****

**Terms of Reference (ToR)**

**Terminal Evaluation**

**Strengthening Capacity to Control the Introduction and Spread of Alien Invasive Species in Sri Lanka**

Location: Sri Lanka

Application Deadline: 31st January 2017

Category: Energy and Environment

Type of Contract: Individual Contract

Assignment Type: International Consultant

Languages Required: English

Starting Date: 20th February 2017

Duration of Initial Contract: 20th February – 31st March 2017 (15 days in Sri Lanka)

Expected Duration of Assignment: 24 working days from February to March 2017

1. Background

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the Project *‘*Strengthening capacity to control the introduction and spread of alien invasive species in Sri Lanka’ (PIMS 3013)

1. Objective and Scope

The project was designed to: Sri Lanka’s geographic location, varied climatic conditions and topography have given rise to its unique biological diversity. The country’s globally significant biodiversity is being threatened by increasing introduction, establishment and spread of invasive alien fauna and flora. Weak and overlapping legislative and institutional mandates, the lack of a coherent or integrated strategic planning and management framework combined with limited information base and awareness of the threat posed by invasive alien species (IAS) are contributing to the loss of biodiversity as well as undermining associated economic processes and human well-being. As Sri Lankan markets become increasingly integrated into the global economy and in the face of biodiversity loss and ecosystem degradation, it is likely that the threats posed by invasion will worsen in the future – as would their impacts on the natural environment, human production systems and pro-poor economic growth.

The project aims to generate substantial benefits at the national and global levels on biodiversity conservation and human and economic well-being. The ecological services from biodiversity that are necessary for livelihoods and agricultural production will be sustained, benefitting primarily the poor whose livelihoods depend on healthy ecosystems. The project makes a major contribution to the global environment by safeguarding Sri Lanka’s globally important biodiversity, including reducing the risks to endemic species, unique and threatened ecosystems and protected areas. It is also anticipated that by improving the control of the export of potentially invasive species out of Sri Lanka, the project will reduce the threats to biodiversity in other parts of the world and risks to production and trade which are important to the economies and livelihoods in other countries.

Following are the main outcomes expected from the project:

Outcome 1: A comprehensive national regulatory framework for the control of IAS in Sri Lanka is in place

Outcome 2: A well-coordinated institutional mechanism is in place for integrated planning and decision making at national and local levels with greater access to information on the status, threat and means of controlling IAS

Outcome 3: Decision makers at national and local levels are aware of cost-effective IAS controls being implemented at national and local levels, best practices are shared and stakeholders’ capacities strengthened

The project is executed by the Biodiversity Secretariat of the Ministry of Mahaweli Development and Environment of Sri Lanka in close cooperation with national level line agencies and research institutes, provincial councils, national and local NGOs and community representatives.

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.

1. Evaluation approach and method

An overall approach and method[[1]](#footnote-1) for conducting project terminal evaluations 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 (*fill in* [*Annex C*](#_TOR_Annex_C:)) The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it 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 Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Colombo, Kaluthara, Hambantota, Kandy, Polonnaruwa, Nuwara Eliya, Trincomalee, Puttalam including the following project sites in those districts. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: Forest Department, Department of Wild Life Conservation, Department of Agriculture, Department of Irrigation, Marine Environment Protection Agency, Department of Botanical Gardens, Land Reclamation and Development Authority and Sri Lanka Forest Institute.

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.

1. Evaluation Criteria & 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](#_TOR_Annex_A:)), 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 finance / cofinance

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 Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financingsection.

Mainstreaming

UNDP supported GEF financed projects are key components in UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programmes. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender.

Impact

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. 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.[[2]](#footnote-2)

Conclusions, recommendations & lessons

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

**5. Competencies**

**Technical work**

Strong expertise in Environmental Management

Evaluation experience related to the national level multi-disciplinary projects

Familiarity with the International Conventions addressing Biodiversity Conservation. Climate Change, Desertification

**Partnerships**

Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability.

Maturity and confidence in dealing with senior members of national institutions.

Excellent written communication skills, with analytical capacity and ability to synthesize relevant collected data and findings for the preparation of quality analysis for the project proposal.

**Consultant Independence:** The consultants cannot have engaged in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project’s related activities

**6. Qualifications**

**Education:**

A Master’s degree in Environmental Science or other closely related field

**Professional Experiences**

More than 10 years of international experience in project evaluation in the fields of environment, biodiversity, ecosystems or any other closely related fields

More than 7 years of International experience in progamme development, adaptive management related to environment/biodiversity management or natural resource management including in Asian Countries

Professional experience related to Invasive Alien Species Management will be considered as an added advantage

**Language**

Fluency in reading, writing and speaking in English and excellent communication skills

7. Implementation arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Sri Lanka. Environment Sustainability Disaster Resilience (ESDR) cluster of the UNDP CO 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.

8. Evaluation timeframe

The total duration of the evaluation will be *24* days according to the following plan:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Completion Date/ Timing |
| Application closes | *31st January 2017*  |
| Selection of consultants (TE team)  | *6th February 2017* |
| Submission of project documents to TE team | 20th *February 2017* |
| Document review and preparation of inception report  | 20th – 24th February *2017*  |
| Submission of inception report | *24th February 2017*  |
| Submission of comments to inception report | *27th February 2017*  |
| Finalization of the Inception report | 2nd March 2017  |
| Evaluation Mission; stakeholder consultations, field visits | *7th March –16th March 2017*  |
| Presentation of initial findings  | *20th March 2017*  |
| Submission of Draft Final Terminal Evaluation Report | 28th March *2017*  |
| Submission of comments to the Draft report | *30th March 2017*  |
| Final Terminal Evaluation Report Submission after incorporation of comments | *6th April 2017*  |

9. Evaluation deliverables

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Deliverable | Content  | Timing | Responsibilities |
| **Inception Report** | Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method  | 24th February 2017  | Evaluator submits to UNDP CO  |
| **Presentation** | Initial Findings  | End of evaluation mission. 20th March 2017  | To project management, UNDP CO |
| **Draft Final Report**  | Full report, (as per the report outline given in the Annex F)  | 28th March 2017  | Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs |
| **Final Report\*** | Revised report  | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft. By 6th April 2017  | Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC.  |

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

**10. TERMINAL EVALUAION ARRANGEMENTS**

The principal responsibility for managing this TE resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project’s TE is UNDP Country Office in Sri Lanka.

The commissioning unit will contract the consultants and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the TE team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the TE team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

11. Team Composition

The team of two independent consultants will conduct the Terminal Evaluation -one international team leader and one national consultant. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The selection of consultants will be aimed at maximizing the overall “team” qualities in the following areas:

* Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies (15%);
* Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios (10%);
* Competence in adaptive management, as applied to Biodiversity (10%);
* Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations (10%);
* Experience working in South Asian Countries (10%);
* Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 7 years (15%);
* Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and Biodiversity; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis (5%).
* Excellent communication skills (5%);
* Demonstrable analytical skills (10%);
* Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset;
* A Master’s degree in Environmental Science, or other closely related field (10%).

12. DUTY STATION

Home based, including a 10-day mission of filed visits to consult partners, stakeholders and field travel to Kaluthara, Hambantota, Kandy, Polonnaruwa, Nuwara Eliya, Trincomalee, Puttalam districts. International consultant shall stay total of 15 days (without international travel time) in Sri Lanka (including 10-day mission) until initial findings are presented.

13. Evaluator Ethics

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex E) 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)

14. Payment modalities and specifications

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| % | Milestone |
| *10%* | At contract signing |
| *40%* | Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report |
| *50%* | Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report  |

15. Application process

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

* Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability using 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)**[[3]](#footnote-3)** provided by UNDP;
* Updated CV and a Personal History Form ([P11 form](http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc)[[4]](#footnote-4))
* Brief description of approach to work/technical proposal of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)
* Financial Proposal

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. All Inclusive Lump Sum Fee (Professional Fee ) : LKR \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ or All Inclusive Daily Fee LKR \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
2. All-inclusive Lump Sum Fee ( Costs other than Professional Fee indicative below ) : LKR \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
3. Total Lump Sum Fee ( a+b) LKR \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
 |   |

**Note:** Payments will be based on invoices on achievement of agreed milestones i.e. upon delivery of the services specified in the TOR and certification of acceptance by the UNDP. The applicant must factor in

All possible costs in his/her “***All Inclusive Lump Sum Fee/Daily Fee***” financial proposal including his/her consultancy and professional fee, Accommodation, Travel costs applicable for the 3 star class of hotels in Colombo, Sri Lanka, Airfare (to and from the home country of the consultant in economy class via the most economical/direct route), communication cost such as telephone/internet usage, ad-hoc costs, stationery costs. No costs other than what has been indicated in the financial proposal will be paid or reimbursed to the consultant. The UNDP will only pay for any unplanned travel outside of this TOR and Duty Station on actual basis and on submission of original bills/invoices and on prior agreement with UNDP officials. Daily per dium and costs for accommodation/meals/incidental expenses for such travel shall not exceed established local UNDP Daily Subsistence Allowance ( DSA ) rates.

For an Individual Contractor who is of 62 years of age or older, and on an assignment requiring travel, be it for the purpose of arriving at the duty station or as an integral duty required under the TOR, a full medical examination and statement of fitness to work must be provided.  Such medical examination costs must be factored in to the financial proposal above. Medical examination is not a requirement for individuals on RLA contracts.

**Criteria for Evaluation of Proposal:** Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated. Offers will be evaluated according to the Combined Scoring method – where the educational background and experience on similar assignments will be weighted at 70% and the price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring. The applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score that has also accepted UNDP’s General Terms and Conditions will be awarded the contract.

Note:

* Please group all your documents into one (1) single PDF document as the system only allows uploading maximum one document.
* Qualified women and members of minorities are encouraged to apply.
* Incomplete applications will not be considered. Please make sure you have provided all requested materials.

*Prepared by*

………………………………………………………………………………………….

*(Vajira Hettige – Technical Coordinator, IAS Project)*

*Approved by*

*………………………………………………………………………………………………*

*(Vishaka Hidellage – Assistant Country Director, ESDR)*

Annex A: Project Logical Framework

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Indicator(s)** | **Baseline** | **Targets****End of Project** | **Source of Verification** | **Risks and Assumptions** |
| **Project Objective** To build capacity across sectors to control the introduction and spread of invasive species in Sri Lanka, in order to safeguard globally significant biodiversity | % of relevant agencies meeting minimum standards to enable the implementation of IAS act provisions | Less than 5% of relevant agencies have all staff strained in IAS control | 80% of relevant agencies meet minimum standards [a. SOPs in place; b. All relevant staff trained in IAS control] | Reports of the IAS Unit of the BDS with information on the extent of IAS controlled, number of confiscated consignments containing IAS, number of new entries of IAS to the country.Project Progress and Technical ReportsProject Annual Reports/PIRSurveys and reports of new IAS introduced and reaction to such incidents.IAS Risk Assessment Protocols/ eradication and management protocols/manualsIAS Control Best Practice demonstration sites  | “IAS” continues to be a priority for the Government of Sri Lanka.Continued cooperation of the technical, enforcement and customs and other agencies and authorities Interest of the NGOs, private sector, media and the general public general public in IAS control programs remain strongChanging and variable conditions of climate may alter the threats and risks associated with IASCosts of IAS measures prohibit their adoption, replication and scaling up |
| Number of joint initiatives between Agencies, Private Sector and NGOs formulated through the NISSG & NFP on IAS control | Four (joint) joint activities implemented through inter-agency participation, with no private sector involvement | At minimum 10 joint initiatives are organized involving Agencies, Private Sector and NGOs through the NISSG/NFP on IAS control |
| Total targeted environmentally sensitive area preserved with community participation  | Less than 100 ha of Protected Area currently preserved with community participation | At minimum 50,000 ha of globally important PAs benefit directly from IAS management programme, including 3,000 ha of protected area in Sri Lanka cleared of IAS with community participation.  |
| Outcome 1[[5]](#footnote-5)A comprehensive national regulatory framework for the control of IAS in Sri Lanka is in place | Number of environmental management (including climate change adaptation) policies, and strategies developed  | A working draft of the National IAS policy  | * 1. A comprehensive National IAS Policy adopted
 | National IAS Policy documentThe National IAS Control Act is published in the gazette of the Government of Sri LankaNational IAS Strategy and Action PlanSectoral IAS Action PlansProject Progress and Technical Reports and final evaluation reportAnnual reports of the National Focal Point (NFP) for IAS Control (see Outcome 2)Availability of proposals to amend relevant Acts. | Key stakeholders reach agreement of policy and legal reformsLaws and policies will be enacted promptly without constraining the timely implementation of the project.IAS Theme is acceptable to all sectors of the public and interpreted in a positive manner.The IAS Focal Point is able to develop and retain the capacity to undertake the technical risk analysis to an international standard.Adaptability and acceptability of proposals by enforcement authorities. |
| A working draft of the National IAS Strategy and Action Plan | * 1. National IAS Strategy and Action Plan is finalized and adopted
 |
| Presence of a national IAS control act | National IAS Control Act does not exist Drafting of a National IAS Control Act approved by the Cabinet of Ministers  | 1.3 National IAS Control Act is formulated, and enacted  |
| Inadequate provisions for IAS Control in relevant existing Acts.  | 1.4 IAS related regulations of 5 Acts are reviewed and proposed for amendments.  |
| Outcome 2A well-coordinated institutional mechanism is in place for integrated planning and decision making at national and local levels with greater access to information on the status, threat and means of controlling IAS | Presence of an institutional coordination mechanism for IAS control | No formal national experts’ committee to advise the stakeholders on IAS related matters | 2.1 NISSG established and mandated for advising Government of Sri Lanka on IAS control | Government budget proposalsProject Progress, Technical Reports and the final evaluation reportReports on confiscations based on the risk assessment protocolReports and audits of the Customs, and National Animal and Plant Quarantine Services and the private sector Number of species in the National Lists of IASNational database and website linked to other internationally recognized websites.Number of individuals/ agencies using website & database increased annuallyNumber of IAS provincial profiles available for useNumber of research reports available  | Government will continue to support the NISSG and NFPGovernment is willing to host and manage the website and databaseTravellers and trade cooperate in inspection of consignments at ports of entryStakeholders willing to share informationand expertise.Users participate in consumer surveysGovernment commitment to enforce necessary legislations and stakeholder co-operation to the governance processAuthorities grant access to lands for surveying Timely completion of research studies by research contract holders  |
| National Focal Point (NFP) or mechanism for effective implementation of the IAS control activities does not exist | 2.2 A National Focal Point (NFP) in place |
| Number of knowledge products developed  | Draft set of scientifically valid IAS Risk Assessment Protocols available | 2.3 IAS pre-entry and post-entry Risk Assessment Protocols developed and used by the stakeholders |
| Ad hoc national lists of invasive alien flora and fauna  | 2.4 National lists, potential lists and black lists of invasive alien flora and fauna in place and updated every 3 years |
| No national level database on IAS | 2.5 Web-based interactive and user-friendly IAS database developed and regularly updated |
| No survey data on presence and spread of IAS in the country. | 2.6 Existence and spread of priority IAS are collected, mapped for all 9 provinces in the country and available for use.  |
| Limited information on ecology, biology and control of IAS | 2.7 Two catalogues of IAS of Sri Lanka with detailed information on ecology, biology and related international knowledge  |
| No adequate species information to conduct Risk Assessment | 2.8 Research Agenda on IAS  Control is prepared. 2.91 Adequate information on 20 priority and potential IAS are available |
| No national level interactive website on IAS | 2.92 A website on IAS is developed and regular update mechanism in place |
| Outcome 3Decision makers at national and local levels are aware of cost-effective IAS controls being implemented at national and local levels, best practices are shared and stakeholders’ capacities strengthened | Presence of a National IAS Communication Strategy | No national communication strategy on IAS | 3.1 National IAS Communication Strategy introduced and dialogue on IAS Control enhanced | Government budget proposalsReport on the approval of the National IAS Communication Strategy by MENRProject Progress, Technical Reports and the final evaluation reportAnnual financial reports on IAS control and awareness activitiesPosters, paper articles, paper supplements, booklets and leaflets produced on IASPublications, manuals and/or reports on the case studies focusing on cost-effectiveness and their impacts on target priority IASReports on capacity building programsPartnership AgreementsMedia events and reports | Stakeholders agreeing on the National Communication Strategy on IASStakeholders interest to participate in the training programs remain strongSpecific expertise/resource persons available.Stakeholder willing to co-finance the capacity building programs carried out on IASGovernment agreeing to finance national level IAS control programsPublic and private sector agencies agreeing to enter into partnerships for IAS control |
| % of trained technical, enforcement and customs agency staff applying skills 6 month after training | Poorly coordinated IAS control and quarantine mechanisms in place with inadequate staff trained and in a limited number of fields | 3.2 At least 500 staff from technical, enforcement and customs agencies at all ports of entry are trained in the following areas through the new National IAS Policy: IAS detection; legal restrictions on IAS import, export and use; sanitary and phytosanitary standards; risk analysis; and IAS control techniques with at minimum 85% applying skills 6-months post training.  |
| % participants in public awareness and workshops that report greater knowledge of IAS management efforts | <5 % of political leaders, <20% of secondary level school children and general public, 0% of media institutions are aware of the threats of IAS and the need for their control | 3.3. 80% of participants indicate increased awareness of the threats of IAS and the need for their control post training. |
| Presence of financial incentives and disincentives support for IAS control  | No market-based instruments and financing mechanisms to support IAS control | 3.4 Financial incentives and disincentives to support IAS control are developed and endorsed by the government for their use |
| Number of knowledge products developed and piloted | No best practice toolkits or participatory mechanisms in place | 3.5 Site specific, cost-effective, best practice toolkits developed for 4 cases each of priority invasive alien fauna flora are piloted at selected sites through public-private-NGO partnerships. |

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

1. PIF
2. UNDP Initiation Plan
3. UNDP Project Document
4. UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results
5. Project Inception Report
6. All Project Implementation Reports (PIR’s)
7. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
8. Audit reports
9. Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools at CEO endorsement and midterm
10. Project Mid Term Review Report
11. Project Consolidation Report
12. Training Needs Assessment, Training Plan, Communication Strategy and Plan.
13. Research reports, IAS profiles
14. Published knowledge materials
15. Consultancy Reports
16. Oversight mission reports
17. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
18. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team

The following documents will also be available:

1. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
2. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
3. Minutes of the Strengthening capacity to control the introduction and spread of alien invasive species in Sri Lanka Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
4. Project site location maps

Annex C: Evaluation Questions

*This is a generic list, to be further detailed with more specific questions by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on the particulars of the project.*

| **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?  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards? |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?**  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

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 shortcomings4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS)3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems1. 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 risks1. 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[[6]](#footnote-6)**

**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[[7]](#footnote-7)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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[[8]](#footnote-8)) |
| **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[[9]](#footnote-9))  |
| **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. For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](http://www.undp.org/evaluation/handbook), Chapter 7, pg. 163 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. 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-2)
3. <https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx> [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. <http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc> [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. *All outcomes monitored annually in the APR/PIR. It is highly recommended not to have more than 4 outcomes.* [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. 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-9)