

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 implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of **Support to the Consolidation of a Protected Area System in Guinea-Bissau's Forest Belt** (PIMS 3650.)

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

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	Support to the Consolidation of a Protected Area System in Guinea-Bissau's Forest Belt			
GEF Project ID:	GEF ID 3575		<i>at endorsement (Million US\$)</i>	<i>at completion (Million US\$)</i>
UNDP Project ID:	PIMS No. 3650 GNB00075274 Award: 59979	GEF financing:	1.00	1.00
Country:	Guinea-Bissau	IA/EA own:	0.82	0.82
Region:	Africa	Government:	1.47	
Focal Area:	Biodiversity	Other:	1.69	
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	BD-3 (PA networks)	Total co-financing:	3.16	
Executing Agency:	IBAP	Total Project Cost:	4.87	
Other Partners involved:	Environment Secretariat of State; Foundation "Chimbo"	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		09/07/2010
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: 30/09/2014	Actual: 30/04/2016

OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

Guinea-Bissau is a small country wedged between the sub-Saharan arid ecosystems and the Guinean moist forest ecoregion. The resulting combination creates majestic terrestrial landscapes and a patchy mosaic of dense and open forests, gallery forests and woodland savannah that are rich in globally significant plant and animal life and a refuge for many migratory species that move across the West-African savannahs. The forest belt region of Guinea-Bissau (south and southwest) contains several and rare and threatened species of birds, higher plants, reptiles and mammals, including elephants (*Loxodonta africana*), large ungulates such as the buffalo (*Syncerus manatus*), hippopotamus (*Hyppopotamus amphibius*) and the eland (*Taurotragus derbianus*). These outstanding terrestrial ecosystems have until now remained unprotected. In turn, protection of the coastal and marine region of western Guinea-Bissau –also extremely rich in biodiversity – has received for the past decade the undisputed attention of both donors and Government in their effort to conserve the country's natural endowment. Six marine and coastal parks have been created and are being effectively managed. They cover almost 15% of the country's territory. This project was designed to correct this imbalance in conservation priorities with respect to ecosystem representation.

This project is part of the GEF's Strategic Programme for West Africa (SPWA), Sub-component on Biodiversity. **The project's goal is** to conserve globally significant biodiversity in Guinea-Bissau's forest belt region by creating and strengthening protected areas. Its specific **objective** is to establish and operationalize terrestrial PAs in the Dulombi-Boé-Tchetche (DBT) complex and thereby significantly expand and strengthen Guinea-Bissau's PA system. In order to achieve this objective, three outcomes are expected from the project, as follows:

- (1) Immediate threats to terrestrial ecosystems mitigated through the effective expansion and management of PAs in the forest belt region;
- (2) Improved systemic and institutional capacity of key PA management stakeholders provides the enabling framework for establishing and managing a more representative PA network; and
- (3) Participatory conservation management approaches in the DBT Complex are implemented.

Despite being one of the poorest nations on Earth, the Guinea-Bissau is showing great courage in conservation and expects through this project to protect almost a quarter of its territory, preserve globally important biodiversity, maintain regionally critical migratory routes, protect emblematic species such as the western chimpanzee and the African elephant and give its people viable options for sustainable development.

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 method¹ for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact**, as defined and explained in the [UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects](#). A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR ([Annex C](#)) The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to [Guinea-Bissau](#), covering several areas and sites including Boé, Dulombi, Tchetché, Beli, Cansamba, Quirafo, Cuntabane and Xitole. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

- the GEF operational focal point
- Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (General Directorate/Department of Forestry and Fauna)
- State Secretariat for Environment (SEA)
- IBAP
- Bioguinea Foundation Executive Secretariat
- Ministry of Economy, Planning and Regional Integration (General Directorate of Planning),
- Gabu, Bafatá an Quinará Regional Government
- Project Steering Committee
- Project team (capital and field-based)
- Key co-financiers, partners and donors (World Bank, FFEM, EU, MAVFA Foundation, etc.)
- UNDP Country Office
- UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor for Ecosystems based in Istanbul, Turkey.

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

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

EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS

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

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

PROJECT FINANCE / COFINANCE

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

Co-financing (type/source)	UNDP own financing (mill. US\$)		Government (mill. US\$)		Partner Agency (mill. US\$)		Total (mill. US\$)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual
Grants								
Loans/Concessions								
• In-kind support								

• Other								
Totals								

MAINSTREAMING

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

IMPACT

The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project achieved 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 In assessing project results, the TE will: a) seek to determine the extent of achievement and shortcomings in reaching project objectives as stated in the project appraisal document, and indicate if there were any changes and whether those changes were approved. If the project did not establish a baseline (initial conditions), the evaluators should seek to estimate the baseline condition so that achievements and results can be properly established; b) focus on achievements in terms of outputs, outcomes, or impacts. Output achievement is easy to access but not sufficient to show whether the interventions were effective in delivering global environmental benefits. Impacts may take a long time to manifest thus difficult to be assessed at this stage. Instead, assessment of outcomes captures project efficacy in terms of delivering medium-term expected results. The outcomes will be rated based on the following scale:

- **Highly satisfactory (HS).** The project had no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency.
- **Satisfactory (S).** The project had minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency.
- **Moderately satisfactory (MS).** The project had moderate shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency.
- **Moderately unsatisfactory (MU).** The project had significant shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency.
- **Unsatisfactory (U).** The project had major shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency.
- **Highly unsatisfactory (HU).** The project had severe shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency.

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](#)

CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

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

IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Guinea-Bissau. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluator and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country. 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 according to the following tentative plan:

Activity	Tentative Timeframe
Preparation	4 days, June-July 2018
Evaluation Mission	12-day mission in June-September, dates TBD
Draft Evaluation Report	10 days, to be submitted within 4 weeks after field mission, yet at the latest by 19 October
Final Report	4 days, to be submitted within 2 weeks after receipt of comments, at the latest by 9 November (N.B. the official annual deadline for submission to the GEF is in early December)

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.	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
Presentation	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission	To project management, UNDP CO
Draft Evaluation Report	Full report with annexes (per annexed template), in draft version	Within 4 weeks of the evaluation mission	Sent to CO & RTA, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs

Final Evaluation Report*	Revised report	Within 2 weeks after receipt of comments, at the latest by 9 November (N.B. the official annual deadline for submission to the GEF is in early December)	Sent to CO & RTA for clearance by RTA and 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.

EVALUATOR

The evaluation will be conducted by one independent international consultant, with additional support provided either by a national consultant or suitable counterparts in UNDP CO and IBAP . The consultant shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The international consultant will be responsible for finalizing the report. 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 evaluator must present the following qualifications:

- Minimum of 10 years of relevant professional experience
- Knowledge of UNDP and GEF
- Previous and recent experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
- Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s)
- Experience using SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations would be an asset;
- Experience conducting similar evaluations in Africa would be an advantage;
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to biodiversity and protected area management
- Experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis.
- Excellent communication skills;
- Demonstrable analytical skills;
- Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset.

Qualifications of International Consultant

- Have a master's degree in biology, environmental studies, development studies, or other fields related to biodiversity and protected areas management
- A minimum of 10 years of relevant experience is required.
- Substantive experience in evaluating similar projects, preferably with UNDP-GEF or other UN or GEF agencies;
- Excellent English writing and communication skills, with sufficient verbal communication skills in Portuguese, Spanish or French, and sufficient reading skills in Portuguese.
- Highly knowledgeable of participatory monitoring and evaluation processes, and experience in evaluation of technical assistance projects with major donor agencies;
- Ability and experience to lead multi-disciplinary and national teams, and deliver quality reports within the given time;
- Familiarity with Guinea-Bissau or other similar countries in (West) Africa is an asset;
- Excellent in human relations, coordination, planning and team work.

The international consultant will take the overall responsibility for the quality and due submission of the final evaluation report. Specifically, the international consultant will perform the following tasks:

- Lead and manage the evaluation mission;
- Design the detailed evaluation scope and methodology (including the methods for data collection and analysis);
- Decide the division of labor within the evaluation team;
- Conduct an analysis of the results, outcomes and outputs;
- Present preliminary TE outcomes to stakeholders;
- Draft related parts of the evaluation report;
- Finalize the evaluation report in English and submit it to UNDP Guinea-Bissau (completion by the team in both languages would be desirable but is not a requirement, given that translation can be considered).

EVALUATOR ETHICS

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

PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

%	Milestone
20%	upon approval of the TE Inception Report
30%	Following submission and approval of the complete draft TE report
50%	Following submission and approval (by UNDP-CO and UNDP-GEF RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report

SECTION II: STRATEGIC RESULTS FRAMEWORK (SRF) AND GEF INCREMENT

PART I: Strategic Results Framework, SRF (formerly GEF Logical Framework) Analysis

INDICATOR FRAMEWORK AS PART OF THE SRF

Objective/ Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	End of Project target	Source of Information	Risks and assumptions
Objective - To establish and operationalize terrestrial PAs in the Dulombi-Boé-Tchetché (DBT) complex and thereby significantly expand and strengthen Guinea-Bissau's PA system.	1. Terrestrial Protected Areas (TPA) legally established within the DBT Complex <i>Refer to Annex 1 for an overview of the SNAP (national PA system).</i>	0 ha gazetted in the DBT Complex The SNAP baseline coverage is 536,972 ha and represents 14.9% of the national territory	319,000 ha of new protected areas in the terrestrial biome of the country representing 8.8% of national territory are gazetted. This will bring the SNAP's total coverage to 885,972 ha or 23.7% of national territory	Official Document or Government Gazette	<i>Risks:</i> Political and institutional instability disrupts minimal governance conditions necessary for project implementation The Government of Guinea-Bissau assigns less priority and limited support for PA expansion in the DBT Complex
	2. Decrease in the rate of forest cover loss in the core areas of the DBT Complex (Dulombi and Boé) expressed in terms of the change in hectareage for dense forest and open forest <i>See Box 1 and Annex 2 for explanations.</i>	<u>In Boé:</u> Dense forest reached as low as 226 ha in 2007 and is being lost at a avg. rate of 11% per year <u>In Dulombi:</u> Dense forest reached as low as 478 ha in 2007 and is being lost at an avg. rate of 23% per year	The aim is to decrease the annual rate of loss of forests to 1% or less so that: - Boé's dense forest hectareage will be stabilized at around 200 ha. - Dulombi's dense forest hectareage	Studies on land-use change for the Dulombi and Boé area. Annex 2 contains some methodological notes. These studies will be refined at project inception.	<i>Assumptions:</i> Approval by the Council of Ministers (Executive Branch) of the gazettal dossiers for the DBT Complex will not meet political barriers. Political stability is minimally maintained

Objective/ Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	End of Project target	Source of Information	Risks and assumptions
	<i>See also Project Map 3 in Section IV, Part II</i>	Open forest covered 17,503 ha in 2007 and is being lost at an avg. rate of 4% per year	will not drop below 270 ha. - Dulombi's open forest heactarage will not drop below 17,500 ha.		throughout project execution period Adequate financial support to IBAP through Government budget is obtained.
	3. The status of emblematic species such as the African elephant in the Dulombi NP and the western Chimpanzees in the Boé area	According to recent survey by Chimbo Foundation, there are approximately 500 chimp individuals in the Boé area. Elephant survey will require update.	Populations of emblematic species maintained stable	Faunal survey	
Outcome 1. Immediate threats to terrestrial ecosystems mitigated through the effective expansion and management of PAs in the forest belt region	4. Increased scores on the GEF4's PA Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool "METT" for all five target sites within the DBT Complex <i>Refer to Annex 5 for the complete Tracking Tool.</i>	[1] Dulombi NP 19 [2] Boé NP 20 [3] Cuntabane-Quebo Corr. 19 [4] Salifo Corridor 19 [5] Tchetché Corridor 21	All scores are ≥ 30 by the MTE All scores are ≥ 40 by end of project	Application of the GEF4's PA Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool "METT" for all five target sites within the DBT Complex vetted by mid-term and final evaluations	<u>Risks:</u> Climate change will exacerbate habitat fragmentation in terrestrial ecosystems <u>Assumptions</u> Ecosystems in the DBT Complex can regenerate fast from degradation and are resilient enough to withstand the most immediate climate change effects
Outcome 2. Improved systemic and institutional capacity provides the enabling framework for establishing and managing a more	5. Increased scores on the UNDP's Capacity Development Scorecard for Protected Areas Management over the baseline	Systemic 14 / 30 (44%) Institutional 24 / 45 (54%) Individual 10 / 21 (46%) (General avg. 49%) <i>Refer to Annex 3 for summarized and detailed scores.</i>	Scores, expressed in absolute terms, increase by at least 20%	Application of UNDP's Capacity Development Scorecard through CEO Endorsement, mid-term and final evaluations	<u>Risks:</u> IBAP's financial sustainability does not improve sufficiently fast, as potential contributors to the BioGuiné Trust Fund (government, donors,

Objective/ Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	End of Project target	Source of Information	Risks and assumptions
representative PA network.	6. Results from the application of UNDP's Financial Sustainability Scorecard	Total Score for PA System = 40 out of a total possible score of 197 (i.e. 20%) <i>Refer to Annex 4 and Annex 5 respectively for summarized and detailed scores</i>	Scores, expressed in absolute terms, increase by at least 30%	Application of UNDP's Financial Sustainability Scorecard (as part of the METT) by mid-term and final evaluations	foundations and private sector) are reluctant to be part of the mechanism <u>Assumptions</u> IBAP is amenable to absorbing capacity through training, coaching and renewed experience with PA management in the terrestrial biome.
Outcome 3. Participatory conservation management approaches in the DBT Complex are implemented.	7. Communities' perception of their livelihood stake in the good stewardship of biological resources in the DBT Complex, measured through the periodic and independent application of the 'Most Significant Change' (MSC) technique.	Not Applicable The MSC technique is to be applied once the project has been launched and some form of change has occurred. The baseline corresponds to all assessments that corroborate the situation analysis for this project, particularly with respect to land-uses and livelihoods.	Changes in livelihoods are perceived through the independent application of the MSC technique	Results and analysis from the application of the MSC technique by mid-term and final evaluators	<u>Risks:</u> Political upheaval in the region, especially in neighboring Guinea Conakry, adds pressure to resources in the DBT Complex Bauxite mining activities expand near the proposed area for the Boé National Park <u>Assumptions</u> Communities are supporting of PAs in the DBT Complex as they realize and share benefits. <u>Assumptions</u> Communities in the DBT Complex are amenable and receptive to change.

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

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

Project Implementation Plan

Implementing/Executing partner arrangements

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

Project sites, highlighting suggested visits

Mid Term Review (MTR) Report

Annual Project Implementation (APR/PIR) Reports

Project budget and financial data

Project Tracking Tool, at the baseline and at the mid-term (if applicable)

National PA policies, strategies, plans and legislation

UNDP Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF)

UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD)

UNDP Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP)

GEF FOCAL AREA STRATEGIC PROGRAM OBJECTIVES ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

This is a generic list, to be further detailed with more specific questions by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on the particulars of the project.

• Evaluative Criteria Questions	• Indicators	• Sources	• Methodology
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels? 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How does the project support the objectives of CBD Programme of Work on Protected Areas? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Linkages between project objective and elements of the CBD, such as key articles and programs of work • UNDP Financial and Capacity Scorecards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan • Project documents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document analyses • Interviews with UNDP and project partners • Desk review • CBD website
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How does the project support the GEF strategic priorities? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level of coherence between project objective and national policy priorities and strategies, as stated in official documents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National legislation and policy documents, such as PA law, National PA and Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plan • Project documents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document analyses • Desk review • Interviews
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How does the project support the environmental and sustainable development objectives of the country? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approved policy and legislation related to management plans, budgets, and relevant retention and land fees. • Existence of National PA Forum to coordinate lobbying/advocacy and donor funds, among other things • Level of financing for PA system 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PA Law • PA Master Plan • Project documents • UNDP Financial and capacity Scorecards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document analyses • Interviews with UNDP and project partners • Desk review
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What was the level of stakeholder participation in project design? • ☐ What was the level of stakeholder participation in project design? • ☐ How does the project support the needs of relevant stakeholders? • ☐ Has the implementation of the project been inclusive of all relevant stakeholders? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level of involvement of local and national stakeholders in project origination and development (number of meetings held, project development processes incorporating stakeholder input, etc.) • ☐ Collaboration opportunity • ☐ Collaborative management approaches 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project staff • Local and national stakeholders • ☐ Project documents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document analyses • Field visit interviews • Desk review

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☑ Increased resources and investment 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How does the project support the GEF biodiversity focal area and strategic priorities? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the project internally coherent in its design? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How is the project relevant with respect to other donor-supported activities? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the project provide relevant lessons and experiences for other similar projects in the future? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? 			
<p>Has the project been effective in achieving the expected outcomes and objectives?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☑ Institutional capacity in place to assess, plan and implement priority conservation management of DBT Complex forest belt taking advantage of newly available EU funding mechanisms and GCF 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☑ See indicators in project document results framework and logframe • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☑ .Project documents ☑ Project team and relevant stakeholders ☑ Data reported in project annual and quarterly reports • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☑ Documents analysis ☑ Interviews with project team ☑ Interviews with relevant stakeholders
<p>Farmers' capacity and incentives for and participation in conservation- oriented management of forestry and humid zones is improved</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☑ Monitoring and evaluation programme for biodiversity conservation management in place ☑ National policy for forestry ecosystem schemes incorporates project experience 	<p>Farmers' capacity and incentives for and participation in conservation- oriented management of forestry ecosystems and humid zones is improved</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☑ Monitoring and evaluation programme for biodiversity conservation management in place ☑ National policy for forestry ecosystem schemes incorporates project experience 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
<p>How is risk and risk mitigation being managed?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☑ How well are risks, assumptions and impact drivers being managed? ☑ What was the quality of risk mitigation strategies developed? Were these sufficient? ☑ Are there clear strategies for risk mitigation related with long-term 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☑ Completeness of risk identification and assumptions during project planning and design ☑ Quality of existing information systems in place to identify emerging risks and other issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☑ Project documents ☑ UNDP, project team, and relevant stakeholders • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☑ Document analysis ☑ Interviews •

sustainability of the project?	☒ Quality of risk mitigations strategies developed and followed		
What lessons can be drawn regarding effectiveness for other similar projects in the future? ☒ What lessons have been learned from the project regarding achievement of outcomes? ☒ What changes could have been made (if any) to the design of the project in order to improve the achievement of the project's expected results?	☒ .	☒ Data collected throughout evaluation	☒ Data analysis

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

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was project support provided in an efficient way? • Was adaptive management used or needed to ensure efficient resource use? • Did the project logical framework and work plans and any changes made to them use as management tools during implementation? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Availability and quality of financial and progress reports • Timeliness and adequacy of reporting provided • Level of discrepancy between planned and utilized financial expenditures • Planned vs. actual funds leveraged 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documents • Project staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk review • Interviews with project staff
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Were the accounting and financial systems in place adequate for project management and producing accurate and timely financial information? • Were progress reports produced accurately, timely and responded to reporting requirements including adaptive 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost in view of results achieved compared to costs of similar projects from other organizations • Adequacy of project choices in view of existing context, infrastructure and cost • Quality of results-based management 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •

<p>management changes?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Was project implementation as cost effective as originally proposed (planned vs. actual)? Did the leveraging of funds (cofinancing) happen as planned? Were financial resources utilized efficiently? Could financial resources have been used more efficiently? Was procurement carried out in a manner making efficient use of project resources? How was results-based management used during project implementation? 	<p>reporting (progress reporting, monitoring and evaluation)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Occurrence of change in project design/ implementation approach (i.e. restructuring) when needed to improve project efficiency Cost associated with delivery mechanism and management alternatives 		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
<p>How efficient are partnership arrangements for the project?</p> <p>☑ To what extent partnerships/ linkages between institutions/ organizations were encouraged and supported?</p> <p>☑ Which partnerships/linkages were facilitated? Which ones can be considered sustainable?</p> <p>☑ What was the level of efficiency of cooperation and collaboration arrangements?</p>	<p>☑ Specific activities conducted to support the development of cooperative arrangements between partners,</p> <p>☑ Examples of supported partnerships</p> <p>☑ Evidence that particular partnerships/linkages will be sustained</p> <p>☑ Types/quality of partnership cooperation methods utilized</p>	<p>☑ Project documents and evaluations</p> <p>☑ Project partners</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> and relevant stakeholders 	<p>☑ Document analysis</p> <p>☑ Interviews</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">
<p>Which methods were successful or not and way?</p>			
<p>Did the project efficiently utilize local capacity in implementation?</p> <p>☑ Was an appropriate balance struck between utilization of international expertise as well as local capacity?</p>	<p>☑ Proportion of expertise utilized from international experts compared to national experts</p>	<p>☑ Project documents and evaluations</p> <p>☑ UNDP</p>	<p>☑ Document analysis</p> <p>☑ Interviews</p>

<p>☐ Did the project take into account local capacity in design and implementation of the project?</p> <p>☐ Was there an effective collaboration between institutions responsible for implementing the project?</p>	<p>☐ Number/quality of analyses done to assess local capacity potential and absorptive capacity</p>	<p>☐ Beneficiaries</p>	
<p>What lessons can be drawn regarding efficiency for other similar projects in the future?</p> <p>☐ What lessons can be learnt from the project regarding efficiency?</p> <p>☐ How could the project have more efficiently carried out implementation (in terms of management structures and procedures, partnerships arrangements etc...)?</p> <p>☐ What changes could have been made (if any) to the project in order to improve its efficiency?</p>	<p>☐</p>	<p>☐ Data collected throughout evaluation</p>	<p>☐ Data analysis</p>
<p>• Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?</p>			
<p>To what extent are project results likely to be dependent on continued financial support? What is the likelihood that any required financial resources will be available to sustain the project results once the GEF assistance ends?</p> <p>•</p>	<p>☐ Financial requirements for maintenance of project benefits</p> <p>☐ Level of expected financial resources available to support maintenance of project benefits</p> <p>☐ Potential for additional financial resources to support maintenance of project benefits</p> <p>•</p>	<p>☐ Project documents</p> <p>☐ Project staff</p> <p>☐ Project stakeholders</p> <p>•</p>	<p>☐ Field visit interviews</p> <p>☐ Desk review</p> <p>•</p>
<p>Do relevant stakeholders have or are likely to achieve an adequate level of “ownership” of results, to have the interest in ensuring that project benefits are maintained?</p> <p>•</p>	<p>☐ Level of initiative and engagement of relevant stakeholders in project activities and results</p> <p>•</p>	<p>☐ Project documents</p> <p>☐ Project staff</p> <p>☐ Project stakeholders</p> <p>•</p>	<p>☐ Field visit interviews</p> <p>☐ Desk review</p> <p>•</p>

Do relevant stakeholders have the necessary technical capacity to ensure that project benefits are maintained? •	<input type="checkbox"/> Level of technical capacity of relevant stakeholders relative to level required to sustain project benefits •	<input type="checkbox"/> Project documents <input type="checkbox"/> Project staff <input type="checkbox"/> Project stakeholders •	<input type="checkbox"/> Field visit interviews <input type="checkbox"/> Desk review •
To what extent are the project results dependent on socio-political factors?	<input type="checkbox"/> Existence of socio-political risks to project benefits	<input type="checkbox"/> Project documents <input type="checkbox"/> Project staff <input type="checkbox"/> Project stakeholders	<input type="checkbox"/> Field visit interviews <input type="checkbox"/> Desk review
To what extent are the project results dependent on issues relating to institutional frameworks and governance?	<input type="checkbox"/> Existence of institutional and governance risks to project benefits	<input type="checkbox"/> Project documents <input type="checkbox"/> Project staff <input type="checkbox"/> Project stakeholders	<input type="checkbox"/> Field visit interviews <input type="checkbox"/> Desk review
Are there any environmental risks that can undermine the future flow of project impacts and Global Environmental Benefits?	<input type="checkbox"/> Existence of environmental risks to project benefits	<input type="checkbox"/> Project documents <input type="checkbox"/> Project staff <input type="checkbox"/> Project stakeholders	<input type="checkbox"/> Field visit interviews <input type="checkbox"/> Desk review

• **Result/Impact:**

Are the anticipated outcomes likely to be achieved? Are the outcomes likely to contribute to the achievement of the project objective? •	<input type="checkbox"/> Existence of logical linkages between project outcomes and impacts •	<input type="checkbox"/> Project documents <input type="checkbox"/> Project staff <input type="checkbox"/> Project stakeholders •	<input type="checkbox"/> Field visit interviews <input type="checkbox"/> Desk review •
Are impact level results likely to be achieved? Are the likely to be at the scale sufficient to be considered Global Environmental Benefits? •	<input type="checkbox"/> Environmental indicators <input type="checkbox"/> Level of progress through the project's Theory of Change •	<input type="checkbox"/> Project documents <input type="checkbox"/> Project staff <input type="checkbox"/> Project stakeholders •	<input type="checkbox"/> Field visit interviews <input type="checkbox"/> Desk review •

ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

<p>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution</p> <p>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</p>	<p>Sustainability ratings:</p> <p>4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks</p>	<p>Relevance ratings</p> <p>2. Relevant (R) 1.. Not relevant (NR)</p> <p>Impact Ratings:</p> <p>3. Significant (S) 2. Minimal (M) 1. Negligible (N)</p>
<p><i>Additional ratings where relevant:</i> Not Applicable (N/A) Unable to Assess (U/A)</p>		

ANNEX E: EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT AND AGREEMENT FORM

Evaluators:

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

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form³

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: _____

³www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE⁴

- 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 Manual⁵)
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 rated⁶)
- 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)

⁴The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

⁵ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

⁶ Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations.

- 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