

## 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 *Reduction of vulnerability to coastal flooding through ecosystem-based adaptation in the south of Artemisa and Mayabeque provinces* (PIMS 5090)

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

### PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	Reduction of vulnerability to coastal flooding through ecosystem-based adaptation in the south of Artemisa and Mayabeque provinces.			
GEF Project ID:	n/a		<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)	<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$)
UNDP Project ID:	84007	GEF financing:	5,592,000	5,592,000
Country:	Cuba	IA/EA own:		
Region:	Caribbean	Government:		6,903,769
Focal Area:		Other:		
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):		Total co-financing:		6,903,769
Executing Agency:	UNDP	Total Project Cost:	<u>5,592,000</u>	<u>12,495,769</u>
Other Partners involved:		ProDoc Signature (date project began): 19 june 2014		
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: september 2019	Actual: september 2020

### OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The project was designed to: The objective of the project is to increase the resilience of populations in the coastal regions of Artemisa and Mayabeque provinces to the effects of climate change. It will focus on delivering concrete and direct benefits along an 84km stretch of coastline in one of the areas of the country that is most vulnerable to climate change (CC) related sea level rise (SLR) and storm impacts, and where such phenomena have the greatest risk of generating negative socioeconomic and developmental impacts. This will be achieved through Ecosystem Based Adaptation (EBA), taking advantage of the proven potential of mangrove forests and associated coastal wetlands to limit the effects of wave erosion and coastal flooding, which are among the most damaging results of climate-change related SLR and storms. 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.

This area, is one of the most vulnerable in the country to tropical storms and hurricanes, and associated storm surges. It is particularly to subject to the problem of saline intrusion into its subterranean aquifers, which are vital for the irrigation of the coastal plains, which are some of the most productive agricultural in the country, and as a source of

drinking water for the city of Havana. Some of the highest levels of beach erosion in the country have occurred in this area, and the mangroves of the area also have some of the lowest health indices in the western region of the country.

Mangroves in this area have been heavily impacted in the past by the extraction of timber and poles, and by infrastructural works such as the construction of drainage channels, a 50km long retention wall and a coastal road. There is clear evidence that those parts of the coast with intact mangrove forests have been less affected by CC-related phenomena than those that have undergone significant anthropogenic modification, due largely to the role of mangroves in retaining sediment and buffering wave impact. Furthermore, benthic environments in coastal waters are generally less degraded in the areas where the seaward belt of red mangrove is intact.

The project is designed to enhance the ability of ecosystems to supply this buffering function. The project will focus in particular on restoring and rehabilitating the areas, covering a total of 7,318ha, which have suffered severest degradation and which constitute flooding hotspots.

The project's objective will be achieved through investments in three complementary components.

Outcome 1 will focus on concrete investments in ecosystem recovery, leading to improved coastline resilience to the impacts of wave action, and improvements to coastal morphology which will reduce seawater incursion; this will be achieved by re-establishing the coastal belt of red mangrove between Surgidero de Batabanó and Punta Mora, restoring mangrove ecosystems between Majana and Surgidero de Batabanó, eliminating and/or controlling invasive alien species and restoring and enriching woodlands along the landward limit of the coastal wetland belt.

Outcome 2 will focus on integrated and participatory management of coastal ecosystems, through mainstreaming EBA into integrated coastal zone planning and productive sector activities, 3 promoting buy-in, participation and governance in local communities and developing knowledge management systems at community level.

Outcome 3 will focus on establishing a favourable enabling environment at regional level for the effectiveness and sustainability of adaptation investments, through the provision of consolidated information on costs and benefits of EBA to decision makers and planners and the strengthening of institutions supporting EBA actions, within the framework of updated and actively implemented action plans

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<sup>1</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 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.

---

<sup>1</sup> For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](#), Chapter 7, pg. 163

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 the south of Artemisa and Mayabeque provinces, including the costal wetland in the municipalities of Guira de Melena, Guines, Batabano, Alquizar, Melena del Sur, Artemisa. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

- Environment Agency (AMA), which belong to the Ministry of Science, Technology and Environment (CITMA)
- Institute of Ecology and Systematic (IES)
- National Institute for Agroforestry Research (IINAF), which belong to the Ministry of Agriculture (MINAG)
- Forestry Enterprises of *Mayabeque* and *South Coast*
- Forest Guard Corps (CGB)
- The Provincial Directorates of CITMA (DPCITMA)
- State Forest Service (SSF)

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](#).

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	5,592,000.00	5199932.05	5,052,700.00	11,000,000.00			10,644,700	16,199,932.05
Loans/Concessions								
• In-kind support								
• Other								
Total	5,592,000.00	5199932.05	5,052,700.00	11,000,000.00			10,644,700	16,199,932.05

## 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>2</sup>

## CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

---

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

## IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

---

The UNDP Country Office in conjunction with the Project Management Unit will assume the responsibility for the coordination and logistical arrangements of the FE.

The Project Management Unit will contract the consultants and also will be responsible to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, and on time will provide per diem and contractual payments.

---

<sup>2</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 FE Team will meet with UNDP Cuba at the beginning and at end of the mission. Teleconferences will be organized with the Regional Technical Advisor in charge of the project at the UNDP Regional Center. Other meetings may be arranged if deemed necessary by one of the parties.

## EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The evaluation will be carried out during the period from May to June 2020 and shall not exceed five months from when the consultant(s) are hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date*
Remote Evaluation	20 days	8 Juni – 3 July
Draft Evaluation Report	10 days	6 – 17 July
Final Report	5 days	27 – 31 July

\*Only working days are counted, not Saturdays and Sundays.

## EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
Draft Final Report	Full report (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 2 weeks of the remote evaluation	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.

Notes:

- The Draft Final Report and the Final Report of TE must be presented in English and Spanish version.
- The Final Report of TE will be considered completed when the expectations of the evaluation have been met and its quality meets UNDP / GEF standards or requirements. The UNDP Country Office and UNDP Regional Office will sign the form in Annex G to confirm their acceptance of the final report.

## TEAM COMPOSITION

The evaluation team will be composed of *2 international evaluators and 1 national 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.

The Team members must present the following qualifications:

Evaluator	Responsibility	Technical knowledge	Experience
1 (international)	Team Leader	Graduated in biological, ecology or forestry sciences.	Demonstrated knowledge in Biodiversity and Ecosystem-Based Adaptation (EBA). Management of environmental projects and conservation of biodiversity.

			Experience as Team leader in Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system or Multilateral Environmental Funds
2 (international)	Member Team	Graduated in biological, ecology or forestry sciences.	<p>Demonstrated knowledge of Mangrove and other coastal wetland ecosystems, also in monitoring and ecological restoration of coastal zone.</p> <p>Participation in Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system or Multilateral Environmental Funds will be considered an asset.</p>
3 (national)	Member Team	Graduated in biological, ecology, forestry or social sciences.	<p>The local team member should demonstrate knowledge of the social, economic, legal and environmental context of the country, local development, stakeholder participation and institutional coordination.</p> <p>A knowledge of Cuba Biodiversity and ecosystems restorations will be considered an asset</p>

- Minimum 10 years of relevant professional experience
- Knowledge of UNDP and GEF
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
- Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s)
- Communication skill in Spanish and English languages.
- The team Leader Demonstrated knowledge in Biodiversity and Ecosystem-Based Adaptation (EBA). Management of environmental projects and conservation of biodiversity. Leader team of Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system or Multilateral Environmental Funds.
- The team member should demonstrate knowledge of Mangrove and other coastal wetland ecosystems, also in monitoring and ecological restoration of coastal zone. Participation in Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system or Multilateral Environmental Funds will be considered an asset.
- The local team member should demonstrate knowledge of the social, economic, legal and environmental context of the country. Local development, stakeholder participation and institutional coordination. A knowledge of Cuba Biodiversity and ecosystems restorations will be considered an asset.

## 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'](#)

#### **PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS**

---

%	Milestone
10%	At contract signing
40%	Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report
50%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report

## ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Numbers of people (men and women) with reduced vulnerability due to proximity of functioning mangrove and wetland ecosystems  
Coastal ecosystems covering 7,318ha are degraded, have excessive salinity levels due to seawater incursion and impeded freshwater flows, and have little

Objective & Components	Indicators	Baseline	Targets	Source of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
<b>Objective:</b> increase the resilience of populations in the coastal regions of Artemisa and Mayabeque provinces to the effects of climate change	<b>I.</b> Area with increases in health indices of mangrove and wetland conditions (soil and water salinity, canopy density, existence of local protection regimes)	- Coastal ecosystems covering 7,318ha are degraded, have excessive salinity levels due to seawater incursion and impeded freshwater flows, and have little	- 7,318ha (the total area where mangrove reforestation, restoration of mangrove ecosystems and restoration and enrichment of landward edge woodlands will be carried out): indices to be proposed in methodological documents developed at project start.	Monitoring reports of IES and IINAF	Extreme climatic Events Variations in commitment of policy makers
	<b>II.</b> Numbers of people (men and women) with reduced vulnerability due to proximity of functioning mangrove and wetland ecosystems	- 17,524 people in 47 communities are directly affected by coastal flooding - 270,705 people are indirectly affected by impacts of CC-related phenomena on economic activities	- 21,502 people (of which at least 45% are women) directly benefit from reduction of coastal flooding. - 270,705 people (of which at least 45% are women) indirectly benefit from reduction of impacts of CC-related phenomena on economic activities.		
<b>Component 1:</b> Reduction of the impacts of coastal flooding through the recovery of coastal ecosystems.	Area (ha) of red mangrove established along sea shore between Batabanó and Punta Mora	533 ha of coastal belt is dominated by a degraded belt of black mangroves with limited resilience to wave impacts	<b>Project year</b>	Annual registers of Forestry Enterprises and Forest Service	Extreme climatic events (storms, droughts) and fires, affecting plant survival rates CC-related changes in tree phenology affecting seed collection and nursery activities Slow equipment
			<b>Area affected (ha)</b>		
			<b>With 85% survival at age 3</b>		
			1		
			2		
			3		
			4		
			5		
			<b>Total</b>		



Objective & Components	Indicators	Baseline	Targets			Source of Verification	Risks and Assumptions		
	Cumulative area of mangrove ecosystem restored between Majana and Surgidero de Batabanó	144 ha of additional coastal mangroves and wetlands are in a degraded condition, with impeded freshwater flows	Project year	Area affected (ha)	With 85% survival at age 3		procurement processes in local Governments Limited availability of inputs and equipment on national market		
			1	139,1	118,2				
			2	618,7	525,9				
			3	575,2	488,9				
			4	263,6	224,1				
			5	115,3	98,0				
			Total	1711,9	1455,1				
	Cumulative area of landward edge woodlands restored and enriched	939 ha of landward edge woodlands are in a degraded condition	Project year	Area affected (ha)	With 85% survival at age 3				
			1	99,9	84,9				
			2	1301,3	1106,1				
			3	1422,2	1208,9				
			4	1075,8	914,5				
			5	416,2	353,8				
			Total	4315,5	3668,2				
	Numbers of IAS management plans developed	0	1, covering 7,318ha						
	1.1 Re-establishment of coastal belt of red mangrove (Rhizophora mangle) between Surgidero de Batabanó and Punta Mora 1.2 Restoration of mangrove ecosystems between Majana and Surgidero de Batabanó 1.3 Elimination and/or control of invasive alien species in coastal wetlands between Majana and Punta Mora in order to improve ecosystem resilience 1.4 Restoration and enrichment of woodlands along the landward limit of the coastal wetland belt, between Majana and Punta Mora								
	Component 2: Integrated and participatory management of coastal ecosystems to increase resilience to climate	Numbers of provincial and municipal development plans that make specific provision for EBA	All provincial and municipal governments are developing plans for CC adaptation, but these do not provide for EBA	2 provincial plans and 6 municipal plans				Surveys and interviews in local provincial and municipal governments	Short term economic and livelihood considerations outweigh medium term benefits of EBA actions in

Objective & Components	Indicators	Baseline	Targets	Source of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
change	Numbers of provincial and municipal governments with EBA-related knowledge management systems in place	- 0	2 provincial governments and 6 municipal governments		priorities of community members
	Numbers of community members (men and women) belonging to local voluntary groups addressing environmental and adaptation issues.	- 0	1 group with at least 15 members (of which at least 45% are women) in each of four municipalities (Alquizar, Guira, Batabanó y Artemisa	Surveys and interviews in local communities	
	Numbers of local schools with study programmes incorporating adaptation issues	- 0	- 16 primary schools - 15 secondary schools - 3 municipal universities - 1 teacher training institute	Surveys and interviews in local schools	
	Numbers of dissemination and awareness raising materials on adaptation issues, produced by local media	- 0	17 audiovisual presentations (TV series, documentaries, multimedia presentations) - 3 local television programmes. - 5 local radio programmes - 2 articles in local press on adaptation issues	Surveys and interviews in local media organizations	
2.1 Key community figures trained for promotion of adaptation activities and awareness among community members 2.2 Raised awareness of adaptation issues among community members in general 2.3 Knowledge management systems at community level					
<b>Component 3:</b> Ensure the effectiveness and sustainability of adaptation investments through the establishment of a favourable enabling environment at regional level.	Frequency of training and technical support visits carried out by provincial and municipal governments to coastal communities in support of EBA	- 0	3 training and technical support visits per year to coastal areas by technical authorities	Surveys and interviews in local provincial and municipal governments	Short term political Considerations outweigh medium term benefits of EBA actions in priorities of members of local institutions
	Frequency of inspection visits to coastal areas by provincial and municipal governments in support of	- 0	3 inspection visits per year to coastal areas by provincial/municipal governments and/or other regulatory and enforcement authorities		

Objective & Components	Indicators	Baseline	Targets	Source of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
	EBA				
	Number of studies and methodologies performed to estimate the cost - benefit ratio of the application of the ABE approach, available to planners and decision makers.	- 0	3 studies carried out and available for decision makers.		
3.1 Consolidated information on costs and benefits of EBA available to decision makers and planners 3.2: Strengthened institutions (provincial and municipal Governments, Forest Guard Corps, Frontier Guards and Fisheries Department) supporting EBA actions, within the framework of updated and actively implemented action plans					

## **ANNEX B: LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE EVALUATORS**

---

1. UNDP Project Document
2. Project Inception Report
3. All Project Performance Reports (PPR's)
4. Quarterly Reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
5. Audit reports
6. Finalized AF Tracking Tools at CEO endorsement and midterm (*fill in specific TTs for this project's focal area*)
7. Oversight mission reports
8. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
9. Midterm Evaluation Report and Recommendations

The following documents will also be available:

10. UNDP - Country Programme Document. 2014-2018
11. Minutes of the Board Meetings and other meetings
12. Project site location maps

## ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
<b>Relevance:</b> 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?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How does the project support environmental priorities and development at the national level?</li> </ul>	There is a tangible contributions made by the Project to the National Biodiversity Strategy.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>National Strategy for Biological Diversity and Action Plan 2014-2020, Cuba. Published by CITMA / UNDP (2016)</li> <li>"Hazards and vulnerabilities of the marine and coastal zone of Cuba: current state and perspectives for climate change up to 2100". Document prepared by M. Iturralde and H. Serrano (2015)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documents analysis. Interviews with project staff and stakeholders. Intervention areas visits.</li> </ul>
<b>Effectiveness:</b> To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What is the behavior and what are the advances in qualitative terms of the indicators of Project Objective? Is the project on track to achieve its objective?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Compliance of the target indicators to the middle of the Project, according to their MML.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Document.</li> <li>Project Performance Reports.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documents analysis. Interviews with project staff and stakeholders. Intervention areas visits.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are the activities carried out in each Project Component according to its design and the expected scope at the middle of its execution?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are achieved the Results Indicators expected thus far in each component, according to the Logical Framework Matrix (LFM) of the Project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Document.</li> <li>Annual Operative Plan.</li> <li>Project Performance Reports.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documents analysis. Interviews with project staff and stakeholders. Intervention areas visits.</li> </ul>
<b>Efficiency:</b> Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?			

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Have the financial resources been used efficiently? Is the project's financial management adequate?</li> </ul>	<p>Difference between the planned and executed budget.</p> <p>Planned vs. actual co-financing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Costs related to the reached results in comparison with the costs of similar projects from other organizations.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project financial reports.</li> <li>Reports of analysis of budget execution and adjustments made by the Project Team with the UNDP Co.</li> <li>Annual Operating Plan</li> <li>Project team.</li> <li>UNDP Co.</li> <li>Stakeholders involved.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documents analysis. Interviews with project staff and stakeholders. Intervention areas visits.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the Project have an M&amp;E System, which it uses to complete, document and ensure the activities of its Components and Results?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Available and updated M &amp; E system.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document prepared by the Project team.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document analysis.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Have the tasks scheduled in the Project's Annual Operational Plans (AOPs) been fulfilled in each of its Components, so that they point to the expected results at the end of the Project?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of activities programmed / fulfilled according to the POA in the period being evaluated.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Annual Operating Plan.</li> <li>Project Performance Reports.</li> <li>Minutes of the activities carried out (workshops, visits, technical documents intended to be elaborated and published, promotional done and their distribution.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documents analysis. Interviews with project staff and stakeholders. Intervention areas visits.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has the programmed activities in each Component been documented to facilitate follow-up?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Activities scheduled by Component / year of project execution.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Annual Operating Plan.</li> <li>Project Performance Reports.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documents analysis. Interviews with project staff and stakeholders. Intervention areas visits.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do national stakeholders continue to have an active role in project decision-making that supports efficient and effective project implementation?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Participation level of the stakeholders in the decision making.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Document.</li> <li>Annual Operative Plan.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documents analysis. Interviews with project staff and stakeholders. Intervention areas visits.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Performance Reports.</li> <li>• Minutes of Steering Committee.</li> <li>• Stakeholders involved</li> </ul>	
<b>Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are the main challenges that could affect the sustainability of project results? Have they been addressed during project management?</li> <li>• What potential measures could contribute to the sustainability of the results achieved by the project?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Financial, institutional, socioeconomic and / or environmental changes that could be challenges for the project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project document.</li> <li>• Project team.</li> <li>• UNDP Co.</li> <li>• Stakeholders involved.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documents analysis. Interviews with project staff and stakeholders. Intervention areas visits.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the level of stakeholder's ownership sufficient to allow for continuation of project benefits?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Institutional and private actors include project objectives in their planning frameworks</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relevant planning frameworks, strategies, programmers, manuals, proceedings and relevant stakeholders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interviews with project staff and stakeholders. Qualitative perception questionnaire.</li> </ul>
<b>Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The health of wetland ecosystems have improved?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increasing in the index of health with respect to the beginning of the project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monitoring reports of research institutes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mangrove health map for the estimation of flood effects. Leda Menendez, Jose Manuel Guzman</li> </ul>

## ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

<b><i>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&amp;E, I&amp;E Execution</i></b> 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	<b><i>Sustainability ratings:</i></b> 4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks	<b><i>Relevance ratings</i></b> 2. Relevant (R) 1.. Not relevant (NR)  <b><i>Impact Ratings:</i></b> 3. Significant (S) 2. Minimal (M) 1. Negligible (N)
<b><i>Additional ratings where relevant:</i></b> 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<sup>3</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>3</sup>[www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct](http://www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct)

## ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE<sup>4</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>5</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>6</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
- 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)

---

<sup>4</sup>The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

<sup>5</sup> UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

<sup>6</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.

- 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: \_\_\_\_\_