Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the *Integrated Environmental Management of the Fanga’uta Lagoon Catchment (Tonga R2R)* (PIMS 5219)

The essentials of the project to be evaluated are as follows: (*fully complete the table below*).

Project Summary Table

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Title: |  | | | | | |
| GEF Project ID: | | 5219 |  | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | | *at completion (Million US$)* |
| UNDP Project ID: | | 00088096 | GEF financing: | $1,756,880 | | 1,756,880 |
| Country: | | Tonga | IA/EA own: | $500,000 | |  |
| Region: | | Asia and the Pacific | Government: | $650,000 | |  |
| Focal Area: | | Biodiversity, Land Degradation and Integrated Water | Other: | $5,500,000 | |  |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): | |  | Total co-financing: | 6,650,000 | |  |
| Executing Agency: | | UNDP | Total Project Cost: | 8,406,880 | |  |
| Other Partners involved: MEIDECC, MLNRS, MAFFF, MIA, | |  | ProDoc Signature (date project began): | | | 04 September 2014 |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | | Proposed:  March 2018 | Actual:  March 2018 |

Objective and Scope

The project was designed to conserve the ecosystem services of the Fanga’uta Lagoon through an integrated land, water and coastal management approach to protect livelihoods, improve food production and enhance climate resilience. To achieve this objective, intervention have been implemented at two interconnected levels; national and site level which are: helping address critical gaps in environmental and ecosystem service conservation in the Fangauta Lagoon catchment through the establishment of an effective governance system and sustainable management of the lagoon ecosystem (component 1); creating an integrate an environmental management approach to help improve conditions of critical habitats productivity, water quality and fisheries in the lagoon catchment (component 2); and strengthening knowledge and awareness of the Fanga’uta Lagoon ecosystem functions and associated socio-economic benefit with national stakeholders and local communities (component 3). The focus of creating an enabling environment for governance (under component 1) is to ensure that an effective governance structure and function is in place. In doing so, a committee will be established to ensure that Fangauta Laggon is managed in an integrated manner. The implementation of an integrated environmental management plan for Fangauta Lagoon (under component 2) is to assist in the improvement of the IFC IEMP to reduce pressure to the lagoon’s ecosystem and their services while enhancing the livelihood of local communities. The strengthening of knowledge and awareness is to improve communication and education of the FLC communities on IEMP and ecosystem services for promoting sustianvle development in the lagoon catchment.

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. It will cover the entire programme under this project.

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

Evaluation approach and method

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

The evaluation must provide evidence‐based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Tonga, including the following project sites within the vicinity of Fanga’uta Lagoon*.* Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: (Ministry of Fisheries; Department of Forestry from Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Forestry; Ministry of International Affairs (Local Governance Department), MEIDECC – Department of Environment; Department of Geology/Natural Resources from Ministry of Lands, Natural Resources and Survey.

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

Evaluation Criteria & Ratings

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

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

Project finance / cofinance

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

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

Mainstreaming

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

Impact

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

Conclusions, recommendations & lessons

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

Implementation arrangements

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

Evaluation timeframe

The total duration of the evaluation will be *30* days over a period of 7 weeks according to the following plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Timing | Completion Date |
| **Preparation** | *4* days | *8 August 2018* |
| **Evaluation Mission** | *15* days | *23 March 2018* |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | *9* days | *9 April 2018* |
| **Final Report** | *2* days | *18 April 2018* |

Evaluation deliverables

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Deliverable | Content | Timing | Responsibilities |
| **Inception Report** | Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method | No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission (8 August) | Evaluator submits to UNDP CO |
| **Presentation** | Initial Findings | End of evaluation mission (21 March 2018) | To project management, UNDP CO and Board Members |
| **Draft Final Report** | Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes | Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission (9 April 2018) | Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs. |
| **Final Report\*** | Revised report | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft (18 April 2018) | Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC. |

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

Team Composition

The evaluation team will be composed of 1 international evaluator*.* The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The international consultant will work with the local consultant to finalize the report. Roles and responsibilities of the consultant will need to be discussed and agreed amongst the team members. 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 Team members must present the following qualifications:

Education (5%)

* A Master’s degree in development, environmental science, natural resource management and/or related field

Experiences (65%)

* Minimum *5* years of relevant professional experience
* Knowledge of UNDP and GEF evaluation process and has lead evaluation process for at least 2-3 of UNDP/GEF funded projects
* Previous experience with results‐based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
* Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s)
* Experience working in Asia and the Pacific and has a good understanding of the environmental sector in the Pacific especially for Tonga would be an advantage;
* Experience working with communities, government sectors, NGOs and understands local protocols and customs and has excellent communication skills;
* Experience in the policy development processes associated with environment and sustainable development issues
* Demonstrable analytical skills;
* Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset

A 30% rating is given to the financial proposal. Financial proposal must include:

* Daily Consultancy Fee (No fee range to be stated)
* Living Expenses while living in duty station for the period of work (only for those applicants living outside of duty station. Do not state UN DSA rate)

Evaluator Ethics

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex E) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the [UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'](http://www.unevaluation.org/ethicalguidelines)

Payment modalities and specifications

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| % | Milestone |
| *20%* | At contract signing |
| *30%* | Following submission and approval of the final draft terminal evaluation report |
| *50%* | Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report |

Application process

Applicants are requested to apply online <http://jobs.undp.org>. Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions. The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in English with indication of the e‐mail and phone contact. Shortlisted candidates will be requested to submit a price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs).

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

Annex A: Project Logical Framework

**TABLE 1:** Project Indicators and End-of-Project Targets

| **Indicator** | **End-of-Project Target** |
| --- | --- |
| **At Objective Level** | |
| Status of completion and implementation of the FLC IEM Plan | FLC IEMP has been formulated by Year 2, accepted and implemented in Year 3 to recognize and promote the conservation and adaptive management of the ecosystem services of the Fanga’uta Lagoon and its catchment |
| Tracking Tool BD 1: Improved management effectiveness of existing and new protected area | About 80 hectares of mangroves and other biodiversity resources in the FL protected areas conserved and managed mainly for the sustainable use of natural ecosystems |
| Tracking Tool BD 2: Increase in sustainably managed landscapes and seascapes that integrate biodiversity conservation | Around 50 hectares of FLC area of production systems with increased vegetation cover |
| Tracking Tool LD 1: Sustained flow of services in agro-ecosystems | Application of enhanced capacity demonstrated (i.e., FLC IEMP, inter-agency governing body, awareness and communication strategy) |
| Tracking Tool LD 3: Integrated landscape management practices adopted by local communities | At least 5 of FLC awareness and communication materials produced and disseminated  A knowledge management website created & maintained |
| Tracking Tool IWs 3: IW portfolio capacity and performance enhanced from active learning/KM/ experience sharing | Water quality improved through small demonstrations and monitoring mechanisms in place for project related indicators |
| **At Outcome Level** | |
| 1.1. Functional enabling environments for conservation and integrated management of the Fanga’uta Lagoon Catchment (FLC)  1.2 Amendments to the environmental management plan of the Fanga’uta Lagoon Catchment | Creation of a nationally recognized FLC Management Committee by Year 1  By Year 3 the feasibility of conversion of a FLC Management Committee into a National Interagency Council with a statutory mandate has been assessed and implemented as appropriate  By mid-term, the existing EMP FLS has been updated incorporating IEM concepts and adaptive management approaches.  By Year 3, updates/amendments to EMP FLS have been approved and adopted  By the end of the project, the concerned authorities will institutionalize integrated ecosystem management and conservation objective for the FLC within the national development system. |
| 2. Decline in negative development pressure on surrounding habitats and ecosystem services in the Fanga’uta Lagoon | By project end, key habitats (mangroves) and ecosystem services in FLC improved compared to baseline level |
| 3. Number of awareness and communication materials produced and disseminated concerning the ecosystem services of the Fanga’uta Lagoon | Production of around 5 awareness and communication materials in various formats, which have been disseminated in relevant Agencies/ institutions (expanded NECCC sitting as Catchment Committee) as well as in all lagoon villages and nearby urban center of Nuku’alofa |

**TABLE 2: STRATEGIC RESULTS FRAMEWORK**

**LIST OF OUTPUTS PER OUTCOME AS PART OF THE SRF**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project’s Development Goal**: To maintain and enhance Pacific Island countries’ (PICs) (i.e., Tonga’s) ecosystem goods and services (provisioning, regulating, supporting and cultural) through integrated approaches to land, water, forest, biodiversity and coastal resource management that contribute to poverty reduction, sustainable livelihoods and climate resilience. | |
| **Project’s Immediate Objective**: To conserve the ecosystem services of the Fanga’uta Lagoon through an integrated land, water and coastal management approach thereby protecting livelihoods and food production and enhancing climate resilience. | |
| **Outcomes:** | **Outputs:** |
| Multi-stakeholder management system established to guide the updating of the EMP FLS and implementation of the FLC Integrated Environmental Management Plan (IEMP) | * Capacity of NECC and FLC Stakeholders enhanced to more effectively plan and implement an integrated lagoon ecosystem management approaches * Measures delivered to fully engage the Fanga’uta Lagoon Catchment (FLC) communities in lagoon ecosystem management |
| Participatory updating of the Fanga’uta Lagoon Catchment IEMP completed, adopted, endorsed and budgeted for | * FLC IEMP prepared and completed; establishing technical, biophysical, oceanographic, socioeconomic and demographic baselines; updating the EMP completed in 2001 with additional parameters to be established * FLC IEMP adopted, mainstreamed and funded * Multi-stakeholder participatory mechanisms conducted to ensure adaptive management through monitoring and evaluation of FLC IEMP development and interventions |
| Improved conditions of critical lagoon habitats, productivity, water quality and fish production through the implementation of priority interventions identified in the IEMP | * Areas of approximately 50 ha of the lagoon’s major coastal habitats (mangroves stands) restored * Mechanisms set up to guarantee participatory fishing area and sustainable fisheries resources management by the FLC communities * Eco-tourism awareness to FLC community conducted and local initiatives demonstrated * Activities based on sustainable land and forest management demonstrated in the catchment areas * Capacity for Fanga’uta Lagoon water quality control strengthened and on-site activities demonstrated |
| Increased awareness and appreciation of the ecosystem services of the Fanga’uta Lagoon | * Awareness programs conducted through the production and distribution of awareness materials |

**TABLE 3: INDICATOR FRAMEWORK AS PART OF THE SRF**

| **Project Strategy** | **Objectively Verifiable Indicators** | | | **Sources of Verification** | **Risks and Assumptions** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Target** |
| **Objective:** To conserve the ecosystem services of the Fanga’uta Lagoon and Catchment (FLC) through an integrated land, water and coastal management approach thereby protecting livelihoods and food production and enhancing climate resilience | Status of completion and implementation of the FLC IEM Plan | The Fanga’uta Lagoon and Catchment faces two major barriers for its conservation and sustainable management at present: i) degradation of ecosystem services and ii) acquiring new approach, method, knowledge and tool. | FLC IEMP has been formulated by Year 2, accepted and implemented in Year 3, to recognize and promote the conservation and adaptive management of the ecosystem services of the FLC | Existence of a functional lagoon management authoritative body and meeting reports  Government publications and communication materials from Outcome 3  Project Reports and publications | The Tonga Government is willing to designate, support, and promote IEM and ecosystem services concepts within FLC.  MEECCDMMIC is prepared to undertake efforts to coordinate and enhance its support to conserve and manage the ecosystems of FLC.  Collaboration among concerned government agencies and other stakeholders is achieved in order to create a national policy environment conducive for integrated management of FLC. |
|  | Tracking Tool BD 1: Improved management effectiveness of existing and new protected area | The Fanga’uta Lagoon marine reserve and catchment covers 2,835 ha of water and 8,000 ha of land having significant agricultural, coastal biodiversity, and other ecosystem services value | About 80 hectares of mangroves and other biodiversity resources in the FL protected areas conserved and managed mainly for the sustainable use of natural ecosystems | Reports from project annual M&E activities  GEF BD Tracking Tool reports | There is effective involvement of all institutions and stakeholders who have a role to act in conserving and sustainable use of lagoon biodiversity and ecosystem services. |
|  | Tracking Tool BD 2: Increase in sustainably managed landscapes and seascapes that integrate biodiversity conservation | 10,800 hectares of the FLC landscape / seascape directly or indirectly contribute to biodiversity conservation or sustainable use of its ecosystem services |  |
|  | Tracking Tool LD 1: Sustained flow of services in agro-ecosystems | The Fanga'uta Lagoon has been facing pressures on agro-ecosystems and natural resources from competing land uses in the wider landscape.  No sustainable agricultural practices are currently implemented in the lagoon catchment areas. | 50 hectares of FLC area of production systems with increased vegetation cover | Reports from project annual M&E activities  GEF LD Tracking Tool reports | Continued political commitment at the national and local levels in incorporating SLM into development plans and practices |
|  | Tracking Tool LD 3: Integrated landscape management practices adopted by local communities | Application of enhanced capacity demonstrated (i.e., FLC IEMP, inter-agency governing body, awareness and communication strategy)  Production of a series of FLC awareness and communication materials produced and disseminated  A project website or webpage created & maintained |  |
|  | Tracking Tool IWs 3: IW portfolio capacity and performance enhanced from active learning/KM/ experience sharing | Limited local capacity exists for overseeing and monitoring of water quality in the lagoon | Water quality improved through small demonstrations and monitoring mechanisms in place for project related indicators | Reports from project annual M&E activities  GEF TWs Tracking Tool reports | Government, private business, and local communities actively participate and contribute in capacity building activities as assumed. |
| **Project Components/Outputs:**  **Component 1: Appropriate Governance of Fanga’uta Lagoon Catchment Areas and Integrated Management of Lagoon Ecosystems**  **Outcome 1.1** Multi-stakeholder management system established to guide the updating of the EMP FLS and implementation of the FLC Integrated Environmental Management Plan (IEMP)  Output 1.1.1 Capacity of NECC and FLC Stakeholders enhanced to more effectively plan and implement an integrated lagoon ecosystem management approaches  Output 1.1.2 Measures delivered to fully engage the Fanga’uta Lagoon Catchment (FLC) communities in lagoon ecosystem management  **Outcome 1.2** Participatory updating of the Fanga’uta Lagoon Catchment IEMP completed, adopted, endorsed and budgeted for  Output 1.2.1 FLC IEMP prepared and completed; establishing technical, biophysical, oceanographic, socioeconomic and demographic baselines; updating the EMP completed in 2001 with additional parameters to be established  Output 1.2.2 FLC IEMP adopted, mainstreamed and funded  Output 1.2.3 Multi-stakeholder participatory mechanisms conducted to ensure adaptive management during the preparation, implementation,monitoring and evaluation of FLC IEMP  **Component 2: Implementation of the Integrated Environmental Management Plan for the Fanga’uta Lagoon Catchment**  **Outcome 2.1** Improved conditions of critical lagoon habitats, productivity, water quality and fish production through the implementation of priority interventions identified in the IEMP  Output 2.1.1 Areas of approximately 80 ha of the lagoon’s major coastal habitats (mangroves stands) restored  Output 2.1.2 Mechanisms set up to guarantee participatory fishing area and sustainable fisheries resources management by the FLC communities  Output 2.1.3 Eco-tourism awareness to FLC community conducted and local initiatives demonstrated  Output 2.1.4 Activities based on sustainable land and forest management demonstrated in the FL catchment areas  Output 2.1.5 Capacity for Fanga’uta Lagoon water quality control strengthened and on-site activities demonstrated  **Component 3: Knowledge Management**  **Outcome 3.1** Increased awareness and appreciation of the ecosystem services of the Fanga’uta Lagoon  Output 3.1.1 Awareness programs conducted through the production and dissemination of awareness materials | | | | | |
| **Outcome 1.1:** Multi-stakeholder management system established to guide the updating of the EMP FLS and implementation of the FLC Integrated Environmental Management Plan (IEMP) | Functional enabling environments for conservation and integrated management of the Fanga’uta Lagoon Catchment (FLC) | Integrated multi-stakeholder mechanism is not established to the existing FLC management. | Creation of a nationally recognized FLC Management Committee by Year 1  By Year 3 the feasibility of conversion of a FLC Management Committee into a National Interagency Council with a statutory mandate has been assessed and implemented as appropriate | Existence of a functional lagoon management authoritative body and meeting reports  Project reports and publications | IEM is based on long-term strategic visions and links different policies at different administrative and stakeholder levels to ensure coherency, this carries the risk that its application will be given different interpretation in each of the management systems and may cause conflicts in implementation. |
| **Output 1.1.1:** Capacity of NECC and FLC Stakeholders enhanced to more effectively plan and implement an integrated lagoon ecosystem management approaches | Status of a multi-stakeholder FLC management authority with dedicated staff and sufficient budget | Department of Environment and Climate Change (DECC) has been designated by the Cabinet to implement the EMP FLS, but no clear provision on financial and other commitments required for plan implementation. | Concerned departments, ministries, partners and stakeholders have all set up contact points to implement IEM concept for FLC and have adopted ecosystem services consideration in key development policies and legislation.  By the project end, establishment of a statutory mandate for the long-term management of FLC | Government reports and interagency communications  FLC Management Committee meetings and reports  Project reports and publications  Existence of FLC Interagency Council Secretariat and office | Clearly defined sets of key stakeholders and their engagement  Political commitment to designate, support, and promote multi-stakeholder management system  Potential local and international donors will engage in project implementation and provide necessary support to ensure long-term achievements. |
| Activities:   1. Establish a Project Management Unit (PMU) to execute all project activities at national and local levels and support the Fanga’uta Lagoon Catchment Management Committee (FLCMC) for the duration of the project; staff recruitment and hiring 2. A review of FLCMC composition, mandates and functions; a ToR of FLCMC, with additional ToR for FLCMC as the Project Steering Committee, formulated and agreed during its first meeting; the FLCMC formally established to convene its duties within first three months of project and regular biannual scheduled 3. Establish project advisory (or expert) groups or sub-steering committees as deem necessary and their ToR formulated, as needed 4. PMU to assess and service national and local training needs in environmental policy, legislation, lagoon and catchment management, ecosystem services assessment, and communication skills 5. Develop training courses and materials on Integrated Environmental Management (IEM) to improve awareness of IEM of FLCMC members and senior management in the government sector; trainings conducted within 6 months of project inception 6. Formulate a draft statutory mandate of a ‘Tonga Interagency Council on FLC’ to be assessed by Year 3 and adopted before the end of the project | | | | | |
| **Output 1.1.2:** Measures delivered to fully engage the Fanga’uta Lagoon Catchment (FLC) communities in lagoon ecosystem management | Number of FLC villages and concerned entities involved in EMP updating and implementation  Number of individuals and/or organizations engaged in design and implementation of mini-projects from Outcome 2 | The existing EMP FLS was prepared in collaboration with 11 government agencies, three NGOs, and more than 20 communities around FL. | By mid-term, all of FLC villages and concerned entities participate in EMP updating and implementation of relating mini-projects. | Lists of FLC community participants in project activity reports  Stakeholder survey demonstrates that FLC communities are fully engaged in the updating and implementation processes.  Mid-term and Final project evaluation reports | Continued political support and commitment for engaging FLC communities into the planning and implementation processes.  Land and lagoon resource tenure issues will not providing negative motivation discouraging active participation in IEM process.  Clearly defined and recognition of stakeholder (FLC community) groups  Sufficient interested, receptive individuals available for capacity building activities |
| Activities:   1. Consolidate identification of key FLC stakeholders 2. Initiate the consultative process in FLC 3. Develop a draft strategy for community action, approaches and functions 4. Sponsor and organize bi-annual lagoon and catchment NGO and stakeholders forums 5. Undertake a selection of demonstrations (or mini-projects) in FLC areas; mini-projects undertaken within 12-18 months of project inception to test replicability and for taking to scale during the FLC IEMP implementation (after Year 3) 6. By Year 2, establish a FLC community-based research and knowledge management center to generate lagoon community action and positive social change through the use of multiple knowledge sources and networks | | | | | |
| **Outcome 1.2:** Participatory updating of the Fanga’uta Lagoon Catchment IEMP completed, adopted, endorsed and budgeted for | Amendments to the environmental management plan of the Fanga’uta Lagoon Catchment | The EMP FLS, a multi-zoning plan, was approved by the cabinet, but limited implementation due to administrative and budget constraints. | By mid-term, The existing EMP FLS has been updated incorporating IEM concepts and adaptive management approaches.  By Year 3, updates/amendments to EMP FLS have been approved and adopted  By the end of the project, the concerned authorities will institutionalize integrated ecosystem management and conservation objective for the FLC within the national development system. | Publication of the EMP FLS Update (or FLC IEMP)  Government publications and communication materials from Outcome 3  Project Reports and publications | Continued political and administrative commitment for integrating IEM into medium- and long-term FLC planning as well as in national development planning  Key stakeholders at the national and local levels maintain their support and involvement during plan updating, reviewing, and endorsement processes.  Institutions receptive to adaptive change |
| **Output 1.2.1:** FLC IEMP prepared and completed; establishing technical, biophysical, oceanographic, socioeconomic and demographic baselines; updating the EMP completed in 2001 with additional parameters to be established | Status of FLC IEMP baseline review and findings completed with key parameters described | The EMP FLS was prepared during 1988-2001 based on scientific information and community consultation. | By Year 1, updating on situation analysis of ecosystems degradation and ecosystem services management in FLC completed | EMP FLS Update reports  Draft FLC IEMP (or EMP FLS Update) available for review and endorsement  Preparatory Task Force meeting minutes and reports | Sufficient networking among regional, national and local experts for exchange of technical information, knowledge and experience across disciplines |
| Activities:   1. Conduct a detailed review on the existing EMP FLS, update data, and identify information gaps on demand for and supply of the key ecosystem services in FLC 2. Consolidate the network of FLC environmental and socio-economic experts 3. Link the FLC management initiative to national development planning and programs and the activities of national and local NGOs as well as the private sector 4. Evaluate current national policy, legal, institutional and human resource arrangements and utilization in respect to FLC coordination and joint management 5. Formulate national and local policy initiatives to facilitate FLC coordination and joint planning 6. Compile demographic framework for FLC from published sources 7. Commission socio-economic surveys in FLC areas to assess current and future patterns of demand for ecosystem services in FLC 8. Establish area-wide patterns of demand; assess opportunity costs of ecosystem services across FLC areas 9. Produce working socio-economic framework to integrate demographic and demand characteristics 10. Identify environmental hot spots and define environmental system limits and parameters; evaluate limits of sustainable use in space and time 11. Convene expert group meetings on FLC environmental policy, legislation and management and publish the results 12. Draft a detailed FLC IEMP setting strategic functional priorities and fostering multiple uses 13. Present the final draft of FLC IEMP to local and national fora; dissemination of draft FLC IEMP to wider audiences | | | | | |
| **Output 1.2.2:** FLC IEMP adopted, mainstreamed and funded | Status of adoption, endorsement and funding of the FLC IEMP | Implementation of the EMP FLS has been a challenge due to the lack of financial commitment and sectoral differences. | By Year 3, the FLC IEMP adopted  By project end, an annual budget request of key concerned ministries has reflected the Administration's priorities in support of the FLC IEMP. | Notification of the Plan in Official Gazette or policy documents  Minutes of meetings  Project M&E reports | Continued political support and commitment to materialize the Plan  Collaboration among concerned government agencies and other stakeholders is achieved. |
| Activities:   1. Prepare and negotiate an updated EMP FLS (FLC IEMP) on the basis of FLC community and stakeholder consultation 2. Clearly delineate responsibilities in implementation of the FLC IEMP across government agencies and other stakeholders 3. Solicit commitments from the government (national and local levels) 4. Develop guidelines on implementing the FLC IEMP (an updated EMP FLS), including lagoon-specific and broader governmental policy commitments and financial obligations, with well-designed ecosystem service and sector indicators 5. Organize biannual capacity building activities for development policy makers and the wider public on FLC IEMP mainstreaming 6. Confirm government’s commitments 7. Major agency-donor conference to discuss the final draft of the FLC IEMP and solicit support for implementation 8. Consensus on timetable for FLC IEMP implementation 9. Confirm donors’ commitments 10. Present the Final Draft FLC IEMP to the FLCMC for adoption 11. Prepare draft FLC management agreements and protocols for consideration by the FLCMC and concerned departments/ministries | | | | | |
| **Output 1.2.3:** Multi-stakeholder participatory mechanisms conducted to ensure adaptive management during the preparation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of FLC IEMP | Regular monitoring of current status of lagoon environment and ecosystem services through a set of measurable key indicators and a response system established that enables modifying key indicators | There exists neither clearly defined monitoring indicator nor response system in FLC management. | By Year 2, monitoring data and information prepared  By mid-term, a monitoring plan developed and implemented to track FLC system status and uncertainties including climate change impacts  By end of project, FLC system monitoring established and fully functioned | Project reports and technical documents  Annual monitoring reports  Communication materials and website from Outcome 3 | Adaptive Management is conceptually concerned with learning, knowledge integration, and experimentation. This requires from start improvement of the understanding of the lagoon system by initiating discussions among the concerned stakeholders and FLC communities.  FLC communities and other stakeholders are ready and willing to participate in adaptive management activities. |
| Activities:   1. Engage concerned government ministries and statutory authorities in identifying related issues and priorities, as well as adaptation options, to address climate change in the FLC IEMP (during the EMP FLS updating processes) 2. Develop monitoring and evaluation procedures; planning for implementation 3. Confirm commitments to schedule and allocate resources for timely monitoring and assessment of the status of the Fanga’uta Lagoon and catchment areas 4. Identify key monitoring indicators and locations 5. Implement community-based activities to conduct regular monitoring of the status of the Fanga’uta Lagoon and catchment areas 6. Produce annual reports on FLC IEMP implementation and progress; communicate M&E results through the FLCMC and project-related meetings | | | | | |
| **Outcome 2.1:** Improved conditions of critical lagoon habitats, productivity, water quality and fish production through the implementation of priority interventions identified in the IEMP | Status of surrounding habitats and ecosystem services in the Fanga’uta Lagoon | Baselines to be quantified and updated per system in Year 1 | By project end, key habitats (mangroves) and ecosystem services in FLC improved compared to baseline level | Field survey data and technical reports using rapid assessment of ecological change methods  Activity reports and communication materials  Reports from project annual M&E activities  GEF TWs Tracking Tool reports | Local communities and key stakeholders will actively engage in assessment and management of the target ecosystems and their services. |
| **Output 2.1.1:** Areas of approximately 80 ha of the lagoon’s major coastal habitats (mangroves stands) restored | Areas of mangroves in FL | Baselines to be quantified and updated in Year 1 | About 80 hectares of mangroves and other biodiversity resources in the FL remained stable, protected areas conserved and managed mainly for the sustainable use of natural ecosystems | Technical reports and government publications | Awareness improvement activities conducted  Political commitment at the national and local levels |
| Activities:   1. Develop criteria and indicators for sustainable management of mangrove resources and ecosystem services in FL 2. Develop monitoring and evaluation procedures 3. Identify key mangrove conservation hot spots and necessary actions to rehabilitate and maintain conditions 4. Produce a Manual on Mangrove Nursery Techniques 5. Organize biannual on-site trainings for ecological mangrove rehabilitation 6. Sponsor and organize community-based mangrove restoration programs involving local youth and women in raising mangrove saplings and maintaining the mangrove nursery 7. Evaluate the results and define limits of sustainable use in space and time | | | | | |
| **Output 2.1.2:** Mechanisms set up to guarantee participatory fishing area and sustainable fisheries resources management by the FLC communities | Status of lagoon fisheries (as contributing to increased fish harvests, improved livelihoods, and healthy lagoon ecosystems) | Quantity and quality of fish and shellfish catches in the lagoon have declined rapidly, leading to increasing conflict and social tension among different user groups | A total area inside the lagoon have been delineated for fisheries conservation and sustainable fisheries management (to be determined during implementation) | Stakeholder meeting minutes and reports  Technical reports and government documents  Project reports and communication | Government support and commitment to manage lagoon fisheries resources for sustainability of ecosystems and for livelihood improvement  Local stakeholders are ready and willing to share information, discuss issues and agree on solutions |
| Activities:   1. Review of current status of supply of and demand for fisheries resources in the lagoon through participatory survey and assessment 2. Review of existing legal frameworks that govern fisheries activities in the lagoon; consolidate expert opinions on sustainable fisheries management in FL 3. Organize technical workshops and consultative meetings to be participated by concerned government agencies and local communities aiming to define and identify managed areas for fish conservation and sustainable utilization. 4. Evaluate the results and define limits of sustainable use in space and time | | | | | |
| **Output 2.1.3:** Eco-tourism awareness to FLC community conducted and local initiatives demonstrated | Status of eco-tourism activities in FLC | Baselines to be quantified and updated in Year 1 | At least 2 proposals to promote eco-tourism in FLC have been received from local tourism service providers  At least 200 women and 200 youth have been engaged in eco-tourism activities | Business proposals  Community surveys reports  Project reports, publications, and communication materials from Outcome 3 | The economy will support increased returns on investment in eco-tourism practices.  Sufficient interested, receptive individuals and organizations available for training/capacity building |
| Activities:   1. Prepare a detailed report on the participatory FLC eco-tourism program development strategy and implementation plan 2. Identify and execute demonstration and pilot projects to promote eco-tourism in FLC involving experienced tour organizers, local entrepreneurs and community association 3. Organize and/or sponsor trainings, workshops, and awareness campaigns for engaging FLC communities in sustainable eco-tourism, focusing on female villagers and youth living in the FLC areas 4. Evaluate the results and define limits of sustainable eco-tourism business practices | | | | | |
| **Output 2.1.4:** Activities based on sustainable land and forest management demonstrated in the FL catchment areas | Areas with improved vegetation in the lagoon catchment  Number of trainings and participants | There is no management scheme to regulate or monitor land use practices which include cash cropping and free-ranging domestic animals developments. | A total areas of 50 ha with improved vegetation cover in the FLC areas have been established or replanted  Biannual trainings on sustainable land management practices conducted and reported with at least a total of 60 participants attended | Project reports, publications, and training materials | Land and resource tenure issues will not provide negative motivation discouraging adoption of improved practices.  Sufficient interested, receptive individuals and organizations available for training/capacity building |
| Activities:   1. Commission community surveys to identify areas and methods of tree planting along the lagoon’s shores and watershed areas 2. Organize an annual campaign to plant trees and raise public awareness and soil conservation 3. Conduct biannual trainings on sustainable land management practices to minimize pollution loadings into the lagoon targeting villagers and landowners living in the lagoon watershed areas 4. Evaluate the results and define limits of sustainable land management practices in space, method and time | | | | | |
| **Output 2.1.5:** Capacity for Fanga’uta Lagoon water quality control strengthened and on-site activities demonstrated | Measures to control pollution discharged from domestic and other sources adopted and enforced  Number of demonstration/pilot activities as well as on-site trainings and participants | Water quality in the lagoon has decreased and the amount of floating debris has increased over the years, potentially from agriculture, domestic sources, and other development activities in the surrounding lagoon catchment. | A set of recommendations for improvement of water quality in the lagoon have been prepared and adopted for FLC IEMP  At least one training course on sanitation improvement and related technical knowledge targeting FLC communities conducted  At least one on-site demonstration/pilot activity implemented | Technical review reports and fact findings  Project reports, publications, and communication materials from Outcome 3 | Collaboration among concerned government agencies and other stakeholders is achieved.  Authorities, politicians, and land owners commit to support land-use planning/zoning methods as assumed  Sufficient interested, receptive individuals and organizations available for training/capacity building |
| Activities:   1. Review the current situation on the nature and extent of agricultural chemical fertilizer/pesticide usage and urban wastewater discharge (including domestic, commercial and industrial sources) in the FLC areas 2. Select a methodology for identifying the nature and extent of pollution discharged into the Fanga’uta Lagoon, and issue scoping 3. Analyze historical water quality monitoring data relative to prevailing environmental conditions to identify links between off-site movement of pollution and factors such as: vegetation cover (height and density of trees); landscape (soil, slopes, buffer strips); climatic conditions (rainfall events, soil dryness index); and methods of chemical pesticide/fertilizer application (broad-acre, point, aerial, ground based) as well as waste disposal from point sources and non-point sources; define information and data gaps 4. Identify appropriate technologies and systems for controlling pollution from domestic sources in FLC areas 5. Identify and execute demonstration and pilot projects to minimize impacts of domestic sources of pollution in target FLC villages 6. Organize on-site trainings and workshops on sanitation improvement and related technical knowledge targeting key FLC communities 7. Conduct a detailed review and evaluation of the use existing legal and institutional instruments for control of water quality in the lagoon; identify key compliance issues and constraints; and recommend appropriate ways to mitigating the existing and potential impacts of non-compliance 8. Organize annual trainings for key concerned decision-makers and community leaders as well as other stakeholders on land-use zoning/planning 9. Evaluate the results and define limits of sustainable land development in FLC | | | | | |
| **Outcome 3.1:** Increased awareness and appreciation of the ecosystem services of the Fanga’uta Lagoon  **[Output 3.1.1:** Awareness programs conducted through the production and dissemination of awareness materials; lessons learned shared with the PICs through the regional program support project] | Number of project brochures, media releases, video documentary in local dialect, feature press article, and website produced, distributed and used in training and capacity building activities concerning the ecosystem services of the Fanga’uta Lagoon | No awareness and communication materials in existence  There is a need to involve stakeholder groups in all stages of FLC IEMP process; limited channels to educate people on benefits of improving FLC conditions. | Production of a series of selected awareness and communication materials, which have been disseminated in all relevant Agencies associated with the NECCC as well as in all lagoon villages and the nearby areas of Tongatapu | Project reports  Reports from project annual M&E activities  GEF TWs Tracking Tool reports  Technical documents and communication materials produced and disseminated | Technical information, knowledge and experiences available from Outcome 1 and Outcome 2 |
| Activities:   1. Consolidate the network of key stakeholders in assessing the production and distribution of FLC awareness materials 2. Commission stakeholder surveys and interviews to define needs and gaps 3. Design key substances created for the FLC awareness and communication purposes 4. Select and produce effective awareness and communication materials 5. Publish and disseminate IEM and FLC IEMP information and communication materials and share these with the regional Pacific R2R program support project 6. Establish, update and improve web access 7. Create public awareness and ecosystem services education campaigns 8. Evaluate periodically the results and identify remaining needs and gaps | | | | | |

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| No. | Document |
| 1 | GEF Project Information Form (PIF), Project Document and Log Frame Analysis |
| 2 | Project Implementation Review Report 2016 |
| 3 | Fangauta Stewardship Plan: Action Plan 2017-2021 |
| 4 | Tonga R2R Quarterly Progress Report 2015, 2016 and 2017 |
| 5 | Community Consultation Report 2015 |
| 6 | Revised Environmental Management Plan for Fanga’uta Lagoon System (Fanga’uta Stewardship Plan) & its annexes |
| 7 | Fanga’uta Lagoon Monitoring Manual |
| 8 | List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Boards, and other partners to be consulted |
| 9 | Project budget and financial data |
| 10 | Technical Working Group Meeting Minutes 2015-2017 |
| 11 | Project Board Meeting Minutes 2015-2017 |
| 12 | Community Management Committee Meeting Minutes 2015-2017 |
| 13 | Inception Workshop Report |
| 14 | Policy Review for IEMP-FLC 2016 |
| 15 | Fanga’uta Status Report 2015-2016 |
| 16 | Quarterly Newsletter 2015-2017 |
| 17 | R2R Summary of Progress 2015- 2017 |
| 18 | R2R Communication Plan |
| 19 | Special Management Plans for 4 villages in Fanga’uta |
| 20 | GEF Tracking Tools at baseline, mid-term, and terminal |

Annex C: Evaluation Questions

*This is a generic list, to be further detailed with more specific questions by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on the particulars of the project.*

| **Evaluative Criteria Questions** | | **Indicators** | **Sources** | **Methodology** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels? | | | | |
|  | * To what extent is the project suited to local and national development priorities and policies? |  |  |  |
|  | * To what extent is the project is in line with GEF operational programs? |  |  |  |
|  | * To what extent are the objectives and design of the project supporting regional environment and development priorities? |  |  |  |
| Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? | | | | | |
|  | * Has the project been effective in achieving the expected outcomes and objectives? |  |  |  | |
|  | * To what extent has the project increased institutional capacity (at national and island level) to increase the resilience of coastal areas and community settlements in Tuvalu? |  |  |  | |
|  | * How was the project been able to influence monitoring and evaluation for coastal resilience? |  |  |  | |
|  | * What were the risks involved and to what extent were they managed? |  |  |  | |
|  | * What lessons have been learned from the project regarding achievement of outcomes? |  |  |  | |
|  | * What changes could have been made (if any) to the design of the project in order to improve the achievement of the project’s expected results? |  |  |  | |
| Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards? | | | | | |
|  | * How cost-effective were project interventions? To what extent was project support provided in an efficient way? |  |  |  | |
|  | * How efficient were partnership arrangements for the project and why? |  |  |  | |
|  | * Did the project efficiently utilize local capacity in implementation? |  |  |  | |
|  | * What lessons can be drawn regarding efficiency for other similar projects in the future? |  |  |  | |
|  | * Was project support provided in an efficient way? |  |  |  | |
| Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? | | | | | |
|  | * What risk have affected/influenced the project and in what ways? |  |  |  | |
|  | * How were these risks managed? |  |  |  | |
|  | * What lessons can be drawn regarding sustainability of project results? |  |  |  | |
|  | * What changes could have been made (if any) to the design of the project in order to improve the sustainability of the project results? |  |  |  | |
| **Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?** | | | | | |
|  | * To what extent has the project contributed to, or enabled a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.? |  |  |  | |
|  | * What lessons can be drawn regarding contributions towards reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological stress? |  |  |  | |
|  | * What changes could have been made (if any) to the design of the project in order to improve the reduction of environmental stress and/or improve ecological status? |  |  |  | |

Annex D: Rating Scales

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

Annex E: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form

**Evaluators:**

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people’s right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people’s right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders’ dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form[[3]](#footnote-3)**

**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: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Annex F: Evaluation Report Outline[[4]](#footnote-4)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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 Manual[[5]](#footnote-5)) |
| **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 rated[[6]](#footnote-6)) |
| **3.1** | Project Design / Formulation   * Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators) * Assumptions and Risks * Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design * Planned stakeholder participation * Replication approach * UNDP comparative advantage * Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector * Management arrangements |
| **3.2** | Project Implementation   * Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation) * Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region) * Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management * 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 * Report Clearance Form * Annexed in a separate file: TE Audit Trail * Annexed in a separate file: Terminal GEF Tracking Took |

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: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Annex H: TE Report audit trail

The following is a template for the evaluator to show how the received comments on the draft TE report have (or have not) been incorporated into the final TE report. This audit trail should be included as an annex in the final TE report.

**To the comments received on (*date*) from the Terminal Evaluation of (*project name*) (UNDP *PIMS #)***

*The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft Terminal Evaluation report; they are referenced by institution (“Author” column) and by comment number (“#” column):*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author** | **#** | **Para No./ comment location** | **Comment/Feedback on the draft TE report** | **Evaluator response and actions taken** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

1. For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](http://www.undp.org/evaluation/handbook), Chapter 7, pg. 163 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office:  [ROTI Handbook 2009](http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/M2_ROtI%20Handbook.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)