****

**DETAILED TERMS OF REFERENCE**

**FOR**

**INDEPENDENT TERMINAL EVALUATION OF THE PROJECT**

**EXPANSION AND STRENGTHENING OF THE PROTECTED AREA SUBSYSTEM OF THE OUTER ISLANDS OF SEYCHELLES AND ITS INTEGRATION INTO THE BROADER LAND AND SEASCAPE**

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**Expansion and Strengthening of the Protected Area Subsystem of the Outer Islands of Seychelles and its Integration into the broader land and seascape (PIMS # 4529.)**

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

Project Summary Table

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Title:** | Expansion and Strengthening of the Protected Area Subsystem of the Outer Islands of Seychelles and its Integration into the broader land and seascape | | | | | |
| **GEF Project ID:** | | 4717 |  | ***at endorsement (Million US$)*** | | ***at completion (Million US$)*** |
| **UNDP Project ID:** | | 4529 | **GEF financing:** | $1,785,500 | | $1,785,500 |
| **Country:** | | Seychelles | **IA/EA own:** | Same as Government | | Same as Government |
| **Region:** | | Africa | **Government:** | $1,042,683 | | $1,042,683 |
| **Focal Area:** | | Biodiversity | **Other:** | $ 9,241,366 | | $ 9,241,366 |
| **FA Objectives, (OP/SP):** | |  | **Total co-financing:** | $10,434,049 | | $10,434,049 (tbc) |
| **Executing Agency:** | | Ministry of Environment, Energy and Climate Change | **Total Project Cost:** | $12,219,549 | | $12,219,549 |
| **Other Partners involved:** | | Island Conservation Society | **ProDoc Signature (date project began):** | | | August 2014 |
| **(Operational) Closing Date:** | | Proposed:  31st June 202 | Actual:  31st June 2020 |

Objective and Scope

The project was designed topromote the conservation and sustainable use of terrestrial and marine biodiversity in the Seychelles’ Outer Islands by expanding the protected areas system and strengthening protected area management, supported by broad-scale ecosystem planning and sustainable land management activities to conserve ecosystem functions. The project will focus outputs and activities – over a period of five years – to achieve both biodiversity conservation and sustainable land management goals: First, to enable biodiversity conservation, the project will support the official establishment of five new protected areas in the Outer Islands, encompassing 1,237 hectares of terrestrial ecosystems and 76,258 hectares of marine ecosystems. Second, to enable sustainable land management, the project will ensure the establishment of the necessary institutional framework (information and planning systems) to support integrated management of the new PA sites that not only addresses BD conservation but also reduces land degradation impacts.

The project’s goal is to *conserve biodiversity in Seychelles Outer Islands through a protected area and sustainable development approach*.

The project objective is to *promote the conservation and sustainable use of coastal and marine biodiversity in the Seychelles’ Outer Islands by integrating a National Subsystem of Coastal and Marine Protected Areas (CMPAs) into the broader land- and seascape while reducing the pressures on natural resources from competing land uses.*

In order to achieve the above objective, the project’s intervention has been organised in two components,

Outcome 1: Management effectiveness is enhanced within a sample of coastal and marine protected areas (IUCN Category I, II and VI) operating under innovative public-private-civil society partnership agreements.

Outcome 2: Sustainable Development and CMPA management integrated into broader land/seascape in the Outer Islands

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

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

Evaluation approach and method

An overall approach and method[[1]](#footnote-1) for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact,** as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR (*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](https://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/capacity-building/discussion-paper--innovations-in-monitoring---evaluating-results/) 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**Seychelles.**Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals, at a minimum: **Ministry Environment, Energy and Climate Change (MEECC), Island Conservation Society (ICS), Island Development Company (IDC),Seychelles Islands Foundation (SIF),Seychelles National Parks Authority (SNPA), D’Arros Research Centre/Save our Seas (DRC/SOS), Seychelles Fishing Authority (SFA), Ministry of Housing, Infrastructure and Land Transport (MHILT), Seychelles Maritime Safety Administration (SMSA), Seychelles Coast Guard (SCG), Desroches Island Development Limited (DIDL), Alphonse Island Fishing Company (AIL), Fishing Boat Owners Association (FBOA), University of Seychelles (UNISEY) and The Nature Conservancy (TNC).**

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** | **UNDP own financing (mill. US$)** | | **Government** | | **Partner Agency** | | **Total** | |
| **(type/source)** | **(mill. US$)** | | **(mill. US$)** | | **(mill. US$)** | |
| **Planned** | **Actual**  **(as at June 2019)** | **Planned** | **Actual**  **(as at June 2019)** | **Planned** | **Actual**  **(as at June 2019)** | **Planned** | **Actual**  **(as at June 2019)** |
| **Grants** | 150,000 | 125,000 |  |  | 109,500 | 261,900 | 259,500 | 386,900 |
| **Loans/Concessions** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **In-kind support** |  |  | 1,042,683 | 977,354 | 9,131,866 | 6,291,032 | 10,174,549 | 7,268,386 |
| **Other** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Totals** | **150,000** | **125,000** | **1,042,683** | **977,354** | **9,241,366** | **6,552,932** | **10,434,049** | **7,655,286** |

Mainstreaming

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

Impact

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

Conclusions, recommendations & lessons

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

Implementation arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in **Seychelles.** *.*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 ***20* days** within a period of 3 months according to the following plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Timing** | **Completion Date** |
| **Preparation** | *2* days | *Early November 2019* |
| **Evaluation Mission** | *10* days in country | *Between 15th November to 15th December 2019* |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | *5* days | *End of December 2019 /Beginning of January 2020* |
| **Final Report** | *3* days | *End of January 2020* |

Evaluation deliverables

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

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

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

Team Composition

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

The evaluator must present the following qualifications:

Corporate Competencies

* Demonstrates integrity by modelling the UNs values and ethical standards.
* Advocates and promotes the vision, mission, and strategic goals of UN.
* Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability.
* Treats all people fairly without favouritism.

Functional Competencies

* Operational effectiveness.
* Solid knowledge of financial and human resources management, contract, asset and procurement, information and communication technology, general administration.
* Ability to lead business processes re-engineering, implementation of new systems (business Management and Leadership.
* Builds strong relationships with clients, focuses on impact and result for the client and responds positively to feedback.
* Consistently approaches work with energy and a positive, constructive attitude.
* Demonstrates excellent oral and written communication skills.
* Demonstrates openness to change and ability to manage complexities.
* Shows mentoring as well as conflict resolution skills.

**Required Skills and Experience**

* An MSc (minimum requirement) or higher degree in Environment, Natural Resource Management or related fields, and adequate experience in the management, design and/or evaluation of comparable natural resources management projects.
* In-depth understanding of biodiversity conservation and protected area issues in tropical/subtropical and island environments (particular experience with Small Island Developing States and in the Western Indian Ocean is an advantage). A minimum of 10 years of relevant working experience is required.
* At least 5 years of evaluation experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies, including use of SMART tools. Competence in adaptive management would be an advantage
* Prior experience in the evaluation of international technical assistance projects with major donor agencies, including UNDP-GEF projects. Experience in similar projects in SIDS is an advantage.
* Demonstrated ability to work in a diverse environment.
* Demonstrated ability to assess complex situations, succinctly distil critical issues, and draw forward-looking conclusions and recommendations.
* Excellent report writing skills and fluency in English is compulsory. Knowledge of French or Creole would be advantageous. Ability to deliver quality reports within the given time.

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** |
| *10%* | Following submission and approval of TE Inception Report |
| *20%* | Following the presentation of initial findings at end of in country Mission |
| *30%* | Following submission and approval (project team and UNDP-CO) of the 1st draft terminal evaluation report |
| *40%* | Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report |

Application process

* Applicants are requested to apply online **UNDP Procurement website** [http://procurement-notices.undp.org/](https://emea01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=http%3A%2F%2Fprocurement-notices.undp.org%2F&data=02%7C01%7C%7C5f964fa5284342826f6b08d622a19b26%7Cb3e5db5e2944483799f57488ace54319%7C0%7C0%7C636734474808811159&sdata=cmd9fh3dDjVxYbKjVjEID3YEbWDL2UL1w0H0eeUJyTo%3D&reserved=0) **and** [https://jobs.undp.org/cj\_view\_jobs.cfm](https://emea01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fjobs.undp.org%2Fcj_view_jobs.cfm&data=02%7C01%7C%7C5f964fa5284342826f6b08d622a19b26%7Cb3e5db5e2944483799f57488ace54319%7C0%7C0%7C636734474808811159&sdata=gsjoxibgB9mXPQFvttPQQhMbNQJCJ0n5gm8oO7NriW8%3D&reserved=0) by **30th September 2019**. 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.
* using the [template](https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx) provided by UNDP;
* **CV** and a **Personal History Form** [(P11 form);](http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc)
* **Brief description of approach to work/technical proposal** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment (max 1 page);
* **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc.), supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the Letter of Confirmation of Interest template. If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

All application materials should be submitted using the **UNDP Procurement website** [http://procurement-notices.undp.org/](https://emea01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=http%3A%2F%2Fprocurement-notices.undp.org%2F&data=02%7C01%7C%7C5f964fa5284342826f6b08d622a19b26%7Cb3e5db5e2944483799f57488ace54319%7C0%7C0%7C636734474808811159&sdata=cmd9fh3dDjVxYbKjVjEID3YEbWDL2UL1w0H0eeUJyTo%3D&reserved=0) **and** [https://jobs.undp.org/cj\_view\_jobs.cfm by 20.00 GMT by](https://jobs.undp.org/cj_view_jobs.cfm by 20.00 GMT by 30th September 2019) **[30](https://jobs.undp.org/cj_view_jobs.cfm by 20.00 GMT by 30th September 2019)[th](https://jobs.undp.org/cj_view_jobs.cfm by 20.00 GMT by 30th September 2019) [September 2019](https://jobs.undp.org/cj_view_jobs.cfm by 20.00 GMT by 30th September 2019).** Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

Applicants are requested to apply online

**Criteria for Evaluation of Proposal:**

Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated. Offers will be evaluated according to the Combined Scoring method – where the educational background and experience on similar assignments will be weighted at 70% as described below and the price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring. The applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score that has also accepted UNDP’s General Terms and Conditions will be awarded the contract.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Education** | **Technical Experience** | **Evaluation Experience** | **UNDP-GEF Experience** | **Stakeholder Engagement** | **Language and Communication** |
| An MSc (minimum requirement) or higher degree in Environment, Natural Resource Management or related fields, and adequate experience in the management, design and/or evaluation of comparable natural resources management projects. | In-depth understanding of biodiversity conservation and protected area issues in tropical/subtropical and island environments (particular experience with Small Island Developing States and in the Western Indian Ocean is an advantage). A minimum of 10 years of relevant working experience is required. | At least 5 years of evaluation experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies, including use of SMART tools.  Competence in adaptive management would be an advantage | Prior experience in the evaluation of international technical assistance projects with major donor agencies, including UNDP-GEF projects. Experience in similar projects in SIDS is an advantage. | Demonstrated ability to work in a diverse environment. | Excellent report writing skills and fluency is English is compulsory. Knowledge of French or Creole would be advantageous. Ability to deliver quality reports within the given time. |
| **15** | **20** | **25** | **20** | **10** | **10** |

Annex A: Project Logical Framework

**The below logframe is the revised following Mid Terms Evaluation; please see original logical framework in project document.**

|  | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Targets**  **(End of Project)** | **Source of verification** | **Risks and Assumptions** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Objective**  To promote the conservation and sustainable use of coastal and marine biodiversity in the Seychelles’ Outer Islands by integrating a National Subsystem of Coastal and Marine Protected Areas (CMPAs) into the broader land- and seascape while reducing the pressures on natural resources from competing land uses. | 1. Capacity development indicator score for protected area system:   * Systemic * Institutional * Individual | 60%  67%  48% | 73%  73%  62% | Review of Capacity Development Indicator Scorecard | **Assumptions:**   * The government, private sector and NGOs commit to constructively engage in protected area partnerships * Adequately qualified consultants / contractors can be sourced to provide technical support to project activities * The appointment of consultants / contractors is not unduly delayed by bureaucratic processes   **Risks:**   * Poor resilience of marine and terrestrial ecosystems to the effects of climate change * Oil and gas development, including: exploration, operations, spills and pollution, and shipping hazards / collisions |
| 2. METT scores:   * Desroches * Alphonse * Poivre * Farquhar * D’Arros | 59%  58%  29%  29%  57% | 80%  80%  40%[[3]](#footnote-3)  74%  76% | METT applied at Mid-Term and Final Evaluation |
| 3. Proposed coverage (ha) of PAs in the Outer Islands (baseline: Aldabra, African Banks, Etoile, Boudeuse)  - Marine  - Terrestrial | * 28,939 ha. * 15,261 ha. | * Targets as defined in the MSP, phase 1 (5% of total EEZ area defined as zone 1, and 10% defined as zone 2) (by December 2017) * Targets as defined in the LUPs (Alphonse, St Francois and Bijoutier: 33.4 ha; Poivre, likely to be South island, 137 ha, Farquhar, likely to be South island, Goelettes Banc du Sable, 403 ha; Desroches tbd, possibly some turtle beach areas). Estimated increase of 573.4 ha | Submission to Government of Marine Spatial Plan phase 1 (macro-level)  Nomination files prepared for new PAs (micro-level) |
| **Outcome 1:** Management effectiveness is enhanced within a sample of coastal and marine protected areas (*IUCN Category I, II and VI*) operating under innovative public-private-civil society partnership agreements. | **Outputs**  1.1 - Biodiversity & Ecosystem Assessment, Monitoring and Conservation Programs to strengthen PA Management  1.2 - Institutional capacity to plan and implement protected area expansion is strengthened  1.3 - Infrastructure and Resources Enhanced to enable Protected Areas management  1.4 - Protected Areas Legally Established  1.5 - Protected Area Management Structures in place and sufficiently financed  1.6 - Protected Area Management Plans Developed and Implemented  1.7 - Increased Education and Awareness levels support Protected Areas management in the Outer Islands | | | | |
| 4. Fine-scale habitat maps of terrestrial ecosystems of the Outer Islands; broad-scale maps of marine ecosystems | 4 out-dated / rough-scale and incomplete maps of PA sites (Desroches, Alphonse, Poivre, and D’Arros) | Updated and complete habitat maps of four target sites  Four terrestrial fine-scale maps  Four broad-scale marine habitat maps based on satellite data interpretation | Maps | **Assumptions**   * Legal gazetting of new Protected Areas is not held up by bottlenecks in the executive or legislative branches of the Government * Enforcement authority is granted to NGO PA staff * Tourism development proceeds on Farquhar and Poivre, generating new income streams for PA management at those sites * Climate impacts (cyclones, storm surges, coral bleaching) do not reduce coral, mangrove and seagrass bed cover / functioning above background levels   **Risks:**   * Poor resilience of marine and terrestrial ecosystems to the effects of climate change * Oil and gas development, including: exploration, operations, spills and pollution, and shipping hazards / collisions |
| 5.number of ngo pa staff with specialised training and/or skills development in:   * Enforcement * Marine research and monitoring * Communications / Public Outreach | 0  10  5 | 20  35  20 | Project training reports  Annual reports of project partners and contractors (ICS, SIF, DRC, among others) |
| 6. # of Protected Areas identified for Outer Islands and nomination files prepared | 4 PA sites (Aldabra, African Banks, Boudeuse, Etoile) | 15% of the marine area of Seychelles identified for protection under MSP phase 1 (macro-level) (by December 2017)  Nomination files prepared for PAs at 5 target sites (including D’Arros) | Legal documents  Nomination files (including management/business plans for proposed new PAs) |
| 7. # of conservation zones (fish protection zones; temporal zones; marine conservation corridors; Important Bird Areas) officially recognized in the Outer Islands | 0 | At least 3 zones with official recognition (within the MSP phase 1) | Notification processes as determined in final, approved PA policy |
| 8. Coral reef monitoring   * New baselines in place (post-2016 bleaching event) * Monitoring protocols | Pre-project baselines for four sites | New baselines  Protocols developed and implemented | Documents (status reports, protocol)  Monitoring results uploaded |
| 9. Mangrove monitoring   * New baselines in place * Monitoring protocols | Pre-project baselines for four sites | New baselines  Protocols developed and implemented | Documents (status reports, protocol)  Monitoring results uploaded |
| 10. Seagrass bed monitoring   * New baselines in place * Monitoring protocols | Pre-project baselines for four sites | New baselines  Protocols developed and implemented | Documents (status reports, protocol)  Monitoring results uploaded |
| 11. Selected reef fish monitoring   * New baselines in place (post-bleaching) * Monitoring protocols | Pre-project baselines for four sites | New baselines  Protocols developed and implemented | Documents (status reports, protocol)  Monitoring results uploaded |
| 12. Increase in funding support to 4 Outer Islands Protected Areas managed by ICS (US$/annum)[[4]](#footnote-4):   * Funding generated by ICS / Island Foundations * Contributions of Outer Island businesses (IDC & Hotels) * Corporate Social Responsibility Tax | 106,661  82,769  0 | 274,729  138,000  100,000 | PA management plans and associated business plans |
| **Outcome 2:** Sustainable Development and CMPA management integrated into broader land/seascape in the Outer Islands | **Outputs**  2.1 - Spatially-based decision support system in place to enable integrated natural resource management in the Outer Islands  2.2 - Land Use Plans completed for targeted Islands  2.3 - Ecosystem-wide Zoning & Master Strategy for the Outer Islands in place to guide conservation and development activities  2.4 - Institutional Capacity strengthened for the implementation of Integrated Natural Resource Management  2.5 - Ecosystem Restoration & Invasive Species Management support Protected Area management objectives  2.6 - Monitoring & Management of Ecosystem Functions reduce land and resource degradation at Protected Area sites | | | | |
| 13. Land Conversion at target sites – No conversion of land set aside as protected within Land Use Plans | * No existing restrictions on land conversion | * 0% land conversion of set-aside areas | Vegetation Management Plans, approved by IDC and MEECC  Land Use Plans submitted to Planning Authority | **Assumptions**   * Climate impacts (cyclones, storm surges, coral bleaching) do not increase coastal erosion above background levels * The government allocates adequate resources (staff and budget) to fulfil its leading role in ecosystem level planning and information management systems   **Risks:**   * Recommendations of the Ecosystem-wide Zoning & Master Strategy and provisions of the Land Use Plans are not implemented – in other words, these products are developed, but not used. * Poor resilience of marine and terrestrial ecosystems to the effects of climate change * Oil and gas development, including: exploration, operations, spills and pollution, and shipping hazards / collisions |
| 14. Pressures from competing natural resources uses in the Outer Islands land- and seascape are reduced through an integrated natural resource management framework (Marine Spatial Plan), including:   * Overall Planning Framework * Land Use Plans | * No existing planning framework for the Outer Islands * 1 Land Use Plan (Coetivy Island) for the Outer Islands; none for project target areas | * Marine Spatial Plan submitted for Cabinet approval * 4 Land Use Plans for target islands prepared for submission to Planning Authority | MSP  Cabinet Memorandum  Four LUPs  Cabinet Memorandum |
| 15. Vegetation management and rehabilitation plans in place for 3 Outer Island sites | No vegetation management plans  Some ad hoc rehabilitation pre-project | Three Vegetation Management / Rehabilitation Plans  Rehabilitation targets defined in VMPs | Documents, approved by IDC and MEECC  Equipment provided for management/ rehabilitation work |
| 16. # of Outer Islands with functioning biosecurity or pest abatement protocols | 1 island (D’Arros) | Aldabra: biosecurity protocols defined and implemented  Desroches, Alphonse, Poivre, Farquhar: pest abatement measures identified and submitted to IDC | Annual reports of SIF  Documents approved by IDC (for forwarding to National Biosecurity Committee) |
| 17. number of govt. and ngo pa staff with specialised training and/or skills development in:   * Database management, decision support tools, and systematic conservation planning * Re-vegetation * Coastal Erosion Control * Pest abatement procedures | 5  5  0  0 | 12  15  10  20 | Project training reports  Annual reports of project partners (ICS, SIF, DRC, MEE, SNPA, among others) |

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

It is anticipated that the methodology to be used for the TE will include, but may not be limited to, the review of the following:

* GEF Project Information Form (PIF)
* UNDP Project Document
* Project Logical Framework
* List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Board, and other partners to be consulted
* UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results
* Project Inception Report
* All Project Implementation Reports (PIR’s)
* Project MTR Report
* Project MTR Management Response
* Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
* Project budgets and financial data
* Audit reports
* Oversight mission reports
* All monitoring reports prepared by the project
* Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team
* Project Board Meeting minutes
* Project Tracking Tool, at baseline, at mid-term, and at terminal points
* UNDP Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF)
* UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD)
* UNDP Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP)
* GEF focal area strategic program objectives

The following documents will also be available:

* Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
* UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
* Guidance for conducting terminal evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed projects

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? | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? | | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
| Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards? | | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
| Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? | | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
| **Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved 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[[5]](#footnote-5)**

**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[[6]](#footnote-6)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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[[7]](#footnote-7)) |
| **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[[8]](#footnote-8)) |
| **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 |

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 to the draft Terminal Evaluation report during (time period); they are referenced by institution (“Author” column) and comment number (“#” column):*

****

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. Revised to take into account likelihood of not being able to base conservation staff on Poivre for the duration of the project. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. It is noted that only Desroches and Alphonse have hotels/resorts and only these two sites generate revenue. But the revenue from these sites alone is expected to reach or exceed the original project target. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. 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-8)