

## **Annex – I: Terms of Reference**

### ***International Consultant for Terminal Evaluation for UNDP/GEF Project: PIMS 4434: Integrated Approach to Management of Forests in Turkey, with Demonstration in High Conservation Value Forests in the Mediterranean Region (SFM)***

#### **1. BACKGROUND**

UNDP Turkey and General Directorate of Forestry (GDF) work in close collaboration to enhance Turkey's efforts for Sustainable Forest Management (SFM). The existing collaboration on sustainable forest management between the GDF and UNDP advances the synergy between forest and sustainable development with special emphasis on climate change mitigation and biodiversity. This partnership will further strengthen and may become more beneficial when the UNDP Turkey Country Office and Ministry of Forestry and Water Affairs start sharing the existing reservoir of knowledge and experience with other countries through collaborative partnerships.

One of the projects in collaboration with the GDF is a 5 year long (2013-2018) GEF Full Size Project, namely Integrated Approach to Management of Forests in Turkey, with Demonstration in High Conservation Value Forests in the Mediterranean Region, aka SFM GEF Project. The project has a unique structure with its multi focal area objectives (i.e. Climate Change Mitigation, Sustainable Forest Management and Biodiversity) which would provide opportunities to implement activities in a holistic way for integrating forests with environmental and land use policies, rural development, wood and non-wood products and services. More particularly, the project will demonstrate approaches to generating, measuring, reporting on, and verifying carbon, biodiversity and socio-economic benefits generated through this integrated approach at five Mediterranean forest sites (over a total area of 450,000 ha).

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 Approach to Management of Forests in Turkey, with Demonstration in High Conservation Value Forests in the Mediterranean Region (PIMS 4434)**. The Consultant shall serve for terminal evaluation of all components.

In the view of the above, the Consultant will serve for Terminal evaluation of the Integrated Approach to Management of Forests in Turkey, with Demonstration in High Conservation Value Forests in the Mediterranean Region (SFM) Project.

#### **2. OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE**

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. The consultant as Terminal Evaluation Expert will be conducted the evaluation of the project according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects.

### **3. DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANT (IC)**

The generic duties and responsibilities of the IC are as follows:

- Preparing detailed methodology, work plan and outline;
- Preparing Terminal Evaluation Report with findings;
- Submitting lessons learned and recommendations for improvement, including recommendations for the revision of project strategy, approach, outputs and activities, if necessary;
- Providing recommendations for a strategy for future replication of the project approach for other types of the climate change and sustainable energy financing projects, for other countries in the region;
- Preparing description of best practices, and an “action list” in a certain area of particular importance for the project;
- Reviewing the documents listed in Annex 2b.

If required by the UNDP Project Team, the IC could provide additional consultancy services on topics related to her/his expertise area for other activities within the scope of this Terms of Reference.

### **4. INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS**

UNDP will provide to IC all relevant background documents. UNDP is not required to provide any physical facility for the work of the IC. However, depending on the availability of physical facilities (e.g. working space, computer, printer, telephone lines, internet connection etc.) and at the discretion of the UNDP and relevant stakeholders, such facilities may be provided at the disposal of the IC.

The IC shall report to Biodiversity and Natural Resources Cluster Lead of UNDP Turkey. The IC shall conduct the Terminal Evaluation in collaboration with Monitoring & Evaluation Advisor of CCE Portfolio at UNDP CO. The IC cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project’s related activities.

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation lies with UNDP Country Office in Turkey. UNDP will assign a facilitator to set up the stakeholder interviews, arrange the field visits, coordinate with the GDF and provide translation (when necessary).

In preparation for the evaluation mission, Biodiversity and Natural Resources Cluster Lead, with assistance of UNDP CO, will arrange completion of the Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT). Results of METT should be used by an international project evaluation consultant, who will provide his/her comments and track the progress in management effectiveness of project sites. Upon incorporation of the evaluator’s comments the METT will be finalized and the results should be attached as a mandatory Annex to the Terminal Evaluation report. **This Terms of Reference follow the UNDP-GEF policies and procedures.**

### **5. DELIVERABLES**

The core product of the Terminal Evaluation will be the Terminal Evaluation Report and Rating Tables given in Annex 2 of this Terms of Reference. IC shall be responsible to submit the following deliverables.

Activity	Milestone/Deliverables	Estimated Deadline	Estimated Number of Days to be invested*
<b>Preparation</b>	<b><u>Inception Report:</u></b> Desk review, development of methodology, updating timetable, drafting mission programme. Incorporating comments received from UNDP Country Office (if necessary).	<b>15 April 2020</b>	5
<b>Evaluation Mission</b>	In-country field visits, interviews, preliminary mission findings briefing(s), debriefings with project partners and providing aide memoire. Delivering a presentation on aide memoire (finding(s) and recommendation(s)) to Project Partners.	<b>20 May 2020</b>	10
<b>Draft Evaluation Report</b>	Submission of <b><u>Draft Terminal Evaluation report</u></b>	<b>20 June 2020</b>	7
<b>Final Evaluation Report</b>	<b><u>Finalization of the Terminal Evaluation Report</u></b> in line with the comments received from the relevant stakeholders regarding the Draft MTR Report.	<b>30 June 2020</b>	3
<b>Total Number of days</b>			25

Each and every activity to be conducted by the IC is subject to UNDP approval. Each step shall be conducted upon approval of the previous step by UNDP.

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

\*Number of days to be invested for each deliverable may change but the **total number of days worked by the individual contractor cannot exceed 25 days for this assignment** (i.e. for submission of the deliverables) as defined in the ToR.

### Reporting Line

The IC shall be responsible to the Biodiversity and Natural Resources Cluster Lead for the completion of the tasks and duties assigned in Section 5. Deliverables of this ToR. All of the reports are subject to approval from Biodiversity and Natural Resources Cluster Lead in order to realize the payments to the IC.

### Reporting Language

The reporting language shall be in English.

### Title Rights

The title rights, copyrights and all other rights whatsoever nature in any material produced under the provisions of this TORs will be vested exclusively in UNDP.

## 6. MINIMUM QUALIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

The expected qualifications of the expert are as follows:

	Minimum Requirements	Assets
<b>General Qualifications</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bachelor’s Degree in environmental studies/economics/Engineering/ natural resources/business administration. (5 Points)</li> <li>Fluency in English. (5 Points)</li> <li>Full computer literacy. (4 Points)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Asset:</b> Masters or Higher Degree in natural resources/biology/forestry/ climate change/ environmental economics/ engineering/ business administration/ economics. (7 Points)</li> </ul>
<b>General Professional Experience</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minimum ten (10) years of relevant professional experience. (15 Points)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Asset:</b> More than fifteen (15) years of relevant professional experience (7 Points)</li> </ul>
<b>Specific Experience</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5 years of specific professional experience in environmental projects /forestry projects/ biodiversity/ monitoring and evaluation of projects. (20 Points)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Asset:</b> Monitoring and evaluation experience in GEF funded projects. (7 Points)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Notes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Internships (paid/unpaid) are not considered professional experience.</li> <li>Obligatory military service is not considered professional experience.</li> <li>Professional experience gained in an international setting is considered international experience.</li> <li>Female candidates are encouraged to apply.</li> </ul>		

## 7. TIMING AND DURATION

The assignment is planned to be started in **02 March 2020** and be completed by **15 July 2020**. The IC is expected to invest **(at maximum) 25 working days** throughout the contract duration as per the Deliverable Table in Section 5.

## 8. PLACE OF WORK

Place of work (duty station) for the assignment is home-based.

There are *missions to Ankara and selected project sites*. The mission shall be a minimum of 10 working days in Turkey, although this may be conducted as two shorter missions with the mutual agreement of the IC and UNDP Turkey, provided that the total number of days spent in Turkey is not less than 10 working days. The mission to Turkey will cover days spent in Ankara, as well as days spent to visit project sites and also possibly a day or days in Istanbul for relevant meetings. All travel related costs (cost items indicated below) of these missions out of the duty station (economy class flight ticket and accommodation in 3 or 4-star hotel) will be borne by UNDP. Approval of UNDP is needed prior to the missions is needed. The costs of these missions may either be;

- Arranged and covered by UNDP CO from the respective project budget without making any reimbursements to the consultant or
- Reimbursed to the consultant upon the submission of the receipts/invoices of the expenses by the consultant and approval of the UNDP. The reimbursement of each cost item subject to following constraints/conditions provided in below table;
- covered by the combination of both options

Cost item	Constraints	Conditions of Reimbursement
Travel (intercity transportation)	full-fare economy class tickets	1- Approval by UNDP of the cost items before the initiation of travel 2- Submission of the invoices/receipts, etc. by the consultant with the UNDP's F-10 Form 3- Acceptance and Approval by UNDP of the invoices and F-10 Form.
Accommodation	Up to 50% of the effective DSA rate of UNDP for the respective location	
Breakfast	Up to 6% of the effective DSA rate of UNDP for the respective location	
Lunch	Up to 12% of the effective DSA rate of UNDP for the respective location	
Dinner	Up to 12% of the effective DSA rate of UNDP for the respective location	
Other Expenses (intra city transportations, transfer cost from /to terminals, etc.)	Up to 20% of effective DSA rate of UNDP for the respective location	

## 9. PAYMENTS

Payments will be made within 30 days upon acceptance and approval of the corresponding deliverable by UNDP on the basis of actual number of days invested in that respective deliverable and the pertaining Certification of Payment document signed by the IC and approved by the responsible Cluster Lead.

The total amount of payment to be affected to the IC within the scope of this contract **cannot exceed 25 working days**. The IC shall be paid in USD if he/she resides in a country different than Turkey. If he/she resides in Turkey, the payment shall be realized in TL through conversion of the USD amount by the official UN exchange rate valid on the date of money transfer.

If the deliverables are not produced and delivered by the IC to the satisfaction of UNDP as approved by the responsible Cluster Lead, no payment will be made even if the IC has invested man/days to produce and deliver such deliverables.

Expected delivery dates of the reports will be finalized by UNDP during the Briefing Meeting that will be conducted upon contract signature.

The amount paid to the IC shall be gross and inclusive of all associated costs such as social security, pension and income tax etc.

Tax Obligations: The IC is solely responsible for all taxation or other assessments on any income derived from UNDP. UNDP will not make any withholding from payments for the purposes of income tax. UNDP is exempt from any liabilities regarding taxation and will not reimburse any such taxation to the IC.

## ANNEX 1.A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

### RESULTS AND RESOURCES FRAMEWORK

<p><b>This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in the 2011 – 2015 CPD for Turkey</b></p> <p>Outcome 3: Strengthening policy formulation and implementation capacity for the protection of the environment, and cultural heritage in line with sustainable development principles and taking into consideration climate change and disaster management</p>
<p><b>Country Programme Outcome Indicators:</b></p> <p>Reductions in the level greenhouse gas emissions.</p>
<p><b>Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development</b></p> <p>Key Result Area 4.1. Mainstreaming environment and energy Key result area 4.3. Promoting climate change adaptation</p>
<p><b>Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program:</b></p> <p>BD-1 Outcome 1.1 Improved management effectiveness of existing and new protected areas. Output 1.1. New protected areas (number) and coverage (hectares) of unprotected ecosystems. Output 1.2. New protected areas (number) and coverage (hectares) of unprotected threatened species (number). CCM-5 Outcome 5.1. Good management practices in LULUCF adopted both within the forest land and in the wider landscape Outcome 5.2. GHG emissions avoided and carbon sequestered Output 5.1. Carbon stock monitoring systems established Output 5.2. Forests and non-forest lands under good management practices CCM-3 Outcome 3.2 Investment in renewable energy technologies increased Output 3.2 Renewable energy capacity installed SFM REDD-1 Outcome 1.3 Good management practices in the wider forest landscape developed and adopted by relevant economic sectors. Output 1.3 Forest area (hectares) under sustainable management SFM REDD-2 Outcome 2.1 Enhanced institutional capacity to account for GHG emission reduction and increase in carbon stocks. Output 2.1 National forest carbon monitoring systems in place</p>
<p><b>Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes:</b> As per project framework on page 1 of the CEO Endorsement Document</p>
<p><b>Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators:</b> As per project framework on page 1 of the CEO Endorsement Document</p>

Project Strategy	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Baseline	Target <sup>1</sup>	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
<p><b>Objective:</b> To promote an integrated approach to management of forests in Turkey, demonstrating</p>	<p>Area of forest landscapes in Turkey with integrated forest-plans developed and under implementation that deliver multiple</p>	0	0.45 mln ha	<p>Forest management plans of Forest Enterprise Directorates (FED)</p>	<p>Ongoing institutional rivalries do not limit full implementation of updated policy framework</p>

<sup>1</sup> The target timeframe for all indicators is by project end, unless otherwise stated.

Project Strategy	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Baseline	Target <sup>1</sup>	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
multiple environmental benefits in high conservation value forests in the Mediterranean forest region	environmental benefits (biodiversity, climate change), ha.				
<b>Component 1.</b> Policy and institutional framework for integrated forest management within landscape	LULUCF Unit	No properly capacitated LULUCF Unit in the Government	One adequately staffed and funded LULUCF unit with technical capacities to drive forest carbon efforts forward in the country	GDF staffing table and annual budgets	Global systemic development of carbon credit systems (market and/or other) provides long-term, viable and adequate support for forest sector credit generation
	Forest protected area regulatory framework	No legal framework defining forest PA expansion and integration within broader landscape	Effective regulatory framework enables GDF to establish forest PAs based on combined SFM criteria, including biodiversity and carbon	Revised enabling regulation	
	MRV for forest-based mitigation and sequestration	No MRV	One MRV for forest-based mitigation and sequestration in Turkey is developed, with initial emphasis on Mediterranean region.	Project reporting re. MRV and FIS database	
	Forest sector Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Action (NAMA)  <b>Establishing the online decision support system for GDF</b>  (In line with the Paris agreement and the guidance of the Ministry of Environment and Urbanization, and the focal point for	No NAMA  No DSS	One fully developed NAMA covering 2-4 million ha Mediterranean-region forests  One software program for DSS is developed and submitted to GDF for further development.	Submitted NAMA proposal  Submitted DSS software program	



Project Strategy	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Baseline	Target <sup>1</sup>	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	<p>UNFCCC in Turkey, it was decided to focus on LULUCF sector Nationally Determined Contributions (NDC) with a stronger MRV system. NAMA preparation task has been replaced with preparation of MRV and reporting of LULUCF sector within NDC as per Project Board decision (February 2015). During the last Steering Committee Meeting held in May 2019, it was agreed that the relevant indicator of Output 1.5 in the Results Framework of the Project (National Mitigation Action in the Forestry Sector) should be changed as (Establishing the online decision support system for GDF) as suggested in the Mid-term Evaluation Review.</p> <p>A program for the Decision Support System produced and submitted to GDF on April 2019. GDF has decided to name the system as "Forest Management</p>				

Project Strategy	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Baseline	Target <sup>1</sup>	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	System" (Orman Yönetim Sistemi in Turkish)				
<b>Component 2.</b> Implementation of forest-based GHG mitigation and carbon sequestration tools within landscape	Fire management and carbon losses from fires	Suppression-focused fire management system; annual carbon losses at five pilot sites average 3,629 tCO <sub>2</sub> /y	Proactive (prevention and load management focussed) fire management methods at pilot sites generate carbon benefits of 1,646 tCO <sub>2</sub> /y over baseline.	Project MRV	No significant variance from PPG calculations re. carbon benefits in individual thematic areas arise once more sophisticated measurement techniques are employed.
	Silvicultural methods consider carbon and biodiversity aspects. Assessment of associated carbon benefits.	Carbon benefits not taken into account or measured; locations not chosen to maximize connectivity enhancements.	Silvicultural approaches at pilot sites generate carbon benefits of 11,572 tCO <sub>2</sub> /y along with enhanced connectivity.	Project MRV	
	Fuel wood removals and associated carbon fluxes.	High levels of legal and illegal fuel wood removals for household consumption, especially home heating, with resulting annual carbon losses at five pilot sites averaging 18,775 tCO <sub>2</sub> /y. No alternative system to replace fire wood consumption in place.	Expansion of micro-credit program into Mediterranean region generates carbon benefits of 13,038 tCO <sub>2</sub> /y over baseline	Project MRV	
	Integrated pest management (IPM) and associated carbon fluxes	No proactive IPM, resulting annual carbon losses at five pilot sites averaging 45,286 tCO <sub>2</sub> /y.	Introduction of IPM methods and establishment of two pest centres generates carbon benefits of 30,191 tCO <sub>2</sub> /y over baseline.	Project MRV	
	Carbon protocols designed and completed before, during and after implementation of	No carbon protocol	Introduction of carbon protocols in line with MRV system (Output 1.3) enabling integration of	Project MRV; Forest Management Plans	

Project Strategy	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Baseline	Target <sup>1</sup>	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	enhancement and mitigation efforts		climate change into forest management plans through a central LULUCF Database under Forest Information System (FIS) Project of GDF.		
<b>Component 3.</b> Strengthening protection of high conservation value forests in Mediterranean landscape	Extent of forest Pas	Mediterranean forest habitats are under-represented in national PA system	Effective protection extended to 79,960 ha, including under-represented Mediterranean forest habitats.	Official gazette; Forest management plans	Newly gazetted areas are adequately protected through management plans and associated measures
	PA management effectiveness: METT Score	Aladağlar National Parks - 35 METT Score Kartal Lake Nature Reserve - 21 METT score	Aladağlar National Parks - 40 METT Score Kartal Lake Nature Reserve - 40 METT score	METT scorecards	
	Improvement in biodiversity indicator species at pilot sites  <b>Improvement in target species at pilot site</b> (During the Last Steering Committee meeting held in May 2019, a decision has been made to change the indicator for Output 3.3 from “Improvement in biodiversity indicator species at pilot sites” ) to "Improvement in target species at pilot sites" along with modified target “Protection of minimum area of suitable habitat for viable population" as proposed by the Mid-Term Review. The project team with the support of	See baseline values for pilot sites in table below  No Figures yet	See target values for pilot sites in table below  Protection of minimum area of suitable habitat for viable population	Ecological surveys  Areas allocated in the Forest Management Plans	

Project Strategy	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Baseline	Target <sup>1</sup>	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	<p>project partner Nature Conservation Centre, will work on this specific indicator and calculate the habitat suitability for the species. The final figures and level of achievement will be reflected to the terminal report of the project)</p>				
	<p>Carbon benefits from forest Pas</p>	<p>Areas are subject to regular logging according to management plans, carbon pools diminishing.</p>	<p>Net carbon benefit associated with new conservation areas estimated at 64,245 t CO<sub>2</sub>e/year.</p>	<p>Project MRV</p>	

## **ANNEX 1.B: LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE IC**

---

1. PIF
2. UNDP Initiation Plan
3. UNDP Project Document
4. UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results
5. Project Inception Report
6. All Project Implementation Reports (PIR's)
7. Mid-Term Review Report
8. Audit reports
9. Knowledge products and visibility materials including reports, training materials, etc. produced under the project
10. Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools at CEO endorsement and midterm (*fill in specific TTs for this project's focal area*)
11. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
12. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team

The following documents will also be available:

13. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
14. Minutes of the Project Steering Committee Meetings and other meetings (if any)
15. Project site location maps

**ANNEX 1.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
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•		•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•

## ANNEX 1.D: RATING SCALES

---

<p><b><i>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&amp;E, I&amp;E Execution</i></b></p> <p>6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings          5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings          4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS)          3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings          2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems          1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems</p>	<p><b><i>Sustainability ratings:</i></b></p> <p>4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability          3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks          2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks          1. Unlikely (U): severe risks</p>	<p><b><i>Relevance ratings</i></b></p> <p>2. Relevant (R)          1.. Not relevant (NR)</p> <p><b><i>Impact Ratings:</i></b></p> <p>3. Significant (S)          2. Minimal (M)          1. Negligible (N)</p>
<p><i>Additional ratings where relevant:</i>          Not Applicable (N/A)          Unable to Assess (U/A)</p>		

## ANNEX 1.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<sup>2</sup>

#### 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: \_\_\_\_\_

---

<sup>2</sup>[www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct](http://www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct)



## ANNEX 1.F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE<sup>3</sup>

---

- 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<sup>4</sup>)
- 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<sup>5</sup>)
- 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

---

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

<sup>4</sup> UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

<sup>5</sup> 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.

- 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

**ANNEX 1.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 1 – H: DETAILED INFORMATION WITH REGARDS TO THE ASSIGNMENT

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

### PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	<b>Integrated Approach to Management of Forests in Turkey, with Demonstration in High Conservation Value Forests in the Mediterranean Region</b>			
GEF Project ID:	4434		<i>at endorsement</i> (Million US\$)	<i>at completion</i> (Million US\$)
UNDP Project ID:	84294	GEF financing:	7,120,000	7,120,000
Country:	Turkey			
Region:	Europe and CIS			
Focal Area:	Multi-Focal Areas Biodiversity Climate Change- Mitigation Sustainable Forest Management (SFM)	Total co-financing:	21,430,000	16,917,881
Executing Agency:	General Directorate of Forestry (GDF)	Total Project Cost:	28,550,000	28,550,000
Other Partners involved:	Nature Conservation Center; Gold Standard Foundation	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		July 23, 2013
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: January 22, 2020	Actual:

## EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

An overall approach and method<sup>6</sup> for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact**, as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR (*fill in Annex I.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 (*location*), including the following project sites (*list*). Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: (*list key stakeholders*).

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

## EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS

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

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

<sup>6</sup> For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](#), Chapter 7, pg. 163

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.<sup>7</sup>

## CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

---

<sup>7</sup> 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](#)

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

## **IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS**

---

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in **Turkey**. 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.

## **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 evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

## **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'

The consultant should avoid any kind of discriminatory behavior including gender discrimination and ensure that;

- human rights and gender equality are prioritized as an ethical principle within all actions;
  - activities are designed and implemented in accordance with “Social and Environmental Standards of UNDP”;
  - any kind of diversities based on ethnicity, age, sexual orientation, disability, religion, class, gender are respected within all implementations including data production;
  - differentiated needs of women and men are considered;
  - inclusive approach is reflected within all actions and implementations, in that sense an enabling and accessible setup in various senses such as disability gender language barrier is created;
- necessary arrangements to provide gender parity within all committees, meetings, trainings etc. introduced.