**TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR TERMINAL EVALUATION OF THE STRENGTHENING THE CAPACITY OF PROTECTED AREAS SYSTEM TO ADDRESS NEW MANAGEMENT CHALLENGES (PASS).**

1. **INTRODUCTION**

In accordance with the UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP-supported, GEF-financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the full-size project “Strengthening the capacity of protected areas system to address new management challenges (PASS) Project” implemented by the Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET) to be undertaken in Quarter 4 of 2017/Quarter 1 2018, (PIMS 4623). The essentials of the project to be evaluated and reviewed are as follows:

1. **Project Summary Table**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Title: | Strengthening the capacity of protected areas system to address new management challenges (PASS) Project | | | |
| GEF Project ID: | PIMS 4623 | **Project financing** | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | *at completion (Million US$)* |
| UNDP ATLAS Project ID: | 00079312 | GEF financing: | 4,000,000 | 4,000,000 |
| Country: | Namibia | IA/EA own: | 360,000 | 360,000 |
| Region: | Southern Africa | Government: | 14,000,000 | 14,000,000 |
| Focal Area: | Biodiversity | Other (Private sector, UNDP, Bilateral Aid Agencies): |  |  |
| GEF Focal Area Objectives, Strategic Program/OP: | Sustainable financing of Protected Area Systems at the National Level (SP 1) | Total co-financing: | 140,000.00 | 140,000.00 |
| Executing Agency: | Ministry of Environment and Tourism | Total Project Cost in cash: | 18,500,000 | 18,500,000 |
| Other Partners involved: | Ministry of Safety and Security, Ministry of Justice, Ministry of Defence, Ministry of Finance | ProDoc Signature (date project began): | | 1 July 2014 |
|  | Planned closing date:  31 December 2017 | Revised closing date:  31 March 2018 |

1. **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The Protected Areas Systems Strengthening (PASS) Project is a project of the Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET), funded by the Global Environmental Facility (GEF), through the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). Over the past years, the Government of the Republic of Namibia has established an impressive system of 21 state-managed Protected Areas (PAs) with a goal of protecting and conserving biological diversity. These efforts are complemented by a strong Community-Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM) through communal conservancies. To date, 44% of Namibia’s land area is under conservation management. Over the years, Namibia has been a beneficiary of substantial catalytic investment from other the GEF and other development partners whose support has resulted in the expansion and improved management effectiveness of the protected areas system. However, the protected areas funding gap remains, mostly due to recent expansion of the PA estate and emerging management challenges such as fire outbreaks and Namibia’s vulnerability to the increasing threat of poaching of key species such as elephants and rhinos. Weaknesses in revenue collection and at various entry points of the economic enforcement chain need to be urgently addressed to ensure Namibia’s response to these challenges is adequate. Specific interventions are also needed to reinforce the fire management response in protected areas.

**The project objective is to** ensure that the Protected Area system of Namibia isstrengthened and financed sustainably through improving current systems for revenue generation, introduction of innovative revenue generation mechanisms; and cost effective enforcement through application of the Enforcement Economics Model.

1. **Scope OF WORK**

**Project-level Terminal Evaluations (TE)**

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 [UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported GEF-financed Projects](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/UNDP-GEF-TE-Guide.pdf).

1. **expected outputs and deliverables**

**Terminal Evaluations (TE)**

The total duration of the evaluation will not be more than *35* days according to the following plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Timing | Completion Date |
| **Preparation and Inception Report** | *3* days | 12 January 2018 |
| **Evaluation Mission** | *11 days* | 26 January 2018 |
| **Draft Evaluation Report and presentation of report to PSC** | *15* days | 02 February 2018 |
| **Final Report** | *6* days | 16 February 2018 |

1. **scope of bid price and schedule of payments**

\*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.

1. **INSTITUTIONAL arrangements**

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Namibia. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluator[[1]](#footnote-1). 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. The consultant will be responsible for making his/her own logistical arrangements for all his/her travel to and from the site and lodging when stationed at the site.

1. **DURATION OF WORK**

The services of the consultant are required from 12 January 2018 to 15 March 2018 with the total consultancy days not exceeding **35 effective person days**.

1. **DUTY STATION**

The consultant’s duty station during the contract will be Windhoek and any other field station identified for the purposes of delivering the expected outputs mentioned in E. above.

1. **QUALIFICATIONS OF THE SUCCESSFUL CONTRACTOR**

The evaluation will be carried out by 1 independent international consultant. The consultant shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF-financed projects is an advantage. The consultant selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The consultant must present the following qualifications/ credentials:

* At least a Masters degree in a relevant field such as biodiversity conservation, environment sciences, natural resources management, agricultural science, land management, water resources management, or a related field;
* Minimum of ten (10) years relevant work experience (e.g. conducting project/ programme evaluations) in the environment;
* Knowledge of conducting evaluations for UNDP / GEF supported projects / programmes is an advantage;
* Competencies in result-based management evaluation, application of SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios, including adaptive management are essential;
* Demonstrable analytical skills;
* Excellent English communication skills;
* Excellent interpersonal skills and the ability to engage and motivate a wide range of stakeholders;
* Evidence of previous work; and
* Experience working in the sub-Saharan African region. Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (in *Annex E*) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the [UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'](http://www.unevaluation.org/ethicalguidelines).

1. **SCOPE OF PRICE PROPOSAL**

All proposals must be expressed in an all inclusive daily fee for the duration of the engagement and submitted in the individual contract (IC) time sheet. Alternatively, an all inclusive lump sum amount should be provided in the offer for the purposes of fixing the contract price regardless of the changes in the cost components. The consultant will be provided with the UN Daily Subsistence Allowance (DSA) prevailing at the time of sourcing, for the duty station and all other cities indicated in the ToR as part of the duty travel destinations.

1. **Application process**

Candidates are expected to submit an offer for this particular assignment by 05th January 2018. To assist candidates in understanding the requirements of this assignment, the following documents have been attached:

1. The Terms of Reference for the assignment described above;
2. The standard Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability, which the candidate must accomplish and submit to UNDP; and
3. The Individual Contract and its General Terms and Conditions, which you would be expected to sign in the event you are the selected Offeror in this procurement process.

Candidates as individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions. The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in English with indication of the e‐mail and phone contact. Candidates are expected to submit a price offer (all inclusive) indicating the total cost of the assignment (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs).

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

1. **RECOMMENDED PRESENTATION OF OFFER**

For purposes of generating Offers whose contents are uniformly presented and to facilitate the

Comparative analysis, it is recommended that the offer is presented in the form for submitting service provider’s proposal contained in the request for proposal (RFP) and containing following documents:

1. Duly accomplished Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability using the template provided by UNDP;
2. Updated personal CV or P11, indicating all past experience from similar projects, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the Candidate and at least three (3) professional references;
3. Brief description of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a methodology, if applicable, on how they will approach and complete the assignment. A methodology is recommended for intellectual services, but may be omitted for support services;
4. Financial Proposal that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price, supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template provided in the request for proposal. If an Offeror 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 Offeror must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.
5. **CRITERIA FOR SELECTION OF THE BEST OFFER**

Offers will be evaluated on the basis of specific criteria and may be done in the following manner:

1. A Combined Scoring method – where the qualifications and methodology will be weighted a maximum of 70%, and combined with the price offer which will be weighted a maximum of 30%.
2. **ANNEXES TO THE TOR**
3. Project Document (which includes the Inception Workshop Report)
4. MTR Report and management responses
5. Project Implementation Review (PIR) reports
6. Quarterly Progress Reports and Annual Work Plans
7. Audit reports
8. Project Extensions Submission
9. GEF Tracking Tools at TE stage
10. M & E Operational Guidelines; and
11. Financial and Administration guidelines.

**The following will also be available amongst others:**

1. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
2. Minutes of Project Steering Committee/ExCo Meetings
3. PMU Meetings Minutes
4. Training Manuals, Info Brochures, Promotional Videos
5. Various Studies Conducted Reports
6. The GEF Completion Report guidelines
7. UNDP Monitoring and Evaluation Frameworks
8. **Evaluation approach and method**

An overall approach and method[[2]](#footnote-2) for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects have 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 (*in Annex E)*. 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, 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 field missions to all project sites where substantive investment has been made to date and relevant surrounding strategic areas*.* These field visits in Namibia will be undertaken to the specific sites for feasibility assessment to improve the consultant’s context of the project and to access additional stakeholders.

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

1. UNDP staff with responsibilities over the PASS;
2. Executing agency: Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET);
3. The Project Management Unit staff;
4. Project stakeholders, particularly those represented by the Steering Committee Members: Ministry of Safety and Security (MoSS), Ministry of Defence (MoD), Ministry of Justice (MoJ); Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry (MAWF) and Ministry of Finance (MoF); and
5. Development Partners with co-financing and or complementary activities, such as the GIZ, KfW.

The evaluator 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, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based review. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included (in *Annex C*) 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 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 F*) completes all annexes respectively for Evaluation Code of Conduct, Report Outline and Clearance Form.

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

**Project finance / co-finance**

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 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 (Private Sector)(mill. US$) | | Total (mill. US$) | |
| Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Actual | 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 has achieved 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) an optimized and accountable revenue collection system with appropriate capabilities, b) enhanced Protected Areas System (PAS) through improved capacity for detection monitoring and cost-effective enforcement; and c) enhanced PAS sustainability through improved fire management, and/or d) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.[[3]](#footnote-3) The GEF Tracking Tool for biodiversity projects and the UNDP Capacity Development score card must be reviewed by the consultants as part of the Terminal Evaluation.

**Conclusions****, recommendations & lessons**

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions**, **recommendations** and **lessons** besides the separate thematic learning review.

1. **APPROVAL**

**This TOR is approved by**: [*indicate name of Approving Manager*]

Signature:

Name and Designation:

Date of Signing:

1. An all-inclusive quotation is needed and evaluator will be directly responsible for their costs as indicated in the scope of price proposal in section L. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](http://www.undp.org/evaluation/handbook), Chapter 7, pg. 163 [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROTI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office:  [ROTI Handbook 2009](http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/M2_ROtI%20Handbook.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-3)