

TERMINAL EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE (NATIONAL CONSULTANT) ADD.3

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of 'Integrated community-based forest and catchment management through an ecosystem service approach (PIMS #4033)'.

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	Integrated community-based forest and catchment management through an ecosystem service approach			
GEF Project ID:			<i>at endorsement (Million US\$)</i>	<i>at completion (Million US\$)</i>
UNDP Project ID:	(UNDP PIMS#4033) 00078499 (UNDP Atlas ID)	GEF financing:	1,758,182.00	
Country:	Thailand	IA/EA own:	12,210,000-	
Region:	Asia-Pacific	Government :		
Focal Area:	Biodiversity conservation and climate change focal areas	Other (UNDP):	350,000-	
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):		Total co-financing:	12,560,000	
Executing Agency:	Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MoNRE), Thailand	Total Project Cost:	14,318,182-	
Other Partners involved:		ProDoc Signature (date project began):		27 February 2012
		Operational Closing Date:	Proposed: 26 June 2017	Actual:

PURPOSE, OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE:

This project's objective is to create an enabling policy and institutional environment for scaling-up integrated Community Based Forestry and Catchment Management (CBFCM) practices through innovative financing mechanisms. The project will achieve this objective by strengthening systemic capacities in sustainable forest and catchment management at the local, regional and national levels (Outcome 1), and by supporting the expansion of CBFCM coverage throughout the country through pilot testing of defined Payment for Environmental Services (PES) and bi-carbon financing mechanisms (Outcome 2).

The project will build capacities of MONRE to harmonise policies, plans and legal instruments to support CBFCM and PES and biocarbon schemes. It will also support the establishment of a multi-sectoral mechanism for CBFCM, with active participation of all Regional CBFCM Networks, REOs, ONEP and RFD. This will act as an effective policy feedback, knowledge sharing and capacity development mechanism. The project will also strengthen national capacities to promote PES (including and biocarbon) in order to strengthen community incentives for effective forest and catchment management.

The project will support scaling up of CBFCM best practices using PES and biocarbon financing mechanisms at four sites, led by four Regional Environment Offices (REOs). These sites include Mae Sa Catchment (North), Tha Chin Catchment (Central), Lam Sebai Catchment (Northeast), and Pa-Ngan Catchment (South). The project will strengthen capacities of local authorities, landholders and the private sector to ensure that innovative financing mechanisms (PES) is used for improving livelihoods, global biodiversity conservation benefits and GHG emission reduction from land use and land use changes. In order to do this, the project will support catchment level ecosystem services valuation (incl. biocarbon) and assessment of benefits, trade-offs and various opportunity costs of land-use options taking into full account the ecosystem services. Biodiversity friendly PES & biocarbon financing strategies will be implemented, with institutionalization of payment distribution structures that fully consider gender and other social equity aspects.

The total project budget is USD. 14,318,182. The allocated resources including the co-financing amount are as follows:

- GEF USD 1,758,182
- MONRE USD 12,210,000
- UNDP USD 350,000

The project will be executed through UNDP's National Implementation Modality (NIM) with the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MONRE) as the Implementing Partner (IP). At the central level, Pollution Control Department under MONRE's Office of Permanent Secretary had served as the focal point of the project and the project management unit from February 2012 to August 2015. In August 2015, the REOs and the project management unit had been shifted to report instead to the Office of Permanent Secretary, under the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment.

At the site level, Regional Environmental Offices (REO) will be the focal points in each pilot site. REO 1 will lead the Northern cluster; REO 12 will lead the North-eastern cluster; REO 5 will lead the Central cluster; REO 14 will lead the Southern cluster.

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 projects 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 method¹ 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 amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Thailand including the project sites in:

- Mae Sa Catchment (North), Chiang Mai Province
- Tha Chin Catchment (Central)
- Lam Sebai Catchment (Northeast), Ubol Ratchathani Province
- Pa-Ngan Catchment (South), Surat Thani Province

At the four pilot sites, key stakeholders include REOs, the local government, forest and protected areas authorities as well government agencies on agriculture, industries and coastal and marine resources management.

Interviews will be held with the following personnel and organizations and individuals at a minimum:

- Project Director
- Project Manager
- Representative of Responsible Parties, including :
 - Head of Corporate Communications, SCCC Public Co., Ltd.
 - Forestry Faculty, Kasetsart University and Project Consultant (Policy Framework)
 - RECOFTC
- Field Officers
- Representatives from pilot communities
- Project Administrative Officer
- Project Financial Officer
- Members of Project Board
- UNDP Country Office in Bangkok in-charge of this project.

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

¹ For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](#), Chapter 7, pg. 163

Reference. The full scope methods used in the evaluation are at the discretion of the evaluator(s), but a mixed method of document review, interviews, and direct observations should be employed, at a minimum. The TE inception report and TE report should explain all the evaluation methods used in detail.

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	<i>rating</i>	2. IA & EA Execution	<i>rating</i>
M&E design at entry		Quality of UNDP Implementation – Implementing Agency (IA)	
M&E Plan Implementation		Quality of Execution - Executing Agency (EA)	
Overall quality of M&E		Overall quality of Implementation / Execution	
3. Assessment of Outcomes	<i>rating</i>	4. Sustainability	<i>rating</i>
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	Planned	Actual
Grants								
Loans/Concessions								
• In-kind support								
• Other								
Totals								

MAINSTREAMING

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

IMPACT

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.²

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 Thailand. 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

The total duration of the evaluation will be 37 days over a time period from 30 Mar to 27 October 2017 according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Tentative Period
Preparation	4 working days	<i>1-5 May 2017</i>
Evaluation Mission	17 working days (Monday-Friday); per diem will be paid on working days and over the weekends.	<i>29 May - 20 June 2017</i> <i>29-31 May 2017; 1-2 June 2017;</i> <i>5-9 June 2017; 12-16 June 2017;</i> <i>19-20 June 2017.</i>
Draft Evaluation Report	6 working days	<i>23-30 June 2017</i>
Final Report	10 working days	<i>11 October 2017</i>

² A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office: [ROtI Handbook 2009](#)

EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
Inception Report	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission: <i>15 April 2017</i>	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
Presentation	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission: <i>20 June 2017</i>	To project management, UNDP CO
Draft Final Report	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 1 week after the evaluation mission: <i>30 June 2017</i>	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs
Final Report*	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft: <i>11 October 2017</i>	Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC.

*When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluator is required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report. See [Annex H](#) for an audit trail template.

TEAM COMPOSITION

The evaluation team will be composed of *an international and a national evaluator*. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The international evaluator will be designated as the team leader and will be responsible for finalizing the report. 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:

A. INTERNATIONAL LEAD CONSULTANT

PROFILE

- Post-Graduate in environmental studies, development studies, social sciences and/ or other related fields (20%)
- Minimum of 8 years accumulated and recognized experience in biodiversity conservation and sustainable utilisation areas, and sustainable livelihoods (20%)
- Minimum of 5 years of project evaluation and/or implementation experience in the result-based management framework, adaptive management and UNDP or GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy (20%)
- Familiarity in similar country or regional situations relevant to that of INTEGRATED COMMUNITY-BASED FOREST AND CATCHMENT MANAGEMENT THROUGH AN ECOSYSTEM SERVICE APPROACH IS an advantage (5%).

- Experience with multilateral and bilateral supported biodiversity conservation and sustainable utilisation projects
- Comprehensive knowledge of international biodiversity conservation and sustainable utilisation best practices (15%)
- Excellent written English (20%)

RESPONSIBILITIES

- Documentation review
- Leading the TE Team in planning, conducting and reporting on the evaluation
- Deciding on division of labour within the Team and ensuring timeliness of reports
- Use of best practice evaluation methodologies in conducting the evaluation
- Leading the drafting and finalization of the Inception Report for the Terminal Evaluation
- Leading presentation of the draft evaluation findings and recommendations in-country
- Conducting the de-briefing for the UNDP Country Office in Thailand and Core Project Management Team
- Leading the drafting and finalization of the Terminal Evaluation Report

B. NATIONAL CONSULTANT

PROFILE

- Post-graduate in environmental studies, development studies, social sciences and/or other related fields (20%)
- Minimum of 5 years of supporting project evaluation and/or implementation experience in the result-based management framework, adaptive management and UNDP or GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy (20%)
- Eight (8) years of project development and implementation (20%)
- Some project management experience in biodiversity conservation and sustainable utilisation (10%) would be an advantage.
- Multilateral and bilateral funded project development and implementation
- Familiarity with Thailand national development policies, programs and projects (20%)
- Excellent in written and spoken English (10%)

RESPONSIBILITIES

- Documentation review and data gathering
- Contributing to the development of the review plan and methodology
- Conducting those elements of the evaluation determined jointly with the international consultant and UNDP
- Contributing to presentation of the review findings and recommendations at the wrap-up meeting
- Contributing to the drafting and finalization of the review report

EVALUATOR ETHICS

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

PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

%	Milestone
8%	At submission and approval of inception report
41%	Following submission and approval of the 1st draft terminal evaluation report
50%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report

APPLICATION PROCESS

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

- a) Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability using the template³ provided by UNDP;
- b) CV and a Personal History Form (P11 form⁴);
- c) Brief description of approach to work/technical proposal of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)
- d) Financial Proposal that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc), supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the Letter of Confirmation of Interest template. If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

All application materials should be submitted by CoB 14 March 2017. Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

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

³

<https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/psa/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx>

⁴ http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc

ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK (REVISED LOGICAL FRAMEWORK MATRIX DURING INCEPTION PHASE)

RESULT	INDICATOR	BASELINE VALUE	TARGET	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS
<p>Objective: To create an enabling policy and institutional environment for scaling-up of integrated community-based forest and catchment management (CBFCM) practise through harnessing of innovative financing mechanisms in Thailand</p>					
<p>Outcome 1: Strengthened policy environment and systemic capacities to promote sustainable community-based forest and catchment management through PES and bio-carbon financing mechanisms</p>					
<p>Output 1.1: Harmonized policies, plans and legal instruments to support CBFCM and PES and bio-carbon schemes</p>	<p>1.1 Number of national policies and plans (identified) that incorporate PES and bio-carbon financing mechanism in support of CBFCM.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forestry and catchment management policies and legal instruments currently have limited inclusion of CBFCM • Department of Water Resources prepare 5 year IWRM but do not include CBFCM, nor focus on any biodiversity or bio-carbon conservation nor provisions for innovative finance • Environmental Protection Act (1992) does not include provisions to promote 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revision significant related Legation/Policies/Plans such as <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Enhancement and Conservation of National Environmental Quality ACT (1992) ○ National Parks Act (1961) ○ The National Economic and Social Development Plan ○ 5 years Environment Quality management Plan ○ Water Resources Management Plan ○ Etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Royal Gazette • Ministerial order/ notification regarding Relevant policy • Relevant policy support document (i.e. environmental management plans of ONEP and REOs) 	<p>RTG and relevant ministries are increasingly committed to supporting strategies and actions towards low-carbon green economy</p>

RESULT	INDICATOR	BASELINE VALUE	TARGET	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS
		<p>economic instruments for GHG emission reduction or sequestration</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National/ Regional and Provincial Plans do not include provisions for CBFCM or PES / biocarbon financing. 			
Output 1.2 Functional multi-sectoral mechanism for CBFCM in place with participation of all Regional CBFCM Networks, REOs, ONEP and Royal Forest Department that facilitates effective policy feedback, knowledge sharing, self-capacity development and access to PES and biocarbon	1.2 Existence of a multi-agency / multi-sectoral mechanism for CBFCM/ PES – biocarbon dialogue, consultation with inclusive participation from all relevant government organizations, CSOs, academia, private sector and CBFCM community networks.	<p>1. Separately and disorganised data system storage</p> <p>2. Lack of MONRE or government’s agency takes clearly responsibility, oversight and implementation monitoring</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Providing ‘Scenario’ and responsible agencies in order to implement and magnify the PES and Bio-carbon outcomes in further. Having a data-base center of PES and Bio-carbon for sharing and extending the results 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meeting Minutes of NEB Minutes of working group meetings 	PES and biocarbon concept is well recognized as an important issues for relevant sectors

RESULT	INDICATOR	BASELINE VALUE	TARGET	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS
Output 1.3 National capacities enhanced to promote incentive based forest and catchment management through local communities	1.3 Institutional capacities strengthened at national (M&E Office) and regional levels (4 pilot REO training centres) to implement PES and biocarbon financing schemes in support of CBFCM .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No central oversight body exist for PES/ biocarbon implementation Existing training and capacity building programmes for REOs do not include PES/biocarbon methods No training centre at REO level. Current institutional and staff capacity levels or REOs in relation to the use and mainstreaming of PES and bicarbon financing for CBFCM (low) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> M&E Office (under PCD's Office) has capacity to coordinate and provide oversights of PES/biocarbon implementation by REOs and Provincial Natural Resources and Environmental Office At least 50 REO Officers trained on PES and biocarbon tools and methods (2-3 staff from each of the 16 REOs) At least 4 REOs can deliver capacity building training to their regional networks on the use of PES/ Biocarbon financing for CBFCM and natural resource management 	<p>M & E reports on PES implementation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> PES / biocarbon finance for natural resource conservation curriculum Training documentations (including budgets, training agendas, training programme participation lists, etc.) 	
Outcome 2: Expanded CBFCM coverage through pilot testing and up-scaling of best practice using PES and biocarbon financing schemes and mechanisms					
Output 2.1 Capacities of local authorities, landholders and the private sector enhanced to ensure market-based payments and harness innovative financing for improved	2.1 Number and Type of PES and biocarbon financing schemes <u>developed and applied</u> (in place) for CBFCM in the 4 pilot sites.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Currently there are no PES and biocarbon financing strategies and schemes developed and/or applied for CBFCM within the 4 REO pilot site regions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 4 PES and biocarbon financing schemes (1 for each REO region pilot site) are developed and implemented during the project cycle. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5- year and annual Strategic Management Plans and Annual Report of the 4 REO regions where the pilot projects exist. 	<p>There will be no major environmental event that will occur within the 4 project areas that will undermine the necessary conditions for PES and biocarbon schemes to be applied and implemented throughout the project period.</p> <p>There are feasible land use measures that can be adopted that can significantly reduce threats to the</p>

RESULT	INDICATOR	BASELINE VALUE	TARGET	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Validated PES Agreements from each of the 4 pilot regions Documentation and results on M & E progress of PES / biocarbon schemes in the 4 pilot sites. 	flow of ES, along with measures to recover and/or improve ES. operationalised.
Output 2.2 Catchment level ecosystem services valuation (incl. biocarbon) and assessment of benefits, trade-offs and opportunity costs of land-use options	2.2 Total area of catchment forest under community management in the 4 pilot catchment basins that is benefiting from PES and biocarbon financing schemes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Current accumulative total of all forest under community management in each of the 4 catchment basin pilot sites. Data collection on total coverage of community managed forests within each catchment basin will need to be undertaken at the start of the project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collectively, 15,000 hectares are identified and designated CBFCM forests within the 4 pilot catchment basins. 	Data provided by REOs on total catchment forests in each of the 4 pilot catchment basins at the end of the project period.	Risk: Rural poverty and indebtedness continue to put pressure on communities to encroach and degrade forest land.

RESULT	INDICATOR	BASELINE VALUE	TARGET	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS
	2.3 Ton of CO2 sequestered and /or avoided emissions within the framework of implemented PES schemes accumulative of all 4 pilot project area catchment basin sites.	Some work on assessment of forest carbon has been initiated by the RFD and DWNP for Thailand's R-PIN application of the World Bank's Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) Readiness Plan, as well as by independent studies by specialists in various universities. Forest carbon stock assessment will have to be undertaken for the 4 pilot sites.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 10% increase in carbon stock from the accumulative total of the 4 pilot catchment basin sites 	Data on CO2 and biodiversity resources before and after PES projects have been launched in the 4 pilot catchment basin areas.	Survival and growth rate are too low for accurate accounting of carbon stock sequestered.
	2.4 Global biodiversity values maintained or enhanced at pilot sites	Threats to forests and associated biodiversity continues at demonstration sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No net loss of natural forests in the catchments from baseline situation Increased overall coverage of native tree species within the catchments, ensuring better connectivity between forest habitats 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Baseline measurements of fauna and flora within the four pilot catchment basins at the beginning and end of project cycle. 	There will be no major environmental event that will occur within the 4 project areas that will undermine the necessary conditions for species viability.
	2.5 Livelihood quality Index	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some socio-economic data can be obtained by the Community Development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5 % increase in livelihood quality of life index in the project's participating communities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Survey results Household accounts 	There will be a transparent and reliable correlation that can be drawn between livelihood quality and PES / biocarbon schemes per project site.

RESULT	INDICATOR	BASELINE VALUE	TARGET	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS
		<p>Department and the Department of Agricultural Extensions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For the 4 selected pilot sites, data collection must be designed specifically for the purpose of measuring livelihood changes resulting from the project. 			
Output 2.3 Land-use based and biodiversity friendly PES & biocarbon financing strategies for CBFCM with result-based, equitable, transparent and unified payment distribution structure in place in 4 REO regions	2.6 Capacities of local authorities and community land users in land use options that enhance ES and to ensure market-based payments from PES and bio-carbon financing for improved livelihoods. Environmental Quality of key ES parameters such as water quality, soil nutrient levels, sedimentation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local capacities in sustainable land use options must be assessed at the beginning of project. There has been some training provided to local authorities and community land user / community forest & watershed networks on sustainable land use practices through various government and independent projects ES and PES 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 4 Tambon Administrative Organizations (TAOs) are actively engaged in PES/ biocarbon scheme implementation within their respective communities in support of CBFCM At least 30% of community forest / watershed network members have adopted sustainable land-use practices in the four pilot catchment basins. Overall land use practices in the four pilot catchment basins sufficiently improve. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PES / biocarbon schemes documentation that are managed by local authorities in the 4 pilot sites for CBFCM (e.g. meeting minutes) Measurable data (quantitative and qualitative) on land use practice by communities in the 4 pilot 	<p>There is sufficient incentive and motivation for land users to adopt better land use practices.</p> <p>There is a clearly identifiable link between a change in unsustainable land use practices and an increase in ES and benefits to the buyers, which results in continuation of PES / biocarbon contract agreements/payments.</p> <p>Traditional /indigenous land use practice can both be sustainable and unsustainable in the present context</p>

RESULT	INDICATOR	BASELINE VALUE	TARGET	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS
		/ bio-carbon financing.		<p>catchment basins.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measurable data on ES parameters within four pilot catchment basins (must show an upward trend in both areas). 	
	2.7 Number of national and regional level forums, meetings and documents highlighting best practice and lessons learned in using PES and bio-carbon financing for CBFCM.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Currently there is no central department / agency to take responsibility for CBFCM, PES/bio-carbon pest practice and lessons learned, or the existence of a database to manage this type of information and make it available to others. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 4 regional best practice/ lesson learned exchange forum on PES • At least 1 National forum for PES policy strategies and collaboration (declaration of cooperation) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existence of National CBFCM coordinating body • Proceeding and documents from seminars, forums, journals and other public media. 	

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

GEF Project Information Form (PIF), Project Document, and Log Frame Analysis (LFA)

Project Implementation Plan

Implementing/Executing partner arrangements

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

Annual Project Implementation (APR/PIR) Reports

Project budget and financial data

Project Tracking Tool, at baseline, at mid-term, and at terminal points

UNDP Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF)

UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD)

UNDP Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP)

GEF focal area strategic program objectives

ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

This Evaluation Criteria Matrix must be fully completed/amended by the consultant and included in the TE inception report and as an Annex to the TE report.

For the sample evaluation criterial matrix, please refer to Annex 4 of the TE Guidance <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/UNDP-GEF-TE-Guide.pdf>

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?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the project relevant to UNCBD and other international convention objectives? 	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the project relevant the GEF biodiversity and climate change focal area? 	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the project relevant to Thailand’s environment and sustainable development objectives? 	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the project addressing the needs of target beneficiaries at the local and regional levels? 	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the project internally coherent in its design? 	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How is the project relevant with respect to other donor-supported activities? 	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the project provide relevant lessons and experiences for other similar projects in the future? 	•	•	•
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has the project been effective in achieving the expected outcomes and objectives? 	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How is risk and risk mitigation being managed? 	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What lessons can be drawn regarding effectiveness for other similar projects in the future? 	•	•	•

Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?

• Was project support provided in an efficient way?	•	•	•
• How efficient are partnership arrangements for the project	•	•	•
• Did the project efficiently utilize local capacity in implementation?	•	•	•
• What lessons can be drawn regarding efficiency for other similar projects in the future?	•	•	•
• 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?	•	•	•
• How is risk and risk mitigation being managed?	•	•	•
• What lessons can be drawn regarding effectiveness for other similar projects in the future?	•	•	•
• Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?	•	•	•
• Was project support provided in an efficient way?	•	•	•
• How efficient are partnership arrangements for the project?	•	•	•
• Did the project efficiently utilize local capacity in implementation	•	•	•

Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?

• Were interventions designed to have sustainable results given the identifiable risks?	•	•	•
• What issues emerged during implementation as a threat to sustainability?	•	•	•
• Are there social or political risks that may threaten the sustainability of project outcomes?	•	•	•

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there ongoing activities that pose an environmental threat to the sustainability of project outcomes? 	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have the entities/people that will carry on the project been identified and prepared? 	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there evidence financial resources are committed to support project results after the project has closed? 	•	•	•
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"> • Has the project made verifiable environmental improvements? 	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the project made verifiable reductions in stress on environmental systems? 	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the project demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements? 	•	•	•

ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

<p>Ratings for Effectiveness, Efficiency, Overall Project Outcome Rating, M&E, IA & EA Execution</p> <p>6. Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings</p> <p>5. Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings</p> <p>4. Moderately Satisfactory (MS): moderate shortcomings</p> <p>3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings</p> <p>2. Unsatisfactory (U): major shortcomings</p> <p>1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe shortcomings</p>	<p>Sustainability ratings:</p> <p>4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability</p> <p>3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks</p> <p>2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks</p> <p>1. Unlikely (U): severe risks</p>	<p>Relevance ratings</p> <p>2. Relevant (R)</p> <p>1. Not relevant (NR)</p>
<p><i>Additional ratings where relevant:</i></p> <p>Not Applicable (N/A)</p> <p>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 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 Form⁵

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: _____

⁵www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE⁶

- i. Opening page:
 - Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
 - UNDP and GEF project ID#s
 - Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report
 - Region and countries included in the project
 - GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program
 - Implementing Partner and other project partners
 - Evaluation team members
 - Acknowledgements
- ii. Executive Summary
 - Project Summary Table
 - Project Description (brief)
 - Evaluation Rating Table
 - Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons
- iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations
(See: UNDP Editorial Manual⁷)
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 rated⁸)
- 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

⁶The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

⁷ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

⁸ See Annex D for rating scales.

- 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

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 (*project name*) (UNDP *PIMS #*)

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