**Terminal Evaluation 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 the implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the**Implementing the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and Benefit Sharing in Bhutan** (PIMS 5239)

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

Project Summary Table

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Title: | **Implementing the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and Benefit Sharing (ABS) in Bhutan** | | | | |
| GEF Project ID: | 5448 |  | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | | *at completion (Million US$)* |
| UNDP GEF Project ID (PIMS): | 5239 |
| UNDP Award ID: | 00080806 | GEF/NPIF financing: | 1,000,000 | | 1,000,000 |
| UNDP Project ID: | 00090375 |
| Country: | Bhutan | IA/EA own: |  | |  |
| Region: | South Asia | Government: | 2,512,232.00 | | 2,512,232.00 |
| Focal Area: | Ecosystems and Biodiversity | UNDP: | 106,000.00 | | 171,652.33 |
|  |  | Other: | 385,436.00 | | 385,436.00 |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): | Objective BD4: Build Capacity on Access to Genetic Resources and Benefit-Sharing | Total co-financing: | 3,003,668.00 | | 3,069,320.33 |
| Executing Agency: | National Biodiversity Centre (NBC), Ministry of Agriculture and Forests | Total Project Cost: | 4,003,668.00 | | 4,069,320.33 |
| Other Partners involved: | Menjong Sorig Pharmaceutical Corporation Ltd. and Bio Bhutan | ProDoc Signature (date project began): | | | 24 Sept 2014 |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | | Proposed:  23 Sept 2018 | Actual:  23 Sept 2018 |

Objective and Scope

Although Bhutan has a relatively good state of biodiversity because of its visionary leaders, it is threatened by overharvesting fueled by population growth and transformation from a subsistence economy to a consumer-based economy, competitive land uses for urbanization and infrastructure development, industrial and mining operations especially in the southern region, poaching along the porous borders with India and China, human-wildlife conflicts as result of crop and livestock depredation by wildlife, and climate change exacerbating the risks of forest fire, and pest and disease.

To counter the various threats to biodiversity, the country has planned various strategies for the conservation and sustainable use of biological resources for socio-economic development at national and local levels. One of the recent biodiversity programs includes bio-prospecting and Access to Genetic Resources and Benefit Sharing (ABS) mechanism. Four years ago, Bhutan did not have a fully functional regulatory and institutional framework for ABS, and the institutional and personnel capacity to carry out bio-prospecting beyond basic level and develop and manage ABS schemes that are compliant with Nagoya Protocol.

The ABS project was designed with the objective to develop and implement a national ABS framework, build national capacities and facilitate the discovery of nature-based products. It will focus on three components: (a) development and operationalization of a national regulatory and institutional framework for ABS; (b) capacity development and awareness-raising for the implementation of the national ABS framework; and (c) demonstration of best practices of ABS processes

**The project has the following Project Goal, Objective, outcomes and outputs:**

**The project’s goal is** to contribute to the conservation and sustainable use of globally significant biodiversity in Bhutan. **The project objective is to** develop and implement a national ABS framework, build national capacities and facilitate the discovery of nature-based products.

**The project objective would be achieved through the implementation of three inter-connected components as follow**:

**The first project component** supported the formulation of the ABS policy, revision of the Biodiversity Act 2003, promulgation of the Biodiversity Rules and Regulations for ABS implementation in compliance with the approved ABS policy and the Nagoya Protocol through an extensive consultation process, and establishment and operationalization of an institutional framework in accordance with the requirements of the Biodiversity Rules and Regulations.

**The second component** supported upgrading of the bio-prospecting laboratory facilities and improving the technical skills of the lab technicians, staff training on ABS Regime Management based on the ABS toolkit and training course developed through a comparative assessment of best approaches and practices for ABS management relevant to Bhutan. Study tours for a group of Bhutanese were organized to observe and secure first-hand knowledge and insights on bio-prospecting and ABS activities in the South and South-East Asia regions. A series of advocacy and sensitization events and mass media programs were organized to raise awareness of ABS among various groups using well-developed communication materials.

**The third component** supported the development and operationalization of three pilot ABS agreements that are compliant with Nagoya Protocol. The pilots have been implemented by three different institutions: The National Biodiversity Center, a government research and development institution which is also the national focal agency for ABS and Nagoya Protocol; Menjong Sorig Pharmaceuticals Corporation Ltd, a state-owned company with the mandate for research and production of traditional medicines; and Bio Bhutan, a private sector enterprise developing and producing bio-products with the involvement of local community groups. These institutes worked with international partners for analysis and product development. This component also involved the development and dissemination of knowledge resources emanating from the country’s experience in ABS.

Each of the above components have outcomes that would have been realized through the delivery of specific outputs that are designed to produce certain outputs. These outcomes and their corresponding outputs are enumerated below:

**Outcome 1: An operational national regulatory and institutional framework on ABS.**

* Output 1.1: An approved national ABS policy in place and disseminated
* Output 1.2: Biodiversity rules and regulations developed and promulgated in compliance with the approved ABS policy, Biodiversity Act and Nagoya Protocol
* Output 1.3: Institutional mechanisms for ABS established and operational

**Outcome 2: Strengthened stakeholder capacity and awareness supports implementation of the national ABS framework**

* Output 2.1: Upgraded facilities and staff skills for bio-prospecting laboratory work and TK documentation
* Output 2.2: Improved technical capacity for implementing ABS activities
* Output 2.3: Increased awareness of ABS and associated national regulatory and institutional framework among a wide range of stakeholders

**Outcome 3: Best practice ABS processes are demonstrated recognizing the principles of biodiversity conservation, Prior Information Consent (PIC) and Mutually Agreed Terms (MAT) including the fair and equitable sharing of benefits through ABS agreements**

* Output 3.1: Three pilot ABS agreements / schemes compliant with the approved ABS Policy and Nagoya Protocol developed and operationalized
* Output 3.2: Knowledge resources emanating from Bhutan’s experience of ABS are developed and disseminated.

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 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 ([*Annex C*](#_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 Bangkok Regional Hub and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to visit project sites in Lokchina under Chhukha Dzongkhag, Langthel under Trongsa Dzongkhag and Dagala under Thimphu Dzongkhag.

Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: National Biodiversity Centre, Menjong Sorig Pharmaceuticals Corporation Ltd, Bio Bhutan and Project Steering Committee Members.

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Project Implementation Report, 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](#_TOR_Annex_B:) of this Terms of Reference.

Evaluation Criteria & Ratings

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against the 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](#_TOR_Annex_D:).

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

Project finance / cofinance

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Co-financing  (type/source) | UNDP own financing (mill. US$) | | Government  (mill. US$) | | Partner Agency  (mill. US$) | | Total  (mill. US$) | |
| Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Actual | Actual |
| Grants |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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 finding 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 Bhutan. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the Evaluator. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluator to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

Evaluation timeframe

The total duration of the evaluation will be 30 days, spread over July-August 2018, according to the following plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Timing | Completion Date |
| **Preparation** | *3* days | *1st week of July (6 Jul 2018)* |
| **Evaluation Mission** | *14* days | *3rd week of July (20 Jul 2018)* |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | *10* days | *2nd week of August (10 Aug 2018)* |
| **Final Report** | 3 days | *4th week of August (31 Aug 2018)* |

Evaluation deliverables

The evaluator 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 (by 6 Jul 2018) | Evaluator submits to UNDP CO |
| **Presentation** | Initial Findings | End of evaluation mission (by 20 Jul 2018) | To project management, UNDP CO |
| **Draft Final Report** | Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes | Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission (by 10 Aug 2018) | Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs |
| **Final Report\*** | Revised report | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft (by 31 Aug 2018) | 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

Since this is a medium size project, the evaluator will be a national consultant. The consultant shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The evaluator selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The **National Consultant** should possess the following attributes:

* A Master’s degree in Natural Resource Management, Biodiversity Conservation, Environmental Science, Sustainable Development, Development Studies or relevant discipline, or other closely related field.
* Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 7 years;
* Knowledge of and/or experience with UNDP and/or GEF;
* Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;
* Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
* Project evaluation/review experiences within the United Nations system, GEF and/or other donor funded projects;
* Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and biodiversity related projects; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis;
* Excellent communication skills;
* Evidence/demonstrable analytical skills.
* Project evaluation/review experiences within the United Nations system will be considered an asset;

The selection of the consultant will be based on the following criteria:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Weight** | **Max. Point** |
| Technical | 70 |  |
| * Education qualification; * Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 7 years; * Specific experience in M&E and GEF project evaluation; * Experience with UNDP and other donor funded projects; * Proposed methodology, approach and implementation plan |  | 15  10  15  10  20 |
| **Sub-total A. (Technical)** |  | **70** |
| Financial | 30 | 30 |
| **Sub-Total B.(Financial)** |  | **30** |
| **Total (A+B)** |  | **100** |

Evaluator Ethics

Evaluation consultant 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'](http://www.unevaluation.org/ethicalguidelines).

Payment modalities and specifications

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| % | Milestone |
| *10%* | At submission and approval of inception report |
| *40%* | 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

Applicants are requested to apply online (<http://www.bt.undp.org/content/bhutan/en/home/operations/jobs.html> by 1 July 2018. Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for this position. The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in English with indication of the e‐mail and phone contact. Consultants are also expected to submit a price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs).

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

Annex A: Project Logical Framework

**Project Title:** Implementing the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and Benefit-sharing from their Utilization in Bhutan

**Project’s Development Goal:** To contribute to the conservation and sustainable use of globally significant biodiversity in Bhutan

| **Objective/ Outcome** | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **End of Project target** | **Source of Information** | **Risks and assumptions** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Objective:**  To develop and implement a national ABS framework, build national capacities and facilitate the discovery of nature-based products | Existence and use of regulatory and institutional frameworks for implementation of ABS in compliance with the Nagoya Protocol | Draft ABS policy in place and under review, and interim institutional measures in place in anticipation of the approval of draft ABS policy. Biodiversity Act in place but there are no rules and regulations detailing procedures and institutional mechanisms for implementation | National ABS Policy approved, and regulatory and institutional frameworks developed and operationalized | * ABS Policy document; * Biodiversity Rules and Regulations document; * 11th Five-Year Plan Review Reports * Websites of NBC, MoAF and GNHC; * Periodic progress reports * Project evaluation reports; | Risks:  Potential delay in approval of the draft ABS Policy would delay the development and operationalization of the regulatory and institutional frameworks.  Lack of consensus among the stakeholders during the promulgation of detailed rules and regulations  Assumption:  The Royal Government of Bhutan is fully committed to the conservation and sustainable use of the country’s biological resources and the introduction of a national framework for ABS. |
| Level of institutional and personnel capacity for implementation of the national ABS framework as indicated by an increase in the GEF ABS Tracking Tool score[[3]](#footnote-3) | 34 out of a possible 69 = 33.33%  Basic to moderate capacity within government agencies but virtually no capacity in the private sector. | Improved institutional and personnel capacity indicated by an increase of at least 25% over the GEF  ABS Tracking Tool baseline score | * Periodic progress reports; * Project evaluation reports; * Training reports; * Key informant interviews |
| **Outcome 1:**  An operational national regulatory and institutional framework on ABS | **Outputs:**   * Output 1.1: National ABS Policy approved and disseminated * Output 1.2: Biodiversity Rules and Regulations encompassing ABS implementation promulgated and disseminated * Output 1.3: Institutional framework compliant with the national ABS policy and regulations and Nagoya Protocol is in place and operational | | | | |
| Approval of ABS policy and Biodiversity Rules and Regulations, and their use in establishing the institutional mechanisms for ABS implementation | Draft ABS Policy in place, Biodiversity Rules and Regulations not promulgated, and existing institutional mechanisms are interim and basic | ABS Policy approved within the first year of the project, followed by promulgation of the Biodiversity Rules and Regulations encompassing ABS implementation in the second year. | * Approved policy and regulatory documents; * Websites of NBC, MoAF and GNHC; * Periodic progress reports; * Project evaluation reports; * Workshop and meeting reports | Risks:  Potential delay in approval of the draft ABS Policy would delay the development and operationalization of the regulatory and institutional frameworks.  Lack of consensus among the stakeholders during the promulgation of detailed rules and regulations  Assumption:  MoAF and Royal Civil Service Commission are supportive of the staffing structure required for establishing and operationalizing the institutional mechanisms required for ABS implementation |
| Operational national ABS institutional framework indicated by:   * Existence, and the number, of Competent Authorities designated at national (and sub-national) level * Number of exit/ entry points designated for checking ABS information/ permits * Existence of a system of internationally-recognized certification of origin and compliance and issuance of certificates | NBC designated as the National Focal Point based on Government Executive Order; no Competent Authorities designated at national/ sub-national levels; no checkpoints designated for checking ABS information/ permits | * Competent authorities designated at national level and, if necessary, at sub-national level based on the approved Biodiversity Rules and Regulations * A network of 4-5 exit/entry points designated for checking ABS information/ permits * System of internationally-recognized certification of origin and compliance in place and operational | * Inter-agency coordination meeting reports; * Periodic progress reports; * Project evaluation reports; * Official correspondences/ government circulars; * Internationally-recognized certificate of origin and compliance |
| **Outcome 2:**  Increased national capacities and awareness for the implementation of the national ABS framework | * **Outputs:**   Output 2.1: Upgraded facility and staff skills for bio-prospecting laboratory work and TK documentation  Output 2.2: Improved knowledge and skills among the staff of NBC and partner agencies for ABS regime management encompassing technical, legal, administrative and social aspects  Output 2.3: Increased awareness among various stakeholders for supporting and participating in ABS initiatives | | | | |
| Increased technical capacity for bio-prospecting laboratory analysis indicated by:   * Type and number of equipment procured and installed at the NBC bio-prospecting laboratory facility; * Number of staff with knowledge and skills in specific bio-prospecting laboratory techniques using the upgraded facility; * Number of crude extracts identified for bio-activity tests and number of compounds fractionated from the extracts | Existing laboratory facility and staff skills cover only crude extraction;  250 crude extracts are preserved in NBC’s extract library for bio-activity test and no compounds have been fractionated for development of trial products | Laboratory facility and staff skills will be upgraded for bio-activity tests up to the level of fractionation;  1,250 crude extracts preserved in NBC’s extract library;  25 compounds fractionated from the extracts for development of trial products | * Direct observation of laboratory facility * NBC extract library * Interviews of lab staff * Periodic progress reports * Project evaluation reports | Risks:  Government staff turn-over, especially trained technical staff, may affect the project negatively  Assumption:  More staff will be added to the bio-prospecting program as projected in the 11th Five-Year Plan, and there will be little or no turnover of trained staff |
| Number of staff at NBC and partner agencies with improved knowledge and skills on the full cycle of ABS regime management | Less than 20 staff have basic and partial knowledge and skills for ABS regime management | At least 25 staff in NBC and partner agencies have improved knowledge and skills for the full cycle of ABS regime management | * Periodic progress reports * Project evaluation reports * Training evaluation reports * Interviews of training recipients |
| Percentage of parliamentarians, researchers, academia, local governments and communities, private sector companies, and other groups targeted by the project awareness campaign that are aware of the national ABS policy and associated regulatory and institutional frameworks | The current level of awareness is expected to be extremely low as the subject is new. A baseline survey will be conducted for the identified target groups in the first year[[4]](#footnote-4). | At least 250 participants, including 50% women, covered through the targeted training seminars  An increase of at least 50% over the baseline survey results from the first year of the project | Baseline survey and end-of-the project awareness surveys (see **Annex 4** for methodology) |
| **Outcome 3.**  Best practice ABS processes are demonstrated recognizing the principles of biodiversity conservation, Prior Informed Consent (PIC) and Mutually Agreed Terms (MAT) including the fair and equitable sharing of benefits. | **Outputs:**  Output 3.1: Three pilot ABS agreements compliant with Nagoya Protocol developed and operationalized  Output 3.2: Knowledge resources on ABS developed and disseminated | | | | |
| Number of pilot ABS agreements developed and operationalized for initial commercialization of trial products | Two ABS agreements exist that pre-date Bhutan’s ratification of the Nagoya Protocol | At least three ABS agreements developed and operationalized for initial commercialization of at least 3 trial products incorporating PIC, MAT and fair and equitable benefit sharing provisions. The agreements should also include *in situ* and/or *ex situ* conservation measures for the concerned biological resources. | * ABS agreement documents * Periodic progress reports * Project evaluation reports | Risks:  Commercial confidentiality restrictions may limit information sharing on development process  Active ingredients investigated in pilot projects fail to show promise for commercialization  The period of the project may be too short to result in bio-discovery despite multiple agreements.  Local communities may not be willing to provide PIC during the lifetime of the project  Some international partners may prove to be uncommitted to work under Bhutan’s ABS Policy framework  Assumption:  Key stakeholders are willing to participate in this project and there is consensus to go ahead with the ABS agreements |
| Number of PIC processes with ILCs implemented in accordance with the planned PIC/community protocol | Some preliminary engagement with local communities is there but no full-fledged processes have been undertaken | At least one PIC process with ILCs implemented in accordance with the planned PIC /community protocol | * ABS agreement documents * Periodic progress reports * Project evaluation reports |
| Number of knowledge resources developed and disseminated | No Bhutan-specific knowledge resources on ABS available | * At least 3 studies on ABS carried out, published and disseminated; * National seminar on ABS experience in Bhutan conducted towards the end of the project | * Study reports * Report of the national seminar * Periodic progress reports * Project evaluation reports |
| Percentage of the population of ILCs participating in the pilot projects aware of the existence, use and option values of the biological resources under their stewardship. | Current levels of awareness expected to be extremely low as the subject is new, with the possible exception of those communities already engaged in bio-exploitation initiatives. A baseline survey will be conducted for the identified communities in the first year[[5]](#footnote-5). | At least 80% awareness level among participating communities | * Awareness surveys of the participating ILCs * Periodic progress reports * Project evaluation reports |

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

1. *GEF Project Information Form (PIF), Project Document, including the Log Frame Analysis (LFA)*
2. *Project Inception Report*
3. *Implementing/Executing partner arrangements*
4. *List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Boards, and other partners to be consulted*
5. *Mid Term Review (MTR) Report*
6. *Project Implementation Reports (PIRs)*
7. *Project budget and financial data*
8. *Project Tracking Tool, at baseline, at mid-term, and at terminal points*
9. *UNDP Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF)*
10. *UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD)*
11. *GEF focal area strategic program objectives*
12. *Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams*
13. *Audit reports*
14. *Oversight mission reports (BTOR)*
15. *Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team*
16. *Project Board Meeting minutes*
17. *Study on Access and Benefit Sharing Awareness and the Impact of ABS Project on Gender*

Annex C: Evaluation Questions

This Evaluation Criteria Matrix is not exhaustive and the it must be fully completed/amended by the consultant and included in the TE inception report and as an Annex to the TE report

| **Evaluative Criteria Questions** | | **Indicators** | **Sources** | **Methodology** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels? | | | | |
|  | * How does the project support the GEF focal area and strategic priorities? |  |  |  |
|  | * How does the project support the biodiversity conservation and sustainable utilization of genetic resources? |  |  |  |
|  | * What was the level of stakeholder participation and ownership in the project design and implementation? |  |  |  |
|  | * How does the project support the needs of the relevant stakeholders? Has the implementation of the project been inclusive of the targeted stakeholders? |  |  |  |
|  | * Were the local beneficiaries and stakeholders adequately involved in the project design and implementation? |  |  |  |
|  | * Are there logical linkages between expected results of the project (log frame) and the project design (in terms of components, implementing partners, scope, financial resources, etc.) |  |  |  |
|  | * Is the length of the project sufficient to achieve its outcomes? |  |  |  |
|  | * Is there coordination and complementarity between donors for similar projects? |  |  |  |
| Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? | | | | | |
|  | * Has the project been effective in achieving its expected outputs and outcomes? |  |  |  | |
|  | * 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? |  |  |  | |
| Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards? | | | | | |
|  | * 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? |  |  |  | |
|  | * 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? |  |  |  | |
|  | * To what extent partnerships/linkages between institutions/organizations were encouraged and supported? |  |  |  | |
|  | * What was the level of efficiency of cooperation and collaboration arrangements? |  |  |  | |
|  | * 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? |  |  |  | |
| Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? | | | | | |
|  | * How well are risks, assumptions and impact drivers for financial, institutional, social and economic 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? |  |  |  | |
|  | * Has the experience of the project provided relevant lessons for other future projects targeted at similar objectives? |  |  |  | |
|  | * 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? |  |  |  | |
| **Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?** | | | | | |
|  | * Does the project adequately take into account the national realities, both in terms of institutional and policy framework towards sustainable utilization of its biological resources in the country in its design and its implementation? |  |  |  | |
|  | * Are there any indicators that the project has contributed towards reducing environmental stress and/or improved ecological status? |  |  |  | |

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 |  |
| *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[[6]](#footnote-6)**

**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[[7]](#footnote-7)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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[[8]](#footnote-8)) |
| **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[[9]](#footnote-9)) |
| **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 |

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 Implementing the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and Benefit Sharing in Bhutan (UNDP *PIMS 5239)***

*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** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

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. See Annex 1 for the GEF ABS Tracking Tool baseline [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. See Annex 4 for the proposed Knowledge, Attitudes and Practices survey methodology [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. See Annex 4 for the proposed Knowledge, Attitudes and Practices survey methodology [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. 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-9)