



Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference (ToR) Template for UNDP-supported GEF-financed projects

1. INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full- and medium-sized UNDP-supported GEF-financed projects are required to undergo a Terminal Evaluation (TE) at the end of the project. This Terms of Reference (ToR) sets out the expectations for the TE of the *full-sized* project titled R2R Strengthening the Management Effectiveness of the National System of Protected Areas (PIMS #5261) implemented through the *Conservation and Environment Protection Authority (CEPA)*. The project started on the 13 November 2015 and is in its 5th year of implementation. The TE process must follow the guidance outlined in the document [‘Guidance for Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported GEF-financed Projects’](#).

2. PROJECT BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

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.

3. TE PURPOSE

The TE report will assess the achievement of project results against what was expected to be achieved and draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming. The TE report promotes accountability and transparency and assesses the extent of project accomplishments.

The TE is also being conducted to document best practices, challenges and capacities that are at hand and that are missing that can inform UNDP CO Programming going forward. The UNDP CO Management and the Implementing Partner/Executing Agency will act on the TE Results. The TE is in line with the UNDP PNG's current evaluation plan.

4. TE APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

The TE report must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful.

The TE team will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure/SESP) the Project Document, project reports including annual PIRs, project budget revisions, lesson learned reports, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based evaluation. The TE team will review the baseline and midterm GEF focal area Core Indicators/Tracking Tools submitted to the GEF at the CEO endorsement and midterm stages and the terminal Core Indicators/Tracking Tools that must be completed before the TE field mission begins.

The TE team is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), Implementing Partners, the UNDP Country Office(s), the Regional Technical Advisor, direct beneficiaries and other stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful TE. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to *CEPA, West Sepik and Morobe Provincial Administrations, YUS CBO and Community Groups*; executing agencies, senior officials and task team/component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project beneficiaries, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. Additionally, the TE team is expected to conduct field missions to Port Moresby (*depending on the covid 19 situation in the country*), including the following project sites *Varirata National Park, Torricelli and YUS in Papua New Guinea*.

The specific design and methodology for the TE should emerge from consultations between the TE team and the above-mentioned parties regarding what is appropriate and feasible for meeting the TE purpose and objectives and answering the evaluation questions, given limitations of budget, time and data. The TE team must use gender-responsive methodologies and tools and ensure that gender equality and women's empowerment, as well as other cross-cutting issues and SDGs are incorporated into the TE report.

The final methodological approach including interview schedule, field visits and data to be used in the evaluation must be clearly outlined in the TE Inception Report and be fully discussed and agreed between UNDP, stakeholders and the TE team.

The final report must describe the full TE approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the evaluation.

5. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE TE

The TE will assess project performance against expectations set out in the project's Logical Framework/Results Framework (see ToR Annex A). The TE will assess results according to the criteria outlined in the [Guidance for Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported GEF-financed Projects](#). *(The scope of the TE should detail and include aspects of the project to be covered by the TE, such as the time frame, and the primary issues of concern to users that the TE needs to address.*

The International Consultant, with support from a national consultant, will have the overall lead responsibility to assess the extent to which the project is achieving project results and improve the sustainability of project gains. Specifically, the International Consultant or the Evaluation Team Leader is expected to lead and undertake 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);
- Brief 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 if –this may not be possible due to covid restrictions but will remain in this list (amendments to the contract can be made to accommodate should this change). Supervising the national consultant for field visits.
- 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);
- Supervision of the work of the national consultant (during entire evaluation period).

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.

The Findings section of the TE report will cover the topics listed below. A full outline of the TE report's content is provided in ToR Annex C.

The asterisk "(*)" indicates criteria for which a rating is required.

Findings

i. Project Design/Formulation

- National priorities and country driven-ness
- Theory of Change
- Gender equality and women's empowerment
- Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)
- Analysis of Results Framework: project logic and strategy, indicators
- Assumptions and Risks
- Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g. same focal area) incorporated into project design
- Planned stakeholder participation
- Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
- Management arrangements

ii. Project Implementation

- Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
- Actual stakeholder participation and partnership arrangements
- Project Finance and Co-finance
- Monitoring & Evaluation: design at entry (*), implementation (*), and overall assessment of M&E (*)
- Implementing Agency (UNDP) (*) and Executing Agency (*), overall project oversight/implementation and execution (*)
- Risk Management, including Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)

iii. Project Results

- Assess the achievement of outcomes against indicators by reporting on the level of progress for each objective and outcome indicator at the time of the TE and noting final achievements
- Relevance (*), Effectiveness (*), Efficiency (*) and overall project outcome (*)
- Sustainability: financial (*), socio-political (*), institutional framework and governance (*), environmental (*), overall likelihood of sustainability (*)
- Country ownership
- Gender equality and women's empowerment
- Cross-cutting issues (poverty alleviation, improved governance, climate change mitigation and adaptation, disaster prevention and recovery, human rights, capacity development, South-South cooperation, knowledge management, volunteerism, etc., as relevant)
- GEF Additionality
- Catalytic Role / Replication Effect
- Progress to impact

Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons Learned

- The TE team will include a summary of the main findings of the TE report. Findings should be presented as statements of fact that are based on analysis of the data.
- The section on conclusions will be written in light of the findings. Conclusions should be comprehensive and balanced statements that are well substantiated by evidence and logically connected to the TE findings. They should highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project, respond to key

evaluation questions and provide insights into the identification of and/or solutions to important problems or issues pertinent to project beneficiaries, UNDP and the GEF, including issues in relation to gender equality and women's empowerment.

- Recommendations should provide concrete, practical, feasible and targeted recommendations directed to the intended users of the evaluation about what actions to take and decisions to make. The recommendations should be specifically supported by the evidence and linked to the findings and conclusions around key questions addressed by the evaluation.
- The TE report should also include lessons that can be taken from the evaluation, including best practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success that can provide knowledge gained from the particular circumstance (programmatic and evaluation methods used, partnerships, financial leveraging, etc.) that are applicable to other GEF and UNDP interventions. When possible, the TE team should include examples of good practices in project design and implementation.
- It is important for the conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned of the TE report to incorporate gender equality and empowerment of women.

The TE report will include an Evaluation Ratings Table, as shown below:

ToR Table 2: Evaluation Ratings Table for the project “Strengthening the Management Effectiveness of the National System of Protected Areas”

Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E)	Rating ¹
M&E design at entry	
M&E Plan Implementation	
Overall Quality of M&E	
Implementation & Execution	Rating
Quality of UNDP Implementation/Oversight	
Quality of Implementing Partner Execution	
Overall quality of Implementation/Execution	
Assessment of Outcomes	Rating
Relevance	
Effectiveness	
Efficiency	
Overall Project Outcome Rating	
Sustainability	Rating
Financial resources	
Socio-political/economic	
Institutional framework and governance	
Environmental	
Overall Likelihood of Sustainability	

6. TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the TE will be approximately *(average 25-35 working days)* over a time period of 8 weeks starting on 01 September 2020. The tentative TE timeframe is as follows:

¹ Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, Implementation/Oversight & Execution, Relevance are rated on a 6-point scale: 6=Highly Satisfactory (HS), 5=Satisfactory (S), 4=Moderately Satisfactory (MS), 3=Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), 2=Unsatisfactory (U), 1=Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). Sustainability is rated on a 4-point scale: 4=Likely (L), 3=Moderately Likely (ML), 2=Moderately Unlikely (MU), 1=Unlikely (U)

Timeframe	Activity
10 August 2020	Application closes
17 August 2020	Selection of TE team
24 August 2020	Preparation period for TE team (handover of documentation)
02 September 2020 (4 days)	Document review and preparation of TE Inception Report
04 September (02 days)	Finalization and Validation of TE Inception Report; latest start of TE mission
14 September 2020 (10 days)	TE mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits, etc.
15 September 2020	Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings; earliest end of TE mission
21 September 2020 (05 days)	Preparation of draft TE report
22 September 2020	Circulation of draft TE report for comments
25 September 2020	Incorporation of comments on draft TE report into Audit Trail & finalization of TE report
30 September 2020	Preparation and Issuance of Management Response
02 October 2020	Concluding Stakeholder Workshop (optional)
05 October 2020	Expected date of full TE completion

Options for site visits should be provided in the TE Inception Report.

7. TE DELIVERABLES

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	TE Inception Report	TE team clarifies objectives, methodology and timing of the TE	No later than 2 weeks before the TE mission: 04 September 2020	TE team submits Inception Report to Commissioning Unit and project management
2	Presentation	Initial Findings	End of TE mission: 15 September 2020	TE team presents to Commissioning Unit and project management
3	Draft TE Report	Full draft report (<i>using guidelines on report content in ToR Annex C</i>) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of end of TE mission: 22 September 2020	TE team submits to Commissioning Unit; reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP
5	Final TE Report* + Audit Trail	Revised final report and TE Audit trail in which the TE details how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final TE report (See <i>template in ToR Annex H</i>)	Within 1 week of receiving comments on draft report: 30 September 2020	TE team submits both documents to the Commissioning Unit

*All final TE reports will be quality assessed by the UNDP Independent Evaluation Office (IEO). Details of the IEO's quality assessment of decentralized evaluations can be found in Section 6 of the UNDP Evaluation Guidelines.²

8. TE ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing the TE resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's TE is *UNDP PNG Country Office*.

The Commissioning Unit will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the TE team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the TE team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

9. TE TEAM COMPOSITION

A team of two independent evaluators will conduct the TE – one team leader who is an International (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in the region including other regions) and one team expert, who is a national. The team leader will be responsible for the overall assessment of the project results and improve sustainability of project gains including design and writing of the TE Inception Report, lead the TE mission, supervise the national consultant and write the final TE report, etc. The team expert will support the TE lead consultant to assess the extent to which the project is achieving project results and improve sustainability of project gains. He will also work with the Project Team in developing the TE itinerary of the mission including meeting appointments and schedules.)

The evaluator(s) cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation and/or implementation (including the writing of the project document), must not have conducted this project's Mid-Term Review and should not have a conflict of interest with the project's related activities.

The selection of evaluators will be aimed at maximizing the overall "team" qualities in the following areas:

Education

- Master's degree in forestry/environmental management/natural resource management/business administration or other closely related field;

Experience

- Minimum 10 years of relevant professional experience in natural resource management and biodiversity conservation focusing on community-based conservation;
- Demonstrated previous experience with UNDP and GEF monitoring and evaluation policies, guidelines and methodologies– at least 2 GEF funded project evaluation experiences preferably with focus on biodiversity conservation and protected areas;
- Relevant experience with results-based management evaluation methodologies;
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to sustainable natural resource management and biodiversity conservation particularly in communities;
- Experience in evaluating projects;
- Experience working in *Asia Pacific Region or developing countries*;

² Access at: <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/section-6.shtml>

- Experience in relevant technical areas for at least *10 years*;
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and natural resource management and biodiversity conservation experience in gender responsive evaluation and analysis;
- Excellent communication skills;
- Demonstrable analytical skills;
- Project evaluation/review experience within United Nations system will be considered an asset.

Language

- Fluency in written and spoken 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.

10. EVALUATOR ETHICS

The TE team will be held to the highest ethical standards and is required to sign a code of conduct upon acceptance of the assignment. This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'. The evaluator must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data. The evaluator must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses without the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

11. PAYMENT SCHEDULE

- 20% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final TE Inception Report and approval by the Commissioning Unit
- 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the draft TE report to the Commissioning Unit

- 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final TE report and approval by the Commissioning Unit and RTA (via signatures on the TE Report Clearance Form) and delivery of completed TE Audit Trail

Criteria for issuing the final payment of 40%³:

- The final TE report includes all requirements outlined in the TE TOR and is in accordance with the TE guidance.
- The final TE report is clearly written, logically organized, and is specific for this project (i.e. text has not been cut & pasted from other TE reports).
- The Audit Trail includes responses to and justification for each comment listed.

12. APPLICATION PROCESS⁴

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

- a) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](#)⁵ provided by UNDP;
- b) **CV and a Personal History Form (P11 form)**⁶;
- c) **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)
- d) **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 to the address: Head of Procurement, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), UN Haus, Level 14, Kina Bank House, Port Moresby, Papua New Guinea in a sealed envelope indicating the following reference “Consultant for Terminal Evaluation of Strengthening the Management Effectiveness of the National System of Protected Areas or by email at the following address ONLY: procurement.png@undp.org by 10 August 2020. Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

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% and the price proposal will

³ The Commissioning Unit is obligated to issue payments to the TE team as soon as the terms under the ToR are fulfilled. If there is an ongoing discussion regarding the quality and completeness of the final deliverables that cannot be resolved between the Commissioning Unit and the TE team, the Regional M&E Advisor and Vertical Fund Directorate will be consulted. If needed, the Commissioning Unit’s senior management, Procurement Services Unit and Legal Support Office will be notified as well so that a decision can be made about whether or not to withhold payment of any amounts that may be due to the evaluator(s), suspend or terminate the contract and/or remove the individual contractor from any applicable rosters. See the UNDP Individual Contract Policy for further details:

https://popp.undp.org/_layouts/15/WopiFrame.aspx?sourcedoc=/UNDP_POPP_DOCUMENT_LIBRARY/Public/PSU_Individual%20Contract_Policy%20Policy.docx&action=default

⁴ Engagement of evaluators should be done in line with guidelines for hiring consultants in the POPP <https://popp.undp.org/SitePages/POPPRoot.aspx>

⁵ <https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/psd/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx>

⁶ http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc

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.

13.TOR ANNEXES

(Add the following annexes to the final ToR)

- ToR Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework
- ToR Annex B: Project Information Package to be reviewed by TE team
- ToR Annex C: Content of the TE report
- ToR Annex D: Evaluation Criteria Matrix template
- ToR Annex E: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators
- ToR Annex F: TE Rating Scales
- ToR Annex G: TE Report Clearance Form
- ToR Annex H: TE Audit Trail

ToR Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework

PROJECT OBJECTIVE AND COMPONENTS	INDICATOR	BASELINE	END OF PROJECT TARGETS	SOURCE OF INFORMATION	RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS
Project Objective: 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	Capacity Development indicator score for CEPA Madang, Morobe and East Sepik Provincial Government, TCA and TKCP	CEPA: 38% Morobe Provincial Government: 27% Madang Provincial Government: 23% East Sepik Provincial Government: 23% West Sepik Provincial Government: 21% TCA: 53% TKCP: 62%	CEPA: 72% Morobe Provincial Government: 50% Madang Provincial Government: 55% East Sepik Provincial Government: 58% West Sepik Provincial Government: 56% TCA: 70% TKCP: 75%	Project review of Capacity Development Indicator Scorecard	Assumptions: <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 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 system Local 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	Varirata – Sogeri Plateau: National Park: 1,054 ha Agreed Community	CEPA Records	

PROJECT OBJECTIVE AND COMPONENTS	INDICATOR	BASELINE	END OF PROJECT TARGETS	SOURCE OF INFORMATION	RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS
		Community Conserved Area: 0 ha YUS: Conservation Area: 76,000 ha Torricelli: 0 ha Protected Area	Conserved Area: 7,000 ha (possibly not yet formally registered) YUS: Community Conservation Area: 151,000 ha Torricelli: Community Conservation Area: 180,000 ha		
	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 Area Management	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 formulated Strategic Plan	Strategic plan included M&E plan	Assumptions: • CEPA transition achieved in timely manner • Approval of draft PNG PPA and implementation of proposed governance framework

PROJECT OBJECTIVE AND COMPONENTS	INDICATOR	BASELINE	END OF PROJECT TARGETS	SOURCE OF INFORMATION	RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS
	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"> 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 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 system Land ownership disputes on Sogeri Plateau, which would hamper the implementation of output 1.4
	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	
	Sirinumu Dam Integrated Land Use Plan approved and being implemented	No Plan in place	Sirinumu Dam Integrated Land Use Plan approved covering a landscape area of > 7000 ha	Record of approval of ILUP	
	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 Local Communities to Cooperatively	Outputs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2.1 Expansion to the landscape level and effective management of the YUS Conservation Area 2.2 Community livelihood assistance in the YUS landscape 2.3 Formal gazetted and effective management of the Torricelli Mountain Range (TMR) 2.4 Community livelihood assistance in the TMR landscape proposed CA: Alternative protein 				

PROJECT OBJECTIVE AND COMPONENTS	INDICATOR	BASELINE	END OF PROJECT TARGETS	SOURCE OF INFORMATION	RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS
Manage Protected Area Sites	Extent of area under different National PA Categories and covered by Integrated Land Use Plans to direct management	YUS: Conservation Area: 76,000 ha Torricelli: 0 ha Protected Area	YUS: Community Conservation Area: 151,000 ha Torricelli: Community Conservation Area: 180,000 ha	CEPA Records	Assumptions: <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 Risks:
	Stable or increased populations of threatened species - YUS	YUS: Baseline: Matschie's Tree Kangaroo (<i>Dendrolagus matschiei</i>) (Endangered) 250+	YUS. Stable or increased population: Matschie's Tree Kangaroo (<i>Dendrolagus matschiei</i>)\ 250+	METT at Mid-term and End of Project Conservation Status and Biodiversity Monitoring reports at site level Annual YUS reports GEF PIRs	<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 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+; Weimag Tree Kangaroo (<i>D. pulcherrimus</i>)	Stable or Increased Populations: Tenkile Tree Kangaroo (<i>Dendrolagus scottae</i>), target 300+ Weimag Tree Kangaroo (<i>D.</i>	METT at Mid-term and End of Project Conservation Status and Biodiversity Monitoring reports at site level Annual TCA reports GEF PIRs	

PROJECT OBJECTIVE AND COMPONENTS	INDICATOR	BASELINE	END OF PROJECT TARGETS	SOURCE OF INFORMATION	RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS
		Population estimate 500+	<i>pulcherrimus</i>), 500+		
	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 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.	YUS – US\$ 50 per Household (coffee and cocoa producers) TCA = US\$ 0	YUS – US\$ 200 per household (coffee and cocoa producers) TCA = US\$ 150 ⁷ per household (Alternative Proteins beneficiaries)	APRs/PIRs	

⁷ 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.

ToR Annex B: Project Information Package to be reviewed by TE team

#	Item (electronic versions preferred if available)
1	Project Identification Form (PIF)
2	UNDP Initiation Plan
3	Final UNDP-GEF Project Document with all annexes
4	CEO Endorsement Request
5	UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) and associated management plans (if any)
6	Inception Workshop Report
7	Mid-Term Review report and management response to MTR recommendations
8	All Project Implementation Reports (PIRs)
9	Progress reports (quarterly, semi-annual or annual, with associated workplans and financial reports)
10	Oversight mission reports
11	Minutes of Project Board Meetings and of other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
12	GEF Tracking Tools (from CEO Endorsement, midterm and terminal stages)
13	GEF/LDCF/SCCF Core Indicators (from PIF, CEO Endorsement, midterm and terminal stages); for GEF-6 and GEF-7 projects only
14	Financial data, including actual expenditures by project outcome, including management costs, and including documentation of any significant budget revisions
15	Co-financing data with expected and actual contributions broken down by type of co-financing, source, and whether the contribution is considered as investment mobilized or recurring expenditures
16	Audit reports
17	Electronic copies of project outputs (booklets, manuals, technical reports, articles, etc.)
18	Sample of project communications materials
19	Summary list of formal meetings, workshops, etc. held, with date, location, topic, and number of participants
20	Any relevant socio-economic monitoring data, such as average incomes / employment levels of stakeholders in the target area, change in revenue related to project activities
21	List of contracts and procurement items over ~US\$5,000 (i.e. organizations or companies contracted for project outputs, etc., except in cases of confidential information)
22	List of related projects/initiatives contributing to project objectives approved/started after GEF project approval (i.e. any leveraged or "catalytic" results)
23	Data on relevant project website activity – e.g. number of unique visitors per month, number of page views, etc. over relevant time period, if available
24	UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD)
25	List/map of project sites, highlighting suggested visits
26	List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Board members, RTA, Project Team members, and other partners to be consulted
27	Project deliverables that provide documentary evidence of achievement towards project outcomes
	<i>Additional documents, as required</i>

ToR Annex C: Content of the TE report

- i. Title page
 - Title of UNDP-supported GEF-financed project
 - UNDP PIMS ID and GEF ID
 - TE timeframe and date of final TE report
 - Region and countries included in the project
 - GEF Focal Area/Strategic Program
 - Executing Agency, Implementing partner and other project partners
 - TE Team members
- ii. Acknowledgements
- iii. Table of Contents
- iv. Acronyms and Abbreviations
1. Executive Summary (3-4 pages)
 - Project Information Table
 - Project Description (brief)
 - Evaluation Ratings Table
 - Concise summary of findings, conclusions and lessons learned
 - Recommendations summary table
2. Introduction (2-3 pages)
 - Purpose and objective of the TE
 - Scope
 - Methodology
 - Data Collection & Analysis
 - Ethics
 - Limitations to the evaluation
 - Structure of the TE report
3. Project Description (3-5 pages)
 - Project start and duration, including milestones
 - Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope
 - Problems that the project sought to address, threats and barriers targeted
 - Immediate and development objectives of the project
 - Expected results
 - Main stakeholders: summary list
 - Theory of Change
4. Findings
(in addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (*) must be given a rating⁸)
 - 4.1 Project Design/Formulation
 - Analysis of Results Framework: project logic and strategy, indicators
 - Assumptions and Risks
 - Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g. same focal area) incorporated into project design
 - Planned stakeholder participation
 - Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
 - 4.2 Project Implementation

⁸ See ToR Annex F for rating scales.

- Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
 - Actual stakeholder participation and partnership arrangements
 - Project Finance and Co-finance
 - Monitoring & Evaluation: design at entry (*), implementation (*), and overall assessment of M&E (*)
 - UNDP implementation/oversight (*) and Implementing Partner execution (*), overall project implementation/execution (*), coordination, and operational issues
 - Risk Management, including Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)
- 4.2 Project Results and Impacts
- Progress towards objective and expected outcomes (*)
 - Relevance (*)
 - Effectiveness (*)
 - Efficiency (*)
 - Overall Outcome (*)
 - Sustainability: financial (*), socio-economic (*), institutional framework and governance (*), environmental (*), and overall likelihood (*)
 - Country ownership
 - Gender equality and women's empowerment
 - Cross-cutting Issues
 - GEF Additionality
 - Catalytic/Replication Effect
 - Progress to Impact
5. Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons
- Main Findings
 - Conclusions
 - Recommendations
 - Lessons Learned
6. Annexes
- TE ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
 - TE Mission itinerary, including summary of field visits
 - List of persons interviewed
 - List of documents reviewed
 - Evaluation Question Matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology)
 - Questionnaire used and summary of results
 - Co-financing tables (if not include in body of report)
 - TE Rating scales
 - Signed Evaluation Consultant Agreement form
 - Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form
 - Signed TE Report Clearance form
 - *Annexed in a separate file:* TE Audit Trail
 - *Annexed in a separate file:* relevant terminal GEF/LDCF/SCCF Core Indicators or Tracking Tools, as applicable

ToR Annex D: Evaluation Criteria Matrix template

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 level?			
<i>(include evaluative questions)</i>	<i>(i.e. relationships established, level of coherence between project design and implementation approach, specific activities conducted, quality of risk mitigation strategies, etc.)</i>	<i>(i.e. project documentation, national policies or strategies, websites, project staff, project partners, data collected throughout the TE mission, etc.)</i>	<i>(i.e. document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc.)</i>
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, socio-political, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
Gender equality and women's empowerment: How did the project contribute to gender equality and women's empowerment?			
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
<i>(Expand the table to include questions for all criteria being assessed: Monitoring & Evaluation, UNDP oversight/implementation, Implementing Partner Execution, cross-cutting issues, etc.)</i>			

ToR Annex E: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators

Independence entails the ability to evaluate without undue influence or pressure by any party (including the hiring unit) and providing evaluators with free access to information on the evaluation subject. Independence provides legitimacy to and ensures an objective perspective on evaluations. An independent evaluation reduces the potential for conflicts of interest which might arise with self-reported ratings by those involved in the management of the project being evaluated. Independence is one of ten general principles for evaluations (together with internationally agreed principles, goals and targets: utility, credibility, impartiality, ethics, transparency, human rights and gender equality, national evaluation capacities, and professionalism).

Evaluators/Consultants:

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 limitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.
8. Must ensure that independence of judgement is maintained, and that evaluation findings and recommendations are independently presented.
9. Must confirm that they have not been involved in designing, executing or advising on the project being evaluated and did not carry out the project's Mid-Term Review.

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System:

Name of Evaluator: _____

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: _____

ToR Annex F: TE Rating Scales

Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, Implementation/Oversight, Execution, Relevance	Sustainability ratings:
6 = Highly Satisfactory (HS): exceeds expectations and/or no shortcomings 5 = Satisfactory (S): meets expectations and/or no or minor shortcomings 4 = Moderately Satisfactory (MS): more or less meets expectations and/or some shortcomings 3 = Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): somewhat below expectations and/or significant shortcomings 2 = Unsatisfactory (U): substantially below expectations and/or major shortcomings 1 = Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe shortcomings Unable to Assess (U/A): available information does not allow an assessment	4 = Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3 = Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks to sustainability 2 = Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks to sustainability 1 = Unlikely (U): severe risks to sustainability Unable to Assess (U/A): Unable to assess the expected incidence and magnitude of risks to sustainability

ToR Annex G: TE Report Clearance Form

Terminal Evaluation Report for (Project Title & UNDP PIMS ID) Reviewed and Cleared By:	
Commissioning Unit (M&E Focal Point)	
Name: _____	
Signature: _____ _____	Date: _____
Regional Technical Advisor (Nature, Climate and Energy)	
Name: _____	
Signature: _____ _____	Date: _____

ToR Annex H: TE Audit Trail

The following is a template for the TE Team 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 listed as an annex in the final TE report but not attached to the report file.

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

The following comments were provided to the draft TE report; they are referenced by institution/organization (do not include the commentator's name) and track change comment number ("#" column):

Institution/ Organization	#	Para No./ comment location	Comment/Feedback on the draft TE report	TE team response and actions taken

