

United Nations Development Programme – Papua New Guinea



Terms of Reference

International consultant to undertake UNDP/GEF Project Terminal Evaluation

Project Title:	R2R Strengthening the Management Effectiveness of the National System of Protected Areas
Type of Contract:	Individual Contract
Duration:	Up to 34 days over the period of 2 months starting in August 2020
Location:	Home based with possible travel to Port Moresby for CEPA/Varirata National Park, Torricelli and YUS in Papua New Guinea (pending covid restrictions though)
Application Deadline:	22 July 2020
Expected Start Date	17 August 2020

Please note that UNDP is not in the position to accept incomplete applications - please make sure that your application contains all details as specified below in this notice.

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 R2R Strengthening the Management Effectiveness of the National System of Protected Areas (PIMS# 5261; Project# 00094837).

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

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE				
Project Title:	R2R Strengthening the Management Effectiveness of the National System of Protected Areas			
GEF Project ID:	#5510		<u>At endorsement</u>	<u>At completion</u>
UNDP Project ID (PIMS):	#5261		<u>(Million US\$)</u>	<u>(Million US\$)</u>
Atlas award ID:	00087986	GEF financing:	10,929,358	
Atlas project ID:	00094837	UNDP financing:	600,000	
Country:	Papua New Guinea	IA/EA own:		
Region:	Asia Pacific	Government:	38,000,000	
Focal Area:	Multi Focal	Other:	5,809,200	
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	LD-2; LD-3; BD-1	Total co-financing:	44,409,200	
Executing Agency:	Dept. of Environment and Conservation, Gov't of PNG	Total Project Cost:	55,338,558	
Other Partners involved:	Woodland Park Zoo	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		13 November 2015
	Tenkile Conservation Alliance	(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: 11 July 2020	Actual: 11 Nov 2020

OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The project was designed to develop a government-supported approach towards creating an enabling environment to i) strengthen government policy and systems with Protected Areas to support community conservation areas in Papua New Guinea and ii) to develop effective natural resource management for community livelihood support. The overall objective of the project aims to operationalize the National Executive Council (NEC) endorsed Protected Area Policy, as well as,

support the institutional transition from the former Department of Environment and Conservation to Conservation and Environment Protection Authority (CEPA). Through this project the links between central government's policy and institutional systems are expected to be strengthen with Protected Areas that are being established by community landowners and conservation partners in key biodiversity areas throughout the country.

This project directly supports a proposed conservation area which is already in the process of finalizing their application – the Torricelli Mountain Range Conservation Area (TMRCA). It focuses on supporting management capabilities of the PNG State by strengthening policies relating to Protected Area management, building capacity, implementing training programs and working to ensure the effective management of Varirata National Park. It further provides direct support to a conservation area which is already fully gazetted and registered – the YUS Conservation Area and intends to expand the landscape level and effective management of the YUS Conservation Area and community livelihood assistance in the YUS landscape with a focus on Conservation Coffee and Cocoa.

This involves demonstration of how the development of national conservation policy framework will contribute towards the establishment of a protected area system to better support community-managed protected areas. The TE for this full-size UNDP/GEF supported project is implemented through the Conservation and Environment Protected Authority.

Duties and Responsibilities

The National consultant will support the TE Lead Consultant to assess the extent to which the project is achieving project results and improve the sustainability of project gains. Specifically, the support to the International Consultant or the Evaluation Team Leader is by way of the following tasks and produce following deliverables:

- Desk review of documents, development of Inception Report, consisting of draft methodology, detailed work plan and Terminal Evaluation (TE) outline. Note: in case the TE team lead can't travel to PNG for in-country mission, the team shall adopt IEO's evaluation guideline of alternative evaluation approaches that is a mix of virtual evaluation approaches with support from a national consultant with valuable local knowledge and experience. However, the challenges associated with this approach, which limit the evaluation scope, access to stakeholders and communities should be outlined in the inception report and clearly detailed in the evaluation report. (No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission);
- Provide brief to the UNDP CO to agree on methodology, scope and outline of the TE report (1 day);
- Interviews with project implementing partners, relevant Government, NGO and donor representatives and UNDP/GEF Regional Technical Advisor (maximum 3 days);
- Field visit to the pilot project site and interviews. As a result of covid 19 restrictions, this will be undertaken by the National Consultant and supervised by the International TE Lead; (10 days)
- Debrief with UNDP (1 day);
- Development and submission of the first draft TE report (after 3 weeks of the country mission). The draft will be shared with the UNDP CO team (Head of the Portfolio, Deputy Resident Representative, Project Manager and Programme Support Unit), UNDP/GEF RTA and key project stakeholders for review and commenting;
- Finalization and submission of the final TE report through incorporating suggestions received on the draft report (within 1 week);
- Based on the results of the evaluation, development of at least 4 knowledge products, in line with UNDP's format of success stories/lessons learnt (4 days);

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

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

EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

An overall approach and method¹ for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation [UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations](#) effort using the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact, as defined and explained in the [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. As noted above, the type of evaluation questions may need some adjustments to fit in the modified evaluation approach.

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 and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to the Central, Morobe and West Sepik Provinces, however given the current situation, this may not be possible. Interviews will be held with the national project director from Conservation and Environment Protection Authority, the UNDP CO project management and other relevant stakeholders involved in the project. The key stakeholders are CEPA, West Sepik and Morobe Provincial Administration, YUS CBO and community groups. In the event the team lead will not be able to travel to PNG and conduct field mission, the national consultant will undertake interviews in the project sites. Whereas, consultation with the central level and provincial stakeholders including NGO partner will have to be facilitated remotely via Zoom and other platforms.

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

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

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	Planned	Actual
UNDP (Grants)	600,000						600,000	
GEF (Grants)					10,929,358	10,929,358	10,929,358	10,929,358
Loans/Concessions								
• In-kind support			38,000,000				38,000,000	
• CEPA (Grant)								
• Other	350,000						350,000	
◦ Woodland Park Zoo / TKCP					2,765,000		2,765,000	
◦ Tenkile Conservation Alliance					3,054,200		3,054,200	
Totals	600,000		38,000,000		16,748,558	10,929,358	55,698,558	10,929,358

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

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 Papua New Guinea. 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 Evaluation team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc. Considering the COVID-19 situation, the TE team should consider alternative methods, technologies and tools to effectively engage stakeholder virtually in the case that traveling is not permitted.

EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the evaluation will be up to 34 days according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
----------	--------	-----------------

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](#)

<i>Preparation / Inception report</i>	<i>4 days</i>	<i>21 August 2020</i>
<i>Evaluation Mission³</i>	<i>10 days</i>	<i>4 September 2020</i>
<i>Draft Evaluation Report</i>	<i>10 days</i>	<i>18 September 2020</i>
<i>Final Report</i>	<i>10 days</i>	<i>2 October 2020</i>

EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

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

*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

³ Note that Travel bans, restrictions and requirements will likely affect the dates and structure of the missions. Flexibility is expected from the selected candidate in terms of the possibility of having alternative mission and consultation arrangements (i.e. desk review, online consultations and data collected remotely, etc.). In view of travel restriction, while the consulting is submitting technical & financial proposal, do not include travel cost as this will be arranged by the CO.

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

The National Consultant must present the following qualifications and competencies:

REQUIRED SKILLS AND EXPERIENCE

Education:

- A Bachelor's or Master's degree in forestry/environmental management/natural resource management/ business administration other related disciplines.

Experience:

- Minimum 7 years of relevant professional experience in natural resource management and biodiversity conservation focusing on community-based conservation;
- Demonstrated previous experience with monitoring and evaluation policies, guidelines and methodologies and experience with UNDP or GEF evaluations would be an advantage;
- Familiarity with challenges developing countries face in sustainable natural resource management and biodiversity conservation particularly in communities;
- Ability to plan and coordinate an evaluation process with minimal supervision with proven successful outcomes would be an advantage;
- Experience working in PNG on monitoring and evaluation of resource projects;

Language

- High proficiency in both spoken and written English.

COMPETENCIES

Corporate Competencies:

- Demonstrates integrity by modeling the UN's values and ethical standard
- Promotes the vision, mission, and strategic goals of the UN
- Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality, and age sensitivity and adaptability
- Treats all people fairly without favoritism.

Functional Competencies:

- Thorough knowledge of GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy
- Familiarity with the challenges developing countries face in sustainable natural resource management and biodiversity conservation including communities
- Conceptual thinking and analytical skills
- An independent, reliable, responsible self-motivator able to work under time pressure
- Excellent communication, team-building and diplomatic skills to develop partnerships.

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

(this payment schedule is indicative, to be filled in by the CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on their standard procurement procedures)

<i>%</i>	<i>Milestone</i>
<i>50%</i>	<i>Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report</i>
<i>50%</i>	<i>Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report</i>

Evaluation

Cumulative analysis

The proposals will be evaluated using the cumulative analysis method with a split 70% technical and 30% financial scoring. The proposal with the highest cumulative scoring will be awarded the contract. Applications will be evaluated technically, and points are attributed based on how well the proposal meets the requirements of the Terms of Reference using the guidelines detailed in the table below:

When using this weighted scoring method, the award of the contract may be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

- a) Responsive/compliant/acceptable, and
- b) Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation.

* Technical Criteria weighting; 70%

* Financial Criteria weighting; 30%

Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 49 points in the Technical Evaluation would be considered for the Financial Evaluation. Interviews may be conducted as part of technical assessment for shortlisted proposals.

Criteria	Points	Percentage
Qualification		10%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A Bachelor's or Master's degree in forestry/environmental management/natural resource management/ business administration other related disciplines 	10	
Experience		60%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimum 7 years of relevant professional experience in natural resource management and biodiversity conservation focusing on community-based conservation 	20	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrated previous experience with monitoring and evaluation policies, guidelines and methodologies and an advantage with UNDP and GEF projects. 	25	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Familiarity with challenges developing countries face in sustainable natural resource management and biodiversity conservation particularly in communities; 	5	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Experience working in Asia-Pacific region or developing countries; 	5	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High proficiency in both spoken and written English 	5	
Competencies		0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conceptual thinking and analytical skills; An independent, reliable, responsible self-motivator able to work under time pressure; Excellent communication, team-building and diplomatic skills to develop partnerships. Demonstrates integrity by modeling the UN's values and ethical standard; Treats all people fairly without favoritism. 		
Technical Criteria		70%
**If necessary, interviews shall also be conducted as part of the technical evaluation to ascertain best value for money.		
Financial Criteria – Lowest Price		30%

Documents to be included when submitting Consultancy Proposals

The following documents may be requested:

- Duly executed **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the template provided by UNDP
- CV**, indicating all past experience from similar projects, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the Candidate and at least three (3) professional references

- c) *Brief description of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a methodology, if applicable, on how they will approach and complete the assignment. A methodology is recommended for intellectual services, but may be omitted for support services;*
- d) *Financial Proposal shall include only the professional fee and associated cost to be incurred in completing the assignment. In order to assist the requesting unit in the comparison of financial proposals, the financial proposal must additionally include a breakdown of this daily fee (including all foreseeable expenses to carry out the assignment). Costs for mission airfares, terminal expenses, insurance, and living allowances should not be included in the financial proposal. If an Offeror 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 Offeror must stipulate that arrangement at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated.*

Lump-sum contracts

The financial proposal shall specify only the professional fee and associated cost to be incurred in completing the assignment, and payment terms around specific and measurable (qualitative and quantitative) deliverables (i.e. whether payments fall in instalments or upon completion of the entire contract). Payments are based upon output, i.e. upon delivery of the services specified in the TOR. To assist the requesting unit in the comparison of financial proposals, the financial proposal will include a breakdown of this lump-sum amount (including travel, living expenses, and number of anticipated working days).

Travel

- *Travel will be arranged by UNDP CO under COVID-19 situation vis-à-vis travel restriction policy of the government. UNDP CO will bear the cost of the travel on actual basis once the travel is confirmed.*
- *In general, UNDP should not accept travel costs exceeding those of an economy class ticket. Should the IC wish to travel on a higher class he/she should do so using their own resources.*

- In the case of unforeseeable travel, payment of travel costs including tickets, lodging and terminal expenses should be agreed upon, between the respective business unit and Individual Consultant, prior to travel and will be reimbursed based on provision of supporting documentation.
- In line with the UNDP's financial regulations, when determined by the Country Office and/or the consultant that a deliverable or service cannot be satisfactorily completed due to the impact of COVID-19 and limitations to the evaluation, that deliverable or service will not be paid.
- Due to the current COVID-19 situation and its implications, a partial payment will be considered if the consultant invested time towards the deliverable but was unable to complete to circumstances beyond his/her control.

Submission Instructions

Incomplete proposals and failure to comply with proposal submission instruction will not be considered or will result in disqualification of proposal.

Completed proposals should be submitted via email procurement.png@undp.org, no later than 22 July 2020.

For any clarification regarding this assignment please write to Ripana James on procurement.pg@undp.org

Please be guided by the instructions provided in this document above while preparing your submission.

UNDP looks forward to receiving your Proposal and thank you in advance for your interest in UNDP procurement opportunities.

ANNEX A: STRATEGIC RESULTS FRAMEWORK (SRF)

PROJECT OBJECTIVE AND COMPONENTS	INDICATOR	BASELINE	END OF PROJECT TARGETS	SOURCE OF INFORMATION	RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS
<p>Project Objective:</p> <p>To strengthen national and local capacities to effectively manage the national system of protected areas, and address threats to biodiversity and ecosystem functions in these areas</p>	Capacity Development indicator score for CEPA Madang, Morobe and East Sepik Provincial Government, TCA and TKCP	<p>CEPA: 38%</p> <p>Morobe Provincial Government: 27%</p> <p>Madang Provincial Government: 23%</p> <p>East Sepik Provincial Government: 23%</p> <p>West Sepik Provincial</p>	<p>CEPA: 72%</p> <p>Morobe Provincial Government: 50%</p> <p>Madang Provincial Government: 55%</p> <p>East Sepik Provincial Government: 58%</p> <p>West Sepik Provincial Government: 56%</p>	Project review of Capacity Development Indicator Scorecard	<p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CEPA develops and implements its organisational structure to effectively meet its mandate for administering the protected area system Government continues to view protected areas as a key investment strategy for meeting biodiversity conservation (and selected socio-economic development) targets. Local NGOs and CBOs continue to support the implementation of CCAs

PROJECT OBJECTIVE AND COMPONENTS	INDICATOR	BASELINE	END OF PROJECT TARGETS	SOURCE OF INFORMATION	RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS
		Government: 21% TCA: 53% TKCP: 62%	TCA: 70% TKCP: 75%		and have the capacity to do so Risks: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Capacities at different levels of government increase at a slower pace than required by the needs of the PA systemLocal NGOs and CBOs do not get long-term financial support to allow them to continue operations
	METT Scores of Varirata NP, YUS Conservation Area and Torricelli Mountain Range Conservation Area	Varirata NP: 27% YUS: 57% Torricelli: 57%	Varirata NP: 50% YUS: 75% Torricelli: 72%	Project review of METT Scorecards at mid-term and end of project	
	Extent of area under different National PA Categories	Varirata – Sogeri Plateau: National Park: 1,054 ha Community Conserved Area: 0 ha	Varirata – Sogeri Plateau: National Park: 1,054 ha Agreed Community Conserved Area:	CEPA Records	

PROJECT OBJECTIVE AND COMPONENTS	INDICATOR	BASELINE	END OF PROJECT TARGETS	SOURCE OF INFORMATION	RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS
		<p>YUS: Conservation Area: 76,000 ha</p> <p>Torricelli: 0 ha Protected Area</p>	<p>7,000 ha (possibly not yet formally registered)</p> <p>YUS: Community Conservation Area: 151,000 ha</p> <p>Torricelli: Community Conservation Area: 180,000 ha</p>		

PROJECT OBJECTIVE AND COMPONENTS	INDICATOR	BASELINE	END OF PROJECT TARGETS	SOURCE OF INFORMATION	RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS
	Number of villages directly benefitting from community-based livelihood activity that contribute to the reducing the extent and intensity of threats to the YUS and Torricelli CAs	0	>60	Project record of technical support and sub-grant funding agreements	
Component 1 Management capabilities of the PNG state to support and oversee Protected	Outputs: 1.1 Policies relating to PA Management and Biodiversity Conservation Strengthened. 1.2 Capacity of CEPA emplaced for effective management of the National PA System. 1.3 Training Programs targeting PA managers institutionalized. 1.4 Effective management of Varirata NP and its integration into the broader Sogeri Plains Landscape.				
	Policy guidance regarding PA management	New PA Policy	PNG PA Policy in place and implemented through a	Strategic plan included M&E plan	Assumptions:

PROJECT OBJECTIVE AND COMPONENTS	INDICATOR	BASELINE	END OF PROJECT TARGETS	SOURCE OF INFORMATION	RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS
Area Management			formulated Strategic Plan		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CEPA transition achieved in timely manner
	Standards and Guidelines for PA Management in PNG approved	Standards and guidelines: None	Standards and guidelines: Complete	Record of approval and adoption of standards and guidelines	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approval of draft PNG PPA and implementation of proposed governance framework
	Number of CEPA's PA Unit completing specialised, targeted short-course training in PA oversight and coordination	0	>30 professional staff trained	Staff training records Staff training certification Project reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sogeri Plateau – good work collaboration with JICA component; Careful partnership building with local land owners creates sufficient buy-in and commitment for establishment of CCA
	Sirinumu Dam Integrated Land Use Plan approved and being implemented	No Plan in place	Sirinumu Dam Integrated Land Use Plan approved covering a	Record of approval of ILUP	<p>Risks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Capacities at different levels of government increase at a slower pace than required by

PROJECT OBJECTIVE AND COMPONENTS	INDICATOR	BASELINE	END OF PROJECT TARGETS	SOURCE OF INFORMATION	RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS
			landscape area of > 7000 ha		<p>the needs of the PA system</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land ownership disputes on Sogeri Plateau, which would hamper the implementation of output 1.4
	Sedimentation levels in the Laloki River as measured at relevant downriver site (and compared to levels in the Sirinumu dam)	To be determined in Year 1 of the project	5% less than the baseline	Technical studies, assessments and project reports	
Component 2: Strengthening the Capacity of the State and	<p>Outputs:</p> <p>2.1 Expansion to the landscape level and effective management of the YUS Conservation Area</p> <p>2.2 Community livelihood assistance in the YUS landscape</p>				

PROJECT OBJECTIVE AND COMPONENTS	INDICATOR	BASELINE	END OF PROJECT TARGETS	SOURCE OF INFORMATION	RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS
Local Communities to Cooperatively Manage Protected Area Sites	2.3 Formal gazettal and effective management of the Torricelli Mountain Range (TMR)				
	2.4 Community livelihood assistance in the TMR landscape proposed CA: Alternative protein				
	Extent of area under different National PA Categories and covered by Integrated Land Use Plans to direct management	<p>YUS:</p> <p>Conservation Area: 76,000 ha</p> <p>Torricelli:</p> <p>0 ha Protected Area</p>	<p>YUS:</p> <p>Community Conservation Area: 151,000 ha</p> <p>Torricelli:</p> <p>Community Conservation Area: 180,000 ha</p>	CEPA Records	<p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - TCA and TKCP are available as IPs - Local land owners committed to continue their conservation efforts - CEPA and provincial government capacitated to coordinate regional PA work <p>Risks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local NGOs and CBOs do not get long-term financial support to allow them to continue operations • Climate change may exacerbate habitat
	Stable or increased populations of threatened species - YUS	<p>YUS: Baseline:</p> <p>Matschie's Tree Kangaroo</p>	YUS.	<p>METT at Mid-term and End of Project</p> <p>Conservation Status and</p>	

PROJECT OBJECTIVE AND COMPONENTS	INDICATOR	BASELINE	END OF PROJECT TARGETS	SOURCE OF INFORMATION	RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS
		<i>(Dendrolagus matschiei)</i> (Endangered) 250+	Stable or increased population: Matschie's Tree Kangaroo (<i>Dendrolagus matschiei</i>)\ 250+	Biodiversity Monitoring reports at site level Annual YUS reports GEF PIRs	fragmentation in the designated CCAs
	Stable or increased populations of threatened species - TMR	Tenkile Tree Kangaroo (<i>Dendrolagus scottae</i>) (Critically Endangered) Population estimate 300+;	Stable or Increased Populations: Tenkile Tree Kangaroo (<i>Dendrolagus scottae</i>), target 300+	METT at Mid-term and End of Project Conservation Status and Biodiversity Monitoring reports at site level	

PROJECT OBJECTIVE AND COMPONENTS	INDICATOR	BASELINE	END OF PROJECT TARGETS	SOURCE OF INFORMATION	RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS
		Weimag Tree Kangaroo (<i>D. pulcherrimus</i>) Population estimate 500+	Weimag Tree Kangaroo (<i>D. pulcherrimus</i>), 500+	Annual TCA reports GEF PIRs	
	Productivity of organic coffee and cocoa in existing agricultural zones in YUS	Coffee = 2.5 tons per year from 22,650 ha. Cocoa = 38.6 tons per year from 6,091 ha.	Coffee > 30 tons per year from 22,650 ha Cocoa > 103 tons per year from 6,091 ha	APRs/PIRs	
	Formal agreements in place between communities in participating conservation areas and central and/or	YUS – US\$ 50 per Household (coffee and cocoa producers)	YUS – US\$ 200 per household (coffee and cocoa producers)	APRs/PIRs	

PROJECT OBJECTIVE AND COMPONENTS	INDICATOR	BASELINE	END OF PROJECT TARGETS	SOURCE OF INFORMATION	RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS
	Provincial Government/ project IAs, to provide financial and in-kind (service provision) support to participating communities, resulting in at least PGK 400 (approximately USD 150) in additional resources per household per year provided to the communities concerned.	TCA = US\$ 0	TCA = US\$ 150 ⁴ per household (Alternative Proteins beneficiaries)		

⁴ A methodology will have to be developed during project implementation to measure this as “in-kind” or “subsistence” value for the alternative protein activities in TMR CA.

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

The project will make available the necessary documents to be reviewed by the evaluator, these include but are not limited to the following;

1. Project document,
2. Annual progress reports,
3. Annual work plans,
4. Signed CDRs
5. Budget revision documents,
6. Technical reports produced during the project implementation
7. All Project Implementation Report (PIRs)

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.

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

•	•	•	•
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

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

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 Form⁵

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: _____

⁵www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE⁶

- 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 Manual⁷)
- 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 rated⁸)
- 3.1 Project Design / Formulation
 - Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)

⁶The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

⁷ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

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.

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

*Annexed in a separate file: GEF-UNDP Co-financing template for
MTR-TE*

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.

UNDP/GEF PROJECT TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT AUDIT TRAIL

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

To the comments received on [Date of when comments received from UNDP and responded to by consultant] and [Name of Project, Project ID and Award ID]

The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft TE report; they are referenced by institution ("Author" column) and track change comment number ("#" column):

<i>Author</i>	<i>#</i>	<i>Para No./ comment location</i>	<i>Comment/Feedback on the draft TE report</i>	<i>TE team response and actions taken</i>

Patricia Kila 15-Jul-2020

Prepared by:

Patricia Kila, National Project Manager, CEPA/GEF/UNDP Protected Areas Project

Andrew Rylance [Signature] -2020

Approved by:

Dr Andrew Rylance, UNDP Head of the Environment Portfolio and Senior Advisor on Climate Change