Terminal Evaluation - National consultant

detailed Terms of Reference

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 the***“*****Expanding coverage and strengthening management effectiveness of the protected area network on the island of Mauritius*”*** *(PIMS 3749)*

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

Project Summary Table

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Title: |  | | | | | |
| GEF Project ID: | | 3526 |  | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | | *at completion (Million US$)* |
| UNDP Project ID: | | 3749 | GEF financing: | 4.000 | |  |
| Country: | | Mauritius | IA/EA own: | 0 | |  |
| Region: | | Africa | Government: | 4.1874 | |  |
| Focal Area: | | Biodiversity | Other: | 7.577 | |  |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): | | GEF 4: BD–1 (Catalyzing Sustainability of PAs) | Total co-financing: | 11.7644 | |  |
| Executing Agency: | | Ministry of Agro-Industry, Food Production and Security (MoA) | Total Project Cost: | 15.7644 | |  |
| Other Partners involved: | | Forestry Service (FS), National Parks and Conservation Service (NPCS), Ministry of Social Security, National Solidarity, and Environment and Sustainable Development, Ministry of Tourism (MoT), Ministry of Housing and Lands (MoHL), Ministry of Finance and Economic Development (MoF), State Law Office (SLO), Ministry of Local Government and Outer Islands (MoLG): Municipal and District Councils, Mauritian Wildlife Foundation (MWF), University of Mauritius (UM), Private landowners and lease holders, Mauritius Meat Producers Association (MMPA) | ProDoc Signature (date project began): | | | 05th March 2010 |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | | Proposed:  March 2015 | Actual:  April 2018 |

Objective and Scope

Mauritius, like most oceanic islands, has high levels of floral and faunal endemicity and has suffered high extinction rates caused by a growing human population, habitat destruction and degradation. In order to safeguard the remaining biodiversity, the Government of Mauritius have established a terrestrial protected area network on the mainland, and associated offshore islets, comprising 20 formal state protected areas (8027ha). This is supplemented by a number of different types of less secure conservation areas (7,168ha), under varying levels of protection. Under current conditions, the terrestrial protected area network (PAN) is however not effectively safeguarding the country’s unique terrestrial biodiversity because: (i) a number of natural ecosystem processes, habitats and species are not adequately represented in the existing PAS; (ii) the capacity of the institutions responsible for the planning and management of the protected areas is generally weak; and (iii) the technical knowledge to cost-effectively contain the threats to biodiversity within the PAN is under-developed.

This project seeks to strengthen the systemic, institutional and operational capacity to: (i) identify, prioritize and target gaps in representation that can be filled through protected area expansion, and complementary conservation, efforts on private and state-owned land; (ii) develop regulatory drivers and an incentives framework to support PA expansion, and complementary conservation, efforts on private and state-owned land; (iii) establish and administer a conservation stewardship program to implement PA expansion initiatives on privately owned or managed land; (iv) effectively plan, resource and manage an expanded PAN comprising both private and state protected areas; (v) cost-effectively mitigate the threats to, and pressures on, the unique biodiversity contained within the expanded PAN (notably the spread of invasive alien species); (vi) ensure better integration of the PAN into the country’s socio-economic development priorities, in particular development of the tourism industry, to ensure its long-term financial sustainability; and (vi) respond effectively to the needs of, and meaningfully involve, different stakeholder groups in the ongoing planning and operational management of the expanded PAN.

The global environmental benefits of the project are represented by: (i) adding 6,893 ha of terrestrial landscapes under formal protection; (ii) increasing management effectiveness at the PA level (from a METT baseline of <37% -65% to a METT target of all PAs scoring >55% and IUCN category II PAs >70%); (iii) improving the overall PA institutional capacity (from baseline of 56% in the Capacity Assessment Scorecard to >65%); and (iv) increasing the financial sustainability of the PAN (from a financial sustainability baseline score of 17% to >45%).

The original components / outcomes are summarised below:

**Component / Outcome 1: Systemic framework for PA expansion improved**

Work under this component will support the amendment, streamlining and harmonisation of the policy, legislative and regulatory framework to enable improvement in the representativeness, conservation security, financing and active management of a national system of protected areas. A conservation stewardship programme will be designed to underpin the negotiation of voluntary conservation agreements with private leaseholders and landowners that enables their designation as formal protected areas. Incentive mechanisms and tools that could support the implementation of this stewardship programme will be developed, tested, and their efficacy assessed. A business-oriented financial plan for an expanded PAN (comprising a matrix of private and state-owned land) will be prepared. To support and complement efforts to expand the protected area network, a concurrent communication, education and awareness programme will be initiated, targeting key political and institutional decision-makers and affected landowners, leaseholders and local use groups.

**Component/ Outcome 2: PA institutional framework strengthened**

Work under this component will involve undertaking a cost-benefit analysis of the institutional and governance options for the PAN. Based on the outcomes of this cost-benefit analysis, an institutional development plan will be developed to guide the reform of the institutional structures responsible for PA management, clarify the mandated roles and responsibilities of each institution and rationalize the cooperative governance structures. Strategic/ business planning processes for the responsible PA institution/s will then be supported to ensure the allocation of resources to institutional priorities and to achieve cost-effective conservation outcomes. The efficacy of a number of different financing mechanisms proposed in the financial and business plan for the PAN (see Output 1.4) will be piloted tested, evaluated and adapted (based on lessons learned) within the relevant PA institutions. A conservation stewardship unit will be established and staffed within the most appropriate conservation agency to implement the conservation stewardship programme developed in component 1 (see Output 1.3). An intensive staff training programme will be developed and implemented to strengthen the skills and competencies of PA staff.

**Component/ Outcome 3: Operational know-how in place to contain threats**

Work under this component will support the preparation of integrated management plans for the individual protected areas. Within the framework of these management plans (and the institutional strategic plan/s developed in component 2), an IAS control programme will be scaled up in 3 demonstration sites to test the most cost-effective techniques, implementation arrangements and tools through a ‘learning by doing’ continual improvement system developed for the project. To complement this scaled-up IAS control, procedures and protocols will be developed for the identification and phased introduction of biological control agents for selected plant invasives. Rehabilitation and restoration models and techniques for different habitats under IAS control and fire management will be tested, evaluated and implemented in demonstration sites. With the expansion of protected areas in fire-prone habitats, a fire management strategy will be developed and fire incident procedures and protocols established. The effective deployment, and equipping, of compliance and enforcement capabilities across the PAN will be supported. An information support system for communication and exchange of information within and across the project will be developed and maintained.

**Executing Agency/Implementing Partner:** Ministry of Agro-Industry, Food Production and Security

**Implementing Entity/Responsible Partners:** National Parks and Conservation Service, Forestry Service

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[[1]](#footnote-1) for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluation should include a mixed methodology of document review, interviews, and observations from project site visits, at minimum, and the evaluators should make an effort to triangulate information. 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](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/UNDP-GEF-TE-Guide.pdf). A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR (see [*Annex C*](#_Annex_C:_Evaluation)). 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 Mauritius, including implementation sites. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

* Ministry of Agro-Industry, Food Production and Security (MoA);
* National Parks and Conservation Service (NPCS);
* Forestry Service (FS);
* Ministry of Social Security, National Solidarity, and Environment and Sustainable Development;
* Ministry of Tourism (MoT);
* Ministry of Housing and Lands (MoHL);
* Ministry of Finance and Economic Development (MoF);
* State Law Office (SLO);
* Ministry of Local Government and Outer Islands (MoLG): Municipal and District Councils;
* Mauritian Wildlife Foundation (MWF);
* University of Mauritius (UoM);
* Private landowners and lease holders;
* Mauritius Meat Producers Association (MMPA).

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](#_Annex_B:_List) of this Terms of Reference.

Functions and key results expected:

The International Consultant will be the team leader and will be responsible for the quality of the report and timely submission. The National Consultant will provide supportive roles in terms of professional inputs, knowledge of local policies, local navigation, translation / language support, etc.

1. The review team is expected to prepare an Evaluation Report based on the outline listed in [*Annex C*](#_Annex_C:_Evaluation) while specifically including the following aspects:
2. Adequacy of the overall project concept, design, implementation methodology, institutional structure, timelines, budgetary allocation or any other aspect of the project design that the evaluation team may want to comment upon;
3. Extent of progress achieved against the overall project objective disaggregated by each of the individual Outcomes, Outputs and Activities (including sub-activities); as against the Impact Indicators identified and listed in the project document. Extent of the incremental value added with project implementation;
4. Performance in terms of in-time achievement of individual project activities as well as overall project in terms of adherence to planned timelines;
5. Relevance and adequacy of mid-course changes in implementation strategy with PSC approval, if any and the consequent variations in achievements, if any;
6. Degree of effectiveness of the Project Management Unit to identify gaps, if any with lessons learned and alternative scenarios, if any;
7. Extent to which systemic framework for Protected Area expansion has been improved. Identify gaps, if any, and provide alternative scenarios;
8. Extent to which Protected Area institutional framework has been strengthened. Identify gaps, if any, and provide alternative scenarios;
9. Extent to which the Operational know-how is in place to contain threats related to Protected Area;
10. Evaluate the impact of the project activities on the various government and private institutions;
11. Extent of effectiveness of awareness generation activities by way of quality of promotional packages / awareness material, number of Awareness Programmes, Trainings undertaken and level of awareness created. Quality of documentation, if any, produced under the project like, brochure, etc. should also be considered;
12. Pattern, in which funds have been leveraged, budgeted, spent and accounted for in the project;
13. Preparation of Terminal GEF Tracking Tool in collaboration with the Chief Technical Advisor, Project Manager and IAS Manager.
14. The team should also focus their assessments on project impacts as listed:
15. Perceptions on the “Situation at the end of the Project” as it seems to the review team at the terminal review stage;
16. Nature and scale of the policy impact made by the project, if any, on relevant line departments of the Government or other policy making bodies;
17. Extent of effectiveness of capacity building initiatives undertaken under the aegis of the project;
18. Appropriateness and effectiveness of the institutional arrangement deployed in the project with alternative scenarios, if any;
19. Details of co-funding, if any, leveraged by the project and its impact on the project;
20. The effectiveness of monitoring and overseeing systems such as Project Steering Committee and suggestion on improvements if any.
21. Terminal Evaluation and Knowledge Management Workshop
22. The International consultant will conduct a minimum one-day terminal evaluation and knowledge management workshop (during the evaluation mission) on monitoring and evaluation concepts and methodology for capacity development of relevant stakeholders. One of the aims of the workshop should be to enable the stakeholders to be capacitated to monitor and document project experiences, draw out lessons learned and envision how to implement the lessons learnt going forward. The program of the workshop must be included in this offer.

Evaluation Criteria & Ratings

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see [Annex A](#_TOR_Annex_A:)), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact.** Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in [Annex D](#_Annex_D:_Rating).

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

Project finance / cofinance

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration.

The position of financing and co-financing as on September 2013 which was assessed during the Mid Term Review is given in table below:

**Project Budget, Financing and Co-financing (Million USD)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **GEF** | | | |
|  | **Budget** | **Actual** | **%** |
| Outcome 1: Systemic framework for PA expansion improved | 478,000 | 47,278 | 9.9 |
| Outcome 2: PA institutional framework strengthened | 745,000 | 0 | 0 |
| Outcome 3: Operational know-how in place to contain threats | 2,377,000 | 193,436 | 8.1 |
| Project Management | 400,000 | 213,843 | 53.5 |
| **TOTAL** | **4,000,000** | **454,556** | **11.4** |

The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Co-financing  (type/source) | UNDP own financing (mill. US$) | | Government  (mill. US$) | | Partner Agency  (mill. US$) | | Total  (mill. US$) | |
| Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Actual | Actual |
| Grants |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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]](#footnote-2)

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 Mauritius.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.

The Consultants shall comply strictly with comments made on any deliverable by the UNDP CO, the UNDP GEF Regional Technical Adviser and the UNDP Independent Evaluation office (IEO).

Evaluation timeframe

The total duration of the evaluation will be 30-person days over a period of 10 weeks according to the following plan for the national consultant:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Timing  (Number of working days) | Completion Date |
| **Document review** | 4 days | 09th February 2018 |
| **Evaluation Mission including workshop** | 12 days | 12th to 27th February 2018 |
| **Provide inputs in the drafting of the evaluation report and GEF Tracking Tool** | 8 days | 16th March 2018 |
| **Final Report and GEF Tracking tool** | 6 days | 10th April 2018 |

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. | Evaluator submits to UNDP CO, IEO |
| **Presentation** | Initial Findings | End of evaluation mission | To project management, UNDP CO, Project Steering Committee, Key Stakeholders, IEO |
| **Draft Final Report** | Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes | Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission | Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PAN Project team, GEF OFPs, IEO |
| **Final Report\*** | Revised report | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft | Sent to IEO and CO for uploading to UNDP ERC. |

\*When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluator is required also to provide an 'audit trail' (see [annex H](#_Annex_H:_TE)), detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report.

The National Consultant will be allocated 20 person days input.

Team Composition

The evaluation team will be composed of two independent consultants - one international consultant and one national consultant. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities. The international consultant will serve as the team leader and will be responsible for the final deliverable of the TE inception report, draft report and final report. The national expert will support the international expert in performing the following tasks:

* Design the detailed evaluation scope and methodology (including the methods for data collection and analysis);
* Collect data through project documents review, interviews and field visits;
* Conduct an analysis of the outcome, outputs and partnership strategy (as per the scope of the evaluation described above);
* Draft the evaluation report; and
* Finalize the whole evaluation report, incorporating stakeholders’ feedbacks

The selection of consultant will be aimed at maximizing the overall “team” qualities. The national consultant should have:

**Education:**

* At least a Master’s Degree in Biodiversity, Conservation, Natural Resources management other social sciences or business administration/ project management or related field; PhD is considered an asset;

**Work Experience:**

* At least 5 years of relevant experience in managing biodiversity or other environment programmes or projects;
* Knowledge of Project Adaptive Management, as applied to conservation or natural resource management projects. Past experience as evaluator of GEF projects and knowledge of GEF M&E guidelines and tools (PIR, METT, Financial Score Card, etc.) is a strong asset;
* Prior experience in environment project evaluation essential;
* Experience in dealing with multi-stakeholder projects and good knowledge of policies and regulations related to biodiversity conservation in Mauritius;
* Experience with internationally funded Biodiversity related projects. Experience within GEF and/or United Nations system will be considered an asset;
* Experience applying participatory monitoring approaches;
* Demonstrable analytical skills;
* Fully computer literate with strong editing skills.

**Corporate Competencies:**

* Demonstrates integrity and ethical standards
* Creative and innovative
* Sound analytic capacities
* Ability to address complex concepts and to gather written materials in a clear, concise and meaningful manner with a high level of accuracy and attention to detail
* Highly organized, able to effectively develop and manage projects, ensuring that deadlines are met

**Functional Competencies:**

* Excellent writing, analytical and research skills
* Showing strong attention to details
* Excellent interpersonal skills
* Ability to work in a multicultural and international environment
* Ability to work under pressure and to meet tight deadlines

**Language**

* Excellent spoken, written English, French and Mauritian Creole required

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, experience on similar assignments and brief technical proposal 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.

The evaluation criteria will be as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criteria (Technical)** | **Weight (%)** |
| Master’s Degree in Biodiversity, Conservation, Natural Resources management other social sciences or business administration/ project management or related field | 15 |
| At least 5 years of relevant experience in managing biodiversity or other environment programmes or projects; | 10 |
| Experience in evaluation of environmental projects | 10 |
| Knowledge of Project Adaptive Management, as applied to conservation or natural resource management projects. Past experience as evaluator of GEF projects and knowledge of GEF M&E guidelines and tools (PIR, METT, Financial Score Card, etc.) is a strong asset; | 10 |
| Experience in dealing with multi-stakeholder projects and good knowledge of policies and regulations related to biodiversity conservation in Mauritius | 10 |
| Experience with internationally funded Biodiversity related projects. Experience within GEF and/or United Nations system; | 5 |
| Fully computer literate. | 5 |
| Ability to address complex concepts and to gather written materials in a clear, concise and meaningful manner with a high level of accuracy and attention to detail | 5 |
| Highly organized, able to effectively develop and manage projects, ensuring that deadlines are met | 5 |
| Excellent spoken, written English, French and Mauritian Creole | 5 |
| Brief Technical Proposal mentioning both Evaluation method and Training on Knowledge management | 20 |
| **Total points obtainable** | **100** |

Evaluator Ethics

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct ([Annex E](#_Annex_E:_Evaluation)) 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)

Payment modalities and specifications

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| % | Milestone |
| *20%* | At submission and approval of work plan |
| *30%* | Following submission and approval of the draft terminal evaluation report & draft GEF Tracking Tool |
| *50%* | Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO, UNDP RTA and IEO) of the final terminal evaluation report & GEF Tracking Tool |

Application process

Applicants are requested to apply online <http://jobs.undp.org> by 11th January 2018. Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions. The application should contain the following document:

1. Duly accomplished **Letter of Confirmation of interest and Availability** using the template provided by UNDP
2. **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,
* a methodology, on how the candidate will approach and complete the assignment; and
* the programme for the Terminal Evaluation and Knowledge Management Workshop.

1. **Financial Proposal** that indicates the contract price, supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template provided. If the 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 and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP

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

## Annex A: Project Logical Framework

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPD:** Design and implementation of a portfolio of activities and solutions developed at national and subnational levels for sustainable management of natural resources, integration of ecosystem services approaches, sound management of chemicals and waste, while ensuring that climate change challenges in terms of adaptation and mitigation are fully addressed. | | | | | |
| **Country Programme Outcome Indicators:**  **Key Indicator (1):** Hectares of land managed sustainably through protected area management, biodiversity and ecosystem conservation | | | | | |
| **Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area (same as that on the cover page, circle one):** Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Areas Systems | | | | | |
| **Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program:** Strengthened Terrestrial Protected Area Networks | | | | | |
| **Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes: 1)** Improved ecosystem coverage of under-represented terrestrial ecosystems areas as part of national protected area system  **2)** Improved management of terrestrial protected areas | | | | | |
| **Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators: 1)** Improved management of terrestrial protected areas  **2)** Protected area management effectiveness as measured by individual protected area scorecards | | | | | |
|  | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Target** | **Sources of Verification** | **Assumptions** |
| **Objective** |  |  |  |  |  |
| To expand and ensure effective management of the protected area network to safeguard threatened biodiversity. | Coverage (ha) of the terrestrial formal protected area network of mainland Mauritius and the islets:   * State protected areas * Private protected areas | 8.027 ha  0 ha | 11,700ha  3,220ha | Protected Area Information System  Annual Reports of FS and NPCS Ministry of Housing and Lands Land Use/Class database MoE NDU ESA database  Audited financial reports of FS and NPCS  Audited financial reports of NEF and NCF  Audited financial reports of MWF  Annual Financial Sustainability Scorecard | * The government commits to an incremental growth in the grant funding allocation to finance the protected area network * The financial reporting of the MoA (FS and NPCS) develops dedicated budget codes for PA planning and management functions |
| Total operational budget (including HR and capital budget) allocation (US$) for protected area management | ~US$2.3m | >US$4.1m |
| Financial sustainability score (%) for national systems of protected areas | 17% | >45% |
| Capacity development indicator score (%) for protected area system:   * Systemic * Institutional * Individual | 50%  56%  62% | 78%  65%  82% | Annual Institutional Capacity Development Scorecard  METT applied at Mid-Term and Final Evaluation |
| METT scores for different categories of formal protected areas on mainland Mauritius and the islets   * National Parks (2) * Bird Sanctuary (1) * Nature Reserves (14) * Forest Reserves (3) | 40% & 58%  57%  37-65%  <37% | All > 70%  > 65%  All > 60%  All > 55% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcomes / Output** |  |  |  |  | |  |
| **Outcome 1:** Systemic framework for PA expansion improved  **Output 1.1:** Enabling national policy for a representative system of protected areas is formulated  **Output 1.2:** Legislative and regulatory framework for the PAN is updated and reformed  **Output 1.3:** Rationale for PA expansion in place, and conservation stewardship strategy and tools established to guide implementation  **Output 1.4:** Business-oriented financial and business plan prepared for PAN  **Output 1.5:** Awareness of the need to conserve native biodiversity is improved | Number of ‘Land Types’ included in the PAN | 8 of 16 | 12 of 16 | Protected Area Information System | | * Legislative and regulatory reforms are supported and adopted by Government, and provide for the establishment of private protected areas * Land designated as category 1 and category 2 ESA’s will remain under some form of protection or conservation in the medium-term * Distributional data of threatened native species is being updated and maintained |
| Ecological corridors and marine-terrestrial linkages incorporated into the PAN | None | 2  (1 in South; 1 in North) | Protected Area Information System  Ministry of Housing and Lands Land Use/Class database  MoE NDU ESA database | |
| Number of rare and threatened plant species (of 231 with a known distribution) having at least 1 wild population represented in the PAN.   * Previously considered extinct Extirpated in the wild * Critically endangered * Endangered * Vulnerable | 2  1  44  25  62 | 6  2  70  33  71 | Protected Area Information System  Mauritius Herbarium | |
| Reach (estimated number of people in the target audience) of the communications and awareness programme   * Broad-based communications (estimated number of audience receiving different media message) * Outreach programmes (number of people attending) * Experiential learning programmes (number of people attending) * Lobbying of key decision-makers (number of people and institutions) | n/a  n/a  n/a  n/a | 100,000  500  300  10 of 4 | Project Reports | |
| **Outcome 2:** PA institutional framework strengthened  **Output 2.1:** Management and governance options for the PAN reviewed.  **Output 2.2:** Strategic planning for PA institutions completed  **Output 2.3:** Financial sustainability of PA institutions improved  **Output 2.4:** Conservation stewardship unit established and pilot programme implemented  **Output 2.5:** Skills and competencies of PA staff improved | Number of strategic plans prepared for PA institutions that are linked to the MTEF | 0 | 2 | Annual Reports of FS and NPCS | | * Stakeholder institutions constructively engage in the identification of the most cost-effective institutional and governance arrangements for the PAN * The individual PA institutions maintain a clear mandate and unequivocal authority to fulfil oversight and management obligations for the protected area network |
| Income from other sources (i.e. non- state budget allocation), as a percentage of the total operational budget of the PAN | 33% | 54% | Audited financial reports of FS and NPCS  Audited financial reports of NEF and NCF  Audited financial reports of MWF | |
| Number of tourism concessions awarded | 0 | 1 | Concession agreements | |
| Number of private landowners concluding stewardship agreements:   * Informal, non-binding, agreements * Formal, legally binding, agreements | 0  0 | >6  >2 | Stewardship agreements  Project reports | |
| Number of planning support and operational PA staff completing specialized training and/or skills development programs   * Short course training * Mentoring programme * Train-the-trainers programme * IAS and ecosystem restoration skills development * Partnering agreements with counterpart institutions | 0  0  0  0  0 | >40  5  5  50  3 | Training reports  Project reports  Annual reports of FS and NPCS | |
| **Outcome 3:** Operational know-how in place to contain threats  **Output 3.1:** Integrated management plan prepared for Black River Gorges National Park  **Output 3.2:** Cost-effective IAS control measures, and ecosystem restoration techniques, developed and tested  **Output 3.3:** Enforcement and compliance capability improved  **Output 3.4:** Information management system for recording, exchanging and disseminating information in place | Number of protected areas with updated and approved management plans | 1 | >3 | | Annual reports of FS and NPCS | * A generic management planning format for PAs is adopted by all responsible PA institutions * The Government sustains, or improves, its financial commitment to IAS control and ecosystem restoration * Biological control agents will remain under development by other countries for targeted IAS, and available for release within the time frame of the project * Stakeholder groups continue to work collaboratively in IAS control and ecosystem restoration * Information to support the planning and management of the PAN is made available by existing public and private data suppliers |
| Extent of area (ha) under active IAS management and ecosystem restoration | 60 | >400 | | Annual reports of FS and NPCS  Project Reports |
| Average cost (US$/ha) of IAS control and ecosystem restoration   * Initial clearing and first follow-up * Subsequent follow-ups | US$9,000  US$1,000 | US$1,500  US$500 | | Protected Area Information System |
| % of PAs with no, or poorly, demarcated boundaries | 95% | <50% | | Project reports  Annual reports of FS and NPCS |

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

* Project Document;
* Project implementation reports (PIRs);
* Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams;
* Audits reports
* Mid Term Evaluation Report
* M & E Operational Guidelines, all monitoring reports prepared by the project;
* Financial and Administration guidelines;

GEF Project Information Form (PIF)

List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Boards, and other partners to be consulted

Project budget and financial data

GEF project Tracking Tools, at baseline and at mid-term.

* GEF focal area strategic program objectives

The following documents will also be available:

* The project M&E framework
* Knowledge products from service providers
* Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems;
* Minutes of the Project Steering Committees and Executive Committees, and other project management meetings;

Maps: Project sites, highlighting suggested visits

* The GEF Implementation Completion Report guidelines; and,
* The UNDP Monitoring and Evaluation Frameworks.

## Annex C: Evaluation Questions

| **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 and national levels? | | | | |
| * Are the project objectives conforming to agreed?   priorities in the UNDP Country Programme  Document (CPD)? | * How does the project support the environment and sustainable development objectives of the Republic of Mauritius? | * In line with the national priorities mentioned in the UNDP Country Programme   Document | * UNDP Country Programme Document * Project document | * Documents analyses * Interviews with UNDP and project team |
| * Is the project relevant to the GEF climate change mitigation area? | * How does the project support the GEF climate change mitigation area? | * Existence of a clear relationship between the project objectives and GEF climate change mitigation area? | * Project documents * GEF focal areas strategies and documents | * Documents analyses * GEF website * Interviews with UNDP and project team |
| * Is the project relevant to the Republic of Mauritius’s environment and sustainable development objectives? | * Is the project country-driven? * What was the level of stakeholder participation in project design? * What was the level of stakeholder ownership in implementation? * Does the project adequately take into account the national realities, both in terms of institutional and policy framework in its design and its implementation? | * Degree to which the project supports national environmental objectives * Degree of coherence between the project and national’s priorities, policies and strategies * Appreciation from national stakeholders with respect to adequacy of project design and implementation to national realities and existing capacities * Level of involvement of government officials and other partners in the project design process * Coherence between needs expressed by national stakeholders and UNDP-GEF criteria | * Project documents * National policies and strategies * Key project partners | * Documents analyses * GEF website * Interviews with UNDP and project team |
| * Is the project addressing the needs of target beneficiaries at the local level? | * How does the project support the needs of relevant stakeholders? * Has the implementation of the project been inclusive of all relevant stakeholders? * Were local beneficiaries and stakeholders adequately involved in project design and implementation? | * Strength of the link between expected results from the project and the needs of relevant stakeholders * Degree of involvement and inclusiveness of stakeholders in project design and implementation | * Project partners and stakeholders * Project documents | * Document analysis * Interviews with relevant stakeholders |
| * Is the project internally coherent in its design? | * 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.)? * Is the length of the project sufficient to achieve Project outcomes? * Whether gender issues had been taken into account in project design and implementation and in what way has the project contributed to greater consideration of gender aspects, (i.e. project team composition, gender-related aspects of pollution impacts, stakeholder outreach to women’s groups, etc.). If so, indicate how | * Level of coherence between project expected results and project design internal logic * Level of coherence between project design and project implementation approach | * Program and project documents * Key project stakeholders | * Document analysis * Key interviews |
| * How is the project relevant with respect to other donor-supported activities? | * Does the GEF funding support activities and objectives not addressed by other donors? * How do GEF-funds help to fill gaps (or give additional stimulus) that are necessary but are not covered by other donors? * Is there coordination and complementarity between donors? | * Degree to which program was coherent and complementary to other donor programming nationally and regionally | * Documents from other donor supported activities * Other donor representatives * Project documents | * Documents analyses * Interviews with project partners and relevant stakeholders |
| * 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 |
| **Evaluative Criteria** | **Questions** | **Indicators** | **Sources** | **Methodology** |
| Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been 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 log frame | * Project documents * Project team and relevant stakeholders * Data reported in project annual and quarterly reports | * Documents analysis * Interviews with project team * Interviews with relevant stakeholders |
| * How is risk and risk mitigation being managed? | * How well are risks, assumptions and impact drivers being managed? * What was the quality of risk mitigation strategies developed? Were these sufficient? * Are there clear strategies for risk mitigation related with long-term sustainability of the project? | * Completeness of risk identification and assumptions during project planning and design * Quality of existing information systems in place to identify emerging risks and other issues * Quality of risk mitigations strategies developed and followed | * Project documents * UNDP, project team, and relevant stakeholders | * Document analysis * Interviews |
| * What lessons can be drawn regarding effectiveness for other similar projects in the future? | * What lessons have been learned from the project regarding achievement of outcomes? * What changes could have been made (if any) to the design of the project in order to improve the achievement of the project’s expected results? |  | * Data collected Throughout evaluation | * Data analysis |
| **Evaluative Criteria** | **Questions** | **Indicators** | **Sources** | **Methodology** |
| Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards? | | | | |
| * Was project support provided in an efficient way? | * Was adaptive management used or needed to ensure efficient resource use? * Did the project logical framework and work plans and any changes made to them use as management tools during implementation? * Were the accounting and financial systems in place adequate for project management and producing accurate and timely financial information? * Were progress reports produced accurately, timely and responded to reporting requirements including adaptive management changes? * Was project implementation as cost effective as originally proposed (planned vs. actual) * Did the leveraging of funds (co-financing) happen as planned? * Were financial resources utilized efficiently? Could financial resources have been used more efficiently? * Was procurement carried out in a manner making efficient use of project resources? * How was results-based management used during project implementation? | * Availability and quality of financial and progress reports * Timeliness and adequacy of reporting provided * Level of discrepancy between planned and utilized financial expenditures * Planned vs. actual funds leveraged * Cost in view of results achieved compared to costs of similar projects from other * organizations * Adequacy of project choices in view of existing context, infrastructure and cost * Quality of results-based management reporting (progress reporting, monitoring and evaluation) * Occurrence of change in project design/ implementation approach (i.e. restructuring) when needed to improve project efficiency * Cost associated with delivery mechanism and management structure compare to alternatives | * Project documents and evaluations * UNDP Project team | * Document analysis * Key interviews |
| * How efficient are partnership arrangements for the project? | * To what extent partnerships/ linkages between institutions/ organizations were encouraged and supported? * Which partnerships/linkages were facilitated? Which ones can be considered sustainable? * What was the level of efficiency of cooperation and collaboration arrangements? * Which methods were successful or not and why? | * Specific activities conducted to support the development   of cooperative arrangements between partners,   * Examples of supported partnerships * Evidence that particular partnerships/linkages will be sustained * Types/quality of partnership cooperation methods utilized | * Project documents and evaluations * Project partners and relevant stakeholders | * Document analysis * Interviews |
| * Did the project efficiently utilize local capacity in implementation? | * Was an appropriate balance struck between utilization of international expertise as well as local capacity? * Did the project take into account local capacity in design and implementation of the project? * Was there an effective collaboration between institutions responsible for implementing the project? | * Proportion of expertise utilized from international experts compared to national experts * Number/quality of analyses done to assess local capacity potential and absorptive capacity | * Project documents and evaluations * UNDP * Beneficiaries | * Document analysis * Interviews |
| * What lessons can be drawn regarding efficiency for other similar projects in the future? | * What lessons can be learnt from the project regarding efficiency? * How could the project have more efficiently carried out implementation (in terms of management structures and procedures, partnerships arrangements etc.)? * What changes could have been made (if any) to the project in order to improve its efficiency? |  | * Data collected throughout evaluation | * Data analysis |
| * 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 log frame | * Project documents * Project team and relevant stakeholders * Data reported in project annual and quarterly reports | * Documents analysis * Interviews with project team * Interviews with relevant stakeholders |
| * How is risk and risk mitigation being managed? | * How well are risks, assumptions and impact drivers being managed? * What was the quality of risk mitigation strategies developed? Were these sufficient? * Are there clear strategies for risk mitigation related with long-term sustainability of the project | * Completeness of risk identification and assumptions during project planning and design * Quality of existing information systems in place to identify emerging risks and other issues * Quality of risk mitigations strategies developed and followed | * Project documents * UNDP, project team, and relevant * stakeholders | * Document analysis * Interviews |
| * What lessons can be drawn regarding effectiveness for other similar projects in the future? | * What lessons have been learned from the project regarding achievement of outcomes? * What changes could have been made (if any) to the design of the project in order to improve the achievement of the project’s expected results? |  | * Data collected throughout * evaluation | * Data analysis |
| **Evaluative Criteria** | **Questions** | **Indicators** | **Sources** | **Methodology** |
| Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? | | | | |
| * Is the Project financially sustainable? | * Are there financial risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outcomes? * What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once GEF grant assistance ends? | * The likely ability of an intervention to continue to deliver benefits for an extended period of time after completion. | * UNDP, project team, and relevant stakeholders | * Document analysis * Interviews |
| * Is the Project environmentally and socially sustainable? | * Are there ongoing activities that may pose an environmental threat to the sustainability of project outcomes? |  | * UNDP, project team, and relevant stakeholders | * Document analysis * Interviews |
| * To what extent the stakeholders will sustain the project? | * Are there social or political risks that may threaten the sustainability of project outcomes? * What is the risk for instance that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? * Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that project benefits continue to flow? * Is there sufficient public/stakeholder awareness in support of the project’s long-term objectives? |  | * UNDP, project team, and relevant stakeholders | * Document analysis * Interviews |
| **Evaluative Criteria** | **Questions** | **Indicators** | **Sources** | **Methodology** |
| **Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?** | | | | |
| * Assess the likely permanence (long lasting nature) of the impacts | * Clarify based on extent: a) verifiable improvement in energy intensity; and/or * b) through specified indicators that progress is being made towards achievement of project objectives * c) regulatory and policy changes at regional, national and/or local levels | * The positive and negative, foreseen and unforeseen changes to and effects produced by a development intervention | * Project documents * UNDP, project team, and relevant stakeholders | * Document analysis * Interviews |

## Annex D: Rating Scales

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution*** | ***Sustainability ratings:*** | ***Relevance ratings*** |
| 6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings  5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings  4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS)  3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings  2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems  1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems | 4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability | 2. Relevant (R) |
| 3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks | 1.. Not relevant (NR) |
| 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks  1. Unlikely (U): severe risks | ***Impact Ratings:***  3. Significant (S)  2. Minimal (M)  1. Negligible (N) |
| *Additional ratings where relevant:*  Not Applicable (N/A)  Unable to Assess (U/A | | |

## Annex E: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form

**Evaluators:**

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people’s right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people’s right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders’ dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form[[3]](#footnote-3)**

**Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System**

**Name of Consultant:** \_\_     \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Name of Consultancy Organization** (where relevant)**:** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.**

Signed at *place* on *date*

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Annex F: Evaluation Report Outline**[[4]](#footnote-4)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **i.** | Opening page:   * Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project * UNDP and GEF project ID#s. * Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report * Region and countries included in the project * GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program * Implementing Partner and other project partners * Evaluation team members * Acknowledgements |
| **ii.** | Executive Summary   * Project Summary Table * Project Description (brief) * Evaluation Rating Table * Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons |
| **iii.** | Acronyms and Abbreviations  (See: UNDP Editorial Manual[[5]](#footnote-5)) |
| **1.** | Introduction   * Purpose of the evaluation * Scope & Methodology * Structure of the evaluation report |
| **2.** | Project description and development context   * Project start and duration * Problems that the project sought to address * Immediate and development objectives of the project * Baseline Indicators established * Main stakeholders * Expected Results |
| **3.** | Findings  (In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) must be rated[[6]](#footnote-6)) |
| **3.1** | Project Design / Formulation   * Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators) * Assumptions and Risks * Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design * Planned stakeholder participation * Replication approach * UNDP comparative advantage * Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector * Management arrangements |
| **3.2** | Project Implementation   * Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation) * Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region) * Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management * Project Finance: * Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (\*) * UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (\*) coordination, and operational issues |
| **3.3** | Project Results   * Overall results (attainment of objectives) (\*) * Relevance (\*) * Effectiveness & Efficiency (\*) * Country ownership * Mainstreaming * Sustainability (\*) * Impact |
| **4.** | Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons   * Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project * Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project * Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives * Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success |
| **5.** | Annexes   * ToR * Itinerary * List of persons interviewed * Summary of field visits * List of documents reviewed * Evaluation Question Matrix * Questionnaire used and summary of results * Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form * Report Clearance Form * *Annexed in a separate file:* TE audit trail * *Annexed in a separate file:* Mid term GEF 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 to the draft Terminal Evaluation report during (time period); they are referenced by institution (“Author” column) and comment number (“#” column):*

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

**Annex I: management response template**

**UNDP-GEF TE Management Response Template**

**Management response to the Terminal Evaluation of (*title of the Project)*[[7]](#footnote-7)**

Project Title:

UNDP Project ID (PIMS) #:

GEF Project ID (PMIS) #:

Terminal Evaluation Mission Completion Date:

Date of Issue of Management Response:

Prepared by: *This will most likely be the Consultants and Commissioning Unit*

Contributors: *For example, the UNDP-GEF RTA, the TE team, the Project Board*

Cleared by: *The Commissioning Unit, UNDP-GEF RTA, Project Board*

**Context, background and findings**

1. *Insert here up to several paragraphs on context and background and UNDP’s response to the validity and relevance of the findings, conclusions and recommendations.*
2. *Second paragraph.*
3. *Third paragraph, etc.*

**Recommendations and management response**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Terminal Evaluation recommendation 1.** | | | | |
| **Management response:** | | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | **Responsible unit(s)** | **Tracking[[8]](#footnote-8)** | |
| **Comments** | **Status[[9]](#footnote-9)** |
| 1.1 |  |  |  |  |
| 1.2 |  |  |  |  |
| 1.3 |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Terminal Evaluation recommendation 2.** | | | | |
| **Management response:** | | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | **Responsible unit(s)** | **Tracking** | |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| 2.1 |  |  |  |  |
| 2.2 |  |  |  |  |
| 2.3 |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Terminal Evaluation recommendation 3.** | | | | |
| **Management response**: | | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | **Responsible unit(s)** | **Tracking** | |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| 3.1 |  |  |  |  |
| 3.2 |  |  |  |  |
| 3.3 |  |  |  |  |

1. For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](http://www.undp.org/evaluation/handbook), Chapter 7, pg. 163 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office:  [ROTI Handbook 2009](http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/M2_ROtI%20Handbook.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. This template is in alignment with the [Management Response Template](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/handbook/documents/templates/Independent-Evaluation-Management-response.doc) for UNDP project-level evaluations in the Evaluation Resource Centre. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. If the TE is uploaded to the ERC, the status of implementation is tracked electronically in the Evaluation Resource Centre database (ERC). [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Status of Implementation: Completed, Partially Completed, Pending. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)