## **Terms of Reference for Terminal Evaluation**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Reference** | PIMS 4732 |
| **Country** | Georgia |
| **Description of the Assignment:** | International Consultant for Terminal Evaluation of UNDP-GEF Expansion and Improved Management Effectiveness of Achara Region’s Protected Areas |
| **Project:** | PIMS 4732: Expansion and Improved Management Effectiveness of Achara Region’s Protected Areas |
| **Period of Assignment/Services:** | 25 working days over three months between September 15, 2018 to December 15, 2018 |
| **Duty Station:** | Home Based with one mission of estimated 10 working days in Batumi and Tbilisi (app. 7 and 3 days respectively) |

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 full sized project titled *“Expansion and Improved Management of the Achara Region’s Protected Areas*” (PIMS#4732)

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

Project Summary Table

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Title: Expansion and Improved Management Effectiveness of the Achara Region’s Protected Areas | | | | |
| GEF Project ID: | 4835 |  | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | *at completion (Million US$)* |
| UNDP Project ID: | 00088000 | GEF financing: | 1,283,636 | tbd |
| Country: | Georgia | IA/EA own: | 40,000 | tbd |
| Region: | Eastern Europe and Central Asia | Government: | 10,791,079 | tbd |
| Focal Area: | Biodiversity | Other: | 2,567,063 | tbd |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): | SO-1, SP-3 Strengthening Terrestrial Protected Areas | Total co-financing: | 13,358,142 | tbd |
| Executing Agency: | Agency for Protected Areas, Ministry of Environment Protection and Agriculture | Total Project Cost: | 14,998,778 | tbd |
| Other Partners involved: |  | ProDoc Signature (date project began): | | 09 June 2014 |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | Proposed: 09 June 2018 | Actual: 31 December 2018 |

Objective and Scope

The project was designed to: enhance the management effectiveness, biogeographically coverage and connectivity of Protected Areas of the Achara Autonomous Region of Georgia in order to better conserve the globally unique Colchic Forests 1(temperate rainforest). The area is of biodiversity importance because of the humid Pliocene flora refugium, high proportion of narrow-ranged (local endemic) plants, high percentage of endemic, as a well-known bottle-neck for migratory birds.

The project supported the government to bring about the functional operation of the recently gazetted Machakhela National Park which forms the last link in a chain of 4 protected areas established to conserve the Colchic forests of the region (i.e. Kintrishi, Mtirala and Machakhela in Georgia and Jamili in Turkey). Additionally, the project helped to build management effectiveness and sustainability of all the protected areas in this chain in Achara and tried to establish transboundary links with the Jamili Biosphere Reserve in Turkey.

It further supported the Georgian Agency for Protected Areas (APA) and the target PA Administrations to improve financial planning, better integrate local communities into protected areas management and build capacity for applying, adaptable and participatory approaches most likely to achieve long term conservation and sustainable local rural livelihoods

The project aims to contribute to this long-term solution through achievement of its goal: *“To establish a regional PA estate that can effectively ensure the conservation and sustainably use of the globally important Colchic Temperate Rain Forests of the Lesser Caucasus Mountain Range in South West Georgia”.* The project objective, in turn, is described as being “*To enhance the management effectiveness, biogeographically coverage, and connectivity of Protected Areas to conserve forest ecosystems in the Achara Region”.*

In order to achieve this objective, the project sort, in turn, to achieve two outcomes with their respective outputs: *Outcome 1: Enhancement of PA Management Effectiveness in the Achara Region* – focusing primarily on Kintrishi Protected Areas and Mtirala National Park with three targeted outputs, and *Outcome 2: PA System Expansion to Increase Functional Connectivity of PAs in the West Lesser Caucasus* also with three targeted outputs.

The project was planned as a four-year project – thus, the projected end of project (EOP) date was 09 June 2018. However, the project requested a 6.5 month “no -cost” extension and the final end date was changed to 31st December 2018.

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects.

The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

Evaluation approach and method

An overall approach and method[[1]](#footnote-1) for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact,** as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR ([*Annex C*](#_TOR_Annex_C:)) The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence‐based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Ajara Region, including the following project sites: Machakhella valley and National Park, Mtirala National Park, Kintrishi Protected Areas. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

*Ajara*

* Directors and staff of target Protected Area’s Administrations (Machakhela NP, Mtirala NP, Kintrishi PA’s)
* Khelvachauri Municipality (specifically - Head of the Natural Resources and Agriculture service of the Mayor’s office.)
* Mtirala NP and Machakhela NP Friends Association
* Environment Directorate of Ajara, Ajara Government.
* Achara A.R. Government administration - Head of the Department of relation with Administrative Bodies

*Tbilisi*

* Agency for Protected Areas, Ministry of Environment Protection and Agriculture
* GEF Operational Focal Point (Ministry of Agriculture and Environmental Protection)
* UNDP Country Office (E&E Team Leader, DRR/Head of Programme)
* Support Programme for Protected Areas (KfW/GFA) – Kintrishi PA partner
* WWF Georgia
* CNF Georgia
* Key National Contractors (Ilia University, Geographic, Black Sea Eco-Academy, Energy Efficiency Centre, NACRES, Georgian Ecotourism Association,
* Key National Consultants (NP Awareness Building – Ramaz Gokhelashvili, Management Options for Machakhela “Support Zone” / Protected Landscape consultant – Marika Kavtarishvili, Friends Association Strategy Consultant – Kakha Bakhtadze; PA governance consultant – Anzor Gogotidze)

*Istanbul* – UNDP Regional Office – UNDP, GEF Regional Technical Adviser (Skype interview only)

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](#_TOR_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](#_TOR_Annex_A:)), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact.** Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in  [Annex D](#_TOR_Annex_D:).

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

Project finance / cofinance

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

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

Mainstreaming

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

Impact

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

Conclusions, recommendations & lessons

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

Implementation arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Georgia. 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 25 days according to the following plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Timing | Completion Date |
| **Preparation** | *3* days *(recommended: 2-4)* | *01.10.2018* |
| **Evaluation Mission** | 12 days (*r: 7-15)* | *31.10.2018* |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | 8 days (*r: 5-10*) | *20.11.2018* |
| **Final Report** | 2 days *(r;: 1-2*) | *15.12.2018* |

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 2 weeks before the evaluation mission. | Evaluator submits to UNDP CO |
| **Presentation** | Initial Findings | End of evaluation mission | To project management, UNDP CO and APA |
| **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, Project Implementing Partner (APA) |
| **Final Report\*** | Revised report | Within 2 weeks of receiving UNDP and other stakeholder 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 (team leader) and 1 national evaluator. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. 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 international evaluator (team leader) must present the following qualifications:

* Proven Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s) – Biodiversity conservation and specifically protected areas management (ideally including practical protected areas management experience or experience in projects supporting protected areas establishment/management)
* Minimum *10* years of relevant professional experience
* Knowledge of UNDP and GEF evaluation procedures
* Previous experience with results‐based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
* At least 5 similar tasks completed
* Excellent English is required,

Assets would include:

* Experience of implementing GEF funded or relevant/ similar donor funded biodiversity projects.
* Experience in the CIS region and ideally in Georgia (relevant to Team Leader only)

Corporate competencies:

* Demonstrates integrity by modeling the UN’s values and ethical standards,
* Promotes the vision, mission, and strategic goals of UNDP,
* Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability.

Functional competencies:

* Strong interpersonal skills, communication skills and ability to work in a team,
* Ability to plan and organize work, efficiency in meeting commitments, observing deadlines and achieving results,
* Openness to change and ability to receive/integrate feedback,
* Ability to work under pressure and stressful situations,
* Strong analytical, research, reporting and writing abilities.

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

Payment modalities and specifications

(*this payment schedule is indicative, to be filled in by the CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on their standard procurement procedures)*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| % | Milestone |
| *10%* | After clearance of Inception report by UNDP CO |
| *40%* | Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report |
| *50%* | Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report |

Application process

Applicants are requested to apply online <http://www.ge.undp.org/content/georgia/en/home/operations/jobs.html> by 31.07.2018. 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.

|  |
| --- |
| **These annexes in the ToR are not included here because most of them appear in this TE Report:**  Annex A: Project Logical Framework  Annex B: List of Documents to be reviewed by the evaluators  Annex C: Evaluation Questions  Annex D: Rating Scales  Annex E: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form  Annex F: Evaluation Report Outline[[3]](#footnote-3)  Annex G: Evaluation Report Clearance Form |

1. For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](http://www.undp.org/evaluation/handbook), Chapter 7, pg. 163 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office:  [ROTI Handbook 2009](http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/M2_ROtI%20Handbook.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)