA management by-laws and regulations (including SPA statutes) revised to include steppe-specific context, and eliminate non-steppe relevant regulations | 1 | 4 or more documents. | The indicator and its target value are reformulated as recommended by the MTR. |
| MNRE SPA Capacity Scorecard | (see categories and scores below) | (see categories and scores below) |  |
| Policy formulation  Systemic  Institutional | Policy Formulation 3 / 6 2 / 3 | Policy Formulation 5 / 6 2 / 3 |  |
| Implementation  Systemic  Institutional   Individual | Implementation 3 / 9 10 / 27 6 / 12 | Implementation 7 / 9 20 / 27 8 / 12 |  |
| Engagement & consensus  Systemic  Institutional   Individual | Eng. & consensus 3 / 6 2 / 6 1 / 3 | Eng. & consensus 5 / 6 4 / 6 2 / 3 |  |
| Info & knowledge  Systemic  Institutional   Individual | Info & knowledge 2 / 3 2 / 3 1 / 3 | Info & knowledge 3 / 3 3 / 3 2 / 3 |  |
| Monitoring  Systemic  Institutional   Individual | Monitoring 3 / 6 2 / 6 1 / 3 | Monitoring 4 / 6 4 / 6 2 / 3 |  |
| % improvement of SPA staff understanding of key steppe issues (grazing, fire, species conservation, agricultural context) before/after training. | TBD at beginning of each training workshop | At least + 25% in scoring at end of each training workshop | MTR recommended to conduct follow-up survey with training participants six months after training to assess if/how knowledge is actually applied in professional duties. |
| # of scientific / methodological publications (incl. Internet-based) based on / related to the project activities | 0 | At least 50 | As MTR recommended reporting on this indicator should specify the number of publications produced in peer-reviewed scientific journals or other sources.  Project has predominantly effect-oriented outputs as opposed to the academic articles published in peer-reviewed scientific journals. Therefore, as of today, Project has not produced scientific publications for peer-reviewed journals. However, taking into account the MTR recommendation, Project will facilitate publication of academic articles produced by the Project experts through granting the translation and editing services for the articles to comply with requirements of peer-reviewed journals. |
| Size of circulation for key steppe conservation such as Steppe Bulletin. | Current circulation - 1500 printed and 1300 circulated through mail. | 2000 printed and 1700 through mail | MTR suggested that the project explains the value of the target results so that one could brainstorm a logic chain with publication of the bulletin leading to actual conservation of steppe biodiversity. Accordingly, the project experts made an assessment of the number of the institutions and the key experts in steppe conservation in Russia (all ones - scientific, governmental, NGO, SPA administrations, etc). It is not more than 1000 persons and organizations. The steppe conservation professional community in other Russian-speaking countries (Kazakhstan, Ukraine, Moldova, Mongolia, etc) can be assessed in 500-600 entities. Thus our aim in supporting the SB is to cover all the community with the SB circulation. Actually the aim is achieving at 80-90% (1450 copies totally and about 1000 in Russia).  The circulation size is stable (not increasing) as we found no need to increase the circulation further. Such rise would have no sense because all reachable recipients are already covered. Sporadic new ones are adding without increase of number of printed copies. |
| # of visits of the steppe conservation website. | Current level of monthly site visitation 0 | # of visits up to 15,000 a month | According to the MTR recommendation, the following assessment has been made. We assessed visitation rates for appropriate thematic group of Russian-language web-sites presented in three main ratings for Russian segment of Internet. We found 15000 visits per month is a relatively good level of visitation, placing at first third or even quarter (for different ratings) of the list. |

Annex B: List of Documents to be reviewed by the evaluator

* Project document
* Inception Report
* Annual Project Implementation Reports
* Tracking tools
* Mid-term evaluation report
* Management response to Mid-Term evaluation report
* Project Steering Committee meeting minutes
* Notes from project monitoring missions
* Financial management documents, such as project budget revisions and audit reports
* Various reports and documents available on the project website/with the PIU

Annex C: Evaluation Questions

*This is a generic list, to be further elaborated during the evaluation mission.*

| **Evaluative Criteria Questions** | | **Indicators** | **Sources** | **Methodology** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels? | | | | |
|  | * Did the project’s objectives fit GEF strategic priorities? |  |  |  |
|  | * Did the project’s objectives fit within national priorities, priorities of the local government and local communities? |  |  |  |
|  | * Do the project’s objectives support implementation of the relevant multi-lateral environmental agreement? |  |  |  |
| Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? | | | | | |
|  | * To what extent have the project Objective and Outcomes have been achieved? | * Logframe indicators at the level of project Objective and Outcomes achieved as planned/otherwise | * Project Logframe, last year PIR |  | |
|  | * How did stakeholder involvement and public awareness contribute to the achievement of project objective and outcomes? | * Stakeholder pools from the project show raise of interest to project objective and activities; corresponding Logframe indicator values show progress as planned; interview with the project management and key stakeholders confirmed/otherwise PM reports on stakeholder involvement | * Last year PIR, Project Logframe, interviews |  | |
|  | * Which were the key factors that contributed to project success/underachievement; can positive key factors be replicated in other cases, or could negative factors have been anticipated and minimized? |  |  |  | |
| Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards? | | | | | |
|  | * Was the project cost-effective? In case its implementation was delayed, did that affect cost-effectiveness? Were expenditures in line with international standards and norms? Was co-financing received at the level anticipated in the project document? | * Project expenditures for each of the outcomes correspond with rates agreed in the project document; project management costs did not exceed acceptable levels; project audits revealed no questionable costs and/or violation of procurement, financial and HR administration rules | * Project financial statements, co-financing reports, PIRs, NIM audit reports |  | |
|  | * Was the project management effective? Were there any particular challenges with the management process? Did the project Steering Committee provide the anticipated input and support to project management? Were risks assessed in time and adequately dealt with? Was the level of communication and support from the implementing agency adequate and appropriate? | * Project management arrangements contributed/otherwise to attainment of project objective and outcomes, and were implemented according to the established principles and procedures | * Interviews with key project stakeholders, incl. National Implementing Agency and UNDP; project risk log, project Steering Committee minutes |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
| Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? | | | | | |
|  | * What is the likelihood that any required financial resources will be available to sustain the project results once the GEF funding is over? | * Major project endeavors (such as financial instruments, institutional arrangements, infrastructure support) will get financial support and be maintained without GEF funding | * Interviews with stakeholders, project reports, financial data if available |  | |
|  | * What is the likelihood that institutional and technical achievements, legal framework, policies and governance structures and processes will allow for the project results to be sustained? Are there key institutional and governance risks to sustainability? | Major institutional changes, technical solutions, legal framework amendments get strong support at policy and decision-making levels | Interviews with stakeholders, project reports, |  | |
|  | * Are there any environmental risks that can undermine the post-project impact and global environment benefits? |  |  |  | |
| **Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?** | | | | | |
|  | * Did the project achieve its planned impacts? Why or why not? |  |  |  | |
|  | * Which where the key lessons learned in course of project implementation? |  |  |  | |

Annex D: Rating Scales

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution*** | ***Sustainability ratings:*** | ***Relevance ratings*** |
| 6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings  5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings  4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS)  3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings  2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems  1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems | 4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability | 2. Relevant (R) |
| 3. Moderately Likely (ML):moderate risks | 1.. Not relevant (NR) |
| 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks  1. Unlikely (U): severe risks | ***Impact Ratings:***  3. Significant (S)  2. Minimal (M)  1. Negligible (N) |
| *Additional ratings where relevant:*  Not Applicable (N/A)  Unable to Assess (U/A | | |

Annex E: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form

**Evaluators:**

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people’s right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people’s right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders’ dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form[[2]](#footnote-2)**

**Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System**

**Name of Consultant:** \_\_     \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Name of Consultancy Organization** (where relevant)**:** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.**

Signed at *place* on *date*

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Annex F: Evaluation Report Outline[[3]](#footnote-3)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **i.** | Opening page:   * Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project * UNDP and GEF project ID#s. * Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report * Region and countries included in the project * GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program * Implementing Partner and other project partners * Evaluation team members * Acknowledgements |
| **ii.** | Executive Summary   * Project Summary Table * Project Description (brief) * Evaluation Rating Table * Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons |
| **iii.** | Acronyms and Abbreviations  (See: UNDP Editorial Manual[[4]](#footnote-4)) |
| **1.** | Introduction   * Purpose of the evaluation * Scope & Methodology * Structure of the evaluation report |
| **2.** | Project description and development context   * Project start and duration * Problems that the project sought to address * Immediate and development objectives of the project * Baseline Indicators established * Main stakeholders * Expected Results |
| **3.** | Findings  (In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) must be rated[[5]](#footnote-5)) |
| **3.1** | Project Design / Formulation   * Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators) * Assumptions and Risks * Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design * Planned stakeholder participation * Replication approach * UNDP comparative advantage * Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector * Management arrangements |
| **3.2** | Project Implementation   * Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation) * Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region) * Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management * Project Finance: * Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (\*) * UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (\*) coordination, and operational issues |
| **3.3** | Project Results   * Overall results (attainment of objectives) (\*) * Relevance(\*) * Effectiveness & Efficiency (\*) * Country ownership * Mainstreaming * Sustainability (\*) * Impact |
| **4.** | Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons   * Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project * Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project * Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives * Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success |
| **5.** | Annexes   * ToR * Itinerary * List of persons interviewed * Summary of field visits * List of documents reviewed * Evaluation Question Matrix * Questionnaire used and summary of results * Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form |

Annex G: Evaluation Report Clearance Form

*(to be completed by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and included in the final document)*

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

UNDP GEF RTA

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office:  [ROTI Handbook 2009](http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/M2_ROtI%20Handbook.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)