



INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANT PROCUREMENT NOTICE

Date: 1st September 2017
UNDP-IC-2017-185

JTN 9275

Country: Pakistan

Consultant: International (Individual)

Description of the assignment: Conduct of Terminal Evaluation (E) of the project "**Mountain and Market Project: Biodiversity and Business in Northern Pakistan (PIMS 4048)**" as the International Consultant.

Project Name/Title: (PAK/00076779) **Mountain and Market Project: Biodiversity and Business in Northern Pakistan**

Period of assignment/services (if applicable): 24 days effective from the date of signing of individual contract spread over a period of three months (October – December 2017)

Duty Station: Islamabad (with possible travel to project sites in KPK and Gilgit)

Please submit your Technical and Financial proposals to the following address or through e-mail at bids.pk@undp.org no later than **15th September 2017** (**Hand Delivery is not acceptable**).

UNDP Registry, Quotation/Bids/Proposals

United Nations Development Programme
Serena Business Complex, 2nd Floor, Khayaban e Suharwardy,
Islamabad, Pakistan

Tel: +92 51-8355600 Fax: + 92 51-2600254-5

Important note for email submissions: Please put reference no. **UNDP-IC-2017-185** in the subject line along with the title of the consultancy. Further, our system will not accept emails those are more than 3.5 MB size. If required, segregate your emails to accommodate email data restrictions. For segregate emails please use sequence of emails like Email 1, Email 2 in the subject line. For attachment purposes please only use MS Word, Excel, Power Point or PDF formats.

If you request additional information, please write to pakistan.procurement.info@undp.org the team will provide necessary information within due date. However, any delay in providing such information will not be considered a reason for extending the submission date of your quotation. All/any query regarding the submission of the quotation may be sent prior to the deadline at the e-mail/address mentioned above.

1. BACKGROUND

Spread across 175,000 km² of the Hindu Kush, Karakoram and Western Himalayan mountain ranges, northern Pakistan is a rich storehouse of global biodiversity. Populations of many globally threatened species are still found here, from snow leopard and lynx to the highly endangered Woolly Flying Squirrel. Although protected areas now cover some 11% of the mountains, and community co-managed conservancies a further 12%, threats remain to the region's unique biodiversity, due to poverty and limited options for sustainable sources of livelihood. The project will use voluntary certification of Non-Timber Forest Products (NTFP) as a tool to promote biodiversity conservation and strengthen existing conservation efforts with innovative market-based mechanisms. The project will develop community and institutional capacity for certified production of 'biodiversity-friendly' NTFPs in northern Pakistan and stimulate market demand for biodiversity friendly NTFP thereby creating new economic incentives for conservation.

2. MAIN OBJECTIVES, RESPONSABILITIES AND DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ANALYTICAL WORK.

The project's objective is the **Sustainable production of biodiversity goods and services through community ecosystem-based enterprises** in demonstration conservancies in the northern mountains of Pakistan. This objective is being achieved through the following four outcomes:

Outcome 1: Market demand for biodiversity friendly non-timber forest products (NTFPs) stimulated

Outcome 2: Strengthened capacity of local communities to produce and market biodiversity friendly products

Outcome 3: Positive biodiversity linkages strengthened at landscape level through CBE Conservation and Sustainable Resource Use (SRU) Agreements

Outcome 4: Strengthen institutional capacity for scale up and replication of CBEs

The project seeks to create market-based incentives to address threats to biodiversity in northern Pakistan arising from the unsustainable commercial exploitation of NTFP. The project focuses on supply chain management, including the development of voluntary certification systems for selected NTFP, strengthening producer capacity to comply with certification standards, stimulating market demand for certified biodiversity-friendly NTFP and increasing access to markets.

The geographic scope of the project includes two provinces: Gilgit-Baltistan (Chilas and Astore conservancies) and Khyber-Paktunkhwa (Upper Swat and upper Dir conservancies). These sites were identified on the basis of their strong potential, previous engagement of the executing/implementing agencies and set criteria of social, biological and administrative set up.

The Project Management Unit is based in Islamabad and is supported by two field offices in the pilot areas, with two field managers, who coordinated the planning, implementation and monitoring with local community based organizations, NGO's and the district and provincial authorities.

Ministry of Climate Change, Government of Pakistan is the implementing Partner and has the overall responsibility of implementing the project on the ground with support from UNDP (Executing Agency) and provincial line departments and IUCN-Pakistan (Responsible Partners).

The Terminal Evaluation (TE) will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and Global Environment Facility (GEF) as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects¹.

The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, map the overall contribution of the project towards the conservation and sustainable use agenda of the government of Pakistan, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

3. SCOPE OF WORK, RESPONSIBILITIES AND DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ANALYTICAL WORK

i. Duration of Assignment, Duty Station and Expected Places of Travel

The international consultant is expected to visit Pakistan during the consultancy period, with possible travel required to the two project sites in KPK and Gilgit. The assignment is expected to take 24 working days spread over a period of 3 months (October – December 2017). Below is the breakdown of the expected number of working days:

- | | |
|--|-----------------|
| a) Travel from home station to Islamabad (Pakistan): | 02 working days |
| b) Consultations in Islamabad: | 03 working days |
| c) Field visits to Khyber Pakhtunkhawa: | 02 working days |
| d) Field visits to Gilgit Baltistan: | 08 working days |
| e) Inception meeting with stakeholders at Islamabad: | 02 working days |
| f) Travel from Islamabad to home station: | 02 working days |
| g) Submission of draft Terminal Evaluation Report: | 03 working days |
| h) Submission of Final Terminal Evaluation Report: | 02 working days |

UNDP will arrange travel for project field visits in Pakistan whereas travel to and from the duty station will be responsibility of the consultant.

ii. Deliverables

The International Consultant will lead the terminal evaluation and will be responsible to deliver the following:

¹ Guidance for conducting terminal evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed projects, UNDP Evaluation Office, 2013

Deliverable	Content	Time Frame	Payment schedule in % Percentage
Inception Report	Evaluator devise methodology and timeframe	03 working days	20%
Dev. of questionnaire and conduct field missions	Evaluator will visit to the project sites in KP and GB in Pakistan	10 working days	30%
Inception meeting	Inception meeting with stakeholder in Islamabad	02 working days	0%
Presentation	Initial Findings	02 working days	0%
Draft Report	Draft report, (per annexed template) with annexes	02 working days	30%
Final Report*	Revised report	02 working days after receipt of comments from stakeholders	20%

*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. An audit trail template is available in Annex H.

4. REQUIREMENTS FOR EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS

I. Academic Qualifications:

The international Consultant must possess at least PhD or Master's degree in Natural Resource Management, Environmental science, Forestry, Social sciences or other closely related disciplines.

II. Experience and competencies:

- Minimum 15 years of relevant professional experience in programme/project development, adaptive management and project evaluation in the areas of natural resource management, biodiversity conservation, environment, and related fields;
- Knowledge of UNDP and GEF projects, policies and procedures;
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
- Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s): Natural resource management, biodiversity conservation, non-timber forest produce, including sound knowledge of forest conservation and sustainable use of its component; and
- Experience of working in similar regions as the mountains environment of Northern Pakistan will be an added advantage.
- Excellent interview and report writing skills in English.

5. DOCUMENTS TO BE INCLUDED WHEN SUBMITTING THE PROPOSALS.

All applications including P11 form, CV, and technical and financial proposals should be submitted to the UNDP Country Office by **15th September 2017** the following reference "International Consultant for Terminal Evaluation for ***Mountain and Market Project: Biodiversity and Business in Northern Pakistan***" or by email at following address ONLY: bids.pk@undp.org. Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

Recommended Presentation of proposal: Introduction about the consultant/CV and their capability for the assignment; proposed methodology and work plan (max 1 page); financial proposal, including proposed fee and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc).

6. FINANCIAL PROPOSAL

The financial proposal shall specify a total lump sum amount, and payment terms around specific and measurable (qualitative and quantitative) deliverables (i.e. whether payments fall in installments or upon completion of the entire contract). Payments are based upon output, i.e. upon delivery of the services specified in the TORs. In order to assist in the comparison of financial proposals, the financial proposal will include a breakdown of this lump sum amount (including travel, per diems, and number of anticipated working days).

Travel:

All envisaged travel costs must be included in the financial proposal. This includes all travel to join duty station/repatriation travel. In general, UNDP should not accept travel costs exceeding those of an economy class ticket. Should the IC wish to travel on a higher class he/she should do so using their own resources. In the case of unforeseeable travel, payment of travel costs including tickets, lodging and terminal expenses should be agreed upon, between the respective business unit and Individual Consultant, prior to travel and will be reimbursed.

EVALUATION

The award of the contract should be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

- Responsive/compliant/acceptable; and
- Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation:

* Technical Criteria weight; [70%]

* Financial Criteria weight; [30%]

Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 70% technical score would be considered for the Financial Evaluation.

Criteria	Weight	Max. Point
<i>Technical Competencies</i>	<i>70</i>	
Master's degree or Ph. in Natural Resource Management, Environmental science, Forestry, Social sciences or other closely related disciplines	20	
Minimum 10 years of relevant professional experience in programme/project development,		

adaptive management, project evaluation related to natural resource management, biodiversity conservation, environment, and related fields	15	
Knowledgeable and skills in the result-based management approach and UNDP or GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy;	25	
Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s): Natural resource management, biodiversity conservation, non-timber forest produce, including sound knowledge of forest conservation and sustainable use of its component	10	
<i>Financial (Lower Offer/Offer*100)</i>		
<i>Total Score</i>	<i>Technical score 70 + 30 Financial</i>	
Weight per Technical Competence		
Weak: Below 70%	The individual consultant/contractor has demonstrated a WEAK capacity for the analyzed competence	
Satisfactory : 70-75%	The individual consultant/contractor has demonstrated a SATISFACTORY capacity for the analyzed competence	
Good: 76-85%	The individual consultant/contractor has demonstrated a GOOD capacity for the analyzed competence	
Very Good: 86-95%	The individual consultant/contractor has demonstrated a VERY GOOD capacity for the analyzed competence	
Outstanding: 96-100%	The individual consultant/contractor has demonstrated a OUTSATNDING capacity for the analyzed competence	

ANNEXS:

ANNEX-I: TORs OF THE TERM EVALUATION (TE)

ANNEX-II: GENERAL CONDITIONS OF CONTRACT FOR THE SERVICES OF INDIVIDUAL CONTRACTORS

ANNEX-III: PROPOSAL SUBMISSION FORM

ANNEX-IV: CONFIRMING INTEREST AND AVAILABILITY

ANNEX- V: FINANCIAL PROPOSAL

ANNEX- VI: PII FORM

Annex-I

TERMS OF REFERENCE

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and Global Environmental Facility (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 ***Mountains & Market: Biodiversity and Business in Northern Pakistan (PIMS 4048)***.

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

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	<i>"Mountains & Market: Biodiversity and Business in Northern Pakistan (PIMS 4048)."</i>			
UNDP Project ID:	00076779	Project financing	\$ 7,793,182	<u>at MTE (Million US\$)</u>
ATLAS Project ID:	00060848	GEF financing:	\$ 1,793,182	\$ 1,793,182
Country:	Pakistan	IA/EA own:	\$ 1,500,000	\$ 1,500,000
Region:	Asia	Government:	\$ 4,500,000 (in-kind)	\$ 4,500,000 (in-kind)
Focal Area:	Biodiversity (Mainstream biodiversity in production landscapes/seascapes and sectors)	Other:		
		Total co-financing:	\$ 4,500,000	\$ 4,500,000
Executing Agency:	Ministry of Climate Change, Government of Pakistan	Total Project Cost in cash:	\$ 3,293,182	\$ 3,293,182
Other Partners involved:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forests and Wildlife Department of Gilgit-Baltistan • Forestry department of Khyber Paktunkhwa • IUCN Pakistan • Local communities 	Pro Doc Signature (date project began):		June 2012
			Planned closing date: May 2016	Revised closing date: December 2017

OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The project's objective is the **Sustainable production of biodiversity goods and services through community ecosystem-based enterprises** in demonstration conservancies in the northern mountains of Pakistan. This objective is being achieved through the following four outcomes:

Outcome 1: Market demand for biodiversity friendly non-timber forest products (NTFPs) stimulated

Outcome 2: Strengthened capacity of local communities to produce and market biodiversity friendly products

Outcome 3: Positive biodiversity linkages strengthened at landscape level through CBE Conservation and Sustainable Resource Use (SRU) Agreements

Outcome 4: Strengthen institutional capacity for scale up and replication of CBEs

The project seeks to create market-based incentives to address threats to biodiversity in northern Pakistan arising from the unsustainable commercial exploitation of NTFP. The project focuses on supply chain management, including the development of voluntary certification systems for selected NTFP, strengthening producer capacity to comply with certification standards, stimulating market demand for certified biodiversity-friendly NTFP and increasing access to markets.

The geographic scope of the project includes two provinces: Gilgit-Baltistan (Chilas and Astore conservancies) and Khyber-Paktunkhwa (Upper Swat and upper Dir conservancies). These sites were identified on the basis of their strong potential, previous engagement of the executing/implementing agencies and set criteria of social, biological and administrative set up.

The Project Management Unit is based in Islamabad and is supported by two field offices in the pilot areas, with two field managers, who coordinated the planning, implementation and monitoring with local community based organizations, NGO's and the district and provincial authorities.

Ministry of Climate Change, Government of Pakistan is the implementing Partner and has the overall responsibility of implementing the project on the ground with support from UNDP (Executing Agency) and provincial line departments and IUCN-Pakistan (Responsible Partners).

The Terminal Evaluation (TE) will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and Global Environment Facility (GEF) as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects².

The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, map the overall contribution of the project towards the conservation and sustainable use agenda of the government of Pakistan, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

An overall approach and method 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 ([Annex C](#)). The evaluator is expected to

² Guidance for conducting terminal evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed projects, UNDP Evaluation Office, 2013

amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of the TE 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 Kalam, Miandam, Bishigram, Kumrat, (KP), Gais, Goharabad and Hudur Valleys (GB) for direct interaction with the local Community Biodiversity Enterprises (CBEs). The Evaluator will also conduct dedicated meetings with WCS, IFAD project of Economic Transformation, Marketing Wing of AKRSP, NTFP Directorate of KP, Forest and Wildlife Departments of KP and GB, IUCN Pakistan, SFM project and academia (Universities of Swat and Karakoram) and the relevant officers of the Ministry of Climate Change. The project has developed and signed Letter of Agreements (LOAs) with provincial government and IUCN-Pakistan. The Evaluator will review and assess the effectiveness of the LOAs with regard to the future efficacy of such agreements.

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual PPRs, 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](#) of this Terms of Reference.

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](#)), 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](#).

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-financing table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

Co-financing (type/source)	UNDP own financing (mill. US\$)		Government (mill. US\$)		Partner Agency (mill. US\$)		Total (mill. US\$)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Actual	Actual
Grants	1,500,000	1,500,000			1,793,182	1,793,182	3,293,182	3,293,182
Loans/Concessions								
• In-kind support			4,500,000	4,500,000			4,500,000	4,500,000
• Other								
Totals	1,500,000	1,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	1,793,182	1,793,182	7,793,182	7,793,182

MAINSTREAMING

UNDP supported GEF financed projects are key components in UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programme. 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.³

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 CO in Pakistan. 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.

EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

Deliverable	Content	Time Frame
Inception Report	Evaluator devise methodology and timeframe	03 working days
Dev. of questionnaire and conduct field missions	Evaluator will visit to the project sites in KP and GB in Pakistan	10 working days

³A 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](#)

Inception meeting	Inception meeting with stakeholder in Islamabad	02 working days
Presentation	Initial Findings	02 working days
Draft Report	Draft report, (per annexed template) with annexes	02 working days
Final Report*	Revised report	02 working days after receipt of comments from stakeholders

EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content
Inception Report	Evaluator devise methodology and timeframe
Dev. of questionnaire and conduct field missions	Evaluator will visit to the project sites in KP and GB in Pakistan
Presentation	Initial Findings
Draft Report	Draft report, (per annexed template) with annexes
Final Report*	Revised report

*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. An audit trail template is available in Annex H.

TEAM COMPOSITION

The evaluation team will be comprised of an *International Evaluator (team leader)*⁴ and *National Evaluator*. The consultants must have prior experience in evaluating similar projects/programs. 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 Team members must present the following qualifications:

- Master's degree or Ph. in Natural Resource Management, Environmental science, Forestry, Social sciences or other closely related disciplines;
- Minimum 10 years of relevant professional experience in programme/project development, adaptive management, project evaluation related to natural resource management, biodiversity conservation, environment, and related fields;
- Knowledge of UNDP and GEF;
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;

⁴ The team leader will be responsible for finalizing the report.

- Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s): Natural resource management, biodiversity conservation, non-timber forest produce, including sound knowledge of forest conservation and sustainable use of its component; and
- Experience of working in similar regions as the mountains environment of Northern Pakistan will be an added advantage.

EVALUATOR ETHICS

Evaluation consultants 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'](#)

PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

(This payment schedule is indicative, to be filled in by the CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on their standard procurement procedures)

%	Milestone
20%	At submission and approval of inception report
30%	Initial Findings through Presentation
30%	Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report
20%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report

APPLICATION PROCESS

Applicants are requested to apply online on the following link:

<http://www.pk.undp.org/content/pakistan/en/home/operations/procurement/>

By 20th September 2017. Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions. The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in English with indication of the e-mail and phone contact. Shortlisted candidates will be requested to submit a price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs).

UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

This project will contribute to the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPAP or CPD: A comprehensive approach integrating environmentally sustainable development, global environmental concerns and commitments in national development planning, with emphasis on poverty reduction and with quality gender analysis.					
Country Programme Outcome Indicators: Commitments under global conventions on Biodiversity being implemented					
Primary applicable Key Environmental and Sustainable Development Key result Area: 1. Mainstreaming environment and energy OR 2. Catalyzing environmental finance OR 3. Promote climate change adaptation OR 4. Expanding access to environmental and energy services for the poor.					
Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program: Strategic Objective 2 of the Biodiversity Focal Area: Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Production Landscapes and Sectors, and more specifically with SP5, Fostering Markets for Biodiversity Goods and Services.					
Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes: 1. Conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity incorporated in the productive landscape. 2. Global certification systems for NTFPS produced in production landscapes include technically rigorous biodiversity standards					
Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators: (1) Number of hectares in production landscapes under sustainable management but not yet certified (2) Number of Hectares/production systems under certified production practices that meet sustainability and biodiversity standards (3) Published certification systems that include technically rigorous biodiversity standards					
	Indicator	<u>Baseline</u>	<u>Target</u> (end of project)	Sources of Verification ⁵	Risks and Assumptions
Goal:	Mountain biodiversity conservation and sustainable livelihoods in northern Pakistan				
Project Objective: Sustainable production of biodiversity goods and services through community ecosystem-based enterprises	1. Increase in income for NTFP collectors and villages participating in sustainable NTFP production through CBEs	1. Currently NTFP is collected by: nomadic graziers and poorer resident households. Women and children are the main collectors. Contribution of pine nuts and morels to average household income varies from site to site. Baseline values to be determined in	1. a) NTFP collectors obtain 50% more income from sale of sustainably harvested pine nuts and morels to CBEs than from earlier sales to local traders and contractors b) Community members of least 18/20 CBEs satisfied with CBE performance and willing and able to continue	1. a) Start and end of project assessments b) Surveys of communities at time of CBE establishment & end of project	NTFP collectors and communities, including resource owners, remain willing to participate in production of certified NTFP

⁵ For all indicators, the final evaluation (FE) report, terminal project report, annual and final PIR and the Tracking Tool will also be an important source of verification of achievement of project objective, outcomes and outputs.

	<p>2. At least 20,000 ha of critical habitat of target high value NTFPs protected for sustainable production of certified NTFPs in project conservancies</p> <p>3. Landscape conservation approaches introduces resulting in improved conservation management of selected threatened species and habitats</p>	<p>Yr 1 for the following: a) household income from pine nuts and morels in target valleys</p> <p>b) Community perceptions of value of NTFP and expectations from CBEs in in target valleys</p> <p>2. 0 Ha of forest under certified NTFP production</p> <p>3. Some conservation measures implemented by local communities, but not for the following:</p> <p>a) Leaves of <i>Taxus wallichiana</i> (CITES Appendix I) harvested gally for fodder and as NTFP</p> <p>b) Morel mushroom collection practices adversely impacts pheasant populations, including globally</p>	<p>CBE operations</p> <p>2. At least 5,000 ha of critical habitat of Chilghoza forest and 15,000 ha of other high value target NTFPs in temperate forest in Astore, Kalam and Dir Kohistan protected and under certified production of NTFPs.</p> <p>3. Improved conservation management of at least 1 significant threatened species or natural habitat type each CBE valley:</p> <p>a) No illegal harvesting of <i>Taxus wallichiana</i> (Himalayan yew, Cites Appendix I) in at least 15 CBE areas</p> <p>b) Collectors in 10/15 CBE areas collect morels later in</p>	<p>2. Field surveys & independent verification by certifying body</p> <p>3.a-c Project field surveys at start and end of project as well as participatory monitoring assessments by PMAC, VCC and CBEs</p>	<p>Government and private sector support NTFP certification as a tool for generating environmental and social benefits</p> <p>Local communities perceive sufficient value in CBEs and sustainable NTFP production and are therefore willing to support additional conservation measures through Conservation & SRU Agreements</p> <p>National and provincial governments and rural development and conservation agencies support community-based certified NTFP production and responsive to CBE</p>
--	---	--	---	--	--

	4. Strengthened institutional capacity for landscape conservation and CBE establishment and certified production of NTFPs in Pakistan	<p>threatened species (e.g. White crested Kalij), through breakage and collection of pheasant eggs</p> <p>4. a) Considerable capacity, especially among NGOs, (e.g. RSPN, Sarhad RSP, AKRSP) for social mobilization & establishment of different types of village organizations, including, to a lesser extent, enterprise development</p> <p>Some national capacity for organic certification of agricultural /horticultural products. Little capacity among NGOs or key government agencies / dpeartments (e.g. PFI, KP & GB Forestry Departments & MINFAL) for promoting biodiversity conservation through certified production of NTFP by local communities or for delivering extension services in an integrated rather than sectoral way</p>	<p>season to minimize damage to wild pheasant eggs</p> <p>4. a) At least 70% of CBE requests for additional capacity development support and extension services to be established in Year 3 are met satisfactorily by Year 4</p>	4. a) CBE & CBE Association records & Project reports	<p>requests and effective mechanism in place for recording CBE requests for support from NGOs and government agencies and whether these are are satisfactorily met, e.g. through CBE Association proposed under Output 2.3</p>
--	---	---	--	---	--

		b) No agency in Pakistan has experience or training to verify whether NTFP production complies with agreed certification standards	b) At least one national body trained (and potentially accredited) to verify NTFP produced under certification scheme	b) Project reports & Final Evaluation report	
Outcome 1: Market demand for biodiversity friendly non-timber forest products (NTFP) stimulated	1. Increased support for sustainable NTFP production use within private sector in Pakistan through BBRT 2. Number of voluntary NTFP certification systems established 3. Number of alliances with national & international buyers representing preferential markets for certified biodiversity-friendly NTFP from project CBEs	1. No opportunity for private sector to preferentially buy sustainably produced wild NTFP as no certification systems in place 2. 0 3. 0	1. At least 3 major herbal industries in Pakistan include reference in their CSR policy to preferential buying of certified NTFP from project areas 2. Voluntary certification schemes for sustainable production established for at least 2 NTFP including: a) Chilghoza pine nuts; b) Morel mushrooms; 3. At least 10 operational alliances with international and national buyers representing preferential markets for certified biodiversity-friendly NTFP from northern Pakistan	1. CSR policies of major herbal companies; CBE reports, project reports 2. The approved schemes 3. CBE & project reports	Major private sector companies dealing in NTFP increasingly supportive of sustainable NTFP production Govt supports development and use of NTFP certification as a tool for biodiversity conservation & mountain livelihoods development Markets for biodiversity-friendly NTFP remain resilient to impacts of global economic

	4. Revised regulatory framework for NTFP collection & trade	4. No comprehensive regulatory framework for NTFP collection & trade. A few special rules for some products.	4. A comprehensive regulatory framework for NTFP collection & trade that supports sustainable NTFP production	4. The regulatory framework	downturn & other external shocks Govt continues to support revision of regulatory framework to strengthen sustainable use of NTFPs
Output 1.1 A Business and Biodiversity Round Table (BBRT) Output 1.2 Voluntary certification schemes for NTFP Output 1.3 National and international demand for biodiversity-friendly NTFP stimulated Output 1.4 A regulatory framework for NTFP collection and trade					
Outcome 2 Strengthened capacity of local communities to produce and market biodiversity-friendly products	1. Number of conservancy villages & valleys receiving support for CBE development & management	1. Conservancy villages have experience of forming new village institutions and understanding of biodiversity conservation & SRU principles & a few have experience of enterprise development, but none have experience of certified sustainable production of NTFP 2. All Valleys have Valley	1. At least 20 villages and 10 valleys receive training on the business and technical skills needed for successful CBE establishment & participation in voluntary certification schemes 2. At least 20 CBEs with	1. Training reports, CBE reports 2. CBE business plans & Valley	Communities see value in establishing CBEs & participating in certification schemes Business & technical capacity development of communities & development / adoption of of NTFP certification system

	<p>2. Number of operational CBEs with approved business plans participating in voluntary NTFP certification schemes</p> <p>3. Community access to relevant technical, financial and market information services for CBE development</p>	<p>Conservation Plans and Valley Conservation Funds. Some have community-based trophy hunting enterprises. There is no community-based certified NTFP production</p> <p>3. No extension services currently available to communities for biodiversity business planning or sustainable, commercially viable NTFP production</p>	<p>approved business plans participating in one or more NTFP voluntary certification schemes</p> <p>3. A mechanism for coordinated delivery of technical, financial and market advisory services to CBEs in place and being used effectively by CBEs for business planning and development</p>	<p>Conservation Committee records</p> <p>3. CBE reports, business plans & Project reports</p>	<p>proceeds in a smooth & timely fashion</p> <p>Key government, private sector, research institutions and relevant non-government agencies able to coordinate effectively and provide CBEs with integrated advisory services to enhance their capacity and competitiveness</p>
<p>Output 2.1 Enhanced business and technical capacity of local communities to establish and manage CBEs</p> <p>Output 2.2 Pilot CBEs with approved business plans established</p> <p>Output 2.3 Improved community access to technical, financial and market advisory services</p>					
<p>Outcome 3</p> <p>Positive biodiversity linkages strengthened at landscape level through CBE Conservation and Sustainable Resource Use (SRU) agreements</p>	<p>1. Number of specific biodiversity conservation measures successfully implemented by project CBEs at landscape level under their Conservation and SRU Agreements</p>	<p>1. Some biodiversity conservation measures are being implemented under Village and Valley Conservation Plans, which will not be duplicated in this project</p>	<p>1. At least 2 specific and quantifiable priority conservation measures included in each of the 20 CBEs Conservation & SRU Agreements and integrated into the relevant Landscape Conservation Plans (LCPs)</p>	<p>1. The Conservation Agreements and relevant LCPs</p>	<p>Communities derive sufficient value from participating in CBEs and certification schemes to honor Conservation & SRU agreements</p>

	<p>2. Number of collaborative forest management initiatives developed and implemented by State Forestry departments and local communities</p> <p>3. Number of community-based assessments of CBE performance, including economic and conservation benefits generated</p>	<p>2. Not applicable as there is no collaborative forest management in the country.</p> <p>3. Not applicable as CBEs do not exist yet. However, there is precedent of such assessments developed through MACP and continued through PMAC in relation to reviews of Valley Conservation Plans by concerned villagers</p>	<p>2. At least one collaborative forest management developed and under implementation in every conservancy.</p> <p>3. Annual participatory community-based assessments of CBE performance used together with project monitoring and any other assessments to adapt individual CBE management, including implementation of business plan and Conservation & SRU Agreement</p>	<p>2. The collaborative management plans and progress reports</p> <p>3. Assessment reports, CBE & Project Reports, Valley Conservation Committee (VCC) meeting records</p>	<p>Communities and State forest agencies find collaborative management mutually beneficial.</p> <p>Practical monitoring and assessment protocols developed by project together with local communities are implemented systematically</p>
<p>Output 3.1 CBE Conservation and Sustainable Resource Use Agreements developed and integrated with Valley Conservation Plans</p> <p>Output 3.2. Access rights and tenure security for local communities secured through collaborative forest and NRM arrangement.</p> <p>Output 3.3 Community-based adaptive management of CBEs</p>					
<p>Outcome 4</p> <p>Strengthened institutional capacity for scale up and replication of CBEs</p>	<p>1. Number of key institutions and agencies with capacity to provide coordinated support to mountain communities wishing to establish CBEs and participate in certified sustainable NTFP production</p>	<p>1a) Targeted institutions and agencies have considerable capacity in their sectors/ focus areas but limited expertise in supporting biodiversity-friendly, commercially competitive enterprises</p>	<p>1a) Targeted capacity development of at least 8 major partner national organizations/government agencies to support certified NTFP production by CBEs in northern Pakistan, including KP and GB Forest Departments,</p>	<p>1a) Training reports</p>	<p>National & provincial government departments, private sector and rural development and conservation NGOs continue to see value sCBEs as a means of</p>

			AKRSP, SRSP, PFI, MINFAL		generating biodiversity and livelihood-related benefits
		1b) No mechanisms exist for coordinated delivery of extension services	1b) Mechanism for providing coordinated support to communities agreed and implemented by key partners willing to provide on-going support to communities for CBE development and certified NTFP production	1b & c) CBE Association records, Project Reports, written document on coordination mechanism endorsed by participating partners	
		1c) There is no partnership yet and hence no budgetary support for CBE scale up & replication other than through the cofinanciers of this project (MoDM/PMAC & UNDP)	1c) Committed budgetary support from the partnership of organizations to provide capacity development to communities for CBE scale up and replication		
	2. Number of dedicated follow up activities to systematically analyze, document and disseminate project knowledge and lessons learned regionally, nationally and globally	2. No project knowledge or lessons exist as the project has not started implementation	2a) At least one synthesis report summarizing main project achievements and lessons in English and Urdu	2a) The report	
			b) Community to community learning facilitated by arranging for	2b) Community	

			<p>non-project villages to visit successful CBEs.</p> <p>c) Project knowledge and lessons shared across northern Pakistan through PMAC, the Valley and Conservancy Management Committees AKRSP, Sarhad RSP and AJKRSP</p> <p>d) At least one regional conference bringing together local communities, government, NGOs, private sector and other key stakeholders to share project achievements</p> <p>2e) One national conference organized through the Business & Biodiversity Round Table to share project knowledge & lessons learned with key national stakeholders</p>	<p>feedback, CBE reports, Project reports</p> <p>2c) Project reports</p> <p>2d) Conference proceedings</p> <p>2e) Conference proceedings</p>	<p>Project staff and partners committed to ensuring systematic capture, analysis, documentation and sharing of project knowledge and lessons during implementation</p>
<p>Output 4.1 Targeted capacity development of key institutions to support CBE development</p> <p>Output 4.2 Project knowledge and lessons systematically analyzed, documented and shared with key stakeholders in northern Pakistan, nationally and internationally</p>					

ANNEX B: LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE EVALUATORS

- GEF Concept and/or Proposal, signed Project Document
- Inception workshop Report,
- Annual Progress Reports, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016 and 2017
- Quarterly Reports from January to December of each year of the project implementation
- Minutes of the 1st, 2nd, 3rd and 4th PSC Meetings
- Mid-Term Evaluation Report of the project
- All project technical and activity reports
- Training reports on sound collection, processing and post processing of NTFs in the tow provinces
- Baseline report produced by IUCN
- Letter of Agreements with IUCN-Pakistan, KP and Gb provinces
- Sustainable Resource Use Agreements by IUCN
- Training report on certification of the NTFPs species by FairWild and CBI
- In addition, all other publications, reports and leaflets produced by the project through various partners

ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

This is a generic list, to be further detailed by the evaluation team and submitted with the TE inception report and as an annex to the TE report.

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the AF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Was/Is the project a good idea given the situation needing improvement? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strengthened Institutional capacities to implement policies, plans and investments and contribution to the conservation of forests and livelihood creation for the local communities in the northern Pakistan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Communities record Annual and Quarterly Reports Mid-Term Evaluation Reports Government legal documents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Individual Interviews Desk Reviews Reports
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does it deal with target group priorities? Why or why not? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased income at the house hold level 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Communities record register 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Individual Interviews Desk Reviews FGD's
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have the planned purpose and component objectives, outputs and activities been achieved? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ban imposed by the government and communities on the open collection of Medicinal and aromatic plant species Rules and regulation for the participatory management of MAPs in place The project concept and idea internalized by the government 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual and Quarterly Reports Mid-Term Evaluation Reports Government legal reports/Rules/ official notification 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Individual Interviews Desk Reviews Reports FGD's
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Were inputs (resources and time) used in the best possible way to achieve outcomes? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The right capacities, systems and knowledge about sustainable collection in place Government officers exposed to national/international markets Buyers and sellers for lined for information sharing/ business 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual and Quarterly Reports Mid-Term Evaluation Reports BBRT meeting reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Individual Interviews with exporters Desk Reviews Meeting minutes Reports FGD's

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent was the project cost-effective? 			
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent has the project contributed towards its longer-term goals? Why or why not? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improved living conditions of communities A system created for replication of the concept with budget 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual and Quarterly Reports Mid-Term Evaluation Reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Individual Interviews Desk Reviews Reports
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will there be continued positive impacts as a result of the project once it has finished? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adaptive capacity enhanced to illegal extraction of MAPs Improvement witnessed in the biological population of endangered and critical species 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual and Quarterly Reports Case studies conducted Baseline reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Individual Interviews Desk Reviews FGD's

ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

<p><i>Ratings for Effectiveness, Efficiency, Overall Project Outcome Rating, M&E, IA & EA Execution</i></p> <p>6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings 5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings 4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS): moderate shortcomings 3: Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings 2: Unsatisfactory (U): major problems 1: Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems</p>	<p><i>Sustainability ratings:</i></p> <p>4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks</p>	<p><i>Relevance ratings</i></p> <p>2. Relevant (R) 1. Not relevant (NR)</p>
<p><i>Additional ratings where relevant:</i> Not Applicable (N/A) Unable to Assess (U/A)</p>		

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 wrong doings 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 Form⁶

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

⁶www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

Signature: _____

ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE⁷

- i. Opening page:
 - Title of UNDP supported AF financed project
 - UNDP and AF project ID#s
 - Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report
 - Region and countries included in the project
 - 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 Manual⁸)
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 rated⁹)
- 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)

⁷The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

⁸ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

⁹ See Annex D for rating scales.

- Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management
 - Project Finance
 - Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry (*), implementation (*), and overall assessment (*)
 - Implementing Agency (UNDP) execution (*) and Executing Agency execution (*), overall project implementation/ execution (*), coordination, and operational issues
- 3.3 Project Results
- Overall results (attainment of objectives) (*)
 - Relevance (*)
 - Effectiveness (*)
 - Efficiency (*)
 - Country ownership
 - Mainstreaming
 - Sustainability: financial resources (*), socio-economic (*), institutional framework and governance (*), environmental (*), and overall likelihood (*)
 - 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
 - Report Clearance Form
 - *Annexed in a separate file:* TE audit trail
 - *Annexed in a separate file:* Terminal GEF Tracking Tool, if applicable

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: _____

ANNEX H: TE REPORT AUDIT TRAIL

The following is a template for the evaluator to show how the received comments on the draft TE report have (or have not) been incorporated into the final TE report. This audit trail should be included as an annex in the final TE report.

To the comments received on (date) from the Terminal Evaluation of the project titled "*Mountains & Market: Biodiversity and Business in Northern Pakistan (PIMS 4048)*".

The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft Terminal Evaluation report; they are referenced by institution ("Author" column) and track change comment number ("#" column):

Author	#	Para No./ comment location	Comment/Feedback on the draft TE report	TE team response and actions taken