

TERMS OF REFERENCE
Terminal Evaluator
Biodiversity Mainstreaming Evaluation Expert

PIMS # 2904 / UNDP-GEF Project ID #00074945 -
Partnerships for Biodiversity Conservation: Mainstreaming in Local Agricultural
Landscapes (Biodiversity Partnerships Project)

BACKGROUND

The Philippines is considered to be one of the world's most biologically rich countries. Its marine waters support the richest coral reef communities on the planet and its terrestrial ecosystems are similarly diverse, supporting a wealth of natural resources and a rich array of species diversity. It is one of the world's 17 megadiversity countries, which together host more than 70% of the world's species. Together with Madagascar, it is also one of the only two countries in the world which are both a megadiverse country and a global conservation hotspot. The entire country comprises a Conservation International Hotspot, and all remaining forest and coastal areas fall within one of four WWF Global 200 Ecoregions. This makes the Philippines one of the planet's highest conservation priorities. The country is home to a vast assemblage of species, many of them found nowhere else in the world. The Philippines has among the highest rates of species discovery in the world (sixteen new species of mammals have been discovered in the last ten years alone). New species are being discovered at a remarkable rate and this pattern shows no sign of slowing. Current taxonomic estimates show that the Philippines has the highest level of endemism in the Indo-Malayan Realm on a per unit-area basis and the highest concentration of biodiversity on earth.

The primary government response to protect this important biodiversity has been the establishment of a system of protected areas through the National Integrated Protected Areas System (NIPAS). However, the system currently excludes other areas of critical connective habitat and other sites which are globally significant for biodiversity conservation. These are the Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs) and the surrounding production landscapes of PAs and KBAs which are important for connectivity of key biodiversity corridors. The result is a highly fragmented landscape, consisting of unsustainable agricultural and natural resources production systems and incompatible land uses which further expose the remaining natural habitats to threats. These are more evident at the level of local government units who are responsible for integrated management of lands under their jurisdiction, including PA/KBA territories, and the production landscape. To arrest fragmentation and ensure that activities in the surrounding landscape conserve species assemblages and maintain ecosystem functions, three major capacity constraints have been identified: (i) inadequate policies, systems, tools and capacities by government agencies at the national level to encourage local government unit (LGU) landscape level biodiversity conservation efforts; (ii) weak capacities and lack of tools by LGUs for mainstreaming biodiversity in landscape level and local development planning; and (iii) failure to integrate biodiversity concerns into local development planning, leading to unsustainable management of the surrounding landscape.

The Biodiversity Partnerships Project, hereinafter referred to as the BPP, directly addresses these barriers through an integrated approach aimed at strengthening enabling policies at the national level; enhancing capacities of LGUs, and demonstration in selected pilot sites. These would be achieved through partnerships with key national government agencies, LGUs and national and local conservation NGOs, to muster their resources and expertise.

These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for the Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the BPP.

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

Table 1. Project Summary Table				
Project Title : Partnerships for Biodiversity Conservation: Mainstreaming in Local Agricultural Landscapes (Biodiversity Partnerships Project)				
GEF Project ID:	3859		At Endorsement (US \$ M)	At Completion¹ (US \$ M)
PIMS No.:	2904			
UNDP Project ID:	00074945	GEF Financing:	4,500,000	To be updated
Country:	Philippines	UNDP	301,404	To be updated
Region:	Asia Pacific	Government:	2,121,778	To be updated
Focal Area:	To mainstream biodiversity conservation in production landscapes/seascapes and sectors Strategic Program under Strategic Objective Two: Strengthening the policy and regulatory framework for mainstreaming biodiversity	Other (NGOs, LGUs, communities)	8,142,820 1,956,059	To be updated
Operational Program:	Biodiversity	Total Co-financing:	12,522,061	To be updated
Executing Agency:	UNDP	Total Project Cost:	17,022,061	
Other Partners Involved:	NEDA, DA, DILG, DTI, NCIP, DOT, PCW, HLURB, League of Provinces, Cities, and Municipalities, CI-Philippines, Haribon Foundation, FFI, PEF, LMDA, PBCFI, UP ISSI, Province of Quirino Local Government Unit,	ProDoc Signature: 20 September 2010		
		Date Project began: December 2011 (Inception Workshop)		
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: August 2016	Actual: Estimated at December 2016

¹ To be determined in November 2016.

Table 1. Project Summary Table				
Project Title : Partnerships for Biodiversity Conservation: Mainstreaming in Local Agricultural Landscapes (Biodiversity Partnerships Project)				
	Cagayan State University, and the Isabela State University			

OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The objective of BPP is to demonstrate how Local Government Units (LGUs), with enhanced capacities, and working together with local and national partners, can plan and manage economic activities and growth in ways that meet landscape-level biodiversity conservation and sustainable use objectives in critical biogeographic regions.

The project, which is a programmatic initiative on biodiversity rather than the usual site-based projects, intends to generate the following major outcomes and corresponding outputs:

Outcome 1: National-level systems, policies, tools and capacities are in place to support LGU level biodiversity conservation efforts.

- 1.1 Policy & tools for biodiversity impact assessments of national agricultural & natural resource policies, plans & programmes adopted by DA & DENR.
- 1.2 National-level policy, programs & technical capacity to support biodiversity-friendly agricultural practices.
- 1.3 Enhanced national-level system for regulation of trade in wild plant & animal resources.
- 1.4 Policies to encourage investments in biodiversity-friendly business opportunities.
- 1.5 National-level systems for knowledge management

Outcome 2: LGUs encompassing 1.6 Million hectares in five key biogeographic regions have the tools and capacities to integrate sustainable management into decentralized government structures.

- 2.1 Tools, guidelines & methods developed to mainstream biodiversity in local development policy making, planning, budgeting, M & E.
- 2.2 Toolkits & implementation capacity for application of SEAs, as well as, landscape & seascape level natural resource management, across multiple LGUs.
- 2.3 LGU-level policy framework & technical capacity to support biodiversity-friendly agricultural practices in critical eco-regions.
- 2.4 Strengthened local regulation of trade in wild plant & animal resources.
- 2.5 Regulatory structures & incentive systems to encourage the development of biodiversity-friendly businesses, including investor codes of conduct, established at the LGU level.
- 2.6 Intra-LGU data & knowledge-sharing & advocacy network to synthesize project lessons learned into national policy & decision-making

Outcome 3: Systems, policies, tools and capacities for landscape level biodiversity conservation and sustainable development are applied at eight pilot sites covering 700,000 hectares across five critical biogeographic regions (Luzon, Palawan, Negros-Panay, Mindoro

and Mindanao).

- 3.1 Biodiversity-friendly projects, programmes & policies achieved via impact assessments incorporated into LGU planning process (all sites).
- 3.2 Trans-boundary integrated planning achieved via the implementation of toolkits (QPL, CPM, NNNP, Lake Mainit, Mt. Hamiguitan).
- 3.3 Biodiversity-friendly agricultural practices (e.g. use of indigenous crop varieties), achieved via enhanced & extended standards & associated certification processes. (all sites).
- 3.4 Improved regulations & enforcement of wild animal & plant gathering & trade achieved via strengthening of permitting system & implementation of trade regulation. (CPM, Malampaya, Mt. Hamiguitan).
- 3.5 Biodiversity-friendly investment programs promoted in selected sites (Siburan, NNNP, CPM, Mt. Hamiguitan).
- 3.6 Incentive systems and innovative financing programs to reduce destructive activities by PA/KBA dependent communities (PES in QPL and NNNP, pilot CCAs in PPLS, QPL, CPM, NNNP and Mt. Hamiguitan).
- 3.7 Data and knowledge management to underpin preceding themes (awareness campaigns, support to inter LGU knowledge sharing, biodiversity monitoring, biological assessments).

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects.

The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

An overall approach and method for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects have developed over time. The Evaluation Team 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 (*TOR Annex C*) The Evaluation Team 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 team 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 Evaluation Team is expected to conduct a field mission to Manila and selected project sites (Annex A). Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

- Biodiversity Management Bureau of the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR);
- DENR Regional Offices
- Partner National Government Agencies (NGAs)

- Partner Non-Government Organizations (NGOs)
- Participating local government units representatives

The team will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, Mid Term Evaluation Report (MTR) and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the Evaluation Team 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 ([Annex C](#)), 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](#).

Table 2. Rating of Project Performance

Rating Project Performance		
Criteria	Comments	
Monitoring and Evaluation: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S) Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)		
Overall quality of M and E	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
M & E design at start up	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
M&E Plan Implementation	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
IA & EA Execution: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S) Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)		
Overall Quality of Project Implementation/Execution	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Implementing Agency Execution	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Executing Agency Execution	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Outcomes Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S) Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)		
Overall Quality of Project Outcomes	(rate 6 point scale)	
Relevance: relevant (R) or not relevant (NR)	(rate 2 point scale)	
Effectiveness	(rate 6 point scale)	
Efficiency	(rate 6 point scale)	
Sustainability: Likely (L); Moderately Likely (ML); Moderately Unlikely (MU); Unlikely (U).		
Overall likelihood of risks to sustainability	(rate: 4 point scale)	
Financial Resources	(rate: 4 point scale)	
Socio-economic	(rate: 4 point scale)	
Institutional Framework and Governance	(rate: 4 point scale)	

Environmental	(rate: 4 point scale)	
Overall Project Results	(rate 6 point scale)	

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 Evaluation Team 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.

Table 3. Status of Co-Financing, BPP, as of February 2015

Source of Co-financing	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement (US\$) ²	Actual Amount Contributed at stage of Midterm Review (US\$)	Actual % of Expected Amount
National Government-DENR	DENR	In-Kind total³	2,121,778	386,418.95	18%
	BMB-DENR	In-Kind	-	221,240.68	-
	DENR Region 2 - NECKBA	In-Kind	-	8,499.00	-
	DENR Region 4-B MSPLS	In-Kind	-	5,694.76	-
	DENR Region 6 - CPM	In-Kind	-	44,441.91	-
	DENR Region 11 - MHWRS	In-Kind	-	71,680.19	-
	DENR Region 13/LMDA - LMKBA	In-Kind	-	34,862.41	-
Partner National Government Agencies	Department of Agriculture	In kind total	0	333,804.10	NA
		In-Kind	0	13,804.10	NA
	DA-Alignment of the NAP-SLM to the UNCCD's 10-	Cash		50,000.00	NA

² Line agencies other than the DENR (e.g. Department of Agriculture, Dept of Trade and Industry etc.) provided counterpart financing for their annual work plans. These additional co financing were not anticipated during the CEO endorsement.

³ The DENR co financing is further broken down to constituent agencies

Source of Co-financing	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement (US\$) ²	Actual Amount Contributed at stage of Midterm Review (US\$)	Actual % of Expected Amount
	Strategic Plan and Framework				
	DA-BAR: ITPGRFA	Cash	0	270,000.00	NA
	Dept. of Trade and Industry- Board of Investments	In-Kind Total	0	71,585.70	NA
	Dept of Trade and Industry- Design Center of the Phils	In-Kind Total	0	9,518.04	NA
	Dept of Tourism	In Kind Total	0	11,389.52	NA
	HLURB	In Kind Total	0	13,667.43	NA
Academe	UP-ISSI	In Kind Total	0	4,555.81	NA
Local Government Units	All LGUs cited below	Grant total	6,720,343	0	0%
		In-Kind total	1,422,477	131,176.33	9%
	6 LGUs in Cagayan	In-Kind	-	17,824.01	-
	6 LGUs in Quirino	In-Kind	-	27,304.72	-
	Sablayan, Mindoro Occidental	In Kind	-	150.91	-
	Taytay, Palawan	In-Kind	-	35,856.83	-
	Province of Iloilo and Aklan	In-Kind	-	1,138.95	-
	10 LGUs in CPM	In-Kind	-	4,555.81	-
	LGUs in NNNP	In-Kind	-	10,706.15	-
	LGUs in MHWRS	In-Kind	-	12,847.38	-
	LGUs in Caraga	In-Kind	-	20,791.57	-
NGOs and Communities		Grant Total	611,457	2,000	0.3%

Source of Co-financing	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement (US\$) ²	Actual Amount Contributed at stage of Midterm Review (US\$)	Actual % of Expected Amount
		In-Kind Total	1,344,602	202,956.93	15%
	CI-Philippines	In-Kind	-	69,725.56	-
	FFI	In-Kind	-	11,753.99	-
	Haribon	In-Kind	-	1,591.62	-
	PBCFI	In-Kind	-	101,662.53	-
	Save our Species-IUCN for NNNP	Cash	-	2,000.00	-
	PEF	In-Kind	-	18,223.23	-
UNDP		Grant	301,404	200,589	67%
		TOTAL	12,522,061	1,367,661	11%

Notes:

(a) Sources of co-financing: Bilateral Aid Agencies, Foundation, GEF Partner Agency, Local Government, National Government, Civil Society Organization, Other Multi-lateral agency(ies), Private Sector, Other

(b) Type of co-financing: Grant, Soft Loan, Hard Loan, Guarantee, In-Kind, Others.

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. In addition, the evaluation will be included in the country office evaluation plan.

IMPACT

The Evaluation Team 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, or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.

CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of conclusions, recommendations and lessons. Conclusions should build on findings and be based in evidence. Recommendations should be prioritized, specific, relevant, and targeted, with suggested implementers of the recommendations. Lessons should have wider applicability to other initiatives across the region, the area of intervention, and for the future.

IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in the Philippines. The UNDP CO will contract the Evaluation Team / firm and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluation Team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The Evaluation is expected to start by July 14, 2016 and have an estimated total input of 40 working days. The final work plan will be agreed jointly by the Evaluation Team and UNDP upon submission of a draft work plan and methodology for discussion.

Table 4. Timetable for BPP TE Preparation

Activity	Timing	Indicative Dates ⁴
Preparation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To include orientation to the assignment, initial document review, and preparation/discussion of the Evaluation Plan 	2 days	July 14-15, 2016
Evaluation Mission <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detailed document review, interviews with key project personnel and partners, stakeholder consultations, visits to selected sites 	20 days	July 25- August 31, 2016
Draft Evaluation Report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analysis and preparation of draft evaluation report highlighting initial findings Debriefing Preparation of Draft Evaluation Report including comments provided during the debriefing meeting 	10 days	September 1-16, 2016
Final Report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preparation of Final Evaluation Report, including addressing comments from stakeholders on the first draft Presentation of final draft to Project Board and other key stakeholders 	8 days	September 19-30, 2016

EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

Table 5. TE Deliverables

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
Inception Report	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation Mission.	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
Presentation	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission	To project management, UNDP CO

⁴ Estimates only. These will be validated during Inception.

Draft Final Report	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 2 weeks of the evaluation mission	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs
Final Report ⁵	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC.

EXPERTISE REQUIRED

The BPP seeks to engage the services of two (2) independent national consultants who together will act as the Evaluation Team and perform the Terminal Evaluation of the Project. The Biodiversity Mainstreaming Evaluation Expert will focus the evaluation on the BD-mainstreaming work in the local planning and development processes. The consultant must have at least demonstrated experience in handling international UNDP-GEF Biodiversity Project Terminal Evaluations in the past five (5) years.

The Project Team in consultation with UNDP CO will be responsible for logistical arrangements for the field visits including setting up meetings and organizing in country travel. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluation Team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

The evaluation will commence when formalities are completed by July 1, 2016. The Evaluation Team will present preliminary findings to the Project Board planned in August 2016. A draft Terminal Evaluation Report for comments will be submitted to UNDP within 15 days following the de-briefing. UNDP will coordinate comments from partners and share consolidated written comments with the consultants within 10 days after receiving the draft TE report. A final TE report with comments from partners incorporated will be submitted to UNDP no later than end of September 19, 2016; for consideration in the preparation of the Terminal Project Review/Project Implementation Review by UNDP-GEF.

The consultants must have extensive knowledge in the environmental and local development planning and institutional frameworks for biodiversity conservation in the Philippines. They must have experience in developing performance indicators, project appraisal and evaluation of development projects. They would assess the project's results, sustainability of project outcomes, project's M&E system, processes in achieving project's results, and identify lessons learned and recommendations. Specifically, he/she will provide analysis of the project's overall performance vis-à-vis its replicability and sustainability in the Philippine context.

1) Biodiversity Mainstreaming Evaluation Expert

- Advanced degree in Urban and Regional Planning, Environment and Natural Resource Management; Environmental Economy; Environmental Science, Agrobiodiversity or related fields;
- Demonstrated experience in conducting project evaluations; prior experience in GEF Project evaluations would be an advantage
- At least 5-10 years of proven experience in local development planning with strong elements of biodiversity conservation and environmental assessment and management;

⁵ 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. See Annex J for the audit trail template.

- Demonstrated strong knowledge of Monitoring and Evaluation methods for development projects; knowledge of UNDP's results-based management orientation and practices;
- Familiarity with biodiversity conservation issues in the Philippines;
- A solid understanding of environmental management , with a focus on participatory processes, joint management, and gender issues;
- Fluency in the English language and excellent oral and written communication skills
- Willingness to undertake regular field visits and interact with different stakeholders, especially primary stakeholders;

Desirable:

- Knowledge of the biodiversity, climate change and land degradation - focal areas in which the project operates;
- Understanding of UNDP and GEF procedures;
- Experience in data processing and with computers.
- Experience in the evaluation of technical assistance projects, preferably with UNDP or other United Nations development agencies and major donors. If possible, experience in the evaluation of GEF-funded capacity building projects.

The evaluators should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The Policy and Institutional Evaluation Expert, who will act as the Team Leader, will report to the UNDP Country Director through the Team Leader – Inclusive and Sustainable Development Unit (ISD). The ISD at UNDP CO will provide support to the development of the evaluation work plan in consultation with key project partners. The Project team (PMU) will serve as the reference group for the evaluation and ensure the monitoring of satisfactory completion of evaluation deliverables.

In consultation with the Evaluation Team Leader and as requested, the PMU personnel will make available all relevant documentation and provide contact information to key project partners and stakeholders, and facilitate contact where needed. The team will also assist in organizing any briefing de-briefing meetings including coordination of stakeholders' input in the evaluation draft report.

EVALUATOR ETHICS

The Evaluation Team will be held to the highest ethical standards and is required to sign a Code of Conduct ([Annex F](#)) 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

The Biodiversity Mainstreaming Evaluation Expert will be contracted by UNDP and remunerated according to the reviewed and accepted financial proposal. The contract will be output-based and payment issued only upon delivery of satisfactory outputs/milestones.

Table 6. Payment Schedule

%	Milestone
10%	At submission and approval of TE inception report
30%	Following submission and approval of the 1st draft terminal evaluation report
60%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report

APPLICATION PROCESS

Applicants are requested to apply online (<http://www.undp.org.ph.jobs>) by_____. Individual consultant is invited to submit proposal and a price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs) together with the CV. UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/skills of the Team as well as the financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

APPROVAL

IMEE MANAL
OIC Team Leader, ISD
Date:

TOR Annex A

LIST OF PROJECT SITES

Administrative Region	Site Name	Location	Protected Areas/Key Biodiversity Area (has)
Region II	Northeastern Cagayan Key Biodiversity Area	Cagayan Province, Municipalities of: 1. Lal-lo 2. Gattaran 3. Gonzaga 4. Baggao 5. Buguey and 6. Sta. Teresita	118,782 (183,430)
Region II	Quirino Protected Landscape	Quirino Province, Municipalities of 7. Madella 8. Aglipay 9. Nagtipunan 10. Cabbaroguis 11. Diffun 12. Saguday	164,364
Region IVB	Mt. Siburan	Province of Mindoro Occidental, Municipality of: 13. Sablayan	11,569
Region IVB	Malampaya Sound	Province of Palawan, Municipalities of: 1. Taytay and 2. San Vicente	200,115
Region VI	Central Panay Mountains	Province of Antique, Municipalities of: 3. Sebaste	85,658

Administrative Region	Site Name	Location	Protected Areas/Key Biodiversity Area (has)
		4. Culasi 5. Tibiao 6. Barbaza 7. Laua-an 8. Bugasong 9. Valderrama 10. San Remigio Province of Iloilo, Municipalities of: 11. Janiuay and 12. Lambunao Province of Capiz, Municipalities of: 13. Tapaz and 14. Jamindan Province of Aklan, Municipalities of: 15. Libacao 16. Madalag and 17. Malinao	
Region VI	Northern Negros National Park	Province of Negros Occidental Cities: 18. Talisay 19. Silay 20. Victorias 21. Cadiz	80,455

Administrative Region	Site Name	Location	Protected Areas/Key Biodiversity Area (has)
		22. Sagay and 23. San Carlos; Municipalities of 24. E.B. Magallona 25. Murcia 26. Calatrava 27. Toboso and 28. Don Salvador Benedicto	
CARAGA Region	Lake Mainit	Province of Surigao del Norte, Municipalities of: 29. Tubod 30. Sison 31. Mainit 32. Alegria Province of Agusan del Norte, Municipalities of: 33. Kitcharao 34. Jabonga 35. Santiago 36. Tubay	14,525
Region XI	Mt. Hamiguitan	Davao Oriental Province, Municipalities of: 37. San Isidro	31,879

Administrative Region	Site Name	Location	Protected Areas/Key Biodiversity Area (has)
		38. Governor Generoso 39. Mati City	
		TOTAL	771,995

TOR ANNEX B
LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE EVALUATORS⁶

The evaluation will use the following methods for data collection:

Document Review

- GEF Project Information Form (PIF), Project Document and CEO Endorsement – Partnerships for Biodiversity Conservation: Mainstreaming in Local Agricultural Landscapes (Biodiversity Partnerships Project)
- Implementing/Executing partner arrangements
- Annual Reports
- Quarterly Progress Reports
- APRs/PIRs (2012, 2014, 2015)
- Minutes of Project Board meetings
- Work and Financial Plans (2012-2016)
- MOAs, resolutions, or other official documents expressing local partners support to the project
- Key outputs produced by the project that will include handbook/guides, plans, maps, inventories
- Sample project communication (IEC) materials produced by the site partners
- List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Boards, and other partners to be consulted
- Project sites, highlighting suggested visits
- Mid Term Review (MTR) Report
- Project Tracking Tool, at baseline, at mid-term, and at terminal points
- UNDP Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF)
- UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD)
- GEF focal area strategic program objectives

Key Informant Interviews

The evaluation will include interviews with key stakeholders:

- Members of the Project Board
- Members of the Inter-Agency Technical Working Group (ITWG)
- Officials of BMB
- Members of the BMB Project Facilitation Group (PFG)
- GEF Operational Focal Point
- Staff/Consultants of BPP
- Staff of UNDP Country Office
- Officers, staff of partner NGOs and DENR Regional Offices
- Local government unit officials and staff in pilot sites
- Partner Academe (UP ISSI)

⁶ This list will be updated before TE as more documents become available.

TOR ANNEX C

PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

This Project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPAP or CPD: Key stakeholders are better able to manage environment and natural resources, develop and use sustainable energy sources, cope with the impacts of environmental emergencies and maintain sustainable development
Country Programme Outcome Indicators: Number of inconsistent environment and natural resources policies harmonized/ standardized; Number of ENR issues resolved/addressed favorably with consensus in shortened period of time vs. baseline; Number of sectoral policy gaps addressed through legal issuances; Development plans at national and local levels with enhanced ENR/sustainable energy/sustainable development focus; Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEA) commitments complied
Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area : Mainstreaming environment and energy
Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program: BD-SO2; SP4 To mainstream biodiversity conservation in production landscapes/seascapes and sectors Strategic Program under Strategic Objective Two: Strengthening the policy and regulatory framework for mainstreaming biodiversity
Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes: Policy and regulatory frameworks governing sectors outside the environment sector incorporate measures to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity
Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators: The degree to which policies and regulations governing sectoral activities include measures to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity as measured through the GEF tracking tool

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable Indicators	Baseline	Target	Sources of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
Objective: To demonstrate how Local Government Units (LGUs), with enhanced capacities, and working together with local and national partners, can plan and manage economic	Populations of at least three critically endangered species in three demonstration sites	Expected to decrease by at least 10% by end-project	No decline in populations of tamaraw in Siburan forests; Visayan hornbill in Central Panay and NNNP; and Philippine eagle in Mt. Hamiguitan	Baseline and end of project population assessments by DENR.	Climate change will not cause drastic reductions in populations of critically endangered species
	Extent of habitat fragmentation in unprotected PAs/KBAs in eight	Expected to increase by at least 10% by end-project	No net increase in fragmentation in 287,000 hectares of unprotected PAs/KBAs	Satellite imagery in year 1 and year 6 BMS Reports	No natural disasters will occur in project sites that will result in large scale fragmentation

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable Indicators	Baseline	Target	Sources of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
activities and growth in ways that meet landscape-level biodiversity conservation and sustainable use objectives in critical biogeographic regions	demonstration sites		in eight demonstration sites		
	Extent of remaining natural habitat within PAs in five biogeographic regions	Expected to decrease by at least 10% in PAs in project sites by end-project.	No net loss of remaining natural habitat covering at least 310,000 hectares in PAs within project sites	Satellite imagery in year 1 and year 6 Spot checks of vulnerable areas	No major natural disasters will occur in Project sites that will severely damage natural habitats
	Number of hectares in production landscapes/waterscapes under sustainable management	No increase during the period	At least additional 10,000 hectares under sustainable management but not yet certified At least additional 800 hectares and 8 production systems under certified production practices that meet sustainability and biodiversity standards	GEF Tracking Tool on mainstreaming in biodiversity in production landscapes and seascapes	There will be sufficient market demand for certified products to create parallel incentives to produce these goods
Outcome 1: National-level systems, policies, tools and capacities are in place to support LGU-level biodiversity conservation efforts	Agencies with policies and associated capacity to conduct biodiversity impact assessment of sectoral policies and plans	None	DA and DENR are routinely conducting biodiversity impact assessments of sectoral policies and plans by year 4.	Policy issuances by DA and DENR (Department Administrative Orders) Biodiversity impact assessment tools and guidelines Biodiversity impact assessment reports of new policies and plans	There will be continuing commitment by agency partners to apply biodiversity impact assessment policies and tools in agency wide work

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable Indicators	Baseline	Target	Sources of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
				prepared by agency staff	
	Programmes and policies to support biodiversity friendly agricultural production in critical landscapes	<p>No agrobiodiversity programs in AFMA plan</p> <p>National Action Plan for Sustainable Land management (NAP-SLM) do not include agrobiodiversity projects in buffer zones of PAs and KBAs</p> <p>Standards and certification schemes limited to organic agricultural production</p> <p>Activities to promote conservation and utilization of indigenous crops</p>	<p>Updated AFMA Plan incorporates agrobiodiversity programs.</p> <p>Revised NAP-SLM includes agrobiodiversity projects in buffer zones of PAs or KBAs.</p> <p>Standards and certification system for biodiversity friendly production systems in place</p> <p>Policy and program developed in DA to promote conservation and utilization of indigenous crops</p>	<p>Updated AFMA Plan</p> <p>Revised NAP-SLM</p> <p>Revised standards and certification system at BFAPS for biodiversity friendly agricultural production systems</p> <p>DA Department Order on conservation and utilization of indigenous crops</p>	Implementation of the BPP project takes place before the updating of the development plans of target partner organizations.
	Systems and procedures for implementation of new regulations of trade in wild plant and animal	Department Order issued	System established for surveillance, monitoring, and mapping the sources of illegally traded wild plants and animals	Project reports	

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable Indicators	Baseline	Target	Sources of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
	resources				
	Policies to encourage investments in biodiversity friendly business	None	Policy in place at DTI Priority biodiversity business identified in DTI policy documents.	Department regulations on biodiversity friendly investments	
	National biodiversity information system	PAWB biodiversity information system has limited data and information that can be shared with LGUs, conservation NGOs and other development agencies.	A Knowledge Management System established at PAWB with computerized data storage and retrieval system that can be accessed on-line by LGUs, conservation NGOs and other development agencies.	Project reports on system development report and test runs. MOA on networking signed among cooperating organizations.	NGOs and other development agencies would be willing to share their data and information.
Outcome 2 : LGUs encompassing at least 1.6 Million hectares in five biogeographic regions have the tools and capacities to integrate sustainable management into decentralized government structures	LGUs with tools and capacities for mainstreaming biodiversity in local development policy making, planning, budgeting and M and E systems	Nil	A comprehensive suite of tools and associated capacity-building support for mainstreaming biodiversity available to LGUs in the target regions by year 3.	Project Reports	LGU Executives will have sufficient commitment to negate pressures from other interest groups to ignore implementation of local policies and tools
	LGUs with toolkits and implementation capacity for application of SEAs, as well as landscape level natural resource	Nil	Tools developed and 20% of LGUs in project sites trained in SEAs and landscape level natural resources management User friendly manuals	Procedural Manuals Project Reports	The BPP will be implemented in time for updating of LGU CLUPs

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable Indicators	Baseline	Target	Sources of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
	management, across multiple and individual LGUs		for transboundary resource management planning developed and and 20% of LGUs trained in their use DILG Memorandum Order prescribing planning guidelines and SEA approaches		
	LGU development expenditures for identifiably BD-friendly programmes and investments.	Only LGUs in NNNP and Malampaya have annual budget allocations for biodiversity friendly projects amounting to US \$ 55,562 Other LGUs in the project sites do not have regular budget allotment to support biodiversity conservation Budget support to biodiversity related initiatives is negligible and sporadic.	200% increase in overall LGU development expenditures for biodiversity friendly programmes and investments At least 3 LGUs in each biogeographic region have budget allocations for biodiversity conservation by end-project (11 LGUs)	Project accomplishment and M&E reports. Copy of annual budget and expenditure reports.	LGUs will continue to make conservation programs a priority despite changes in local leadership following elections
	LGUs in critical biogeographic regions with policy framework and	Nil	20% of LGUs with local ordinances and programs adopting biodiversity friendly	Project reports	

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable Indicators	Baseline	Target	Sources of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
	technical capacity to support biodiversity friendly agricultural practices		agricultural practices 20% of LGUs with staff trained in promoting BD friendly agricultural practices 20% increase in LGU budgets for biodiversity friendly agricultural programs	Training reports M and E reports	
	LGUs in critical biogeographic regions with local regulations and capacity to implement policies on wildlife trade	Nil	10 LGUs with local Ordinances to support regulation of local endemics 10 LGUs with staff trained on policies and procedures governing wildlife trade Local coordinating bodies established with DENR, wildlife enforcement agents and volunteers to strengthen regulation of wildlife trade	Local Ordinances passed by Municipal/Provincial Councils Training reports Memorandum of Agreements between LGUs, local DENR, Bureau of Customs, and Volunteer Groups	

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable Indicators	Baseline	Target	Sources of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
	LGUs with regulatory structures and incentive systems to encourage the development of biodiversity-friendly businesses, including investor codes of conduct	Nil	10 LGUs in project sites with regulatory structures, incentive systems, investor codes of conduct and programs and budgets promoting BD-friendly business.	Local Ordinance approved by Municipal/Provincial Councils Municipal/Provincial Investment Programs Published LGU investor codes of conduct	Budget increase will be supported by the LGU Councils.
	Mechanisms and capacities for intra LGU knowledge sharing on mainstreaming biodiversity	Mechanisms exist for intra LGU sharing on environment programs and performance but not on biodiversity	Mechanism and network established to regularly share lessons on mainstreaming biodiversity New national policy proposals formulated/approved based on lessons from LGUs/project sites Improved capacity by LGUs to advocate improved policies	Project reports Copies of proposals LGU resolutions supporting national policies to strengthen mainstreaming of biodiversity in other sectors	LGUs and other local partners are willing to share their data and information

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable Indicators	Baseline	Target	Sources of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
Outcome 3: Systems, policies, tools and capacities for landscape-level biodiversity conservation and sustainable development are applied at eight pilot sites covering at least 700,000 hectares across five critical biogeographic regions (Luzon, Palawan, Negros-Panay, Mindoro, Mindanao). ⁷	LGU development plans at project sites complying with SEA approach, as well as landscape level natural resources management	LGUs do not apply SEAs in local development planning PA management plans and FLUPs not integrated in CLUPs	At least 20% of LGUs in the project sites apply SEA in their development planning. At least 20% of LGUs in the project sites integrate biodiversity conservation zoning (PA or KBA zoning) in their CLUP.	Project accomplishment reports. Copy of CLUPs integrating PA/KBA plans Number of planning staffs trained on SEA and integration of zoning. Copy of manuals on toolkits developed.	
	Inter LGU cooperation in planning and regulation of natural resource use	Municipal and City LGUs plan separately and do not coordinate and harmonize their plans. Provincial Land Use Committees oversee and approves municipal and city land use plans. LGUs within PAs or KBAs do not jointly adopt any economic PES instruments	At least two transboundary conservation areas established LGUs in the project sites (at least 3 jointly managed landscapes) harmonize their development plans for natural resource use in biodiversity landscapes that cut across their administrative boundaries.	LGU Resolutions declaring transboundary conservation areas PAWB records of new transboundary PAs/KBAs established Joint management plans for transboundary PAs/KBAs Project accomplishment report. Copy of the harmonized development plans.	There will be agreements among LGU Executives and stakeholders of individual LGUs to establish transboundary PAs/KBAs Stakeholders will not oppose PES.

⁷Partners: FFI, Haribon Foundation, CI Philippines, Philippine Eagle Foundation, Philippine Biodiversity Conservation Foundation, and Lake Mainit Development Alliance.

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable Indicators	Baseline	Target	Sources of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
			<p>LGUs in the project sites sharing PA or KBA areas jointly adopt resource planning tools such as FLUP, ICRMP, ecological zoning.</p> <p>At least 3 Provincial CLUPs in the project sites adopt the planning tools for biodiversity conservation.</p> <p>PES instrument developed and tested in at least one biodiversity landscape.</p>	<p>Training reports on the application of planning tools such as FLUP, ICRMP and ecological zoning for LGUs</p> <p>Copy of PES and MOA among LGUs sharing the PA or KBA landscape.</p>	
	New conservation areas established	None	Three new conservation areas established covering 15 LGUs	<p>LGU Resolutions declaring new conservation areas</p> <p>PAWB records of new conservation areas established</p> <p>Management plans for new conservation areas</p>	LGU Councils will approve the establishment of new conservation areas
	Farmers adopting biodiversity friendly practices	No increase over project period	At least 5,000 farmers adopting biodiversity friendly agricultural practices	<p>Provincial/Municipal Agricultural Office reports</p> <p>Project reports</p>	Exposure of farmers to climate change risks will not counterbalance the gains from adopting biodiversity friendly

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable Indicators	Baseline	Target	Sources of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
			Additional 2,000 farmers and producers meeting certification standards	OCCP and third party certification system reports Provincial/Municipal Agricultural Office reports on Community Guarantee System	agricultural practices
	Pressures from overharvesting of wild resources	Expected to increase over total area of KBAs/PAs in project sites by 10% each year	Pressure reduced in PAs totaling at least 260,000 hectares No net reduction in population of key species in selected sites (e.g., hornbill, Philippine eagle, etc.)	Biodiversity monitoring reports Population studies of key species in selected sites	
	Private investments in biodiversity friendly business in selected project sites	Nil	At least four businesses engaged in biodiversity-friendly enterprises in project sites by year 5. At least four producer groups in PAs/KBAs adhere to LGU investor codes of conduct	LGU Annual Reports on investment flows LGU Monitoring reports on investments	There will be sufficient interest and financing from the private sector to invest, given the incentives
	Communities receiving incentives for shifting to sustainable practices	Nil	Conservation agreements in place with at least two community groups in CPM and NNNP	Agreements between communities and financing organizations	

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable Indicators	Baseline	Target	Sources of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
			<p>PES schemes negotiated with two more community groups in other sites in PPLS and NNNP</p> <p>10 communities engaged in sustainable livelihoods</p>	<p>Monitoring reports by facilitating NGOs</p> <p>Regular project reports/LGU MENRO and DENR CENRO reports</p>	
	<p>Data and knowledge management systems to support local initiatives</p>	<p>Some LGUs have isolated data and knowledge management systems but not linked to national system</p> <p>Insufficient data to adequately monitor status and trends in biodiversity and impacts of development programs</p>	<p>Rapid resource assessments completed/updated in eight project sites</p> <p>Population estimates of critically endangered species in eight sites determined</p> <p>Monitoring system in place to determine progress in meeting conservation plan objectives, linked to knowledge management system</p> <p>Increased public awareness and positive support to conservation efforts among local</p>	<p>Copies of assessment reports</p> <p>Reports on population estimates</p> <p>Monitoring reports</p> <p>IEC campaigns, statements of support from stakeholders, additional organizations supporting conservation efforts in PAs/KBA sites</p> <p>Training reports</p> <p>Project reports on use of national data and knowledge management system</p>	

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable Indicators	Baseline	Target	Sources of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
			stakeholders LGU level data and knowledge management system enhanced LGU staff trained in use of data and knowledge management system LGUs able to access and share data and information in national system		

TOR ANNEX D: EVALUATION QUESTIONS⁸

This Evaluation Criteria/Question Matrix must be amended, as appropriate, by the consultant and included in 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 GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?				
Is the project relevant to UNCBD and other international convention objectives?	<p>How does the project support the objectives of the UNCBD?</p> <p>Does the project support other international conventions, such as the UNFCCC and the UNDRIP?</p>	<p>UNCBD priorities and areas of work incorporated in project design</p> <p>Level of implementation of UNCBD in the Philippines, Program of Work on Protected Areas and contribution of the project</p> <p>Priorities and areas of work of other conventions incorporated in project design</p>	<p>Project documents</p> <p>National policies and strategies to implement the UNCBD, other international conventions, or related to environment more generally</p> <p>UNCBD and other international convention web sites</p>	<p>Documents analyses</p> <p>Interviews with project team, UNDP and other partners</p>
Is the project relevant the GEF biodiversity focal area?	How does the project support the GEF biodiversity focal area and strategic priorities	Existence of a clear relationship between the project objectives and GEF biodiversity focal area	<p>Project documents</p> <p>GEF focal areas strategies and documents</p>	<p>Documents analyses</p> <p>GEF website</p> <p>Interviews with UNDP and project team</p>
Is the project relevant to the Philippine Development Plan and environment and sustainable development objectives?	<p>How does the project support the environment and sustainable development objectives of the Philippines?</p> <p>How does the project support the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP)?</p> <p>Is the project country-driven?</p> <p>What was the level of stakeholder participation in project design?</p> <p>What was the level of stakeholder ownership in implementation?</p> <p>Does the project adequately take into</p>	<p>Degree to which the project supports national environmental objectives</p> <p>Degree to which the project supports implementation of the NBSAP</p> <p>Degree of coherence between the project and national priorities, policies and strategies</p> <p>Appreciation from national stakeholders with respect to adequacy of project design</p>	<p>Project documents</p> <p>National policies and strategies</p> <p>NBSAP</p> <p>Key project partners</p>	<p>Documents analyses</p> <p>Interviews with UNDP and project partners</p>

⁸ The Consultants are encouraged to develop more specific evaluation questions in the course of preparing the Inception Report

Evaluative Criteria	Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
	account the national realities, both in terms of institutional and policy framework in its design and its implementation?	<p>and implementation to national realities and existing capacities</p> <p>Level of involvement of government officials and other partners in the project design process</p> <p>Coherence between needs expressed by national stakeholders and UNDP-GEF criteria</p>		
Is the project addressing the needs of target beneficiaries at the local and regional levels?	<p>How does the project support the needs of relevant stakeholders?</p> <p>Has the implementation of the project been inclusive of all relevant stakeholders?</p> <p>Were local beneficiaries and stakeholders adequately involved in project design and implementation?</p>	<p>Strength of the link between expected results from the project and the needs of relevant stakeholders</p> <p>Degree of involvement and inclusiveness of stakeholders in project design and implementation</p>	<p>Project partners and stakeholders</p> <p>Needs assessment studies</p> <p>Project documents</p>	<p>Document analysis</p> <p>Interviews with relevant stakeholders</p>
Is the project internally coherent in its design?	<p>Are there logical linkages between expected results of the project (log frame) and the project design (in terms of project components, choice of partners, structure, delivery mechanism, scope, budget, use of resources, etc.)?</p> <p>Is the length of the project sufficient to achieve project outcomes?</p> <p>Are the resources of the project sufficient to achieve project outcomes?</p>	<p>Level of coherence between project expected results and project design internal logic</p> <p>Level of coherence between project design and project implementation approach</p>	<p>Program and project documents</p> <p>Key project stakeholders</p>	<p>Document analysis</p> <p>Key interviews</p>
How is the project relevant with respect to other donor-supported activities?	<p>Does the GEF funding support activities and objectives not addressed by other donors?</p> <p>How do GEF-funds help to fill gaps (or give additional stimulus) that are necessary but are not covered by other donors?</p> <p>Is there coordination and complementarity between donors?</p> <p>How has the Project influenced other donor funded projects/funding</p>	<p>Degree to which program was coherent and complementary to other donor programming nationally and regionally</p>	<p>Documents from other donor supported activities</p> <p>Other donor representatives</p> <p>Project documents</p>	<p>Documents analyses</p> <p>Interviews with project partners and relevant stakeholders</p>

Evaluative Criteria	Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
	<p>organizations which were implemented after BPP?</p> <p>How has the Project catalyzed the support of other donor funded projects and funding organizations/stakeholders active in BD to support major activities initiated under BPP?</p>			
Does the project provide relevant lessons and experiences for other similar projects in the future?	Has the experience of the project provided relevant lessons for other future projects targeted at similar objectives?		Data collected throughout evaluation	Data analysis
Are project activities relevant and appropriate to meet objectives and current development context?	How appropriate are the planned and implemented activities? (in the context of any changes that have occurred in the PAW/ENR sector in the Philippines, recent priorities and opportunities for policy change and program shifts)?		<p>Data collected throughout evaluation</p> <p>Project reports, and new policies in the ENR sector</p>	<p>Data analysis</p> <p>Document review and KII</p>
Effectiveness: To what extent have/will the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been/be achieved?				
Has the project been effective in achieving the expected outcomes and objectives?	Has the project been effective in achieving its expected outcomes?	See indicators in project document results framework and logframe	<p>Project documents</p> <p>Project team and relevant stakeholders</p> <p>Data reported in project annual and quarterly reports</p>	<p>Documents analysis</p> <p>Interviews with project team</p> <p>Interviews with relevant stakeholders</p>
How is risk and risk mitigation being managed?	<p>How well are risks, assumptions and impact drivers being managed?</p> <p>What was the quality of risk mitigation strategies developed? Were these sufficient?</p> <p>Are there clear strategies for risk mitigation related with long-term sustainability of the project?</p>	<p>Completeness of risk identification and assumptions during project planning and design</p> <p>Quality of existing information systems in place to identify emerging risks and other issues</p> <p>Quality of risk mitigations Strategies developed and followed</p>	<p>Project documents</p> <p>UNDP, project team, and relevant stakeholders</p>	<p>Document analysis</p> <p>Interviews</p>
What lessons can be drawn regarding effectiveness for other similar projects in the future?	<p>What lessons have been learned from the project regarding achievement of outcomes?</p> <p>What changes could have been/should be made (if any) to the design of the project in order to improve the achievement of the</p>		Data collected throughout evaluation	Data analysis

Evaluative Criteria	Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
	project's expected results?			
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?				
Was project support provided in an efficient way?	<p>Was adaptive management used or needed to ensure efficient resource use?</p> <p>Did the project logical framework and work plans and any changes made to them used as management tools during implementation?</p> <p>Were the accounting and financial systems in place adequate for project management and producing accurate and timely financial information?</p> <p>Were progress reports produced accurately, timely and responded to reporting requirements including adaptive management changes?</p> <p>Was project implementation as cost effective as originally proposed (planned vs. actual)</p> <p>Did the leveraging of funds (co financing) happen as planned?</p> <p>Were financial resources utilized efficiently? Could financial resources have been used more efficiently?</p> <p>Was procurement carried out in a manner making efficient use of project resources?</p> <p>How was results-based management used during project implementation?</p>	<p>Availability and quality of financial and progress reports</p> <p>Timeliness and adequacy of reporting provided</p> <p>Level of discrepancy between planned and utilized financial expenditures</p> <p>Planned vs. actual funds leveraged</p> <p>Cost in view of results achieved compared to costs of similar projects from other organizations</p> <p>Adequacy of project choices in view of existing context, infrastructure and cost</p> <p>Quality of results-based management reporting (progress reporting, monitoring and evaluation)</p> <p>Occurrence of change in project design/ implementation approach (i.e. restructuring) when needed to improve project efficiency</p> <p>Cost associated with delivery mechanism and management structure compare to alternatives</p>	<p>Project documents and evaluations</p> <p>UNDP</p> <p>Project team</p>	<p>Document analysis</p> <p>Key interviews</p>
How efficient are partnership arrangements for the project?	<p>To what extent partnerships/ linkages between institutions/organizations were encouraged and supported?</p> <p>Which partnerships/linkages were facilitated? Which ones can be considered sustainable?</p> <p>What was the level of</p>	<p>Specific activities conducted to support the development of cooperative arrangements between partners,</p> <p>Examples of supported partnerships</p> <p>Evidence that particular partnerships/linkages will be sustained</p>	<p>Project documents and evaluations</p> <p>Project partners and relevant stakeholders</p>	<p>Document analysis</p> <p>Interviews</p>

Evaluative Criteria	Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
	<p>efficiency of cooperation and collaboration arrangements?</p> <p>Which methods were successful or not and why?</p>	Types/quality of partnership cooperation methods utilized		
Did the project efficiently utilize local capacity in implementation?	<p>Was an appropriate balance struck between utilization of international expertise as well as local capacity?</p> <p>Did the project take into account local capacity in design and implementation of the project?</p> <p>Was there an effective collaboration between institutions responsible for implementing the project?</p>	<p>Proportion of expertise utilized from international experts compared to national experts</p> <p>Number/quality of analyses done to assess local capacity potential and absorptive capacity</p>	<p>Project documents and evaluations</p> <p>UNDP</p> <p>Beneficiaries</p>	<p>Document analysis</p> <p>Interviews</p>
What lessons can be drawn regarding efficiency for other similar projects in the future?	<p>What lessons can be learnt from the project regarding efficiency?</p> <p>How could the project have more efficiently carried out implementation (in terms of management structures and procedures, partnership arrangements, etc...)?</p> <p>What changes could have been made (if any) to the project in order to improve its efficiency?</p>	<p>Value for money of partnership arrangements and delivery mechanisms</p> <p>Efficiency of alternative approaches and adaptation strategies undertaken by the project</p>	Data collected throughout evaluation	Data analysis
How efficient and effective are the management and coordination arrangements, including oversight mechanisms for the project?	<p>Does the Project Board provide a useful management and steering function for the project activities?</p> <p>Does the PMU provide a useful and effective management function? Should other alternative arrangements be explored?</p> <p>How effective is the UNDP CO in supporting project implementation, technical assistance, and oversight?</p> <p>How effective is BMB overall in performing its responsibilities as Implementing Agency?</p>		<p>Minutes of Project Board meetings</p> <p>Project reports</p> <p>Assessment reports</p>	<p>Document review</p> <p>Interview with key staff and officials</p>
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?				
What are the major factors which influence sustainability of the project?	<p>Are policies sufficient and in place to support the roll out of the initiated interventions?</p> <p>Does the DENR provide adequate priority to BD conservation as a</p>	<p>Clear policies specifying procedures and mechanisms</p> <p>Program and budget levels allocated by DENR to PAW, its programs and</p>	<p>Data collected throughout evaluation</p> <p>Community feedback</p> <p>Insights/perceptions from institutions and partners</p>	<p>Document review</p> <p>Community FGD and interviews</p> <p>KII with partners and representatives of key</p>

Evaluative Criteria	Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
	<p>programme and the enhancement of capacities of its agency and staff?</p> <p>Do the stakeholders have sufficient capacities, ownership and commitment to continue the innovations and enhanced systems developed under the project?</p> <p>Is there sufficient financing available or are there suitable fund sources to continue what have been initiated under the project?</p> <p>Do implementation arrangements support ownership of the project outcomes by government and stakeholders?</p> <p>Do project coordination mechanisms support sustainability of the project?</p>	<p>continued capacity development</p> <p>Commitments, pronouncements, joint issuances between DENR/PAWB and partner agencies</p> <p>Estimates of financing required to continue innovations introduced by the project, and financing capacity assessment</p> <p>Evidences of uptake by stakeholders</p> <p>Effectiveness of coordination mechanisms, evidences of ownership</p>	<p>Site reports</p>	<p>institutions/DENR</p> <p>Rapid field assessments in selected pilot sites</p>
<p>Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduction in threats to biodiversity in KBAs, and/or improved ecological status?</p>				
<p>Has the project made/or is likely to contribute to measurable difference to the conservation of terrestrial KBAs in the Philippines?</p>	<p>What evidences have there been, to establish reduction of environmental stress, prevention of incompatible land uses in and around conservation areas, and improvement of ecological status?</p>	<p>Extent of habitat fragmentation, unsustainable land use practices, and/or incompatible land uses within and around KBA pilot sites</p>	<p>Baseline BD assessment results</p> <p>BD monitoring reports in pilot sites</p> <p>Project reports</p> <p>Beneficiaries</p>	<p>Document review</p> <p>Rapid field assessment</p>

TOR ANNEX E: RATINGS

Rating Scales		
Ratings for Effectiveness, Efficiency, Overall Project Outcome Rating, M&E, I&E Execution	Sustainability ratings:	Relevance ratings
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 shortcomings 1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe shortcomings	4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks	2. Relevant (R) 1. Not relevant (NR)
Additional ratings where relevant: Not Applicable (N/A) Unable to Assess (U/A)		

ANNEX F: EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT 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 Form⁹

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: _____

⁹ www.undp.org/unegcodeofconduct

TOR ANNEX G EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE¹⁰

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

Executive Summary

- Project Summary Table
- Project Description (brief)
- Evaluation Rating Table
- Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons

Acronyms and Abbreviations

(See: UNDP Editorial Manual¹¹)

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 rated¹²
)

¹⁰ The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

¹¹ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

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 (*), implementation (*), and overall assessment (*)
- Implementing Agency (UNDP) execution (*), 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

¹² Using the mandatory rating scale as given in Annex D of this ToR.

- 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
- TE report audit trail
- Terminal GEF Tracking Tool (if appropriate)

ANNEX H: 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 County Office

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

UNDP GEF RTA

Name:

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Annex I

CO-FINANCING TABLE FOR UNDP SUPPORTED GEF FINANCED PROJECTS

Co Financing Types/Sources	IA Own Financing (Million US \$)		Government (Million US \$)		Other Sources ¹³ (Million US \$)		Total Financing (Million US \$)		Total Disbursement (Million US \$)	
	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual
Grant										
Credits										
Equity										
In Kind										
Non grant instruments ¹⁴										
Other Types										
TOTAL										

¹³ Other Sources refer to contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector, etc. Specify each and explain "Other sources" of co-financing when possible.

¹⁴ Describe "Non-grant instruments" (such as guarantees, contingent grants, etc.)

