

**TERMINAL EVALUATION FOR THE ENHANCING CAPACITY TO DEVELOP GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT PROJECTS IN THE PACIFIC (CCCD)**

**A. Project Title:**

Capacity for Implementing Rio Conventions in Samoa

**B. Project Description or Context and Background:**

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 the Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the full size project “Capacity for Implementing Rio Conventions in Samoa” (PIMS 4938). The GEF Implementing Agency (IA) for this project is the United Nations Development Programme. The Implementing Partner for this project is the Government of Samoa through the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment.

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

**PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE**

<b>Project Title:</b>	Capacity for Implementing Rio Conventions in Samoa			
GEF Project ID:	5164 (GEF PMIS)		<i>at endorsement (Million US\$)</i>	<i>at completion (Million US\$)</i>
UNDP Project ID:	4938 (UNDP PIMS) 00078841 (Atlas Award ID)	GEF financing:	USD 500,000	USD 483,285.01
Country:	Government of Samoa	IA/EA own:	USD 100,000	USD 100,000
Region:	Asia and the Pacific	Government:	USD 400,000 (in-kind)	USD 400,000
Focal Area:	Multi Focal Area	Other:		
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	CD-2: Generate, access and use of information and knowledge; CD-3: Strengthened capacities for policy	Total co-financing:	USD 500,000.00	USD 500,000

	and legislation development for achieving global benefits			
Executing Agency:	Ministry of Natural Resource and Environment (MNRE)	Total Project Cost:	USD 1,000,000.00	USD 1,000,000.00
Other Partners involved:	UNCCD	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		17 <sup>th</sup> September 2014
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: 17 <sup>th</sup> September 2017	Actual: 31 <sup>st</sup> December 2017

### **C. Scope of Work:**

The project was designed to assist the Government of Samoa to meet its obligations under the three Rio Conventions by catalysing better decisions for the global environment. At the end of the project, activities should have resulted in a set to achieve the mainstreaming and promotions of the Rio Conventions into national development plans, and the strengthening of inter-ministerial cooperation and participatory approaches. As appropriate, the strengthening legislative and regulatory instruments will help further institutionalize capacities developed under the project. The project should help improve awareness to strengthen the understanding of Samoa on the important linkages between national sustainable development priorities. The project has implemented in three linked components:

- 1. The Rio Conventions more effectively implemented through national planning frameworks that are supported by the best practice tools and institutional arrangements**
- 2. Raised public support and understanding of Rio Conventions**
- 3. Development plans and programmes address implementation of Rio Conventions at national and sectoral level**

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<sup>1</sup> 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

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

[UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects](#)<sup>2</sup>. A set of questions covering each of these criteria should be drafted using the Evaluation Question Matrix (see [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 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 Samoa, including the MNRE Premises

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

- 1) UNDP
  - Resident Representative/ Deputy Resident Representative
  - Programme Manager – Environment & Climate Change
  - Programme Associate – Environment & Climate Change
- 2) Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment
  - Chief Executive Officer
  - Assistant Chief Executive Officer – Corporate Service Division
  - Assistant Chief Executive Officer – Legal Division
  - Environment Sector Coordinator
  - Principal Project Accountant
  - Principal IT & Knowledge Management
  - Legal Consultant

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

### **Evaluation Criteria's & Ratings**

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see [Annex A](#)), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a

---

<sup>2</sup> See <<http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/UNDP-GEF-TE-Guide.pdf>>

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](#)

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

### **Project Finance/ Co Finance**

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

Co-financing (type/source)	UNDP own financing (mill. US\$)		Government (mill. US\$)		Partner Agency (mill. US\$)		Total (mill. US\$)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual
Grants								
Loans/Concessions								
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In-kind support</li> </ul>								
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other</li> </ul>								
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 evaluator 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.<sup>3</sup>

**Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons:**

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions, recommendations and lessons**.

**ED: Implementation Arrangements:**

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP MCO in Samoa. The UNDP MCO 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 Evaluator to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

**E. Evaluation Timeframe:**

The total duration of the evaluation will be 20 days over duration of max 3 months\* according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation	2 days	TBA
Evaluation Mission	10 days	TBA
Draft Evaluation Report	6 days	TBA

<sup>3</sup>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](#)

<b>Final Report</b>	2 days	TBA
---------------------	--------	-----

\* The indicated max duration takes into account consultant's initial desk review and quality check of the final report from UNDP MCO, as well as potential delays due to unforeseen circumstances, not included as deliverables in the table above

**F: Evaluation Deliverables:**

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
<b>Inception Report</b>	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission.	Evaluator submits to UNDP MCO, UNDP-GEF RTA & MNRE
<b>Presentation</b>	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission	To project management, UNDP MCO & MNRE
<b>Draft Final Report</b>	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission	Sent to MCO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs & MNRE
<b>Final Report*</b>	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Sent to MCO for uploading to UNDP ERC & final report to MNRE

\*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

**F. Duty Station:**

Home-based with travel to Apia, Samoa. It is expected that the consultant will spend 10 days in Apia, Samoa. When in Samoa the consultant will be based at the UNDP Office or MNRE.

**G. Competencies :**

**Corporate Competencies**

- The independent consultant:
  - Demonstrates integrity by complying with the UN's values and ethical standards;
  - Promotes the vision, mission, and strategic goals of UNDP;

- Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability.

#### **Functional**

- The independent consultant should possess proven and strong analytical and communication skills, including the ability to produce high quality reports.

#### **Project & Resource Management**

- The independent consultant should have strong organizational skills;
- The independent consultant should be able to work independently and collectively to produce individual high quality inputs and collectively high quality and TOR-compliant outputs;
- The independent consultant should possess sound judgment, strategic thinking and the ability to manage competing priorities.

#### **Team Work**

- Demonstrated ability of the team to work in a multi-cultural environment.

#### **H. Team Composition:**

The evaluation team will be composed of 1 independent evaluator. The consultant shall have prior experience in evaluating GEF or GEF/LDCF projects. 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 selected candidate must be equipped with his/her own computing equipment.

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

The consultant must present the following qualifications:

- Degree in environmental management, or other closely related field ((10 points)
- Minimum 7 years of relevant professional experience in providing management or consultancy services to the multi focal area projects; in developing national and regional capacities and enabling conditions for global environmental protection and sustainable development (30 points)
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies (30 points)
- Technical knowledge in the targeted GEF focal areas: Multi Focal Area – Capacity Development(20 points)
- Experience working in the Pacific region (5 points)
- Excellent knowledge of English language (5 points)

Offers will be evaluated according to the Combined Scoring method – where the technical criteria will be weighted at 70% and the financial offer will be weighted at 30%.

## EVALUATOR ETHICS

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

### **I. Payment modalities and specifications:**

%	Milestone
10%	Upon approval of TE Inception Report
30%	Upon submission of draft TE Report
60%	Upon finalization and approval (by the UNDP-MCO and UNDP RTA) of TE Report

### **• Recommended Presentation of Proposal:**

Given below is the recommended format for submitting your proposal. The following headings with the required details are important. Please use the template available (Letter of Offer to complete financial proposal)

CVs with a proposed methodology addressing the elements mentioned under deliverables must be submitted by **Thursday 4<sup>th</sup> January 2018**, electronically via email: [procurement.ws@undp.org](mailto:procurement.ws@undp.org) or apply online attaching all the required documents on <https://jobs.undp.org/>. Incomplete applications will not be considered and only candidates for whom there is further interest will be contacted. Proposals must include:

- **P11 form – template attached**
- **3 professional references (most recent)**
- **Brief Methodology** on how you will approach and conduct the work (no more than 1 page)
- **Financial Proposal** – Professional daily fee (inclusive of per diem and travel costs) or alternatively lump sum amount
- **Letter of interest and availability** summarizing all details required (see template in [ANNEX I](#))

Queries about the consultancy can be directed to [procurement.ws@undp.org](mailto:procurement.ws@undp.org).

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.



### PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators			Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Indicator	Baseline value	Target value and date		
<b>Long-term goal: To strengthen the technical and institutional capacities that will catalyze Samoa’s mainstreaming of the three Rio Conventions and provide for a more effective implementation of the Rio Conventions</b>					
<p><b>Project objectives:</b></p> <p>A. To strengthen key institutional and individual capacities to implement policies, plans, and programmes that deliver global environmental benefits</p> <p>B. To mainstream and integrate obligations of the</p>	<p><b>Outcome indicators:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Rio Convention obligations are an integral part of Samoa’s Sustainable Development Strategy</li> <li>▪ SDS is an overarching plan of action for the environmental and sectoral action plans</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ There is no overarching policy that links the Rio Conventions within the framework of national sustainable development</li> <li>▪ Requirements of the Rio Conventions are not effectively integrated into sectoral plans and policies</li> </ul>	<p><b>By the end of the project:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The 2017-2021 Sustainable Development Strategy has been approved by the Cabinet of Ministers and ready for Parliamentary consideration for adoption</li> <li>▪ There is a minimum of 20% increase in the understanding of the Rio Convention mainstreaming among</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Meeting Minutes<sup>4</sup></li> <li>▪ Technical Working Group meeting reports</li> <li>▪ UNDP quarterly progress reports</li> <li>▪ Independent final evaluation report</li> <li>▪ Rio Convention national reports and communications</li> <li>▪ GoS and Parliament</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Central and line government ministries and authorities maintain political commitment to the formulation and implementation of the Sustainable Development Strategy</li> <li>▪ The project will be executed in a transparent, holistic, adaptive, and collaborative manner</li> <li>▪ Non-state stakeholder</li> </ul>

<sup>4</sup>Meeting minutes includes records of key meetings such as the Project Board, TWG and national consultations regarding inputs on the design and implementation of the relevant output and associated activities. Meetings may be individual or group meetings, with government officials, non-state actors, private and community representatives

<p>three Rio Conventions into Samoa's national policy framework</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The Government of Samoa and a wide range of stakeholders systematically review natural resource and environmental policies in a holistic manner in line with Rio Conventions requirements.</li> <li>▪ Key necessary capacities are built and/or strengthened for a more streamlined implementation of global obligations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ There is little inter-ministerial coordination on the implementation and enforcement of natural resource and environmental policies.</li> <li>▪ Policy interventions often result in overlap, duplication of effort, and weak implementation.</li> <li>▪ There is fragmented data and information to undertake a streamlined and coordinated effort at achieving Rio Convention monitoring and reporting obligations.</li> </ul>	<p>key government agencies and staff</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ There is a minimum of 15% increase in the understanding of the Rio Conventions among the communities, schools and general public</li> </ul>	<p>bodies decisions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ GEF Cross-Cutting Capacity Development Scorecard</li> <li>▪ Statistical analyses of surveys carried out</li> </ul>	<p>representatives, in particular community representatives (Village Council), remain active participants in the project</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Policy and institutional reforms and modifications recommended by the project and the SDS are politically, technically, and financially feasible</li> </ul>
<p><b>Project Strategy</b></p>	<p><b>Objectively verifiable indicators</b></p>			<p><b>Sources of verification</b></p>	<p><b>Risks and Assumptions</b></p>
	<p><b>Indicator</b></p>	<p><b>Baseline value</b></p>	<p><b>Target value and date</b></p>		
<p><b>Outcome 1: The Rio Conventions are more effectively implemented through national planning frameworks that are supported by best practice tools and institutional arrangements</b></p>					

<p><b>Output 1.1</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Independent evaluation of</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Environmental legislation is extensive but not</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Legal enforcement officers, community enforcement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Evaluation report</li> <li>▪ Workshop &amp;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Ministries and Parliament consider policy and</li> </ul>
--------------------------	---	--	---	---	---

<p>Strengthened environmental legal instruments and associated policies and legal frameworks</p>	<p>outdated legislation and frameworks and policies completed by month 6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No less than 2 legal instrument revised and submitted to parliament for consideration by month 30</li> <li>▪ At least 6 workshops conducted with all relevant enforcement legal officers and community enforcement authorities on legislation, frameworks and policies relevant to the Rio Conventions</li> <li>▪ At least one (1) workshop conducted with parliamentary environment steering committee on legislation, frameworks and policies relevant to the Rio Conventions</li> <li>▪ Convention Laws – Rio Conventions</li> </ul>	<p>cohesive and sometimes conflict with other legislation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Rio Conventions obligations are not effectively integrated within national legislation</li> <li>▪ Commitment to Rio Convention provisions are not evident in sectors and national development plans</li> <li>▪</li> </ul>	<p>authorities and parliamentarians awareness of legislation, frameworks and policies relevant to Rio conventions improved<sup>5</sup> by at least 50% by month 24</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ New and/or revised legal instrument approved by relevant authorities by month 365</li> </ul> <p>Convention Laws – Rio Convention published by month 24 and made available through DKIF by month 26</p>	<p>Training reports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Pre&amp;Post questionnaires</li> <li>▪ Revised/new legal instrument</li> <li>▪ <i>Faatonuga a le Kapeneta</i> (FK)</li> <li>▪ Parliament Environment Steering Committee report</li> <li>▪ Published Convention Laws</li> <li>▪ Website and DKIF</li> </ul>	<p>legislative recommendations to mainstream Rio Conventions as a priority</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Delays in approval of revised legislation</li> <li>▪ Not all parliamentarians agree with recommended legislation</li> </ul>
--	---	--	--	---	---

<sup>5</sup>Information acquired through pre & post questionnaires of workshops and trainings conducted

	published by month 24				
<b>Project Strategy</b>	<b>Objectively verifiable indicators</b>			<b>Sources of verification</b>	<b>Risks and Assumptions</b>
	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Baseline value</b>	<b>Target value and date</b>		
<b>Output 1.2:</b>  Effective tools and mechanisms for implementing Rio Conventions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Review of NBSAP, NAP, NAPA, SNAP tools &amp; mechanisms completed by month 6</li> <li>▪ Specific definitions for each tool developed and specific components requiring strengthening to support Rio Convention obligations completed by month 6</li> <li>▪ At least 3 workshops conducted on gaps and weaknesses of tools and mechanisms</li> <li>▪ At least two (2) workshops conducted on the design and development (and validation) of the consolidated</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Rio Convention tools and mechanisms exist however monitoring &amp; reporting not streamlined across the Focal Points and implementing agencies</li> <li>▪ Weak inter-linkages between three Rio Convention reporting obligations</li> <li>▪ Non-existent consolidated environmental monitoring programme</li> <li>▪ Steering committees and TWG exist however strategic approach to implementation of Rio Conventions very weak</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Review of tools &amp; mechanisms, and definitions of tools completed by month 9</li> <li>▪ Training and workshop learning outcomes shows at least 50% improvement in awareness of Rio Convention Focal Points and stakeholders on how to implement consolidated monitoring programme for Rio Convention implementation, monitoring and reporting by month 11</li> <li>▪ Consolidated environmental monitoring programme (M&amp;E components) integrated into relevant sector agency work programmes by month 14</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Analytic matrix and reports</li> <li>▪ Training &amp; Workshop reports</li> <li>▪ Learning outcomes pre&amp;post- training questionnaires</li> <li>▪ Sector agency reports and work plans Pre&amp;Post questionnaires</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Analyses are deemed legitimate, relevant, and valid among all key stakeholder representatives</li> <li>▪ Sector agencies remain committed to undertaking an integrated approach to monitoring and reporting</li> </ul>

	<p>environmental monitoring programme</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Operational multi-sector, multi-agency monitoring programme (M&amp;E components) designed and trialed through workshops</li> <li>▪ At least 2 sector agency work plans show integration of consolidated EMP by month 14</li> <li>▪ Reports on policy dialogues undertaken, on institutionalization of consolidated environmental monitoring programme</li> </ul>				
<b>Project Strategy</b>	<b>Objectively verifiable indicators</b>			<b>Sources of verification</b>	<b>Risks and Assumptions</b>
	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Baseline value</b>	<b>Target value and date</b>		
<b>Output 1.3:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Training plans designed, peer reviewed and published</li> </ul>	<p>Level of understanding of Although the technical qualifications of staff on the Rio Conventions by</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Training and workshop learning outcomes shows at least 50% improvement in awareness of Rio Convention Focal Points and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Training plan</li> <li>▪ Workshop &amp; training reports</li> <li>▪ Website and other</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Trainings are utilized and knowledge sustained</li> <li>Continued commitment and interest of</li> </ul>

Training on best practice approaches to implement Rio Conventions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At least 5 trainings conducted for MNRE, Rio Convention Focal Points, implementing agencies and communities</li> <li>Reports of trainings and workshops 'published' and available via MNRE &amp; other relevant platforms &amp; website</li> </ul>	technical staff is high, this is not the case for the partner implementing agencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>stakeholders on how to implement consolidated monitoring programme for Rio Convention implementation, monitoring and reporting by month 11</li> <li>Strategic training plans listing specific learning outcomes for each required training &amp; workshop completed by month 6</li> <li>All training, workshop reports available for downloading on MNRE &amp; other relevant platforms &amp; website by month 24</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>targeted platforms</li> <li>Sector agency reports</li> <li>Pre &amp; Post questionnaires</li> </ul>	stakeholders maintained
<b>Project Strategy</b>	<b>Objectively verifiable indicators</b>			<b>Sources of verification</b>	<b>Risks and Assumptions</b>
	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Baseline value</b>	<b>Target value and date</b>		
<b>Outcome 2: Raised public support and understanding of Rio Conventions</b>					
<b>Output 2.1:</b> Centralized knowledge & information facility established (DKIF) to collect, manage, share and disseminate knowledge and information on Rio Conventions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assessment report of institutional structure, systems and mechanisms for managing data, knowledge and information completed by month 6</li> <li>At least 2 workshops targeting 60</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is no systematic approach or institutional procedures to collect, synthesize, manage, share and analyze data collected by the three Rio Convention implementing agencies</li> <li>Inadequate data, knowledge &amp; information management systems,</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Intensive targeted training for MNRE, Rio Convention Focal Points and implementing agencies completed by month 14</li> <li>Centralized DKIF operational by month 18</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assessment report</li> <li>Training &amp; Workshop reports</li> <li>Operational DKIF with report of design</li> <li>DKIF Policies, manual and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sustainability of DKIF</li> <li>Ministries and agencies agree to share data and information</li> <li>Data not analyzed properly resulting in wrong data and information released</li> <li>Knowledge acquired through trainings applied</li> </ul>

	<p>participants conducted for MNRE, Rio Convention Focal Points, implementing agencies to present findings, recommendations and design of DKIF</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ High quality DKIF design peer reviewed by relevant knowledge management, communications and data experts by month 14 for implementation by month 18</li> <li>▪ Policies, protocols and parameters for DKIF completed by month 12</li> <li>▪ Hardware, software procured and database designed and operational by month 24</li> <li>▪ At least four (4) national trainings conducted for 90 participants MNRE, Rio Convention Focal</li> </ul>	<p>policies and procedures in place</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ There is limited coordination among agencies and ministries to reconcile design and implement data and knowledge sharing to achieve Rio Convention obligations</li> <li>▪ Databases exist for three Rio Conventions however, storage of information is fragmented and access is very minimal – mostly restricted to Rio Convention Focal Points</li> <li>▪ Inadequate hardware &amp; software to capture, store, manage, extract and analyze data for Rio Convention monitoring &amp; reporting purposes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Targeted surveys<sup>6</sup> on knowledge and information management and sharing shows improvement by at least 50%</li> <li>▪ MNRE website includes new webpage on Rio Convention Laws and information published by implementing agencies by month 26</li> <li>▪ Targeted platforms &amp; websites shows analysed and integrated reports of Samoa's Rio Convention obligations by month 24</li> <li>▪ Rio Convention reporting obligations improved through use of data stored within DKIF by month 24</li> </ul>	<p>procedures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Hardware &amp; software</li> <li>▪ MNRE Website</li> <li>▪ Targeted platforms</li> <li>▪ Survey analysis/report</li> <li>▪ Pre&amp;Post questionnaires</li> </ul>	<p>in-house</p>
--	---	--	--	--	-----------------

<sup>6</sup>Targeting data owners, creators, keepers etc. of Rio Convention implementing agencies

	Points, implementing agencies, and other stakeholders on data entry, managing, sharing and extraction for environmental monitoring and reporting of Rio Convention obligations				
Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators			Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Indicator	Baseline value	Target value and date		
<b>Output 2.2:</b> Raised public awareness and support through national campaign on Rio Conventions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Campaign plan developed and peer reviewed by month 6</li> <li>▪ Simplified and bilingual factsheets/ brochures explaining importance of meeting Rio obligations completed and disseminated by month 30</li> <li>▪ At least 4 (2xSavaii, 2xUpolu) national roadshows involving Rio Convention Focal Points and implementing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Some understanding of Rio Convention exists within implementing agencies and general public however, knowledge not translated to 'grassroots' level</li> <li>▪ Enforcement undertaken at community level however understanding of Rio Convention very basic</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ At least four (4) sector plans show coordinated approach to implementing Rio Conventions through raised awareness, by month 24</li> <li>▪ At least 10 colleges, 10 primary schools on both Savaii &amp; Upolu show improved understanding<sup>7</sup> of Rio Conventions and Samoa's obligations under the Conventions</li> <li>▪ Targeted survey to determine whether campaign improved awareness of schools and relevant stakeholders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Campaign plan</li> <li>▪ Factsheets (bilingual)</li> <li>▪ Brochures (bilingual)</li> <li>▪ Awareness reports</li> <li>▪ Newspaper articles</li> <li>▪ MNRE Website</li> <li>▪ DKIF</li> <li>▪ Survey report/analysis</li> <li>▪ Sector plans</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Roadshow will raise public awareness</li> <li>▪ Campaign ambitious resulting in failure to achieve set targets and dates</li> </ul>

<sup>7</sup>Through targeted national survey



	<p>agencies for both Upolu &amp; Savaii completed by month 24</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Quiz competition shows at least 40% increase in understanding of Rio Conventions (pre &amp; post questionnaires)</li> <li>▪ Annual school debates show at least 40% increase in understanding of Rio Convention obligations (pre &amp; post questionnaires)</li> </ul>		completed by month 30		
--	---	--	-----------------------	--	--

**Outcome 3: Development plans and programmes address implementation of Rio Conventions at national and sectoral level**

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators			Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Indicator	Baseline value	Target value and date		
<p><b>Output 3.1:</b> Strengthened Integration of Rio Conventions in the Samoa SDS 2017-2021 and in other national strategic frameworks</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Reports of policy dialogues undertaken with MOF EPPD during mid-term review of SDS and sector plans completed</li> <li>▪ Revised MTEF showing links and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ SDS exists, but does not fully integrate Rio Convention provisions</li> <li>▪ National MTEF exists but does not show linkages for institutional arrangements for implementation of Rio</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ MOF EPPD review of SDS and sector plans show consideration of mainstreaming Rio Conventions by month 24 and integration by month 36</li> <li>▪ MTEF operational and utilized by MNRE to monitor operational and financial</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Report of dialogues</li> <li>▪ MTEF</li> <li>▪ SDS</li> <li>▪ Training &amp; Workshop reports</li> <li>▪ Mid-Term review report (MOF EPPD)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ MOF and sector agencies committed to mainstream Rio Conventions into national development plans and sector plans</li> <li>▪ Workshops conducive to learning outcome required to fully implement Rio</li> </ul>

	<p>institutional arrangements for implementation of Rio Conventions by month 33</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At least 2 workshops targeting at least 60 participants for central agencies and implementing agencies conducted in collaboration with MOF, on mainstreaming Rio Conventions into SDS</li> </ul>	<p>Conventions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General understanding of Rio Convention obligations in agencies that collaborate with MNRE but knowledge does not extend to operational level of Rio Conventions</li> </ul>	<p>arrangements for implementation of Rio Conventions by month 30</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At least four (4) sector agency work programmes show Rio Convention obligations mainstreamed by month 24</li> <li>Improved awareness and understanding of the value of mainstreaming Rio Conventions within sectoral policies, plans, programmes and legislation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sector plans</li> <li>Pre&amp;Post questionnaires</li> </ul>	<p>Conventions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Delays in mainstreaming Rio Conventions into SDS due to competing priorities</li> <li>Sector agencies committed to mainstreaming Rio Conventions into their respective plans</li> </ul>
Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators			Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Indicator	Baseline value	Target value and date		
<p><b>Output 3.2:</b></p> <p>Identified and addressed capacity gaps for mainstreaming Rio Conventions in four relevant sectors</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Four (4) sector plans integrate Rio Convention obligations by month 24</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No M&amp;E framework exists to monitor implementation status of Rio Convention (for MNRE &amp; relevant sectors)</li> <li>Monitoring and reporting of Rio Convention obligations not systematic</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Survey conducted<sup>8</sup> to assess coordinated monitoring and reporting of global and national priorities by month 30</li> <li>At least four (4) relevant sectors show improved implementation status of Rio Convention by month 36</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Survey instrument</li> <li>Survey responses</li> <li>Integrated M&amp;E Framework</li> <li>Sector agency reports and plans</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Survey respondents contribute their honest attitudes and values</li> <li>Changes in awareness and understanding of Rio Convention mainstreaming can be largely attributed to project activities (survey questionnaire can address this issue)</li> </ul>

<sup>8</sup>Targeted mainly through pre & post questionnaires of workshops and trainings conducted on mainstreaming Rio Conventions

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators			Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Indicator	Baseline value	Target value and date		
<p><b>Output 3.3:</b> Strengthened National &amp; Sectoral capacity on monitoring and reporting obligations of Rio Conventions and other MEAs</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Integrated Monitoring &amp; Evaluation (M&amp;E) Framework developed and trialed by month 10 for implementation by month 12</li> <li>▪ At least four (4) trainings on M&amp;E framework and reporting obligations (tools) of Rio Conventions and other relevant MEAs</li> <li>▪ At least 4 reports published on MNRE website &amp; relevant platforms</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No integrated M&amp;E framework exists</li> <li>▪ Monitoring and reporting of Rio Convention obligations not systematic</li> <li>▪ Databases scattered and information non-qualitative</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ MNRE, Conventional Focal Points, implementing agencies &amp; communities (MOF, MAF, Police,) utilizing M&amp;E framework to monitor and report on Rio Convention obligations by month 24</li> <li>▪ Awareness and understanding of all relevant agencies and stakeholders on inter-linkages of Rio Convention and other MEAs and reporting obligations become more streamlined by month 24</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Integrated M&amp;E framework</li> <li>▪ Sector agency reports</li> <li>▪ Rio Convention reports</li> <li>▪ Workshops &amp; Training reports</li> <li>▪ Pre&amp;Post questionnaires</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Sector agencies committed to utilizing M&amp;E framework</li> <li>▪ Legal and community authorities awareness raised</li> <li>▪ Databases operational and contains right data</li> </ul>

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

---

1. PIF – Project Identification Form;
  2. CCCD– Project Document;
  3. Project inception report;
  4. Quarterly progress reports;
  5. All AWP (annual work plans);
  6. All annual financial project reports (CDRs);
  7. Consultancy products (report, technical studies, etc.);
  8. Financial auditing;
  9. Board Meeting minutes;
  10. All communication products;
  11. Community consultations minutes, if available;
  12. UNDP Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF);
  13. UNDP Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) Samoa country matrix
  14. GEF focal area strategic program objectives;
  15. Any other project relevant documents.
- 

## **ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS**

---

The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of the TE inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

Evaluation questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
<b>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?</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the project relevant to the GEF Multi Focal Area?</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the project addressing the needs of target beneficiaries at the regional level?</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the project internally coherent in its design?</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the project provide relevant experience and lessons learnt for similar future projects?</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<b>Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has the project been effective in achieving the expected outcomes and objectives?</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How is the risk and risk mitigation being managed?</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What lessons can be drawn regarding the effectiveness for other similar projects in the future?</li> </ul>		•	•
<b>Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Was project support provided in an efficient way?</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did the project efficiently utilize local capacity in implementation?</li> </ul>	•	•	•

• To what extent have/will the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been/be achieved?	•	•	•
• Was the project implemented efficiently, in line with international and regional norms and standards?	•	•	•
• Was project support provided in an efficient way?	•	•	•

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

• Were interventions designed to have sustainable results given the identifiable risks?	•	•	•
• What issues emerged during implementation as a threat to sustainability	•	•	•
• Are there ongoing activities that pose an environmental threat to the sustainability of project outcomes	•	•	•
• Have the entities/ people that will carry on the project been identified and prepared?	•	•	•
• Is there evidence financial resources are committed to support project results after the project has closed?	•	•	•

**Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?**

• Has the project demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements

•

•

•

## ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

<b><i>Ratings for Effectiveness, Efficiency, Overall Project Outcome Rating, M&amp;E, IA &amp;EA Execution</i></b>	<b><i>Sustainability ratings</i></b>	<b><i>Relevance ratings</i></b>
6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings 5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings 4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS): moderate shortcomings 3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings 2. Unsatisfactory (U): major shortcomings 1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe shortcomings	4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks	2. Relevant (R) 1. Not relevant (NR)
<i>Additional ratings where relevant:</i> 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<sup>9</sup>

#### 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<sup>10</sup>

---

- 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<sup>11</sup>)

---

<sup>9</sup>[www.unevaluation.org/unevaluationcodeofconduct](http://www.unevaluation.org/unevaluationcodeofconduct)

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

<sup>11</sup> UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

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<sup>12</sup>)

  - 3.1 Project Design / Formulation
    - Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)
    - Assumptions and Risks
    - Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design
    - Planned stakeholder participation
    - Replication approach
    - UNDP comparative advantage
    - Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
    - Management arrangements
  - 3.2 Project Implementation
    - Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
    - Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)
    - Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management
    - Project Finance:
    - Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry (\*), implementation (\*), and overall assessment (\*)
    - Implementing Agency (UNDP) execution (\*) and Executing Agency execution (\*), overall project implementation/ execution (\*), coordination, and operational issues
  - 3.3 Project Results
    - Overall results (attainment of objectives) (\*)
    - Relevance(\*)
    - Effectiveness (\*)
    - Efficiency (\*)
    - Country ownership
    - Mainstreaming
    - Sustainability:financial resources (\*), socio-economic (\*), institutional framework and governance (\*), environmental (\*), and overall likelihood (\*)
    - Impact
4. Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons
  - Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
  - Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project

---

<sup>12</sup>See Annex D for rating scales.

- 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
- *Annexed in a separate file:* TE audit trail

Annex G: Evaluation Report Clearance Form

*(to be completed by MCO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and included in the final document)*

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by	
UNDP Multi-Country Office	
Name: _____	
Signature: _____	Date: _____
UNDP GEF RTA	
Name: _____	
Signature: _____	Date: _____



*Empowered lives.  
Resilient nations.*

**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 Integration of Climate Change Risks and Resilience into Forestry Management in Samoa (PIMS 4318)**

*The following comments were provided 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



*Empowered lives.  
Resilient nations.*