

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 **Capacity-building for the strategic planning and management of natural resources in Belize 00090265 (PIMS #4917.)**

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

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	Capacity-building for the strategic planning and management of natural resources in Belize			
GEF Project ID:	5048		<i>at endorsement</i> <i>(Million US\$)</i>	<i>at completion</i> <i>(Million US\$)</i>
UNDP Project ID:	PIMS# 4917 Atlas Output ID 00090265	GEF financing:	759,000	759,000
Country:	Belize	IA/EA own: Government: MFFSD (IN-KIND) MFFSD (GRANT)	75,000 440,000 128,000	87,190.57 440,000 128,000
Region:	LAC			
Focal Area:	Multi Focal Area – Capacity Development	Other:		
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	CD2 To generate, access and use information and knowledge CD4 To strengthen capacities to implement and manage global convention guidelines	Total co-financing:	643,000	655,190.57
Executing Agency:	Ministry of Forestry, Fisheries and Sustainable Development	Total Project Cost:	1,402,000	1,414,190.57
Other Partners involved:	United Nations Development Programme	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		01/13/2015
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: 01/13/2018	Actual: 12/31/2018

OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The project builds upon the commitment of the Government to pursue sustainable development as indicated by the recently established Ministry of Forestry, Fisheries and Sustainable Development. The barriers to good environmental governance for the global environment are fundamentally an issue of accessing good knowledge and having a good

system by which to make best use of this knowledge. GEF funds will be used to train government staff through directed workshops on how to collect and manage data and information relevant to planning best practices for global environmental governance in the three Rio Convention focal areas. The project's strategy emphasizes a long-term approach to institutionalizing capacities to meet MEA obligations through a set of learning-by-doing activities that lay the foundation for effective decision-making and policy-making regarding global environmental benefits. Specifically, the project will be implemented through three linked components, namely, the strengthening of an integrated environmental monitoring and evaluation system, the integration of natural resource valuation into the Environmental Impact Assessment process, and institutional and financial reforms to ensure long-term benefits to the global environment. Active participation of stakeholder representatives in the full project life cycle facilitates the strategic adaptation of project activities in keeping with project objectives. Moreover, the inclusion of nonstate stakeholders contributes to the adaptive collaborative management of project implementation and promotes long-term sustainability of project outcomes.

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 **Belize**, including the following project sites

- **Statistical Institute of Belize**
- **Department of Environment- Environment Management Information System (EMIS)**

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

(list key stakeholders).

Stakeholder List

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

	Contact Person	Email
Department of the Environment		
	Edgar Ek	deputy@environment.gov.bz
GEF Operational Focal Point/ Chief Executive Officer		
Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries, Forestry, the Environment and Sustainable Development	Dr. Percival Cho	ceo@environment.gov.bz
Project Manager	Judene Tingling Linares	cd2.coordinator@environment.gov.bz
Project Board Members		
United Nations Development Programme	Diane Wade-Moore	diane.wade@undp.org
Ministry of Economic Development, Petroleum, Investment, Trade & Commerce	Carlos Pol	Director.PPU@med.gov.bz
Environmental Research Institute	Leandra Cho Ricketts	lricketts@ub.edu.bz
Statistical Institute of Belize	Dr. Leopold Perriott	lperriott@mail.sib.org.bz
Association of Protected Areas Management Organization (APAMO)	Jose Perez	execdirector@apamobelize.org
Belize Association of Private Protected Areas (BAPPA)	Oswaldo Sabido	oswaldosabido@gmail.com
Ministry of Economic Development, Petroleum, Investment, Trade & Commerce	Lincoln Blake	director.investment@itc.gov.bz
Ministry of Natural Resources	Kerry Belisle	ceo@naturalresources.gov.bz

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in [Annex B](#) 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 (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	<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	Actual	Actual
Grants	75,000	87,190.57	128,000	128,000			203,000.00	215,190.57
Loans/Concessions								
• In-kind support			440,000	440,000			440,000.00	440,000.00
• Other								
Totals	75,000	87,190.57	568,000	568,000			643,000.00	655,190.57

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

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in **Belize**. 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 **20** days according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation	3 days	March 11, 2019
Evaluation Mission	5 days	March 18th – 22nd 2019
Draft Evaluation Report	10 days	12 April 2019
Final Report	2 days	10 May 2019

EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
Inception Report	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission.	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
Presentation	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission	To project management, UNDP CO
Draft Final Report	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, 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.

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](#)

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. 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 Team members must present the following qualifications:

- A Master's degree in natural resource management / environmental management / business / public administration or other related disciplines
- Minimum 7 years of relevant professional experience
- Knowledge of UNDP and GEF
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
- At least two GEF funded project evaluation experiences with focus on multi-focal area capacity development project, e.g. on the three thematic areas of the 3Rio convention namely Climate Change, Biodiversity, and Land Degradation
- Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s) – Multi-Focal Areas – Capacity Development
- Excellent command of English (oral and written)

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
10%	Upon acceptance and approval of the Inception Report
40%	Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report
50%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report

APPLICATION PROCESS

Applicants are requested to apply by **February 26th 2019**. 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

Project Results Framework

This log frame is to be reviewed and revised with the input of UNDP and the International Technical Advisor at the time of project inception.

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators			Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Indicator	Baseline value	Target value and date		
Long-term goal: To put in place new approaches that will facilitate better development decisions for the global environment					
<p>Project objective:</p> <p>To strengthen institutional and technical capacities for: a) improved monitoring and assessment; b)</p>	<p>Outcome indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Monitoring and assessment of environmental impacts and trends are better enabled ▪ Technical and management staff sufficiently trained 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There is high-level support from the Cabinet for sustainable development. Nonetheless, many high-level officials question the 	<p>By the end of the project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Government staff have learned, applied, and tested best practice tools to integrate natural resource valuation into national decision-making processes for improved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Meeting Minutes³ ▪ Working Group meeting reports ▪ UNDP quarterly progress reports ▪ Independent final evaluation reports ▪ Rio Convention national reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Planners and decision-makers are resistant to adopt new attitudes towards the global environment ▪ Involvement of the UNDP will

³ Meeting minutes includes records of key meetings such as local, regional and national consultations regarding inputs on the design and implementation of the relevant output and associated activities. Meetings may be individual or group meetings, with government officials or non-state stakeholders.

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators			Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Indicator	Baseline value	Target value and date		
natural resource valuation and impact assessment; and c) resource mobilization	<p>in the use and application of natural resource valuation tools, and decision-makers fully aware of natural resource valuation tools</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Financial framework for delivering on Rio Conventions obligations is strengthened 	<p>need for the MFFSD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planners and decision-makers do not fully appreciate the value of the Rio Conventions and the use of net present value to determine value leads to heavy discounting of the global environment and poor incorporation into development planning Changes in government leadership 	<p>implementation of Rio Conventions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Future planning and development will account for the true value of environmental goods and services Increased capacity within relevant stakeholder groups to address Rio Convention obligations Gender equality targets per UNDP 2013-2017 Strategic Plan are met 	<p>and communications</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strategic documents detailing the new indicators, valuation tools, and resource mobilization plan GEF Cross-Cutting Capacity Development Scorecard 	<p>ensure, the lack of absorptive capacity does not undermine the project</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Involvement of the UNDP will ensure, the lack of absorptive capacity does not undermine project Improving the valuation process will help decision-making relating to the global environment become more inclusive, legitimate, and robust The project will be executed in a transparent,

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators			Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Indicator	Baseline value	Target value and date		
		have caused uncertainty and confusion over mandates and as well as an overall loss of institutional memory			holistic, adaptive, and collaborative manner
Outcome 1: Planners, policy-makers, and decision-makers are more effectively achieving national and global environmental priorities					
Output 1.1 Improved indicators for environmental monitoring and natural resource management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In-depth analysis of data needs and indicators ▪ Comprehensive set of environmental, natural resource, and sustainable development indicators 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evidence of public sector staff’s technical capacities related to the Rio Conventions is limited ▪ Despite expressed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ At least two senior level meetings are held with each department before month 4 ▪ Analysis completed by month 5, reviewed by month 6, and endorsed by month 8 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Meeting minutes ▪ Tracking and progress reports⁴ ▪ Analysis of data needs and indicators ▪ Letters of endorsement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Analyses and indicators are deemed legitimate, relevant, and valid among all key stakeholder representatives ▪ Expert peer-reviews are

⁴ Tracking and progress reports include UNDP Quarterly Reports, Annual Performance Reports, and Project Implementation Reports. Each output will be tracked by a report that records the activities and milestones of each output using tools such as Gantt or PERT charts.

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators			Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Indicator	Baseline value	Target value and date		
		government commitment to the global environment, several barriers limit policies and efforts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Indicators prepared, reviewed, and endorsed by month 12 		thorough and of high quality
Output 1.2: Uniform data collection methods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expert sub-committee meetings Assessment of current methodologies for collecting and analyzing data and information Learning-by-doing workshops on improved data collection and analysis Synthesis workshop on cross-fertilization 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data is not regularly collected or analyzed in a manner consistent with international standards or Rio Convention obligations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sub-committee meets every four months beginning no later than month 4 Assessment of methodologies drafted by month 5, peer-reviewed by month 8, and finalized by month 12 Workshops begin no earlier than month 13 and are completed by month 17. Each workshop 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meeting minutes Tracking and progress reports Methodologies assessment Participant registration lists Feedback evaluations Workshop reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Members of the sub-committee will be comprised of proactive specialists and project champions Lead agencies will allow their staff to attend all training workshops Trainers will agree with best practices to integrate and implement

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators			Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Indicator	Baseline value	Target value and date		
	among three Rio Conventions		<p>will have at least 20 unique participants.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Final synthesis workshop convened within one month of the completion of previous workshops 		training based on the Rio Conventions
Output 1.3: Strengthened real-time monitoring of environmental trends	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strengthened technological and technical capacities for real-time monitoring Hardware and software for improved data/information management and monitoring systems identified and installed, and training provided Training manuals / guidelines on use 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Belize lacks the national capacities needed to generate good, reliable data and transform it into knowledge that is useful in national development planning processes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hardware and software needs identified and approved by month 12, and procured and installed by month 15 Training on use of new systems provided to at least 75 unique participants with gender balance and appropriate regional representation by month 18 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meeting minutes Tracking and progress reports Participant registration lists Workshop evaluations and results analysis Training materials / guidelines Letter of endorsement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The right representation from the various government ministries, departments, and agencies participate in project activities There is sufficient absorptive capacity to implement improved data management

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators			Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Indicator	Baseline value	Target value and date		
	of improved system		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Feedback evaluations from workshops with 90% response rate and analysis by month 31 ▪ High quality training manuals and/or guidelines updated / drafted by month 20, peer-reviewed and endorsed by month 22 		and monitoring systems
Output 1.4: Rio Convention criteria and indicators are integrated into sustainable development planning frameworks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Improved environmental indicators integrated into NSDS ▪ Global environmental priorities integrated into targeted sectoral development plans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Institutional capacities for managing the Rio Conventions is piecemeal and takes place through Rio Convention-specific projects, with development emphasizing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ NSDS updated by month 20, with revised draft peer-reviewed and finalized by month 24, and approved by the Cabinet by month 33 ▪ At least 50 relevant participants in the learning-by-doing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Meeting minutes ▪ Tracking and progress reports ▪ Participant registration lists ▪ Workshop reports ▪ Revised NSDS and sectoral development plans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The right representation from the various government ministries, departments, agencies, and non-state stakeholders participate in project activities and

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators			Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Indicator	Baseline value	Target value and date		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Workshops with state and non-state stakeholders to update selected sectoral development plans 	<p>near to medium-term socio-economic priorities, often at the expense of long-term sustainability.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The country is currently in the process of preparing its NSDS with the help of UNDESA 	<p>workshops for each topic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two sectoral development plans selected for integrating Rio Convention criteria and indicators by month 24 Series of workshops to draft new plans and peer-review them by month 29, validated by month 30, and finalized by month 32. Plans approved by Cabinet by month 33 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Official letters of approval 	<p>legitimately reflect stakeholder constituent views and priorities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Workshop participants contribute their honest attitudes and values Planners and decision-makers are open to suggested revisions and changes
<p>Output 1.5: Web-based environmental</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Technological structure of data and information management system improved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Many of the government ministries including MFFSD have not created or 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Web-based portal is structured, beta-tested, and launched by month 16 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meeting minutes Tracking and progress reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommended legislative and regulatory reforms are technically, financially, and

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators			Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Indicator	Baseline value	Target value and date		
project database	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> to include a web-based portal ▪ Assessment report recommending changes to regulatory framework ▪ Expert working group drafts recommended regulatory and legislative texts 	<p>updated their web presence following the government restructuring. Data is not easily accessible from one centralized source.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Assessment report is prepared, reviewed, and endorsed by month 18 ▪ Texts drafted by month 24, peer-reviewed and finalized by month 27, endorsed by month 28, and submitted for Cabinet approval by month 31 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Web-based portal ▪ Assessment report ▪ Drafted legislative and regulatory texts 	<p>politically feasible</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ All stakeholders will have access in one way or another to the information that is stored in the database ▪ Web-based portal will be maintained and updated as appropriate following launch
Outcome 2: Holistic planning and decision-making incorporates global environmental values into the development process					
Output 2.1: Natural resource valuation tools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Expert review of lessons learned and best practices on natural resource valuation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There is a shortage of technical capacity amongst planners at all 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ High quality report on best practices and lessons learned drafted by month 6 and peer-reviewed, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Meeting minutes ▪ Tracking and progress reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Planners and decision-makers are resistant to adopt new attitudes

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators			Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Indicator	Baseline value	Target value and date		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Natural resource valuation tools selected and modified for Belize by expert working group ▪ NRV tools integrated into key decision-making processes 	<p>levels to utilize information and knowledge related to the value of environmental goods and services, and to integrate these values into planning and decision-making processes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ NRV guidelines and tools are not widely known or understood among planners and decision-makers 	<p>finalized, and validated by month 7</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Expert working group convened by month 3 ▪ Tools modified and peer-reviewed by month 7, and officially endorsed by month 9. ▪ Tools revised by month 26 based on lessons learned from piloting ▪ MOA to formally include NRV into decision-making processes signed by relevant parties by month 12 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Best practices and lessons learned report ▪ NRV tools ▪ Letter of endorsement ▪ Memorandum of Agreement 	<p>towards the global environment including proposed agreements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Enabling policy and legislation in place to support the signing of an appropriate agreement, and institutions follow through on commitments under agreement ▪ Insufficient commitment from policy-makers to maintain long-term support for project

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators			Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Indicator	Baseline value	Target value and date		
Output 2.2: Training programme on natural resource valuation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Report on best practices and lessons learned for designing and implementing a training programme on natural resource valuation ▪ Training modules and materials for NRV training programme ▪ Training courses for state and non-state stakeholders on NRV ▪ Learning-by-doing piloting of skills in selected development projects through workshops in conjunction with 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There is currently no training available on NRV in Belize, however, the opportunity to do so exists through academic and research institutions in Belize that have other related training programmes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Report on best practices drafted by month 9 and finalized by month 10 ▪ NRV module and training materials drafted and peer-reviewed by month 12 ▪ Six training courses, each with at least 15 unique participants at least half of whom are government staff. All technical staff with responsibilities regarding EIAs participate and have an average test score of at least 80%. ▪ Statistical analysis of incremental learning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Meeting minutes ▪ Tracking and progress reports ▪ Best practices and lessons learned report ▪ Training materials and curriculum ▪ Participation lists and test scores ▪ Feedback from training/workshop ▪ Statistical analyses ▪ Piloted EIA with NRV 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Best practices and lessons learned are applicable in Belize and appropriately used ▪ Improving the valuation process will help decision-making relating to the global environment become more inclusive, legitimate, and robust ▪ Training programme participants are open to new tools and fully absorb

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators			Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Indicator	Baseline value	Target value and date		
	training programme		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Six learning-by-doing workshops convened in conjunction with training programme 		<p>knowledge imparted</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other training programmes and curricula do not work against Rio Conventions
Output 2.3: SEA implementation guidelines	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Institutional analysis of policy assessment Sensitization workshops to raise stakeholder awareness of SEA process Set of guidelines for improving SEA implementation 	The SEA process in Belize does not account for true value of natural resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Institutional analysis and best practices report prepared by month 6, and peer-reviewed by month 7 Three workshops with diverse representation from government, private sector, NGOs, and civil society convened by month 12 Guidelines drafted by month 13, peer-reviewed and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meeting minutes Tracking and progress reports Institutional analysis Participation lists Workshop reports SEA guidelines 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional and non-state stakeholder representation in project activities legitimately reflect their stakeholder constituent views and priorities Raising awareness of issues will increase support for

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators			Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Indicator	Baseline value	Target value and date		
			validated by month 14, and finalized by month 15		project activities
Output 2.4: Targeted institutional and legislative reforms for EIA and SEA compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Expert working group meets regularly ▪ Consultations with senior-level decision-makers to discuss legislative and policy reforms to EIA and SEA processes ▪ Assessment on current legislative and regulatory environment ▪ SEA policy to enable more effective Rio Convention implementation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Belize has poorly defined institutional structures and mandates relating to the collection, management, and sharing of data and information relevant to environmental protection, risk reduction, and development planning. The creation of the MFFSD helped consolidate the mandates under one ministry, but 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Working group convened by month 3 with quarterly meetings for two years, and institutionalization within ministry by month 32 ▪ At least 10 consultative meetings with senior-decision makers by month 10 and regulatory/legislative assessment by month 12 ▪ SEA policy drafted by month 14, peer-reviewed by month 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Meeting minutes ▪ Tracking and progress reports ▪ Institutional and legislative assessment ▪ SEA policy and NRV bill ▪ Peer-review comments ▪ Summary report of stakeholder consultations ▪ Letter of endorsement ▪ Participation lists 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Legislative and institutional reforms recommended by the project are politically, technically, and financially feasible ▪ There is no active institutional resistance to proposed changes ▪ The Parliament approves the institutional and legislative reforms

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators			Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Indicator	Baseline value	Target value and date		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Bill to integrate NRV into planning and development processes with full input from stakeholders ▪ Series of one-day sensitization workshops to raise awareness 	there is still much confusion regarding specific responsibilities and mandates.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 15 and finalized by month 16 ▪ Bill drafted and reviewed by month 18 and presented at stakeholder workshop by month 20. ▪ Discussion forums held in three districts by month 22 with summary of stakeholder consultations prepared and presented by month 23 ▪ NRV bill revised, finalized, endorsed, and submitted for Parliamentary approval by month 24 ▪ Ten one-day workshops with at 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Expert peer reviewers follow through with quality reviews ▪ Integrating NRV into planning processes with improve decision-making with regard to the global environment

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators			Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Indicator	Baseline value	Target value and date		
			least 50 mid-level and senior decision makers between months 20 and 30		
Outcome 3: Institutional reforms and mobilized financial resources ensure long-term term achievement of Rio Convention obligations, and other MEAs					
Output 3.1: Improved monitoring of resource mobilization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Expert finance and economic group leads in-depth analysis of current financial tracking mechanisms ▪ New guidelines for financial tracking mechanism ▪ Learning-by-doing workshops to pilot improved guidelines for tracking mechanism 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Natural Resource management entities including MFFSD are expected to see a freeze or cuts in recurrent budgets. National investments in capacity development for natural resource management have been 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Expert group of at least 20 rotating members convened by month 23 ▪ In-depth analysis and best practices drafted by month 25, peer-reviewed and finalized by month 26 ▪ Guidelines drafted by month 27, peer-reviewed by month 28, and finalized and endorsed by month 30 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Meeting minutes ▪ Tracking and progress reports ▪ Analysis of current tracking and best practices ▪ Financial tracking guidelines ▪ Letter of endorsement ▪ Participation lists ▪ Workshop reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Finance and economic group is composed of specialists who become champions of the project ▪ Peer-reviews and analysis are thorough and of high quality ▪ 100 unique stakeholders for workshops is feasible

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators			Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Indicator	Baseline value	Target value and date		
		<p>stalled due to reduced budgetary allocations as the Government redirects available public finances to social sector stabilization</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Four workshops with at least 25 unique stakeholders at each to be completed by month 33 		
<p>Output 3.2: Resource mobilization strategy for the financial sustainability of global environment outcomes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In-depth financial analysis of monitoring and enforcement of environmental legislation in Belize Best practices and financial/economic instruments for resource mobilization identified and tested for feasibility 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The NCSA and MDG7 Scorecard both indicated weak compliance with existing legislation due to limitations in national capacities for monitoring and enforcement and inadequate financing for 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analytical report drafted by month 25, peer-reviewed and finalized by month 26 Feasibility study on financial instruments drafted by month 27, peer-reviewed by month 28 and finalized by month 30 Operational procedures drafted 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meeting minutes Tracking and progress reports Participation lists Analytical report Feasibility study Operational procedures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> State and non-state stakeholders will remain committed to project outcomes beyond the life of the project Best practices show that the project goal is attainable with on-going and

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators			Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Indicator	Baseline value	Target value and date		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Operational procedures for allocation of funds for natural resource management ▪ Resource mobilization strategy informed by best practices and lessons learned 	environmental management.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ by month 26, tested and piloted by month 30, and approved by month 31. ▪ Resource mobilization strategy is drafted by month 28, peer-reviewed by month 29, and finalized and approved by month 32 ▪ Independent final evaluation by month 36 determines project outcomes are capable of raising and allocating funds 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Resource mobilization strategy ▪ Letter of approval ▪ Final evaluation 	sustained effort without compromising socio-economic development
Output 3.3: Capacity building for low carbon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Assessment of capacity needs to prepare low carbon development strategies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The lack of institutional capacities in terms of technical knowledge, personnel, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Capacity needs assessment completed by month 26 ▪ Four sensitization workshops in four 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Meeting minutes ▪ Tracking and progress reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Best practices and lessons learned are applicable to the context of Belize

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators			Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Indicator	Baseline value	Target value and date		
development strategies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Learning-by-doing sensitization workshops to improve understanding of low carbon development options ▪ Guidelines and training manuals to build capacity to implement integrated global environmental and sustainable development strategies 	financial resources to participate in evidence-based environmental management and development planning limits Belize's ability to develop low carbon strategies	<p>districts with at least 60 participants at each by month 28</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Guidelines and training materials drafted by month 30, peer-reviewed by month 32, and approved by month 33 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Capacity assessment ▪ Participation lists ▪ Workshop reports ▪ Feedback surveys ▪ Guidelines and training manuals ▪ Letter of approval 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Staff have sufficient absorptive capacity and will to effectively participate in training activities

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

- 1. Audit Reports**
- 2. Inventory and Assets**
- 3. PEG Meeting Records**
- 4. Stage Plans / End of Stage Reports and Highlight Reports**
- 5. Project Implementation Review Reports (PIRs)**
- 6. Key Project Deliverables**
- 7. Project Logframe**
- 8. Policy and Institutional Review**
- 9. Financial Needs Assessment**
- 10. NRV Training Modules**
- 11.**

ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?			
• Is the Project relevant to Belize’s environmental management structure?	•	•	•
• Is the project aligned with UNDP strategic Framework and the objectives of the Country Programme Document?	•	•	•
• Does the project address the needs of the target beneficiaries?	•	•	•
• How is the project complementary to the actions and the portfolios of other stakeholders in Belize?	•	•	•
• Is the project consistent in its design?	•	•	•
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
• Are the activities and outputs of the project consistent with the project's goals and objectives?	•	•	•
• To what extent have the delivered outputs contributed to the achievement of the project's expected outcomes?	•	•	•
• How was risk managed during the project?		•	•
• Which are the lessons learnt from the project in terms of effectiveness?		•	•
• Which changes could have been made in project design to improve its effectiveness?		•	•
• How could the project have been more effective in achieving results?		•	•
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?			
• Was adaptive managed needed and used in order to ensure efficient use of resources?	•	•	•
• Were the accounting and financial systems in place adequate?	•	•	•

• Were progress reports produced timely and in compliance to project reporting requirements?	•	•	•
• Was project implementation as cost-effective as originally envisaged?	•	•	•
• Was the expected co-finance leveraged as initially expected?	•	•	•
• Were the reported lessons learnt shared among project stakeholders for subsequent improvement of project implementation?	•	•	•
• Which partnerships and networking were facilitated among stakeholders?	•	•	•
• Was local capacity and know-how adequately mobilized?	•	•	•
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
• Were sustainability issues adequately addressed at project design?	•	•	•
• Is there evidence that some partners and stakeholders will continue their activities beyond project termination? Which ones?	•	•	•
• Which are the main risks to the continuation of policies and actions initiated by the projects? (financial, institutional, socioeconomic, environmental)	•	•	•
• Are project actions and results being scaled up or replicated in the city or elsewhere in the country or region?	•	•	•
• Did the project adequately address institutional and financial sustainability issues?	•	•	•
• How is the beneficiary planning to mainstream the lessons learnt within municipal practices in transport and other areas?	•	•	•
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
• How likely is for the project to achieve its long-term goal?	•	•	•
• Are stakeholders more aware about sustainable transport challenges and policies? Which ones?	•	•	•
• What is the impact of the project in the citizens of Dushanbe in terms of awareness about sustainable transport?	•	•	•

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 Form⁵

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: _____

⁵www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE⁶

- 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 Manual⁷)
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 rated⁸)
- 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)

⁶The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

⁷ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

⁸ 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

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: _____