**Terms of Reference**

**International Consultant to carry out the Terminal Evaluation for the project ‘Rhino Impact Bonds: An Innovative Financing Mechanism for Site-Based Rhinoceros Conservation’**

**Location:** home-based with one mission to London

**Application Deadline:**

**Category:**

**Type of Contract:** Individual Contract

**Post Level:** International Consultant

**Languages Required:** English

**Starting Date:** 3 February 2020

**Duration of Initial Contract:** 17 working days (must complete assignment by 28 February 2020)

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 medium-sized project titled **‘Rhino Impact Bonds: An Innovative Financing Mechanism for Site-Based Rhinoceros Conservation’(PIMS 5382)** implemented through the Zoological Society of London. The project started on the *11 March 2016* and is in its *3rd* year of implementation. The TE process must follow the guidance outlined in the document ‘[Guidance For Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/UNDP-GEF-TE-Guide.pdf)’.

1. **PROJECT BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT**

The international illegal wildlife trade is a key driver of poaching which threatens iconic species including rhinoceros, tigers and elephants. Surging demand for rhinoceros horn in Asian markets is rapidly increasing rhinoceros poaching, particularly in Africa, where more than 1,300 rhinoceros were poached in 2014. Of 11 sub-species of rhinoceros globally, two have recently gone Extinct in the Wild, six are Critically Endangered, and three are Vulnerable or Near Threatened according to the IUCN.

The objective of the project ‘Rhino Impact Bonds: An Innovative Financing Mechanism for Site-Based Rhinoceros Conservation’ is ***to demonstrate a scalable financing mechanism for site-based actions to conserve globally important rhinoceros populations***. It seeks to address two key barriers to rhino population growth:

1. Conservation programme funding by donors and governments restricts conservation planning and implementation;
2. There is insufficient technical support for effective protected area planning, management and law enforcement

The project tested and created an innovative pay-for-performance financing mechanism, known as a Rhino Impact Bond (RIB). In an **Impact Bond**, an investor provides risk capital to on-the-ground service providers (in this case protected area managers) on the basis that the investment will be repaid (potentially with interest) by a donor once pre-agreed performance targets have been reached within the target population. Interventions need to (i) have a strong theory of change from baseline through to intervention and impact, and (ii) be monitored closely to enable adaptive management to occur in order to ensure that performance targets (i.e. rhino population growth) are met. This new funding stream and its associated requirements was intended to drive improvements in PA management effectiveness and the financial sustainability of PAs, contributing to GEF-5 Biodiversity Focal Area Outcomes 1.1 (Improved management effectiveness of existing and new protected areas) and 1.2 (Increased revenue for protected area systems to meet total expenditures required for management).

The project aimed to deliver two Components in order to achieve its objective:

***Component 1:* *Testing and modelling a pay-for-performance mechanism for improved rhino conservation at selected sites***. Adaptive management capacity will be built and demonstrated in three priority rhinoceros sites: Hluhluwe-iMfolozi Park in South Africa, Tsavo West National Park in Kenya and Chitwan National Park in Nepal. Lessons learned from the design, implementation and monitoring of performance in each PA will be used to assess the feasibility of the RIB.

***Component 2:* *Development of the pay-for-performance structure and enabling conditions for a RIB*.** This will involve building the investment readiness of a selection of 5 – 10 priority rhinoceros sites, structuring the mechanism and seeking endorsement from key rhinoceros stakeholders. By the end of the project, the key components of the RIB will have been tested in the field across three countries and the groundwork laid for the launch of this mechanism to conserve up to 10 biologically significant populations of rhinoceros. This will promote sustainable and diversified financing for PAs, as called for by the CBD and promoted by the GEF.

The project was aligned with UNDP’s Strategic Plan 2014–2017, Outcome 1, Output 1.3: Solutions developed at national and sub-national levels for sustainable management of natural resources, ecosystems services, chemicals and waste.

1. **OBJECTIVES OF THE TE**

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.

1. **TE APPROACH & METHODOLOGY**

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

The TE consultant is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts, Implementing Partners, the UNDP Country Office(s), the UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisors, 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 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. The TE consultant is expected to conduct one mission to London. No overseas missions are anticipated. The final TE report should 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.

The specific design and methodology for the TE should emerge from consultations between the TE consultant 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 consultant must ensure that gender-responsive evaluation methodologies, tools and data analysis techniques are used. The final methodological approach including interview schedule, field visits (if relevant) and data to be used in the evaluation should be clearly outlined in the Inception Report and be fully discussed and agreed between UNDP, stakeholders and the evaluators. For example, the TOR might suggest using questionnaires, field visits and interviews, but the TE consultant should be able to revise the approach in consultation with the evaluation manager and key stakeholders. These changes in approach should be agreed and reflected clearly in an Inception Report.

1. **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 TEs of UNDP-supported GEF-financed Projects. A full outline of the TE report’s content is provided in ToR Annex C.

Below are topics to address for the ‘Findings’ section of the TE report. The asterisk “(\*)” indicates criteria for which a rating is required. Detailed questions for each topic are provided in Annex K.

1. Project Design/Formulation
* National priorities and country drivenness
* Theory of Change
* Incorporate of gender in project design
* Social and Environmental 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
* Replication approach
* UNDP comparative advantage
* Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
* Management arrangements
1. Project Implementation
* Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
* Actual stakeholder participation and partnership arrangements
	+ Project management:
	+ Participation and country-driven processes:
	+ Participation and public awareness:
	+ Extent of stakeholder interaction including whether stakeholder engagement exercises were gender responsive
* Project Finance and Co-finance
* Monitoring & Evaluation: design at entry (\*), implementation (\*), and overall assessment of M&E (\*)
* M&E design at entry:
* M&E implementation:
* Implementing Agency (UNDP) (\*) and Executing Agency (\*), overall project implementation/execution (\*), coordination, and operational issues
1. 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 assigning a rating justified with evidence (\*) *(See Table 1)*

**ToR Table 1. Progress Towards Results Matrix (Achievement of outcomes against end-of-project targets)**

Indicator Assessment Key

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Green = Achieved at time of TE | Yellow = Partially Achieved at time of TE | Red = Not Achieved at time of TE |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Objective/Outcome + Description | Indicator | Baseline level | End-of-project Target | Level at MTR *(insert date)* | Level at TE *(insert date)* | Achievement Rating[[1]](#footnote-1) | Justification for Rating |
| Objective: | Indicator (if applicable) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Outcome 1 | Indicator 1.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 1.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 1.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Outcome 2 | Indicator 2.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Outcome 3 | Indicator 3.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 3.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Etc. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

* Relevance (\*)
* Effectiveness (\*)
* Efficiency (\*)
* resource allocation and cost effectiveness:
* Project management and timeliness
* Synergies and complementarities:
* Country ownership
* Gender: how effective the project was in contributing to gender equality and women’s empowerment; how gender results advanced or contributed to the project’s environment, climate and/or resilience outcomes.
* Other Cross-cutting Issues (poverty-environment nexus, poverty alleviation, capacity development, etc.)
* Social and Environmental Standards: whether appropriate environmental and social safeguards, including those on mainstreaming of gender concerns, were addressed during project implementation.
* Sustainability:
* Assess the likelihood of sustainability in terms of each of the following risks:
	+ - Financial (\*)
		- Socio-economic (\*)
		- Institutional framework and governance (\*)
		- Environmental (\*)
* GEF Additionality
* Are the outcomes related to the incremental reasoning?
* Can the outcomes be attributed to the GEF contribution as originally anticipated?
* Are the outcomes sustainable?
* Catalytic Role / Replication Effect
* Impact
	+ Whether the project has demonstrated:
		- verifiable improvements in ecological status
		- verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems (e.g. GHG emission reduction, reduction of waste discharge, etc.)
		- verifiable environmental status change (e.g. change in population of endangered species, forest stock, water retention in degraded lands, etc.)
		- contributions to changes in policy/legal/regulatory frameworks, including observed changes in capacities (awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, monitoring systems, etc.) and governance architecture, including access to and use of information (laws, administrative bodies, trust-building and conflict resolution processes, information-sharing systems, etc.)
		- contributions to changes in socio-economic status (income, health, well-being, etc.), ensuring to capture any such changes achieved at scales beyond the immediate area of intervention and the processes through which these changes have taken place
1. Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons Learned
* The TE consultant 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 and worst 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 consultant 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 include results related to gender equality and empowerment of women.

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

**ToR Table 2: Evaluations Ratings Table for ‘Rhino Impact Bonds: An Innovative Financing Mechanism for Site-Based Rhinoceros Conservation’**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) | Rating[[2]](#footnote-2) |
| M&E design at entry |  |
| M&E Plan Implementation |  |
| Overall Quality of M&E |  |
| Implementing Agency (IA) Implementation & Executing Agency (EA) Execution | Rating |
| Quality of Implementation by IA  |  |
| Quality of Execution by EA |  |
| Overall quality of Implementation/Execution |  |
| Assessment of Outcomes | Rating |
| Relevance |  |
| Effectiveness |  |
| Efficiency |  |
| Overall Project Outcome Rating |  |
| Sustainability | Rating[[3]](#footnote-3) |
| Financial resources |  |
| Socio-political/economic |  |
| Institutional framework and governance |  |
| Environmental |  |
| Overall Likelihood of Sustainability |  |

1. **TIMEFRAME**

The total duration of the TE will be 17 days over a time period of *5 weeks* starting 30 January *2020*. The tentative TE timeframe is as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Timeframe | Activity |
| 3 February 2020 | Selection and recruitment of TE consultant |
| 4 February 2020 | Preparation period for TE consultant (handover of documentation) |
| 4-5 February (2 working days) | Document review and preparation of TE Inception Report |
| 6-7 February (2 days)  | Finalization and Validation of TE Inception Report; latest start of TE mission |
| 10-14 February (5 days)  | TE mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, etc. |
| 14 February | Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings; earliest end of TE mission |
| 17-20 February (4 days) | Preparation of draft TE report |
| 20-25 February  | Circulation of draft TE report for comments |
| 25-27 February (3 days) | Incorporation of comments on draft TE report into Audit Trail & finalization of TE report  |
| *20-28 February* | Preparation and Issuance of Management Response (led by Implementing Partner) |
| 28 February (1 day) | Expected date of full TE completion |

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

1. **TE DELIVERABLES**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| # | Deliverable | Description | Timing *(tentative)* | Responsibilities |
| 1 | TE Inception Report | TE consultant clarifies objectives and methodology of the TE | No later than 2 weeks before the TE mission: (by 5 Feb 2020) | TE consultant submits Inception Report to Commissioning Unit and project management |
| 2 | Presentation | Initial Findings | End of TE mission: (by 14 Feb 2020) | TE consultant presents to Commissioning Unit and project management |
| 3 | Draft TE Report | Full draft report (using guidelines on report content in ToR Annex C) with annexes | (by 20 Feb 2020) | TE consultant submits to Commissioning Unit; reviewed by UNDP-GEF RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP |
| 5 | Final TE Report + Audit Trail | Revised final report and TE Audit trail in which the TE consultant details how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final TE report (See template in ToR Annex H) | (by 28 Feb 2020) | TE consultant submits both documents to the Commissioning Unit |

1. **TE ARRANGEMENTS**

The principal responsibility for managing the TE resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project’s TE is the UNDP Global Environmental Finance (UNDP-GEF) Directorate based at UNDP HQ in New York.

The Commissioning Unit will contract the consultant and be responsible for payments upon submission and approval of deliverables. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the TE consultant to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and handle mission logistics.

1. **TE TEAM COMPOSITION**

This TE assignment will be carried by one independent consultant. The TE consultant will be responsible for working with the project team, UNDP-GEF RTA and other stakeholders; and for the overall design and writing of the TE report.

The TE consultant cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation and/or implementation (including the writing of the project document) and should not have a conflict of interest with the project’s related activities.

The required qualifications of the TE consultant are as follows:

* 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 biodiversity and innovative conservation finance;
* Experience working in Africa and Asia;
* Experience in relevant technical areas (biodiversity, conservation finance) for at least 10 years;
* Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and biodiversity; 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;
* Master’s degree in or equivalent in conservation biology, ecology, environmental studies (science and/or management), natural resources, protected area/park management or other closely related field;
* Fluency in written and spoken English.
1. **EVALUATOR ETHICS**

This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’. The consultant 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 consultant 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 with the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

1. **PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| % | Milestone |
| 20% | Upon submission and approval of final TE Inception Report |
| 50% | Upon submission and approval of draft TE report |
| 30%  | Upon submission and approval of final TE report + TE Audit Trail (TE Report clearance form must be signed by the UNDP-GEF Directorate and UNDP-GEF RTA) |

1. **TOR ANNEXES**

*(to be provided separately)*

* ToR Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework
* ToR Annex B: Project Information Package to be reviewed by TE consultant
* 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 I: Project Information Table
* ToR Annex J: Co-Financing Tables
* ToR Annex K: Suggested questions to address in ‘Findings’ section of the TE report
1. Objective and outcome indicators are rated on a 6-point rating scale: 6 = Highly Satisfactory (HS), 5 = Satisfactory (S), 4 = Moderately Satisfactory (MS), 3 = Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), 2 = Unsatisfactory (U), 1 = Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution, Relevance are rated on a 6-point rating scale: 6 = Highly Satisfactory (HS), 5 = Satisfactory (S), 4 = Moderately Satisfactory (MS), 3 = Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), 2 = Unsatisfactory (U), 1 = Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Sustainability is rated on a 4-point scale: 4 = Likely (L), 3 = Moderately Likely (ML), 2 = Moderately Unlikely (MU), 1 = Unlikely (U) [↑](#footnote-ref-3)