

Terms of Reference for Final Evaluation

Project Title:	Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity in Dibeen Nature Reserve Project (JOR/02/G35, 00013204)
Functional Title:	Consultants for Independent Evaluation
Duration:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• International Consultant / Estimated 23 working days over the period of: 3 June – 26 July 2007• National Consultant / Estimated 26 working days over the period of: 3 June – 26 July 2007

I. INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP/GEF M&E policies and procedures, all regular and medium-sized projects supported by the GEF should undergo a final evaluation upon completion of implementation.

a) UNDP/GEF Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) policy¹

The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) policy at the project level in UNDP/GEF has four objectives: i) to monitor and evaluate results and impacts; ii) to provide a basis for decision making on necessary amendments and improvements; iii) to promote accountability for resource use; and iii) to document, provide feedback on, and disseminate lessons learned. A mix of tools is used to ensure effective project M&E. These might be applied continuously throughout the lifetime of the project – e.g. periodic monitoring of indicators -, or as specific time-bound exercises such as mid-term reviews, audit reports and final evaluations.

In accordance with UNDP/GEF M&E² policies and procedures, all regular and medium-sized projects supported by the GEF should undergo a final evaluation upon completion of implementation. A final evaluation of a GEF-funded project (or previous phase) is required before a concept proposal for additional funding (or subsequent phases of the same project) can be considered for inclusion in a GEF work program. However, a final evaluation is not an appraisal of the follow-up phase.

Final evaluations are intended to assess the relevance, performance and success of the project. It looks at early signs of potential impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental goals. It will also identify/document lessons learned and make recommendations that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP/GEF projects.

b) The project objectives and its context within the program country

The Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity in Dibeen Nature Reserve Project is executed by the Royal Society for the Conservation of Nature (RSCN) and implemented by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), with funding from the Global Environment

¹ <http://thegef.org/MonitoringandEvaluation/MEPoliciesProcedures/mepoliciesprocedures.html>

² <http://www.undp.org/gef/05/monitoring/policies.html>

Facility (GEF), UNDP, the Royal Society for the Conservation of Nature (RSCN) and the local counterparts.

The project is a four-year (2004 -2007). The target site is an area of natural pine and oak forest known as Dibeen, situated 50 kilometers north of the capital city of Amman. The initial intention of the project was to establish a nature reserve within the core area of the forest, as part of a larger, multi-purpose forest park. However the forest park has failed to materialize and the project now focuses on establishing and managing the Dibeen Nature Reserve with little input to the surrounding forest areas and land use.

The site covers an area of pine-oak habitat (*Pinus halipensis*–*Quercus coccifera*) of 8.49 square kilometers, representing the southwestern geographical limit of this forest type. Botanical surveys revealed that Dibeen is one of the best remaining examples of the original pine-oak forest cover in the region and supports at least 17 threatened species. The Forest varies in altitude from 500 meters to 1000 meters above sea level and the main rock type is carboniferous limestone. The local climate is characterized by humid, cool winters with temperatures reaching a minimum of 5 degrees Celsius and hot dry summers with maximum temperatures of 35 – 40 degrees Celsius. The average rainfall in the area is around 400 millimeters per year.

The project is implemented by the Royal Society for the Conservation of Nature (RSCN), working in partnership with national and local stakeholders, including the Ministries of Planning and International Cooperation, Environment, Tourism and Agriculture, local municipalities and local users of Dibeen.

The primary expected result is to sustainably conserve Dibeen’s biodiversity values by effectively regulating the threats from ecosystem fragmentation and degradation (degradation primarily from visitor pressure). The strategy for achieving this result is to establish a nature reserve in Dibeen Forest. Thus a secondary expected result is to ensure the effective management of the Nature Reserve. This includes incorporating the Nature Reserve into Jordan’s national system of protected areas, ensuring it receives appropriate legislative and regulatory support and ensuring it receives adequate funding for long-term management.

II. OBJECTIVES OF THE FINAL EVALUATION

Upon the requirements of the GEF and UNDP, it was agreed that an external final evaluation mission be undertaken prior to the closure of the project at the end of 2007. This Final Evaluation is initiated by UNDP Jordan as the GEF Implementing Agency in agreement with the GEF RCU, in response to UNDP and GEF monitoring and evaluation policy. The evaluation will try to (1) assess achievements, results and impacts towards the project’s objectives and outputs, (2) identify strengths and weaknesses in implementation, (3) identify and distil lessons learned and (4) provide recommendations on performance and delivery for future projects in the country.

The particular objectives and focus of this evaluation are specified below. The evaluators must note that, according to the March 2005 revised modifications of the GEF M&E guidance (see also annex 1), priority emphasis must be put on the first three elements, i.e. assessment of the project achievements, sustainability of the project and strength of the project’s M&E system.

Focus and objectives of the evaluation:

(R) Evaluate project achievements at the **impact** level. Annex 1 details the GEF M&E process that should be followed. Monitoring reports of bio-physical indicators, annual progress reports

against the indicators of the project, mid term evaluation and other assessments should be looked at for reference. In terms of outcome, it should be noted that the project document makes reference to a) environmental benefits and b) institutional benefits. The evaluation will then also analyze to what extent the 'expected situation at the end of the project' has been reached.

(R) Review the progress made by the project toward achieving its **sustainability** in terms of the extent to which the benefits of the project will continue, within or outside the project domain, after it has come to an end. Relevant factors include for example: development of a sustainability strategy, establishment of financial and economic instruments and mechanisms, mainstreaming project objectives into the economy or community production activities. Assess the **replicability** of the project using the same management approach and mechanisms in other areas in the country or region.

(R) Review the **Monitoring & Evaluation** procedures put in place by the project, in particular examine the selection of indicators, the mechanisms of review and monitoring, and the adaptive management approach that the project would have followed to respond to changes in the context and responses (see also annex 1).

(R) Review the implementation approach, in particular focusing on:

- **execution arrangements;**
- **institutional arrangements;**
- the **regional benefits** of the project;
- **coordination arrangements** among the various components (in particular as they provide for sharing and networking, and joint reflection to address common problems);
- **Efficiency of the technical backstopping** of the contractors and partners (i.e. the quality of inputs and performance of the project subcontractors).

Review the financial management of the project; assess the cost-effectiveness of the activities undertaken and cost-sharing arrangements mobilized by the project. Include an assessment of:

- (i) The actual project cost by objectives.
- (ii) The cost-effectiveness of achievements
- (iii) Financial management (including disbursement issues)
- (iv) Co-financing³. Present co-financing figures including both what was planned at the beginning of the project and the actual amount that actually materialized.

(R) Assess the degree of **participation** of the various stakeholders, including scientific, technical, and non-governmental organizations, and **involvement** of the general public and public groups in the implementation of the project (see also annex 1). Assess the relevance of the project to the national development priorities and the needs of the direct project stakeholders.

Present and analyze main findings and key lessons, including examples of best practices for future projects in the region or countries. Key lessons should adequately be supported by evidence.

Identify gaps and practical remedial actions directed to the national governments and entities responsible for the sustainability of the changes achieved by the project.

▪ ³ Please see guidelines at the end of these TORs for reporting of co-financing (*Annex 2*)

Respond to comments received from interested parties and integrate them into the final report as necessary (comments will be delivered to the Team Leader and consolidated). Include, in an annex, an explanation of any differences or disagreements between the findings of the evaluation team, the IA/EA or the GEF recipient organizations.

The main stakeholders of this evaluation include: the executing and implementing agencies; the NSC members and the local beneficiaries:

- United Nations Development Programme.
- Ministry of Tourism and Antiquities.
- Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation.
- Ministry of Environment.
- Ministry of Agriculture.
- Jerash Governorate.
- Al Mu'rad Municipality
- Burma Municipality.
- Forestry Department
- Royal Society for the Conservation of Nature
- National Steering Committee Members.

In addition, it is expected that this evaluation will serve to further build capacity in the region for GEF M&E techniques and processes. The international team will be required to devote attention to 'coaching' the national consultant, working with them to define the tools of evaluation and, at the end, evaluating the performance of the national consultants.

Finally, an explanation of the terminology used in this document is attached in **Annexes 3 and 4**.

III. PRODUCTS EXPECTED FROM THE EVALUATION

As a result of the evaluation exercise the following deliverables should be developed:

- **Final evaluation report**, the evaluators will prepare one final evaluation report in English, including an executive summary, fulfilling the evaluation requirements set out in these TORs. The final report is to be cleared and accepted by UNDP before final payment. The final report (including executive summary, but excluding annexes) should not exceed 50 pages. The first draft report should be submitted, in electronic form in MS Word Format, to UNDP Jordan Resident Representative within two weeks of completion of the in-country part of the mission. The initial draft report will be circulated to 1) the UNDP/GEF Regional Coordinator. Then, upon the UNDP Jordan and UNDP/GEF Regional Coordinator clearance, to 2) the executing agency (RSCN) and the Government coordinating agency (MOPIC), for review and comments. Except for comments correcting factual information, the comments relating to the interpretation and opinion of facts will be inserted as a separate annex to the report.
- **An executive summary of findings**, both in English and in Arabic.
- **A power-point presentation** of the findings of the evaluation: Depending upon the complexity of the evaluation findings, UNDP Jordan could consider organizing a half-day stakeholders meeting at which to make a presentation to the partners and stakeholders. The evaluators should present and analyze main findings and key lessons, including examples of best practices for future projects in the country, region and GEF

(technical, political, managerial, etc.). Stakeholders will be invited to comment on the factual accuracy of these findings and provide counter-evidence if necessary. Stakeholders will not comment on the conclusions drawn by the evaluation team from their findings.

The evaluation report should be structured along the following lines:

1. Executive summary (5 pages)
2. Introduction (4 pages)
3. The project(s) and its development context (5 pages)
4. Findings and Conclusions (30 pages)
 - 4.1. Project Formulation
 - 4.2. Project Implementation
 - 4.3. Results
5. Conclusions and Recommendations (3 pages)
6. Lessons learned (3 pages)
7. Evaluation report Annexes

Details pertaining to each of the above chapters are given in **Annex 5**

Although the final report must be cleared and accepted by UNDP before being made public, the UNDP Evaluation Policy is clear the evaluation function should be structurally independent from operational management and decision-making functions in the organization. The evaluation team will be free from undue influence and has full authority to submit report directly to appropriate levels of decision-making. UNDP management will not impose restrictions on the scope, content, comments and recommendations of evaluation reports. In the case of unresolved difference of opinions between any of the parties, UNDP may request the evaluation team to set out the differences in an annex to the final report.

IV. METHODOLOGY OR EVALUATION APPROACH

An outline of an evaluation approach is provided below; however it should be made clear that the evaluation team will be responsible to develop more elaborate evaluation methodologies-described in an “inception report” or “evaluation work plan”, with the different proposed evaluation techniques including field visits, interviews, meetings and other techniques, like questionnaire surveys, focus groups, workshops, etc. - and to submit it to UNDP at the end of the first week of preparation work. Any changes should be in-line with international criteria and professional norms and standards. They must be also cleared by UNDP before being applied by the evaluation team.

Evaluation team will be responsible to develop more elaborate evaluation methodologies described in an “inception report” or “evaluation work plan”, with the different proposed evaluation techniques including field visits, interviews, meetings and other techniques, like questionnaire surveys, focus groups, workshops, etc.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. It must be easily understood by project partners and applicable to the remaining period of project duration.

The evaluation should provide as much gender disaggregated data as possible.

The Evaluation will be carried out by the team through:

- (i) **Documentation review (desk study)**; an important requirement is that much of the information on project reporting, results and processes will be available for the evaluation team. This information will be presented to the evaluation team upon commencement of the evaluation. It will be provided with an annotated cover note describing the relative importance of each document, key sections and issues to be brought to the evaluators' attention. The list of documentation to be reviewed is included in **Annex 6** to the TORs. All of these documents are available from RSCN and/or UNDP. An important requirement is that much of the information on project reporting, results and processes will be available for the evaluation team. This information will be presented to the evaluation team upon commencement of the evaluation. It will be provided with an annotated cover note describing the relative importance of each document, key sections and issues to be brought to the evaluators' attention.

- (ii) **Meeting and conducting Interviews** with all the involved partners in the project as well as representatives of the communities living in the vicinities of the Dibeen Reserve site. A proposed field mission schedule is attached to this TORs **in Annex 7**. The evaluation consultants should at least interview the following people organizations and persons as a minimum
 - **UNDP:** Resident Representative, DRR, Environment Unit, and GEF Regional Technical Adviser, Biodiversity (Beirut).
 - **RSCN:** Director, all relevant units and experts.
 - **Project team,** Dibeen Project Manager, technical and administrative team.
 - **Key staff ministries/departments**
 - Ministry of Environment.
 - Ministry of Agriculture
 - Forestry Department
 - Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation
 - Ministry of Tourism and Antiquities.
 - **Local Municipalities Representatives:** Al Murad and Burma Mayors.
 - **Other organizations** – IUCN, SGP, Concerned NGOs, Research Centers and Universities
 - **Project National Steering Committee** – there will be opportunities to meet and have discussions with a number of individual members of these committees during visits to relevant agencies.
 - **Dibeen resource users and visitors:** through the use of targeted surveys or visits to adjacent farms, villages and towns

During these meetings, the evaluators will be able to use the assessment technique such as questionnaires, focus group discussion, checklists, etc ...

- (iii) **Field visits** should be made to Dibeen Nature Reserve.
- (iv) **Semi-structured interviews** – the team should develop a process for semi-structured interviews with the different interviewees to ensure that the different aspects are covered. Focus group discussions with project beneficiaries will be held as deemed necessary by the evaluation team.
- (v) **Participatory techniques** and other approaches for the gathering and analysis of data.

V. EVALUATION TEAM

The equivalent of one international evaluator and one national evaluator has been budgeted for this evaluation team. The team is expected to combine international caliber evaluation expertise with knowledge of the national protected area context.

Specifically, the Team Leader will perform the following tasks:

- Lead and manage the evaluation mission;
- Design the detailed evaluation scope and methodology (including the methods for data collection and analysis);
- Decide the division of labor within the evaluation team;
- Conduct an analysis of the outcome, outputs and partnership strategy (as per the scope of the evaluation described above);
- Draft related parts of the evaluation report; and
- Finalize the whole evaluation report.

The International Evaluator (the team leader) should:

- He/she shall possess a solid experience in evaluating internationally funded natural resource management projects.
- Recent knowledge of result-based management evaluation methodologies
- Recent knowledge of participatory monitoring approaches
- Recent knowledge of the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy
- Experience applying UNDP's results-based evaluation policies and procedures
- Competence in Adaptive Management, as applied to conservation or natural resource management projects
- Recognized expertise in the management of Mediterranean pine, or pine-oak forest ecosystems, desirably with a high University Degree (Ph.D/ M.Sc.) in the field of environment and experience (> or = 10 years) at the regional or international level.
- Familiarity with protected area policies and management structures in Jordan
- Demonstrable analytical skills
- Experience with multilateral or bilateral supported conservation projects
- Evaluator should have an updated knowledge of GEF policies and strategies.
- Excellent English Communication Skills (oral, aural, written and presentation).

- His/Her focus will primarily be on assessing institutional arrangements and management of projects and governance, as well as policy impacts on stakeholders and institutionalization of the project at the national and local levels.
- He/she will also be responsible for overseeing the preparation and implementation of the evaluation, under the leadership of the UNDP Programme Unit.

The National Consultant:

The Additional Consultant will provide input in reviewing all project documentation and will provide the Team Leader with a compilation of information prior to the evaluation mission. Specifically, the Additional Consultant will perform tasks with a focus on:

- Review documents;
- Prepare a list of the outputs achieved under project;
- Organize the mission programme and provide translation/interpretation when necessary;
- Participate in the design of the evaluation methodology;
- Conduct an analysis of the outcome, outputs and partnership strategy (as per the scope of the evaluation described above);
- Draft related parts of the evaluation report;
- Assist Team Leader in finalizing document through incorporating suggestions received on draft related to his/her assigned sections.

The objectives to have a national consultant are:

- 1) Build capacity in the region and identify national evaluators that can be groomed to become international evaluators that would be skilled in GEF M&E techniques;
- 2) Provide the national “reality check” thought the evolution process; and
- 3) Fully contribute to the analysis and preparation of the reprot.

The national consultant must have:

- He/she shall possess a high University Degree (Ph.D / M.Sc.) in the field of environment and natural resources conservation.
- Should have an experience in protected areas management with considerable experience at the regional level.
- He/she will have expertise in socio-economic approach, practical knowledge of the integration of conservation and development concepts, and special strengths in assessing livelihood benefits and people/stakeholders participation in protected areas management and processes.
- able to speak Arabic fluently and possess sufficient Arabic reading and writing skills to be able to develop and interpret a user survey in Arabic
- Has excellent English communication skills (oral, aural, written and presentation).

Both consultants will be recruited by UNDP Jordan, in consultation with UNDP – GEF Regional Coordination Unit (Beirut). Finally both consultants should have the ability to train and coach and the capacity to transfer knowledge and skills.

Proposals will be accepted from recognized consulting firms to field a complete team with the required expertise within the evaluation budget. Or alternatively, joint proposals from two independent firms are welcome.

If a proposal is accepted from a consulting firm, the firm will be held responsible for the delivery of the evaluation products and therefore has responsibility for team management arrangements. The Team Leader will have overall responsibility for the delivery of the evaluation products. Team roles and responsibilities will be reflected in the individual contracts.

The evaluation will be undertaken in-line with GEF principles⁴:

- Independence
- Impartiality
- Transparency
- Disclosure
- Ethical
- Partnership
- Competencies and Capacities
- Credibility
- Utility

The evaluation firms must be independent from both the policy-making process and the delivery and management of assistance. Therefore applications will not be considered from evaluators who have had any direct involvement with the design or implementation of the project. Any previous association with the project, Dibeen Nature Reserve, RSCN or other partners/stakeholders must be disclosed in the application. This applies equally to firms submitting proposals as it does to individual evaluators. If selected, failure to make the above disclosures will be considered just grounds for immediate contract termination, without recompense. In such circumstances, all notes, reports and other documentation produced by the evaluator will be retained by UNDP.

Supervision and reporting arrangements:

The Team leader will have overall responsibility and accountability for the organization of the mission and for the production of the output. He/she will report technically and administratively to the UNDP Jordan office / Environment Specialist, who will agree with him/her on the timetable and outputs.

Application process:

Applicants are requested to send in **electronic versions**:

1. Current and complete C.V. in English with indication of the e-mail and phone contact.
2. Company profile in case of Firms.
3. An expression of interest
4. Technical Offer: A proposed methodology (no more than 10 pages outlining the approach and methodology they will apply to achieve the assignment).
5. Financial Offer: Price offer indicating the itemized costs (daily fee and estimated travel costs in country and to country/for international) and the total cost of the assignment.

⁴ See p.16 of the GEF's Monitoring and Evaluation Policy

The total cost of the final evaluation should be estimated as per the following budget lines:

	<i>Price per item</i>	<i>Total</i>
<i>For the international consultant</i>		
Fee per day		
Travel Expenses (on round trip, per diem and Terminal fees)		
<i>For the national consultant</i>		
Fee per day		
Travel Expenses (local transport for the team)		
Misc. (office space, internet connections, printing, etc...)		

to:

Ms. Amal Dababseh
Environment Specialist
UNDP Jordan

Obadah Ibn Al Samet Street
Shmeisani
P.O.Box 94 1631
Amman 11194 Jordan

Tel.: +962 6 566 8171 ext. 220
Fax: +962 6 5676 582

amal.dababseh@undp.org

Dateline for applications is **10 April, 2007**.

Due to the large number of applicants, UNDP regrets that it is unable to inform unsuccessful candidates about the outcome or status of the recruitment process.

UNDP is an equal opportunity employer and all qualified candidates are encouraged to apply.

VI. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

Management arrangements:

The UNDP Jordan Country Office is the main operational point for the evaluation. It will be responsible for liaising with the project team and the national evaluator to set up the stakeholder interviews, arrange the field visits, and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team. These Terms of Reference follow the UNDP GEF policies and procedures, and together with the final agenda will be agreed upon by the UNDP/GEF/Regional Coordinating Unit and UNDP Jordan Country Office.

Time frame:

The time of the evaluation will be from early-June to end-July 2007, with the draft report being available for comment 2 weeks after the completion of the mission. **The consultancy is**

estimated at 23 working days for the international consultant and 26 working days for the national consultant. A schedule of activities is set out below.

- 1- **ONE week preparation before field work (2-7 June 2007: 3 working days for the international consultant and 6 working days for the national consultant):** to review documents, obtain necessary non-project background or supporting documents, finalize evaluation methodology, prepare learning sessions, surveys etc, develop hypotheses about the project strategies and management and consider methods for testing hypotheses. The national consultant will be responsible, with the project manager and UNDP responsible officer, to set the meeting, interviews and the semi-structure meeting in collaboration with the project management unit.
- 2- **TWO working weeks field works in Jordan (9 – 21 June 2007 – 12 working days):** evaluators are expected to work 6-day weeks when on mission. With the evaluation's emphasis on the project's adaptive management framework, the team is expected to work closely with the project team. The in-country period will include learning sessions with the project team and other adaptive management strengthening measures.
- 3- **TWO weeks (23 June- 5 July 2007- 6 working days)** after the mission to prepare the first draft of the evaluation report.
- 4- **TWO weeks for comments on the draft report (7 - 19 July 2007):** The draft final evaluation report should be submitted to the Resident Representative of UNDP Jordan. UNDP and the project's stakeholders should analyze and provide comments.
- 5- **ONE week to integrate the comments and finalize the evaluation report (21-26 July 2007- 2 working days):** The evaluation team will incorporate the comments into the final version within one week of receiving the comments. The evaluation team is responsible for ensuring matters of fact are revised in the report, but matters of opinion may be reflected at their discretion.
- 6- UNDP is required to prepare a management response to the final evaluation's recommendation within **one month after the evaluation report is finalized.** This should be done in close consultation with key stakeholders. The management response to evaluations should be clear and comprehensive.

The detailed suggested time schedule for the final evaluation, to be adapted by the team as appropriate, is drafted in the table below.

Resources required and logistical support needed:

- (i) It is expected that at least one of the concerned UNDP staff, the Environment Specialist, would accompany the team during the visits in order to facilitate and provide clarifications where necessary.
- (ii) For the site visits and stakeholders' meetings and interviews, the project office, in close consultation with the evaluation team and the UNDP, will be responsible for

organizing the visits, meetings and field trips of the consultants during the period of their mission in Jordan.

Suggested time schedule for the final evaluation, to be adapted by the team as appropriate

		Responsible / support	Week 1	Week 2	Week 3	Week 4	Week 5	Week 6	Week 7	Week 8
Week beginning with			3 June	10 June	17 June	24 June	1 July	8 July	15 July	22-27 July
Pre-mission (3 - 7 June 2007)										
	Desk Review	Mission team								
	Design approach and methods	Mission team								
	Finalize evaluation methodology	Mission team								
	Develop hypotheses about the project strategies and management	Mission team								
	Prepare surveys	Mission team								
	Prepare learning sessions	Mission team								
Mission (7 – 21 June 2007)										
	Briefing for evaluators	UNDP								
	Meeting with partners, PMU, NSC...	Mission team/ UNDP & RSCN								
	Field visit	Mission team/ UNDP & RSCN								
	Interviews	Mission team/ UNDP & RSCN								
	Debriefings / Presentation	Mission team								
	Report writing- drafting	Mission team								
After-mission (23 June - 5 July 2007) & (21- 26 July 2007)										
	Finalize report	Mission team								
	Report Submission – UNDP and Circulation of Report for comment	Team leader, UNDP, RSCN...								
	Review and final submission of the report	Team Leader								

VII. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION- SPECIFIC ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED.

The scope of the evaluation will cover:

- The entire GEF-funded project components of the Dibeen Project, including those undertaken by UNDP Jordan and the RSCN.
- The co-financed components such as the UNDP TRAC fund, the in-kind contributions for the Royal Society for the Conservation of Nature and the local counterparts contributions, which have been included in the project work plan.
- The World Bank/ WWF Alliance for forest conservation and sustainable use has developed a **management effectiveness-tracking tool** that has been used by the Global Environment facility. This tool must be applied by the evaluation team, for assessing the final results. The project teams are expected to provide a draft of the completed Tracking Tool before the evaluation commences. As requested by the UNDP. The Dibeen project falls under GEF Strategic Priority BD1 - Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Areas.
- It should also give some attention to the forested area managed by the Ministry of Agriculture surrounding the Nature Reserve. In the project document the Nature Reserve was to be developed within the context of a 60km² Regional Forest Park. This area needs to be considered for at least the following reasons:
 - To assess the impact on the integrity and health of the Dibeen ecosystem of the failure of the Regional Forest Park to materialize
 - To assess the resilience and resistance of the Dibeen ecosystem to potential perturbations in the surrounding forested area
 - To use the essentially unmanaged forested areas to compare the effectiveness of the Nature Reserve's management interventions.
- The Final Evaluation should reach findings on the implications of the proposed development to the viability of Dibeen's forest ecosystem and make recommendations on how the relevant officials (UNDP, Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry Department, Ministry of Environment, RSCN, Municipalities, Civil Society etc) should tackle the issue.

The final Evaluation will cover the following aspects:

- An analysis of the attainment of global environmental objective⁵, project objectives⁶, delivery and completion of project outputs/activities⁷, and outcomes/impacts⁸ (based on indicators).
- Evaluation of project achievements according to GEF Project Review Criteria:

1. Progress Towards Results

- *Changes in development conditions.* Focus on the perception of change among stakeholders, including Dibeen visitors (i.e. user surveys). But also answer the question “has Dibeen Nature Reserve been established?”

⁵ This should be the highest level in the project's logical framework, which is often labeled the “global” to which the project contributes. UNDP describes it as “Development objective”.

⁶ “Project objective” are the second highest level of objectives in the logical framework.

⁷ This refers to outputs, activities or components as described in the Project Document that will contribute to the attainment of the objectives.

⁸ Proposed changes to and effects on the environment and society to be caused by the project

- Measurement of change: Progress towards results should be based on a comparison of indicators before and after (so far) the project intervention. Progress can also be assessed by comparing conditions in the project site to conditions in similar unmanaged sites (areas of the surrounding forest lands, for instance).
- Project strategy: how and why outcomes (listed as outputs in the project document) and strategies contribute to the achievement of the expected results.
 - Examine their relevance and whether they provide the most effective route towards results.
 - Do the 3 outcomes developed during the inception phase still represent the best project strategy for achieving the project objectives (in light of updated underlying factors)? Consider alternatives.
 - What impact has the failure of the Regional Forest Park to materialize had on the project strategy?
- Sustainability: Extent to which the benefits of the project will continue, within or outside the project domain, after it has come to an end. Relevant factors include for example: development of a sustainability strategy, establishment of financial and economic instruments and mechanisms, mainstreaming project objectives into the economy or community production activities. The question whether Dibeem will receive future support from RSCN after the project ends needs to be addressed, as this affects the project's approach to sustainability.
- Gender perspective: Extent to which the project accounts for gender differences when developing and applying project interventions. How are gender considerations mainstreamed into project interventions and the management of the Nature Reserve? Suggest measures to strengthen the project's gender approach.

2. Project's Adaptive Management Framework

(a) Monitoring Systems

- Assess the monitoring tools currently being used:
 - Do they provide the necessary information?
 - Do they involve key partners?
 - Are they efficient?
 - Are additional tools required?
- Reconstruct baseline data if necessary⁹. Reconstruction should follow participatory processes and could be achieved in conjunction with a learning exercise¹⁰
- Ensure the monitoring system, including performance indicators, at least meets GEF minimum requirements¹¹. Apply SMART indicators as necessary.
- Apply the GEF Tracking Tool and provide a description of comparison with initial application of the tool during the inception phase.

(b) Risk Management

⁹ See p.67 of UNDP's "Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluation for Results", available at <http://www.undp.org/gef/05/monitoring/policies.html>

¹⁰ See Annex C of "Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation: approaches to sustainability", available at <http://www.undp.org/gef/05/monitoring/policies.html>

¹¹ See section 3.2 of the GEF's "Monitoring and Evaluation Policies and Procedures", available at <http://www.undp.org/gef/05/monitoring/policies.html>

- Validate whether the risks identified in the project document and PIRs are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate. If not, explain why. Describe any additional risks identified and suggest risk ratings and possible risk management strategies to be adopted
- Assess the project's risk identification and management systems:
 - Is the UNDP-GEF Risk Management System¹² appropriately applied (with particular emphasis on the financial risks related to micro-finance)?
 - How can the UNDP-GEF Risk Management System be used to strengthen project management?

(c) Work Planning

- Assess the use of the logical framework as a management tool during implementation and any changes made to it
 - Ensure the logical framework meets UNDP-GEF requirements in terms of format and content
 - What changes were made to accommodate the failure of the Regional Forest Park to materialize?
- Assess the use of routinely updated workplans. How have they been used to manage the shift from 7 outputs in the project document to 3 outcomes developed during the inception phase?
- Assess the use of electronic information technologies to support implementation, participation and monitoring, as well as other project activities
- Ensure work planning processes are result-based¹³.
- Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions. Any irregularities must be noted.

(d) Reporting

- Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management
- Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

3. Underlying Factors

- Assess the underlying factors beyond the project's immediate control that influence outcomes and results. Consider the appropriateness and effectiveness of the project's management strategies for these factors.
- Re-test the assumptions made by the project management and identify new assumptions that should be made
- Assess the effect of any incorrect assumptions made by the project (such as the Regional Forestry Park)
- Pay particular attention to the following factors:
 - The redevelopment of land owned by the Social Security Corporation within the Nature Reserve
 - The possible future amendment to Agriculture Law No. 44 of 2002. Consider the successful RSCN-led campaign against the proposed amendment in early 2006.

¹² UNDP-GEF's system is based on the Atlas Risk Module. See the UNDP-GEF Risk Management Strategy resource kit, available as Annex XI at <http://www.undp.org/gef/05/monitoring/policies.html>

¹³ RBM Support documents are available at <http://www.undp.org/eo/methodologies.htm>

- Any unclear or misunderstood institutional responsibilities between RSCN and Ministry of Agriculture, compounded by the roles of two municipalities covering the Nature Reserve.

4. UNDP Contribution

- Assess the role of UNDP against the requirements set out in the UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Results. Consider:
 - Field visits
 - TPR
 - Steering Committee/TOR follow-up and analysis
 - APR/PIR preparation and follow-up
 - GEF guidance
 - Quarterly Progress and Financial Reports.
 - Workplans
 - Combined Delivery Report
- Consider the new UNDP requirements outlined in the UNDP User Guide¹⁴, especially the Project Assurance role, and ensure they are incorporated into the project's adaptive management framework
- Assess the contribution to the project from UNDP "soft" assistance (i.e. policy advice & dialogue, advocacy, and coordination). Suggest measures to strengthen UNDP's soft assistance to the project management.

5. Partnership Strategy

- Assess how partners are involved in the project's adaptive management framework:
 - Involving partners and stakeholders in the selection of indicators and other measures of performance
 - Using already existing data and statistics
 - Analysing progress towards results and determining project strategies.
- Identify opportunities for stronger substantive partnerships between RSCN, UNDP and government counterparts, with particular reference to:
 - The proposed redevelopment of land owned by the Social Security Corporation, the application of an international standard EIA and the potential for developing a Public-Private Partnership between the developers and the Nature Reserve
 - The development of the micro-finance component of the project, incorporating UNDP's world-wide experience
- Assess how local stakeholders (Dibeen resource users and visitors) participate in project management and decision-making. Include an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the approach adopted by the project and suggestions for improvement if necessary.
- Consider the dissemination of project information to partners and stakeholders and if necessary suggest more appropriate mechanisms.

The evaluation will include **ratings** on the following aspects: (1) Sustainability; (2) Outcome/Achievement of objectives (the extent to which the project's environmental and development objectives were achieved); (3) Implementation Approach; (4) Stakeholder Participation/Public Involvement; and (5) Monitoring & Evaluation. The evaluators should use a six values rating system

¹⁴ The UNDP User Guide is currently only available on UNDP's intranet. However UNDP can provide the necessary section on roles and responsibility from <http://content.undp.org/go/userguide/results/rmoverview/progprojorg/?src=print>

(High Satisfactory – HS, Satisfactory – S, Moderately Satisfactory, MS, Moderately Unsatisfactory – MS, Unsatisfactory U, Highly Unsatisfactory HU). The benefits of a six value system is that it will allow for a more balanced set of options (three options on the satisfactory side and three options on the unsatisfactory side) while at the same time allowing for a category that while not quite satisfactory is not low enough to be unsatisfactory.

The team leader is responsible for agreeing evaluation methodologies for data verification during the field visits and stakeholder meetings (questionnaires, surveys, interview techniques etc) and presenting them to UNDP before the country visit to commence for endorsement.

Annex 1. Explanation on Terminology Provided in the GEF Guidelines to Terminal Evaluations

Implementation Approach includes an analysis of the project's logical framework, adaptation to changing conditions (adaptive management), partnerships in implementation arrangements, changes in project design, and overall project management.

Some elements of an effective implementation approach may include:

- The logical framework used during implementation as a management and M&E tool
- Effective partnerships arrangements established for implementation of the project with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region
- Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project implementation
- Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management.

Country Ownership/Driveness is the relevance of the project to national development and environmental agendas, recipient country commitment, and regional and international agreements where applicable. Project Concept has its origin within the national sectoral and development plans

Some elements of effective country ownership/driveness may include:

- Project Concept has its origin within the national sectoral and development plans
- Outcomes (or potential outcomes) from the project have been incorporated into the national sectoral and development plans
- Relevant country representatives (e.g., governmental official, civil society, etc.) are actively involved in project identification, planning and/or implementation
- The recipient government has maintained financial commitment to the project
- The government has approved policies and/or modified regulatory frameworks in line with the project's objectives

For projects whose main focus and actors are in the private-sector rather than public-sector (e.g., IFC projects), elements of effective country ownership/driveness that demonstrate the interest and commitment of the local private sector to the project may include:

- The number of companies that participated in the project by: receiving technical assistance, applying for financing, attending dissemination events, adopting environmental standards promoted by the project, etc.
- Amount contributed by participating companies to achieve the environmental benefits promoted by the project, including: equity invested, guarantees provided, co-funding of project activities, in-kind contributions, etc.
- Project's collaboration with industry associations

Stakeholder Participation/Public Involvement consist of three related, and often overlapping processes: information dissemination, consultation, and "stakeholder" participation. Stakeholders are the individuals, groups, institutions, or other bodies that have an interest or stake in the outcome of the GEF-financed project. The term also applies to those potentially adversely affected by a project.

Examples of effective public involvement include:

Information dissemination

- Implementation of appropriate outreach/public awareness campaigns

Consultation and stakeholder participation

- Consulting and making use of the skills, experiences and knowledge of NGOs, community and local groups, the private and public sectors, and academic institutions in the design, implementation, and evaluation of project activities

Stakeholder participation

- Project institutional networks well placed within the overall national or community organizational structures, for example, by building on the local decision making structures, incorporating local knowledge, and devolving project management responsibilities to the local organizations or communities as the project approaches closure
- Building partnerships among different project stakeholders
- Fulfillment of commitments to local stakeholders and stakeholders considered to be adequately involved.

Sustainability measures the extent to which benefits continue, within or outside the project domain, from a particular project or program after GEF assistance/external assistance has come to an end. Relevant factors to improve the sustainability of project outcomes include:

- Development and implementation of a sustainability strategy.
- Establishment of the financial and economic instruments and mechanisms to ensure the ongoing flow of benefits once the GEF assistance ends (from the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and market transformations to promote the project's objectives).
- Development of suitable organizational arrangements by public and/or private sector.
- Development of policy and regulatory frameworks that further the project objectives.
- Incorporation of environmental and ecological factors affecting future flow of benefits.
- Development of appropriate institutional capacity (systems, structures, staff, expertise, etc.) .
- Identification and involvement of champions (i.e. individuals in government and civil society who can promote sustainability of project outcomes).
- Achieving social sustainability, for example, by mainstreaming project activities into the economy or community production activities.
- Achieving stakeholders consensus regarding courses of action on project activities.

Replication approach, in the context of GEF projects, is defined as lessons and experiences coming out of the project that are replicated or scaled up in the design and implementation of other projects. Replication can have two aspects, replication proper (lessons and experiences are replicated in different geographic area) or scaling up (lessons and experiences are replicated within the same geographic area but funded by other sources). Examples of replication approaches include:

- Knowledge transfer (i.e., dissemination of lessons through project result documents, training workshops, information exchange, a national and regional forum, etc).
- Expansion of demonstration projects.
- Capacity building and training of individuals, and institutions to expand the project's achievements in the country or other regions.
- Use of project-trained individuals, institutions or companies to replicate the project's outcomes in other regions.

Financial Planning includes actual project cost by activity, financial management (including disbursement issues), and co-financing. If a financial audit has been conducted the major findings should be presented in the TE.

Effective financial plans include:

- Identification of potential sources of co-financing as well as leveraged and associated financing¹⁵.
- Strong financial controls, including reporting, and planning that allow the project management to make informed decisions regarding the budget at any time, allows for a proper and timely flow of funds, and for the payment of satisfactory project deliverables
- Due diligence due diligence in the management of funds and financial audits.

Co financing includes: Grants, Loans/Concessional (compared to market rate), Credits, Equity investments, In-kind support, Other contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector and beneficiaries. Please refer to Council documents on co-financing for definitions, such as GEF/C.20/6.

Leveraged resources are additional resources—beyond those committed to the project itself at the time of approval—that are mobilized later as a direct result of the project. Leveraged resources can be financial or in-kind and they may be from other donors, NGO’s, foundations, governments, communities or the private sector. Please briefly describe the resources the project has leveraged since inception and indicate how these resources are contributing to the project’s ultimate objective.

Cost-effectiveness assesses the achievement of the environmental and developmental objectives as well as the project’s outputs in relation to the inputs, costs, and implementing time. It also examines the project’s compliance with the application of the incremental cost concept. Cost-effective factors include:

- Compliance with the incremental cost criteria (e.g. GEF funds are used to finance a component of a project that would not have taken place without GEF funding.) and securing co-funding and associated funding.
- The project completed the planned activities and met or exceeded the expected outcomes in terms of achievement of Global Environmental and Development Objectives according to schedule, and as cost-effective as initially planned.
- The project used either a benchmark approach or a comparison approach (did not exceed the costs levels of similar projects in similar contexts)

Monitoring & Evaluation. Monitoring is the periodic oversight of a process, or the implementation of an activity, which seeks to establish the extent to which inputs, work schedules, other required actions and outputs are proceeding according to plan, so that timely action can be taken to correct the deficiencies detected. Evaluation is a process by which program inputs, activities and results are analyzed and judged explicitly against benchmarks or baseline conditions using performance indicators. This will allow project managers and planners to make decisions based on the evidence of information on the project implementation stage, performance indicators, level of funding still available, etc, building on the project’s logical framework.

Monitoring and Evaluation includes activities to measure the project’s achievements such as identification of performance indicators, measurement procedures, and determination of baseline conditions. Projects are required to implement plans for monitoring and evaluation with adequate funding and appropriate staff and include activities such as description of data sources and methods for data collection, collection of baseline data, and stakeholder participation. Given the long-term nature of many GEF projects, projects are also encouraged to include long-term monitoring plans that are sustainable after project completion.

¹⁵ Please refer to Council documents on co-financing for definitions, such as GEF/C.20/6. The following page presents a table to be used for reporting co-financing.

Annex 2. Financial Planning
C-financing

Co financing (Type/Source)	IA own Financing (mill US\$)		Government (mill US\$)		Other* (mill US\$)		Total (mill US\$)		Total Disbursement (mill US\$)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual
- Grants										
- Loans/Concessional (compared to market rate)										
- Credits										
- Equity investments										
- In-kind support										
- Other (*)										
Totals										

* Other is referred to contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector and beneficiaries.

Leveraged Resources

Leveraged resources are additional resources—beyond those committed to the project itself at the time of approval—that are mobilized later as a direct result of the project. Leveraged resources can be financial or in-kind and they may be from other donors, NGO's, foundations, governments, communities or the private sector. Please briefly describe the resources the project has leveraged since inception and indicate how these resources are contributing to the project's ultimate objective.

Annex 3. Transitional Modifications

In general the new GEF office of M&E would like you to ask the evaluators to concentrate on assessing the project's achievements and shortcomings regarding outcomes and two of the GEF Project Review Criteria: sustainability and project M&E systems, and to provide ratings for these three areas. Furthermore, we request that the evaluators incorporate the following four considerations in the terminal evaluations:

1. When assessing project outcomes the evaluators should consider the focal area questions presented in the **Annex 4**, which draw heavily on the program indicators developed by the task forces for the biodiversity, climate change and international waters focal areas. In the case of Biodiversity projects we encourage evaluators to also use the tracking tools developed by the taskforce.
2. When assessing sustainability, terminal evaluations should identify and assess the key conditions or factors that are likely to contribute or detract to the persistence of benefits after project ends. Some of these factors might be outcomes of the project, i.e. stronger institutional capacities, legal frameworks, socio-economic incentives /or public awareness. Nevertheless sustainability assessment should explain how the outcomes of some project components enhance the likelihood that overall project benefits will continue. The sustainability assessment should also explain how other important contextual factors that are not outcomes of the project will affect sustainability . We propose that the evaluators in their analysis of sustainability address at least the following three aspects of sustainability:
 - Financial resources . What is the likelihood that financial and economic resources will be available so that the project outcomes/benefits will be sustained once the GEF assistance ends?
 - Stakeholder ownership . Do the various key stakeholders perceive a continued flow of benefits to be in their interest?
 - Institutional framework and governance . Are the legal frameworks, policies and governance and public administration structures and processes in place to support the objectives of the project and the continued flow of benefits? While responding to this question the evaluators should consider if the required systems for accountability and transparency and the required technical know how are in place.
3. When assessing project M&E systems we propose that the evaluators use the following criteria. Whether an appropriate M&E system for the project was put in place and whether this allows for tracking of progress towards projects objectives. M & E tools might include a baseline, clear and practical indicators and data analysis systems, or studies to assess results planned and carried out at specific times in the project. Whether the capacity and resources to implement the M&E system were in place. Whether the M&E system was used for project management.
4. We propose that, instead of the instructions provided in paragraph number 4 of the May 2003 Guidelines, as of this year the evaluators use a six values rating system (Highly Satisfactory-HS, Satisfactory-S, Moderately Satisfactory MS, Moderately Unsatisfactory-MS, Unsatisfactory U, Highly Unsatisfactory HU). The benefit of a six value system is that it will allow for a more balanced set of options (three options on the satisfactory side and three options on the unsatisfactory side) while at the same time allowing for a category that while not quite satisfactory is not low enough to be unsatisfactory. This is an improvement on a four values rating system in as far as a four value systems would either have three values on the satisfactory

(HS, S and MS) and one on the unsatisfactory side (U) and thus would be unbalanced, or when being balanced (HS, S, MU and U) would not allow for a value that is not good enough to be fully satisfactory but is not low enough to be rated as unsatisfactory.

Annex 4. Frequently expected outcomes in selected GEF focal areas

The following questions are based on the focal area program indicators and will be used to guide the assessment of project outcomes and objectives in the focal areas of biodiversity, climate change and international waters. In addition to the focal area program indicators, the project's contribution to replication or scaling up of innovative practices or mechanisms that support the project objectives will also be assessed as part of the outcomes. All questions of a specific focal area may not apply to a single one project.

Biodiversity¹⁶

1. How has the project contributed to establish and extend protected areas, and improve their management?
2. How has the project contributed to conserve and ensure sustainable use of biological resources in the production environment (landscapes and seascapes)?
3. Has the project contributed to improve the enabling environment through effective policies, institutional capacity building, increased public awareness, appropriate stakeholder involvement, promoting conservation and sustainable use research, leveraging resources and providing incentives for conservation? Explain.
4. How has the project facilitated fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising from the use of genetic resources?
5. What is the project contribution to replication or scaling up of innovative practices or mechanisms that support the project objectives?

¹⁶ Based on indicators of "Measuring results of the GEF biodiversity program. Monitoring and Evaluation Working Paper 12." August 2003

Annex 5: Suggested format for the Final Evaluation report – Consolidated report

1. Executive summary (5 pages)

- Brief description of project
- Context and purpose of the evaluation
- Main conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned

2. Introduction (4 pages)

- Purpose of the evaluation
- Key issues addressed
- Methodology of the evaluation
- Structure of the evaluation

3. The project(s) and its development context (5 pages)

- Project start and its duration
- Problems that the project seek to address
- Immediate and development objectives of the project
- Main stakeholders
- Results expected

4. Findings and Conclusions (30 pages)

In addition to a descriptive assessment, all **criteria marked with (R) should be rated** using the following divisions: Highly Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Marginally Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory and N/A.

4.4. Project Formulation

- Conceptualization/Design (R). This should assess the approach used in design and an appreciation of the appropriateness of problem conceptualization and whether the selected intervention strategy addressed the root causes and principal threats in the project area. It should also include an assessment of the logical framework and whether the different project components and activities proposed to achieve the objective were appropriate, viable and responded to contextual institutional, legal and regulatory settings of the project. It should also assess the indicators defined for guiding implementation and measurement of achievement and whether lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) were incorporated into project design.
-
- Country-ownership/Drivenness. Assess the extent to which the project idea/conceptualization had its origin within national, sectoral and development plans and focuses on national environment and development interests.
-
- Stakeholder participation (R) Assess information dissemination, consultation, and “stakeholder” participation in design stages.
-
- Replication approach. Determine the ways in which lessons and experiences coming out of the project were/are to be replicated or scaled up in the design and implementation of other projects (this also related to actual practices undertaken during implementation).
-

- Other aspects to assess in the review of Project formulation approaches would be UNDP comparative advantage as IA for this project; the consideration of linkages between projects and other interventions within the sector and the definition of clear and appropriate management arrangements at the design stage.

4.2. Project Implementation

- Implementation Approach (R). This should include assessments of the following aspects:
 - (i) The use of the logical framework as a management tool during implementation and any changes made to this as a response to changing conditions and/or feedback from M and E activities if required.
 - (ii) Other elements that indicate adaptive management such as comprehensive and realistic work plans routinely developed that reflect adaptive management and/or; changes in management arrangements to enhance implementation.
 - (iii) The project's use/establishment of electronic information technologies to support implementation, participation and monitoring, as well as other project activities.
 - (iv) The general operational relationships between the institutions involved and others and how these relationships have contributed to effective implementation and achievement of project objectives.
 - (v) Technical capacities associated with the project and their role in project development, management and achievements.
- Monitoring and evaluation (R). Including an assessment as to whether there has been adequate periodic oversight of activities during implementation to establish the extent to which inputs, work schedules, other required actions and outputs are proceeding according to plan; whether formal evaluations have been held and whether action has been taken on the results of this monitoring oversight and evaluation reports.
- Stakeholder participation (R). This should include assessments of the mechanisms for information dissemination in project implementation and the extent of stakeholder participation in management, emphasizing the following:
 - The production and dissemination of information generated by the project.
 - (ii) Local resource users and NGOs participation in project implementation and decision making and an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the approach adopted by the project in this arena.
 - (a) The establishment of partnerships and collaborative relationships developed by the project with local, national and international entities and the effects they have had on project implementation.
- Involvement of governmental institutions in project implementation, the extent of governmental support of the project.

-
- Financial Planning: Including an assessment of:
 -
 - (i) The actual project cost by objectives, outputs, activities
 -
 - (ii) The cost-effectiveness of achievements
 -
 - (iii) Financial management (including disbursement issues)
 -
 - (iv) Co-financing ¹⁷
 -
- Sustainability. Extent to which the benefits of the project will continue, within or outside the project domain, after it has come to an end. Relevant factors include for example: development of a sustainability strategy, establishment of financial and economic instruments and mechanisms, mainstreaming project objectives into the economy or community production activities.
 -
 - Execution and implementation modalities. This should consider the effectiveness of the UNDP counterpart and Project Co-ordination Unit participation in selection, recruitment, assignment of experts, consultants and national counterpart staff members and in the definition of tasks and responsibilities; quantity, quality and timeliness of inputs for the project with respect to execution responsibilities, enactment of necessary legislation and budgetary provisions and extent to which these may have affected implementation and sustainability of the Project; quality and timeliness of inputs by UNDP and GoC and other parties responsible for providing inputs to the project, and the extent to which this may have affected the smooth implementation of the project.

4.3. Results

- Attainment of Outcomes/ Achievement of objectives (R): Including a description *and rating* of the extent to which the project's objectives (environmental and developmental) were achieved using Highly Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Marginally Satisfactory, and Unsatisfactory ratings. If the project did not establish a baseline (initial conditions), the evaluators should seek to determine it through the use of special methodologies so that achievements, results and impacts can be properly established.
 -
 - This section should also include reviews of the following:
 - Sustainability: Including an appreciation of the extent to which benefits continue, within or outside the project domain after GEF assistance/external assistance in this phase has come to an end.
- Contribution to upgrading skills of the national staff

5. Recommendations (3 pages)

- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project

▪ ¹⁷ Please see guidelines at the end of Annex 1 of these TORs for reporting of co-financing

- Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
- Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives

6. Lessons learned (3 pages)

This should highlight the best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success.

7. Evaluation report Annexes

- Evaluation TORs
- Itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- Summary of field visits
- List of documents reviewed
- Questionnaire used and summary of results
- Comments by stakeholders (only in case of discrepancies with evaluation findings and conclusions)

ANNEX 6: LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE EVALUATORS

The following documents are essential reading for the evaluators:

- Project Document signed by Jordan and RSCN
- Website – www.undp-jordan.org, www.rscn.org.jo and www.undp.org/gef/05/monitoring/policies.html
- M & E Operational Guidelines, all monitoring reports prepared by the project
- Financial and Administration guidelines for RSCN
- Training Strategy and assessment
- Communications and Networking Strategy
- Quarterly Progress Report and detailed activity progress reports
- Minutes of Executive Steering Committee, Tripartite Programme Review and Programme Management Committee meetings.
- Presentations and other inputs to Executive Steering Committee, TPR and Programme Management Committee meetings
- Combined Delivery Report
- Atlas Reports (such as the AWP and Project Budget Balance report)
- Project Implementation Reviews
- Inception Report
- UNDP User Guide (relevant sections)
- Mid-term Evaluation Report, the evaluation debriefing presentation and the minute of the stakeholders endorsement.
- The management responses to the MTE recommendations.

Other products and reports produced by Dibeen Project including:

- 1- Technical Reports.
- 2- Socio-economic report (baseline survey).
- 3- Sub-project proposal (socio –economic):
- 4- Special issues on the Dibeen project, Al Reem Newsletter, 2 Quarter 2005.
- 5- Strategy documents; ecotourism, training, education, internal system, conservation plans.
- 6- Species Conservation Action Planning process and reports
- 7- Reserve maps.

Annex 7 - Proposed field mission schedule

Day	Activity
Fri.	· Arrival in Amman
	· Initial consultation meeting with UNDP Programme Officer
Sat	· Meeting with the national evaluator
	· Briefing from DNR Project Manager on project status
	· Amendment of field mission schedule
Sun	· Briefing meeting with UNDP Programme Manager, and Environment Unit
	· Development of methodology for key informant interviews
Mon	· Meeting with UNDP RR, DRR
	· Teleconference with GEF Biodiversity Regional Task Manager
	· Meeting with RSCN top management, ADG
	· Meeting project Executing Agency- RSCN - Head of departments
Tue.	· Meeting with directorate of Jerash - Ministry of Agriculture
	· Field visit to DNR site and Meeting with Reserve and Project Management staff
Wed	· Meeting with SGP
	· Meeting with IUCN
Thu.	Field meeting with Dibeen stakeholders
	· Meeting with Governor of Jerash
	· Meeting with one group of municipal stakeholders - almurad
	· Meeting with second group of municipal stakeholders - Burma
	· Meeting with the MoA site representative
Fri.	· Field visit to DNR to observe tourist use of site.
	· Workshop and Draft Report preparation
Sat	· Workshop and Draft Report preparation
Sun	· Meeting with the Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation
Mon	· Meeting with the Ministry of Tourism
	· Meeting with the Ministry of Environment
	· Steering Committee Meeting
	· Meeting with the Ministry of Agriculture
Tue	· Workshop and Draft Report preparation
Wed	· Meeting with Dibeen Project Team for further inquiries and fact-checking
	Meeting with UNDP Environment Unit for follow-up questions and fact-checking
Thu.	Workshop Presentation: validation workshop with all relevant stakeholders
Fri.	Departure