



INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANT PROCUREMENT NOTICE

Date: 10 July 2018

Country: Suriname

Description of the assignment: International Consultant – Terminal Evaluation (TE) of Mainstreaming global environment commitments for effective national environmental management (PIMS 4937)

Project name: Mainstreaming global environment commitments for effective national environmental management

Period of assignment/services (if applicable): 23 working days - in the period 01 Aug – 15 Oct 2018 (non-consecutive), with at least 8 working days during the month of August in Suriname.

The applicant is requested to submit an offer, including financial proposal (quotation) accompanied by a resume (CV) and P11 history form to the following email address procurement.sr@undp.org no later than **20 July 2018**.

Any request for clarification must be sent in writing, or by standard electronic communication to the address or e-mail indicated above. The Procurement unit will respond in writing or by standard electronic mail and will send written copies of the response, including an explanation of the query without identifying the source of inquiry, to all consultants.

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 the *Mainstreaming global environment commitments for effective national environmental management (PIMS 4937)*

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

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	Suriname Coastal Protected Area Management			
GEF Project ID:	5126		<i>at endorsement</i> <i>(Million US\$)</i>	<i>at completion</i> <i>(Million US\$)</i>
UNDP Project ID:	4937	GEF financing:	980,000	980,000
Country:	Suriname	IA/EA own:	grant 185,000 (in-kind) 50,000	grant 200,000 (in-kind) 35,000
Region:	LAC	Government:	(grant) 440,000 (in-kind) 625,000	(grant) 840,000 (in-kind) 325,000
Focal Area:	Multi-focal area	Other:	(in-kind 100,000	
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	CD2; CD4	Total co-financing:	2,380,000	2,380,000
Executing Agency:	UNDP	Total Project Cost:	2,380,000	2,380,000
Other Partners involved:	NIMOS, Planning Office, CELOS, GBS	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		30 October 2015
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: 30 October 2018	Actual: 30 October 2018

OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The project was designed to: *This project is targeted towards addressing cross-cutting capacity gaps and needs, by supporting interventions that will strengthen key government structures, as well as mechanisms for the civil society sector, to improve the institutional framework set up to implement the Rio Conventions and to deliver global environmental benefits. Under this project, capacity development support will lead to two outcomes: (1) Increased capacity of decision makers and stakeholders to manage environmental planning and processes that lead to decisions aimed at increasing global environmental benefits through better use of information and knowledge; and (2) Improved national capacities for the effective coordinated management and implementation of the Rio Conventions, and to continued leverage of financial resources to support the Conventions' objectives.*

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 assess if the project was able and to which extent, realize the stated objectives. The goal and objectives of the project are; this project seeks to address priority cross-cutting capacity development needs as identified in the NCSA, taking into account recent evolutions in the political, institutional, regulatory framework of the country, as well as the current status in terms of environmental management capacity, which are highlighted in Section B.2. The NCSA priorities served as a point of departure to develop cross-cutting capacity development interventions, this was followed up with a review of the baseline context and an analysis of recent interventions that have followed the NCSA. The project is also designed to address the capacity barriers that still exist (see Section B.5) in meeting national and international sustainable development objectives.

The cross-cutting priorities that will be addressed following the afore mentioned analysis through this project are:

A. Public reform and physical planning

- Interdepartmental cooperation
- Clear mandates and responsibility

B. Capacity Improvement and Research

- Improved natural resource management
- Data gathering
- National inventories and databases

C. Systemic level

- Environmental Framework Act

D. Communication

- Cross-sector communication
- Coordination of awareness activities and public awareness.

The project is also geared to support Suriname in meeting its obligations under MEAs to which it is a party. The proposed project is intended to facilitate an important step towards developing the capacities for an effective

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

national environmental management framework. At start of project in October 2015, the following institutional changes materialized. National project start up context is one whereby the Ministry of Labour, Technological Development and Environment (ATM) as a result of the State Resolution of 27 March 2015, SB 2015 no 41 has been dissolved with all Environment related task and project responsibilities having been transferred technically to the Office of the President and the National Institute for Environment and Development (NIMOS). For efficiency the editing of ATM throughout the text to reflect the updated Environmental and project management situation has been kept to a minimum, however in moving ahead where ATM is mentioned should be read as Office of the President and NIMOS, with overall project implementation role being entrusted to NIMOS.

The evaluator will conduct country mission to Paramaribo, Suriname. All interviews are to be conducted in and around Paramaribo with no project field sites to visit. The list of stakeholders interviewed should include at minimum the following:

- ABS; Algemeen Bureau Voor de Statistiek (Statistics Bureau Suriname)
- ADEK; Anton de Kom University of Suriname
- CM Coordination Environment, Office of the President
- CELOS; Centre for Agricultural Research in Suriname
- MinFin; Ministry of Finance, Department for Planning and Development Finance
- METEO; (Meteorological Services)
- BBS; National Herbarium (institute under ADEK)
- NIMOS; National Institute for Environment and Development in Suriname
- Planbureau; Suriname Planning Institute
- ROGB; Ministry of Physical Planning, Land and Forest Management
- SBB; Foundation for Forest Management and Production Control

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

EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework ([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	<i>rating</i>	2. IA& EA Execution	<i>rating</i>
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	<i>rating</i>	4. Sustainability	<i>rating</i>

Relevance		Financial resources:	
Effectiveness		Socio-political:	
Efficiency		Institutional framework and governance:	
Overall Project Outcome Rating		Environmental:	
		Overall likelihood of sustainability:	

PROJECT FINANCE / COFINANCE

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

Co-financing (type/source)	UNDP own financing (mill. US\$)		Government (mill. US\$)		Partner Agency (mill. US\$)		Total (mill. US\$)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual
Grants	185,000	200,000	440,000	840,000				
Loans/Concessions								
• In-kind support	50,000	35,000	625,000	325,000				
• Other					100,000	0		
Totals	235,000	235,000	1,065,000	1,065,000	100,000	0	1,400,000	1,400,000

MAINSTREAMING

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

IMPACT

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.²

CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

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

IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

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](#)

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in *Suriname*. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the evaluation will be 23 days according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation	4 days	03 Aug 2018
Evaluation Mission	10 days	19 Aug 2018
Draft Evaluation Report	7 days	12 Sept 2018
Final Report	2 days	05 October 2018

EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

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

*When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluator is required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report.

TEAM COMPOSITION

The evaluation team will be composed of *(1 international evaluator)*. The consultant shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. *(If the team has more than 1 evaluator, one will be designated as the team leader and will be responsible for finalizing the report)*. The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The Evaluator must present the following qualifications:

- Master’s degree or higher in Natural Resource Management, environmental management, socio-economics field or other related field
- Minimum 7 years of relevant professional experience
- Substantial knowledge in GEF Multi-focal areas and cross-cutting capacity development projects
- At least 5 years of recent experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies
- At least 5 years’ experience applying participatory monitoring approaches
- At least 3 years’ experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios
- Recent knowledge of UNDP’s results-based evaluation policies and procedures
- Recent knowledge of the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy
- Excellent command of the English language (oral and written)
- Knowledgeable of the Suriname context and national circumstances is an advantage
- Good command of the Dutch language is an advantage

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 submission and acceptance of inception report including work plan
40%	Following submission and approval of the 1 st draft terminal evaluation report
40%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report

APPLICATION PROCESS

Individual consultants are requested to email to procurement.sr@undp.org by 20th July 2018. Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions. The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in English with indication of the e-mail and phone contact. Shortlisted candidates will be requested to submit a price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs).

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

ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Annex A. Logical Framework

Project objective: Objective of the project is to generate global environmental benefits through improved decision-support mechanisms and improved local planning and development processes in Suriname, by harmonizing existing information systems that deal with the Rio Conventions, integrating internationally accepted measurement standards and methodologies.

Impact Indicator: Indicator: degree of capacity to make cross-cutting environmental decisions as measured by scorecard

Duration: 36 months

Component	Outcome	Outcome-level Indicator	Baseline	Target	Means of Verification	Outputs	Activities
Component 1: Generation of access and use of information and knowledge through improved decision-support mechanisms and the development of an environmental information and knowledge platform	1. Increased capacity of decision makers and stakeholders to manage environmental planning and processes that lead to decisions aimed at increasing global environmental benefits through better use of information and knowledge.	Degree to which environmental data/information is available and accessible to government and civil society	The following information is available disparately but not accessible to end-users in a comprehensive way: national biodiversity information under NBINS; development indicators under DEVINFO; statistical information under ABSinfo; water-related data under SWRIS; land registration and land information system under GLIS; forestry information under NFI, conservation data by NARENA	Sectoral environmental data be accessible to end users in a comprehensive and policy-relevant way	Capacity scorecard	1.1. Improved ability of institutions and stakeholders to access, manage and analyze information for better environmental planning and processes.	1.1.1 Build a Knowledge Platform (KP) that enhances the availability and accessibility of data relevant for environmental management. 1.1.2. Develop mechanisms for managing information flows from identified sources (govt., multilateral, NGOs, indigenous organizations, academic, corporate and other), including mechanisms for managing and maintaining the KP, through a communication and training strategy. 1.1.3. Produce Suriname

							environmental atlas through consultations by members of the Knowledge Platform
						1.2. Increased capacity of government and other stakeholders to work with disadvantaged minorities in the environmental context.	1.2.1. Develop and deliver a training program aimed at for government, civil society, academia, and corporations on working effectively with vulnerable communities in the context of environmental management.
Component 2- Creating and enhancing capacities for management and implementation of convention guidelines	2. Improved national capacities for the effective coordinated management and implementation of the Rio Conventions, and to continued leverage of financial resources to support the Conventions' objectives	Existence of an agreed roadmap towards the development of a legislative and institutional framework for environmental management at national level	There is not an agreed roadmap towards the development of a legislative and institutional framework for environmental management at the national level	Agreement on roadmap	Existence of roadmap	2.1. Elements of the Environmental Framework Act are agreed through the facilitation of an information and advocacy initiative involving diverse stakeholders.	2.1.1. Implement an information campaign aimed at parliamentarians and the general public to explain the importance of the Environmental Framework Act in the context of implementing the Rio Conventions. 2.1.2. Support a civil society platform on environment issues and advocacy that brings together representatives from NGO/CBO, researchers, academics, legal and law enforcement organizations and institutions, and corporations. 2.2 Improved environmental governance at 2.2.1. Develop or revise elements of the

						<p>the national level in place through the creation and implementation of a roadmap for change.</p> <p>2.3. Develop a financial plan for the long-term sustainability of project activities and the retention of developed capacity</p>	<p>Environmental Framework Legislation.</p> <p>2.2.2. Conduct a study on the status of the environmental governance structure and processes, including stewardship and management of the Rio Conventions in Suriname.</p> <p>2.2.3. Develop an agreed roadmap for improved environmental governance in collaboration with government and civil society partnerships.</p> <p>2.2.4 Develop a short to medium term transition plan to fill the sustainable development skills gap</p> <p>2.3.1. Enhance the existing financial plan of the government for environmental governance through cross-cutting capacity development, including exploration and building on innovative sources of financing.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	---

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

Non- limitative

- 1 *UNDAF 2012 – 2016, UNMSDF 2017-2021;*
- 2 *UNDP CPD 2012 – 2016, UNDP CPD 2017 - 2021;*
- 3 *Project Document;*
- 4 *Annual work plans;*
- 5 *APRs/PIR reports;*
- 6 *Project Progress Reports;*
- 7 *Minutes from relevant meetings UNDP – NIMOS;*
- 8 *ToRs for Consultancies;*
- 9 *Workshop reports;*
- 10 *Multi Annual Development Plan (OP 2012 – 2016), (OP 2017 – 2021);*
- 11 *Risk Logs;*
- 12 *UNDP’s Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluation for Results;*
- 13 *Technical Report Environment Atlas;*
- 14 *Technical Report Roadmap and Sustainable Financing;*
- 15 *Report legal reform;*
- 16 *Audit reports;*

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
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 realistic were the project's intended outcomes? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Degree to which the project supports national environmental Objectives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents and evaluations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document analysis
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Were the project's objectives and components relevant, according to the social and political context? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Degree of coherence between the project and national priorities, policies and strategies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NIMOS, Project team, UNDP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interviews
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Were counterpart resources (funding, staff, and facilities), enabling legislation, and adequate project management arrangements in place at project entry? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appreciation from national stakeholders with respect to adequacy of project design and implementation to national realities and existing capacities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project partners and relevant stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interviews
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are the stated assumptions and risks logical and robust? And did they help to determine activities and planned outputs? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coherence between needs expressed by national stakeholders and UNDP-GEF criteria 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extent to which the project is actually implemented in line with incremental cost argument 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document analysis
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent were project results achieved? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See indicators in the project document results framework and log frame 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents and evaluations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document analysis
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In what ways are long-term emerging effects to the project foreseen? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Level of coherence between project expected results and project design internal logic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NIMOS, Project team, UNDP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interviews
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Were the relevant representatives from government and civil society involved in project implementation, including as part of the project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Level of coherence between project design and project implementation approach 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project partners and relevant stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document analysis

steering committee?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Was an intergovernmental committee given responsibility to liaise with the project team, recognizing that more than one ministry should be involved? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Level of coherence between project design and project implementation approach 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents and evaluations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document analysis
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Was adaptive management used and if so, how did these modifications to the project contribute to obtaining the objectives? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quality of existing information systems in place to identify emerging risks and other issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents and evaluations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document analysis
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How did institutional arrangements influence the project's achievement of results? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quality of risk mitigations strategies developed and followed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ROGB, Project team, UNDP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interviews
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Were the indicators provided in the Project Document effectively used for measuring progress and performance? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Occurrence of change in project design/ implementation approach (i.e. restructuring) when needed to improve project efficiency 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents and evaluations NIMOS, Project team, UNDP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interviews
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Were baseline conditions, methodology and roles and responsibilities well-articulated at project start-up? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Occurrence of change in project design/ implementation approach (i.e. restructuring) when needed to improve project efficiency 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents and evaluations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interviews
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In what way may the benefits from the project be maintained or increased in the future? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See indicators in project document results framework and log frame 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents and reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document analysis
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is there sufficient public/stakeholder awareness in support of the project's long-term objectives? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that particular partnerships/linkages will be sustained 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NIMOS, Project team, UNDP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interviews
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Which of the project's aspects deserve to be replicated in future initiatives? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that particular practices will be sustained 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NIMOS, Project team, UNDP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interviews
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do the legal frameworks, policies, and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that Mainstreaming has taken place and SLM concepts are integrated in 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document analysis

jeopardize sustainability of project benefits?	multiple sectors' policies.	reports	
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See indicators in project document results framework and log frame 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documents and evaluations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document analysis
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NBSAP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project team • Project partners and relevant stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews

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</p> <p>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 G: 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)
 - Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management

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.

- Project Finance:
- Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (*)
- UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (*) coordination, and operational issues

3.3 Project Results

- Overall results (attainment of objectives) (*)
- Relevance (*)
- Effectiveness & Efficiency (*)
- Country ownership
- Mainstreaming
- Sustainability (*)
- Impact

4. Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons

- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
- Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
- Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
- Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success

5. Annexes

- ToR
- Itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- Summary of field visits
- List of documents reviewed
- Evaluation Question Matrix
- Questionnaire used and summary of results
- Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

Annex F. Capacity Development Scorecard

To establish the baseline capacity, stakeholders were asked to score their understanding of the existing institutional capacities for cross-cutting capacity development, where they would like to move the capacity to in the three-year timeframe, and how they would prioritize each capacity.

This scorecard was adapted from the standard scorecards used by UNDP to fit the context of cross-cutting capacity development and measure the priority areas that were noted in the NCSA. The scorecards were filled collaboratively through a participatory process at the validation workshop, by the following stakeholders:

- ABS
- ADEK
- ATM
- CELOS
- Finance
- Justice & Police (JUSPOL)
- Maritime Authority of Suriname (MAS)
- METEO (Meteorological Services)
- National Herbarium (institute under ADEK)
- NIMOS
- ROGB
- SBB
- UNDP (as per ATM's request)

The participants were provided the following instructions:

The Capacity Scorecard is structured to measure progress against the barriers noted in the project document.

The scoring scale is:

1. *No evidence of capacity*
2. *Anecdotal evidence of capacity*
3. *Partially developed capacity*
4. *Widespread, but not comprehensive capacity*
5. *Fully developed capacity*

1. Information Knowledge Management Capacity							
Capacity Indicator	Baseline: Level of Existing Capacity					Target level of Capacity in the timeframe 3 years	Priority of Capacity (h/m/l)
	1	2	3	4	5		
1.1 To what extent is cross-cutting capacity development knowledge shared and accessible through appropriate media and informational platforms ?	X					4	H
1.2 To what extent do local stakeholders have access to relevant environmental data and information that will inform their activities?		X				3	H
1.3 To what extent do information platforms and data banks provide cross-cutting policy-relevant information?		X				3	M
1.4 To what extent are different data platforms interconnected ?	X					2	H
1.5 To what extent are current data banks providing environmental information that will measure progress against MEA commitments?		X				3	M
1.6 To what extent is local knowledge being incorporated in national data banks?	X					2	H
1.7 To what extent are government staff retrieving environmental information from current banks of data?		X				3	M
1.8 To what extent are non-state stakeholders retrieving environmental information from current banks of data?		X				3	M
1.9 To what extent is the government collaborating with national and local research institutions to identify, apply, and institutionalise cross-cutting capacity development?			X			4	L
1.10. To what extent do public awareness programs include cross-cutting capacity development and sustainable development information?	X					2	H

1.11 To what extent are cross-cutting capacity development and sustainable development public awareness programs accessible to communities so it overcomes local languages, literacy, technical and geographic barriers?	X					2	H
1.12 To what extent are public awareness campaigns on environmental legislation, environmental governance and MEAs attaining the local level?		X				3	M
1.13 To what extent are non-state stakeholders involved in the development public awareness campaigns?		X				3	M
1.14 To what extent do environmental education programs include cross-cutting capacity development?	X					2	H
1.15 To what extent is local knowledge ' scaled up ' to inform district and national level environmental legislation?		X				3	M

2. Financial and Resources Capacity							
Capacity Indicator	Baseline: Level of Existing Capacity					Target level of Capacity in the timeframe 3 years	Priority of Capacity (h/m/l)
	1	2	3	4	5		
2.1 To what extent is there effective advocacy for the inclusion of MEA implementation in planning, budgets and programming?			X			3	L
2.2 To what extent are innovative financing options being developed to finance cross-cutting capacity development?			X			4	H
2.3 To what extent is there sufficient financial resource mobilization for cross-cutting capacity development priorities?		X				3	H
2.4 To what extent are functioning financial management and reporting systems in place for cross-cutting capacity development initiatives?		X				3	M

2.5 To what extent is there an integrated financial management informationsystem/databases for measuring expenditures on cross-cutting capacity development management?	X					3	M
2.6 To what extent are there reporting mechanisms for cross-cutting capacity development programming?	X					3	M
2.7 To what extent is there effective human resource management (HRM) to attract and retain talent for cross-cutting capacity development programming?	X					2	M
2.8 To what extent does government budget allocation at national , level reflect cross-cutting capacity development priorities	X					3	L

3. Cross-Sectoral Coordination and Stakeholder Participation & Inclusion							
Capacity Indicator	Baseline: Level of Existing Capacity					Target level of Capacity in the timeframe 3 years	Priority of Capacity (h/m/l)
	1	2	3	4	5		
3.1 To what extent is there an effective government coordination mechanism for MEA-related dialogue & policy making?			X			4	H
3.2 To what extent is there effective government coordination for cross-cutting information generation ?	X					3	H
3.3 To what extent are government actors aware of their roles, responsibilities and mandates with regards to environmental stewardship?			X			4	H
3.4 To what extent are institutional mandates clearly defined ?			X			4	M
3.5 To what extent is there political engagement at national and provincial levels on how to meet the three MEAs ?			X			5	H

3.6 To what extent are there clear core functions and roles relating to MEA implementation with regards to district and local level authorities?			X			4	M
3.7 To what extent are non-state stakeholders such as CSOs, indigenous communities, vulnerable groups (women & youth) and private sector participating in MEA coordination mechanisms?			X			4	H
3.8 To what extent are non-state stakeholders participating in the development of the Environmental Framework Act and other environmental legislation?	X					4	H
3.9 To what extent are local level communities aware of the environmental laws that govern them?	X					3	M
3.10 To what extent is there community engagement around cross-cutting capacity development priorities?			X			4	M
3.11 4.5 To what extent are the needs of vulnerable groups addressed to enable them to engage and mobilize around cross-cutting capacity development priorities?		X				4	H
3.12 To what extent are gender issues mainstreamed to enable women to engage and mobilize around cross-cutting capacity development?		X				4	M
3.13 To what extent are alternative sustainable livelihood opportunities identified and linked with national sustainable development goals?				X		5	M
3.14 To what extent are there partnerships between the public sector and private sector for implementing cross-cutting capacity development			X			4	M

4. Environmental Governance & Stewardship							
Capacity Indicator	Baseline: Level of Existing Capacity					Target level of Capacity in the timeframe 3 years	Priority of Capacity (h/m/l)
	1	2	3	4	5		
4.1 To what extent are there frameworks to manage planning of cross-cutting capacity development			X			4	H

programming at the national level?							
4.2 To what extent are there frameworks to manage planning of cross-cutting capacity development programming at the regional level and local levels?		X				3	M
4.3 To what extent are environmental policies aligned with broader sustainable development goals and strategies?			X			4	H
4.4 To what extent is there a harmonized legal framework with incentives and compliance mechanisms that reflect MEA priorities?	X					2	H
4.5 To what extent are environmental frameworks understood cross-sectorally by Government actors?		X				3	H
4.6 To what extent are local laws and traditions harmonized into broader environmental policies and frameworks?	X					2	M

ANNEX G: EVALUATION REPORT CLEARANCE FORM

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

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