



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

Annex I Terms of Reference (TOR)

"Providing National Consultancy Services for Terminal Evaluation of Building a Multiple-use Forest Management Framework to Conserve Biodiversity in the Caspian Hyrcanian Forest Landscape "

I. 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 Building a Multiple-use Forest Management Framework to Conserve Biodiversity in the Caspian Hyrcanian Forest Landscape (PIMS 4078).

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

II. Project Summary Table

Project Title: Building a Multiple-use Forest Management Framework to Conserve Biodiversity in the Caspian Hyrcanian Forest Landscape				
GEF Project ID:	4470		<u>at endorsement (US\$)</u>	<u>expenditure as at end of September 2018 (US\$)</u>
UNDP GEF Project ID:	4078			
Atlas award ID:	00071681	GEF financing:	US\$ 1,900,000	US\$ 1,691,025.28
Atlas project ID:	00085011			
Country:	Islamic Republic of Iran	IA/EA own:		
Region:	Asia Pacific	Government:	Cash US\$ 3,000,000 In kind US\$ 1,925,000	US\$ 99,153.15 US\$ 584,000
Focal Area:	Biodiversity	Other:	UNDP Cash US\$150,000 UNDP Cash (Parallel) US\$ 200,000	UNDP Cash US\$56,559.51

FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	BD2 Mainstream BD conservation and sustainable use into production landscapes and sectors.	Total co- financing:	US\$5,275,000	US\$ 739,712.66
Executing Agency:	Forests, Rangeland and Watershed Management Organization, FRWO	Total Project Cost:	US\$ 7,175,000	US\$ 2,430,737.94
Other Partners involved:		ProDoc Signature (date project began):		5 May 2013
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: 4 May 2018	Actual: 4 May 2019

III. OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The project was designed to conserve biodiversity in key landscapes within the Caspian broadleaf deciduous forest ecoregion. The ecoregion is recognized for its high levels of endemism; it is also an important storehouse of threatened species. It will do this by strengthening the national and local policy framework governing land use in the Caspian forests (which cover an area of approximately 1.8 million hectares), enhancing the rights and roles of the local communities in their management and demonstrating ways and means of improving management (including land use planning, zoning, compliance monitoring and enforcement).

The project will trigger a paradigm shift from sector-focused management to multiple use management, to reduce the conjunction pressures arising from different land uses. It will put in place the necessary policy and regulatory mechanisms needed to mainstream biodiversity conservation considerations into land use plans and build the capacities of key institutions to implement the reformed planning and management approach. The project is thus consistent with GEF Strategic Objective 2 of GEF 5: Mainstream biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into production landscapes, seascapes and sectors and in particular Outcome 2.1: Increase in sustainably managed landscapes and seascapes that integrate biodiversity conservation. The successful implementation of this project will set the foundations for replication of the approach in other important forest ecosystems across the country.

The project is responsible for achieving the following project objective: "To put in place a collaborative governance system and know-how for managing a mosaic of land uses in the Caspian Hyrcanian forest that provides habitat integrity and helps maintain landscape level ecosystem functions and resilience".

The project is designed to lift the barriers to establishment of a landscape approach to the management of biodiversity. The project comprises three complementary components, which are cost shared by the GEF and co-financing. Each addresses a different barrier and has discrete outcomes.





Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

- Component 1. An enabling policy and regulatory framework
- Component 2. Institutional and staff capacity strengthening for multiple-use forest management
- Component 3. Community piloting of integrated forest management

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.

IV. EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

An overall approach and method for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluators are 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 (see Annex C). The evaluators are 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 national evaluator is expected to attend various national meetings in Tehran and conduct a field mission to Golestan, Mazandaran and Guilan provinces including the following project sites:

- Chehel chay pilot, Minudasht, Golestan
- Baliran pilot, Amol, Mazandaran
- Dohezar-Sehezar pilot, Tonekabon, Mazandaran
- Fariroud-Zilakiroud pilot, Rodbar & Siahkal, Guilan

Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: FRWO Tehran and heads of Natural Resources & Watershed Management in pilots, Department of Environment (DOE), Ministry of Jihad Agriculture (MoJA), ICHTO, District Governors, Local communities & NGOs (Provincial).

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.

Main responsibilities and tasks of the National Evaluator include:

1. Close collaboration with International Evaluator (as a team leader) and assist him/ her in all Terminal Evaluation process including preparation/ mission/ reporting phases.



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

2. 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.
3. Assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework.
4. 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.
5. Provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful.
6. Review all relevant sources of information which includes any materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment, and draft review information synthesis report (in English) to be shared with International Evaluator, and exchange ideas and issues.
7. Assess the key financial aspects of the project which will be included in the terminal evaluation report, and consider the extent of co-financing planned and realized, and variances between planned and actual expenditures.
8. 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.
9. Assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts.
10. Assist International Evaluator to draft and finalize TE report, and then National Evaluator should draft the managerial and synthetic TE report (in both Farsi and English).

V. EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS

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

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



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

Overall Rating	Project Outcome	Environmental:
		Overall likelihood of sustainability:

VI. 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								

VII. 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.

VIII. 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.



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

IX. CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of conclusions, recommendations and lessons. Conclusions should build on findings and be based in evidence. Recommendations should be prioritized, specific, relevant, and targeted, with suggested implementers of the recommendations. Lesson should have wider applicability to other initiatives across the region, the area of intervention, and for the future.

X. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in the Islamic Republic of Iran. 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.

XI. EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The duration of the national evaluator contract will be 33 days, starts on **21 January 2019** until **7 April 2019** and delivery of above inputs will be according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation	4 days	27 Jan 2019
Draft Review Information Synthesis Report	3 days	4 Feb 2019
Evaluation Mission (4 project pilot sites and Project Office) and National Meetings (Tehran)	18 days (8 days in 4 provincial project pilot sites and 6 days in Project Office in Chalus, as well as 4 days in Tehran for national meetings)	15 March 2019
Draft Evaluation Report	4 days	25 March 2019
Final Report	2 days	30 March 2019
Draft the Managerial and Synthetic TE Report and Response	2 days	5 April 2019

XII. Evaluation deliverables

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies
- Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s) of biodiversity
- Have a broad-based knowledge and international/national experience related to capacity building, local community development and natural resource/forest management
- Knowledge of NIM guidelines and national laws
- Excellent English and Farsi written and verbal communication skills.

XIV. 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'

XV. Payment modalities and specifications

Milestone	Date	Amount (IRR)
Preparation and submission of Review Information Synthesis Report and Inception Report and initial project review	4 Feb 2019	28,000,000
Conducting evaluation mission and submission of first draft of terminal evaluation report	15 March 2019	132,000,000
Submission of final terminal evaluation report and draft the Managerial and Synthetic TE Report and Response	5 April 2019	16,000,000
Living allowances in Other Cities (cities are mentioned in TOR)	15 March 2019	83,832,000

Note

- In full consideration for the complete and satisfactory performance of the Services under this contract, UNDP shall pay the Contractor total amount of IRR 259,832,000 (two hundred fifty-nine million, eight hundred thirty-two thousand Iranian Rial) based on the above payment schedule.
- Confirmation of the Forests, Rangelands and Watershed Management Organization on delivery by the consultant, and acceptance by UNDP of all deliverables is a prerequisite to each payment.
- All envisaged travel costs (except the Air ticket) must be included in the offeror's financial proposal.

No. 8, Shahrzad Blvd, Darrou, 1948773911 Tehran, I.R. Iran (P.O. Box 15875-4557)
Tel: (98 21) 2286 0691-4, 286 0925-8, Fax: (98 21) 22869547, Email: registry@undp.org, website:
www.ir.undp.org





Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

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 and Project CO
Presentation	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission	To project management, UNDP CO
Draft Evaluation Report	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission	Sent to Project and UNDP CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs
Final Report*	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP and Project 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.

In addition to the above deliverables that are to be jointly completed by the evaluation team, the national evaluator is also responsible for submission of the following two deliverables, as per the schedule in the 'Evaluation Timeframe' above:

- **Draft the Review Information Synthesis Report (in English).**
- **Draft the Managerial and Synthetic TE Report (in both Farsi and English).**

XIII. Team Composition

The evaluation team will be composed of **1 international /1 national evaluator**. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The International consultant will be the team leader and responsible for finalizing the report. The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The National Evaluator will work closely with the International Evaluator and Project Management Team and will report to the National Project Manager (NPM), who will review and accept all services and deliverables.

The National Evaluator must present the following qualifications:

- Minimum 15 years of relevant professional experience
- Knowledge of UNDP and GEF
- Experience in the review of sustainable development projects, preferably with UNDP or GEF or other United Nations development agencies and major donors
- Experience in project design, project cycle management, and project monitoring and evaluation.

No. 8, Shahrzad Blvd, Darrous, 1948773911 Tehran, I.R. Iran (P.O. Box 15875-4557)
Tel: (98 21) 2286 0691-4, 286 0925-8, Fax: (98 21) 22869547, Email: registry@undp.org, website:
www.ir.undp.org

- The project will provide air ticket for each local travel to visit the project sites- therefore the cost to be excluded from this contract.

As for living allowances, the current living allowances in below cities of Iran has been included in the Financial Proposal template. The living allowances will be reimbursed after completion of each mission upon submission of travel claim form and based on the actual rate on travel dates. The cost of each mission is payable only against submission of boarding passes as well as other associated costs' invoices.

- Mazandaran (10 days comprised of 4 days in project pilot sites and 6 days in Project Office);
- Guilan (2 Days);
- Golestan (2 Days)
- Each payment will be made in IRR upon satisfactory completion of the tasks and respective deliverables as per submission of deliverables/claims by the consultant and the project/UNDP approvals.
- Each payment will be transferred by UNDP in IRR to the account number of the contractor introduced through a completed vendor form and bank certificate indicating full banking information.
- Payments will be made according to UNDP regulations as explained in the contract documents.
- The National Consultant shall not do any work, provide any equipment, materials and supplies or perform any other services which may result in any cost in excess of the above-mentioned amount.

XVI. TRAVEL

If travel is required under the contract, the individual consultant shall:

1. Obtain the security clearance from UNDP office (the details of travel including date of departure and arrival, accommodation and purpose of travel shall be submitted to UNDP office 2 working days before date of travel)
2. Undertake the training courses on Basic Security in the Field and Advanced Security in the Field (only applicable for certain destination; to be checked with UNDP) and provide UNDP with both certificates; the related CD ROMs are available at UNDP office.
3. Undertake a full medical examination including x-rays and obtain medical clearance from an UN-approved physician. This is only applicable for the contractors on the age of 65 years or more.
4. All envisaged travel costs must be included in the Offeror's financial proposal. This includes all duty travels, travels to join duty station and repatriation. The anticipated mission travel has been included in the TOR; however, in the event of unforeseeable travel, UNDP and the Individual Contractor will agree upon the manner in which travel costs including tickets, lodging and terminal expenses are to be reimbursed to the traveler.



*Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.*

XVII. Financial proposal

Candidates are asked to submit a financial proposal as per "Annex III" that indicates the all-inclusive total price (consultancy fee + travel costs), supported by a breakdown of costs as per the deliverables outlined in this TOR.

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.

A handwritten signature in black ink is located in the bottom right corner of the page. The signature is stylized and appears to be a cursive script.

Annex A: Project Logical Framework

This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in the CPD for Iran: UNDAF/Country programme Outcome 1. Environmental considerations integrated into development decision-making; 2. Iran contributes to implementation of Multilateral Environment Agreements and internationally agreed targets; UNDAF/Country programme Outcome 4: National, subnational and local capacities enhanced to ensure 1) integrated management, conservation and sustainable use of ecosystems, natural resources and biodiversity; 2. Main-streaming environmental economics into national planning and audits; 3) effective use of knowledge and tools in prevention, control and response to current and emerging environmental pollution; 4) formulation and implementation of climate change mitigation and adaptation plans and projects.

Country Programme Outcome Indicators: **Indicator 4.1.** Number of localized (tailored to national context) frameworks and mechanisms that integrate sustainable environmental management. ^[SEP] Baseline: The 5th NDP provides the legal basis for integration of principles of sustainable development. Target: By 2016, national frameworks for sustainable management of wetlands, mountain ecosystems, dryland and Caspian forests, and biodiversity conservation are in place and piloted. ^[SEP]

Indicator 4.2: Frameworks for improved PCB and HCFC Management in place and implementation started (Yes/No). Baseline: Inadequate frameworks conducive to national development priorities. ^[SEP] Target: Frameworks introduced by 2016

Indicator 4.3. Localized frameworks, mechanisms and models (tested and piloted according to national context) on climate change mitigation and adaptation are developed (Yes/No). Baseline: Second National Communication in place. ^[SEP] Target: By 2016, Third National Communication and Residential Energy Efficiency Frameworks in place.

Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program: **BD-2:** Mainstream Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use into Production Landscapes/ Seascapes and Sectors

Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes: **Outcome 2.1:** Increase in sustainably managed landscapes and seascapes that integrate biodiversity conservation

Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators: Policies and regulatory frameworks (number) for production sectors.

STRATEGIC RESULTS FRAMEWORK (Amended version proposed to the MTR. Status of indicators at MTR are highlighted in green)

Objective/Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	Targets ¹	Means of verification	Assumptions
The long-term goal to which the project will contribute is “an effective multiple use forest governance system is in operation resulting in enhanced biodiversity and maintained landscape level ecosystem functions, integrity and resilience for the Caspian Hyrcanian Forests of Iran”.					
Objective: To put in place a collaborative governance system and know-how for managing a mosaic of land uses in the Caspian Hyrcanian forest that provides habitat integrity and helps maintain landscape level ecosystem functions and resilience.	Landscape area in the Caspian Hyrcanian forests where forestry and other production activities mainstream biodiversity conservation	0 ha	Policy and regulatory frameworks for managing multiple use forest landscapes across~ 800,000 ha of forests The Green Development Strategy for the Hyrcanian Forests (awaiting approval) covers all 1.85 million ha of the Caspian Forest in Iran	Green Development Strategy Project Reports; Independent mid-term and final evaluations	The interest and commitment of FRWO management and staff to the new policies and practices developed under the project remain sufficiently high and long-lasting to have the transformational impact.
	Area of biodiversity set-asides created governed by clear specific management guidelines	Approximately 11% is formally protected by DOE and a further 1% is Forest Reserves (FRWO) but without any systematic	At least 100,000 ha of new biodiversity set asides under FRWO management defined (with management guidelines) 400,734 ha of potential candidate Special Areas for Biodiversity (SABs) have been identified with FRWO	Project reports; Independent mid-term and final evaluations	Cooperation of other production sectors such as Livestock, Tourism and Agriculture located in the Caspian forests landscape are forthcoming and fully supportive of the project's objective and approach

¹ The final time period for realizing project targets is project end (2018), unless otherwise specified.



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

Objective/Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	Targets ¹	Means of verification	Assumptions
		management regime for biodiversity conservation	and expert inputs. Field assessments are under way, and a final recommendation for at least 100,000ha of SABs will then be made for approval.		
	Extent of forest cover (CV) and forest condition score (CD) in each pilot landscape	Forest cover		No net loss of forest cover and improved quality with reduced loss of high grade species These indicators will be re-measured only for the Terminal Evaluation	Monitoring reports GIS-RS data
		Basin #	Forest Cover ha		
		22 & 23	27943		
		33 & 34	25610		
		53	20685		
		92	12599		
		Forest condition			
		Basin #	CD		



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

Objective/Outcome	Indicator	Baseline				Targets ¹	Means of verification	Assumptions
		22 & 23	13					
		33 & 34	13					
		53	11					
		92	9					
	Status of rare or flagship species in pilot landscapes (Average Forest Bird Specialist index (FS) and % sample plots in each pilot recording Persian leopard (PL) and red deer (RD))	Baseline was measured in 2014				No decline in status of rare or flagship species in pilot landscapes by end of project	Biodiversity assessment reports at TE	
		Bas in #	F S	P L %	R D %	These indicators will be re-measured for the Terminal Evaluation		
		22 & 23	8.5	3	3			
		33 & 34	13.8	10	0			
		53	9.3	27	9			



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

Objective/Outcome	Indicator	Baseline				Targets ¹	Means of verification	Assumptions
		92	1 5. 4	0	0			
Outcome 1: An enabling policy and regulatory framework for multiple use forest management is developed	<p>Outputs:</p> <p>1.1 Systematic assessment of values of forests and related ecosystem services for pilot landscapes (detailed) and Hyrcanian Forest landscape (high level), and externalities of deforestation and forest degradation incorporated into policies, plans and sector decisions and finance options identified to offset opportunity costs.</p> <p>1.2 Inter-sectoral coordination mechanisms established and national regulations and policies (inventory, function mapping and zoning, carrying capacity and utilisation plans etc.) for planning and management for Caspian Hyrcanian forest landscapes based on biodiversity mainstreaming needs reviewed and adopted</p> <p>1.3 Integrated, multi-purpose forestry strategy and plan, including sustainable land use plan for Caspian Hyrcanian forest, based on in depth biodiversity information, and management options analyses, that a) define biodiversity rich areas to be classified as biodiversity set-asides and secure financial resources for their management and b) lays out appropriate land-uses and management practices to be prescribed in the adjacent production landscape</p> <p>1.4 National and local operational guidelines in place to manage multiple land uses in forest landscapes including improved forestry, small holder agriculture and livestock practices</p>							
	Extent of integration of ecosystem values into production sector strategies and plans	Ecosystem goods and services are utilised by production sectors, however their true ecological value is not understood or incorporated into the economics of	Systematic analysis of values of forests and externalities of deforestation and forest degradation incorporated into sector decisions and finance options identified to offset opportunity costs.				Review of sectoral plans of forestry, livestock/agriculture and tourism sectors	FRWO and key sector agencies will support and act upon BD mainstreaming approaches including adoption of appropriate policies and regulations
			Ecosystem services mapping					Stakeholder institutions are willing to share information



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

Objective/Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	Targets ¹	Means of verification	Assumptions
		key production sectors	and valuation studies completed. PES options scheme drafted.		that is required for mainstreaming biodiversity conservation into sector strategies and plans
	Inter-sectoral coordination mechanisms established, national policy and regulatory framework is adjusted to meet BD mainstreaming requirements and is updated within operational procedures	FRWO and other sectors are not coordinated and lack inclusion of biodiversity conservation practices	Inter-sectoral coordination mechanisms established at Hyrcanian Forest and pilot landscape levels. Regional Coordination Committee (RCC) established for whole of Caspian Forests, and Local Coordination Committees (LCC) established for each pilot landscape (4) 1 FRWO regulation on multiple use planning issued Planned for 2017/18	Government Orders or notifications, meeting records	Caspian Hyrcanian Forest stakeholders will embrace and take ownership of a multiple use approach to sustainable forest management Support will be provided by FRWO and other land managers towards stronger degrees of coordination in multiple use management that promotes mainstreaming biodiversity conservation
	Integrated, multi-purpose forestry strategy and plan, (including measures for replication/upscaling of pilot integrated	No coordinated plan for production sectors in the Caspian Forests exists	Integrated, multi-purpose forestry strategy and plan, including Sustainable land use plan for Caspian Hyrcanian forest, that a) define biodiversity rich areas to be gazetted as new PAs and b) lay	Approved integrated, multi-purpose forestry strategy and plan, including Sustainable use plan document	There is interest and will to incorporate ecological values into the economics assessment of the of key production sectors and modify plans/strategies



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

Objective/Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	Targets ¹	Means of verification	Assumptions
	management plans and sustainable land use plans) that defines a clear direction for the Caspian Hyrcanian Forests and supports mainstreaming biodiversity conservation		out appropriate land-uses and management practices to be prescribed in the adjacent production landscape The Green Development Strategy for the Hyrcanian Forests is in final draft and awaiting approval		accordingly
	Operational guidelines are being utilised to manage multiple land uses in forest landscapes, including improved forestry, small holder agriculture and livestock practices	Forestry, tourism and agriculture sectors lack a coordinated approach to management	At least 3 improved operational guidelines for: i) multi-purpose forestry; ii) sustainable small holder agriculture; iii) improved livestock practices and iv) sustainable tourism Not started	Approved operational guidelines documents Project reports	
Outcome 2: Enhanced institutional and staff capacity for implementing a multiple use forest management plan	Outputs: 2.1 Central and district staff of FRWO and other key stakeholders trained and able to apply / oversee multiple-use landscape level forest management, and training materials and best practices incorporated into FRWO staff induction courses 2.2 Integrated management plan developed in a participatory way for each pilot landscape and operationalized with appropriate institutional arrangements, coordination mechanisms and adequate budget 2.3. Effective monitoring and enforcement systems in place to control harvesting forest resources 2.4 Best practices manual and guidelines for multiple-use forest landscape management prepared, tested and revised 2.5 Sustainable land-use plan implemented in a pilot landscape to provide 'learning by doing' and replication plan for other pilot				
No. 8, Shahrzad Blvd, Darrous, 1948773911 Tehran, I.R. Iran (P.O. Box 15875-4557) Tel: (98 21) 2286 0691-4, 286 0925-8, Fax: (98 21) 22869547, Email: registry@undp.org , website: www.ir.undp.org					



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

Objective/Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	Targets ¹	Means of verification	Assumptions
	landscapes (and input for the whole Caspian Hyrcanian forest landscape) initiated with secured resources from central and provincial government by the end of the project				
	Improvement in Total Capacity Development Score for multi-purpose forestry	10 (adapted scorecard gives revised baseline of 11)	26 at the mid-term evaluation 42 at the final evaluation course The mid-term Capacity Development Score is assessed as 30	Scorecards at Mid-term and Final Evaluation	Institutions are unwilling to commit the expected number of personnel for training and capacity building Trained staff may not continue in current roles Sector representatives are committed to implementing the sectoral plans that form part of the landscape level Sustainable Land Use Plan for the Caspian Forests
	Number of FRWO and other sector staff trained and able to apply multiple-use forest management approaches	0	FRWO: 100 Agriculture: 50 Mining: 20 Tourism: 50 Animal Husbandry: 50 FRWO: 176 Agriculture: 25 Mining: 0 Tourism: 25 Animal Husbandry: 4 Governor offices: 52 Water: 14	Training records; training evaluations	



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

Objective/Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	Targets ¹	Means of verification	Assumptions
			Environment: 45 Local communities: 77 NGOs: 122 Private sector: 65 Health: 5 Islamic Devel. Org.: 160 Min Education: 52 Total: 878 (slight overestimation due to overlaps in individuals between courses)		
	Number of landscape level integrated management plans approved and being implemented	0	At least 2 IMPs approved and being implemented Integrated management plans have been drafted for each of the four pilot landscapes and are awaiting approval. Quick wins have and are being implemented Lessons learned compendium will be compiled in 2017/18	Project reports Mid-term and terminal evaluation reports	



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

Objective/Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	Targets ¹	Means of verification	Assumptions			
	Use of a community based, functional and effective monitoring mechanism for illicit felling and land clearing in the pilot landscapes	Does not exist	Effective monitoring systems in place to control harvesting forest resources To be developed during 2016 and 2017 - currently building trust with communities	Project reports Mid-term and terminal evaluations				
Outcome 3: Community based integrated forest management piloted	Outputs: 3.1 Public awareness raised and communities mobilised and empowered to contribute to multi-purpose forestry 3.2 At least 2 community-based FMPs (covering 30,000ha) developed and implemented that include prescriptions for sustainable use of forest resources, resource sharing mechanisms and responsibilities of the local communities for the implementation of the plan. 3.3 Alternative livelihood development plan implemented that includes agri-livestock based activities (independent to forest ecosystems) and also a NTFP enterprises development and value addition strategy							
	Public awareness of forest goods and services, values and responsibilities	<table><tr><td>Ba sin #</td><td>Overall indicat or</td></tr><tr><td>22 & 23</td><td>55.2</td></tr></table>	Ba sin #	Overall indicat or	22 & 23	55.2	Public awareness increases 20% overall and 50% in pilot landscapes This indicator will be re-measured for the Terminal Evaluation.	Survey reports
Ba sin #	Overall indicat or							
22 & 23	55.2							



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

Objective/Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	Targets ¹	Means of verification	Assumptions
		33 & 34	53.5		economic activities would stimulate the poor natural resource dependent marginal communities to organize and perform better.
		53	58.5		
		92	54.0		
	Number of community based forest management plans developed, agreed by community management committees and implemented	0	2 community based forest management plans covering 30,000ha Community based Forest Management training has been given and CFFMPs initiated in 2 pilots	Project reports CBF management plan Mid-term and terminal evaluation reports	
	Number of persons involved in new sustainable livelihoods, and total additional \$ generated in their income in the pilot landscapes	0 Baseline income generated from new livelihoods = US\$ 0	At least 100 males and 100 females in 4 different types of sustainable livelihood activities Type (#Men, #Women) Handicrafts (9,82) Tourism (172,59) MedHerbs/Food (0,20) Wood processing (1,7) Tree nursery (6,0)	Project administrative records Mid-term and terminal evaluations	



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

Objective/Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	Targets ¹	Means of verification	Assumptions
			IPM Rice (10,10) Comm. Forestry (194,5) At least US\$ 200,000 generated Type (total US\$ earned) Handicrafts (12,450) Tourism (5,500) MedHerbs/Food (800) Wood processing (2,200) Tree nursery (0) IPM Rice (0) Comm. Forestry (0) TOTAL: US\$ 20,950		



*Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.*

Annex B: List of Documents to be reviewed by the evaluators

- Project Original Document, Log frame
- Project Annual Work plan
- Project Annual & Mid-Year Reports
- Project MTE Report and Management response
- Project PIRs
- Financial Reports
- Project publications
- Project website
- Demonstration sites management plans
- Consultants technical reports (International and national)
- Annual Audit reports/ Management Respons

A handwritten signature is located at the bottom right of the page, below the page number.



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

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?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

•	•	•	•
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•

1/10

United Nations Development Programme



Empowering people.
Resilient nations.

Annex D: Rating Scales

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

No. 8, Shahrzad Blvd, Darrous, 1948773911 Tehran, I.R. Iran (P.O. Box 15875-4557)
 Tel: (98 21) 2286 0691-4, 286 0925-8, Fax: (98 21) 22869547, Email: registry@undp.org, website:

www.ir.undp.org

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.



United Nations Development Programme



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form²

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: _____

²www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

A handwritten signature in black ink is located at the bottom right of the page, below the page number.



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

Annex F: Evaluation Report Outline³

- 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 Manual⁴)
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 rated⁵)
- 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

³The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

⁴ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

⁵ 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.

No. 8, Shahrzad Blvd, Darrou, 1948773911 Tehran, I.R. Iran (P.O. Box 15875-4557)

Tel: (98 21) 2286 0691-4, 286 0925-8, Fax: (98 21) 22869547, Email: registry@undp.org, website:

www.ir.undp.org

A handwritten signature in black ink is located in the bottom right corner of the page.



- Planned stakeholder participation
 - Replication approach
 - UNDP comparative advantage
 - Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
 - Management arrangements
- 3.2 Project Implementation**
- Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
 - Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)
 - Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management
 - 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

A handwritten signature is located in the bottom right corner of the page.



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: _____

A handwritten signature in black ink is located at the bottom right of the page, below the page number.