**Annexes to 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’**

**ToR Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework**

Project Title: Rhino Impact Bonds: An Innovative Financing Mechanism for Site-Based Rhinoceros Conservation

Project’s Development Goal: New performance-based protected area finance mechanism improves management effectiveness of priority rhinoceros populations to ensure species survival

| **Objective/ Outcome** | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **End of Project Target** | **Source of Information** | **Risks and Assumptions** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Objective:** **To demonstrate a scalable financing mechanism for site-based actions to conserve globally important rhinoceros populations** | Establishment of a pay-for-performance mechanism for the first time in species conservation, with endorsement by key conservation and financial stakeholders. | No pay-for-performance funding mechanisms exist for rhinoceros conservation | One pay-for-performance mechanism established and market-ready for potential launch in 5 - 10 PAs holding populations of rhinoceros, and endorsed by at least two of each of the following stakeholders:1. Local PA stakeholders
2. National governments
3. Banks
4. Investors
5. Donor agencies
6. Conservation agencies
7. Independent rhinoceros experts
 | RIB operational plan for selected PAs; letters of endorsement from key conservation and financial stakeholders; project M&E reports | Risks:Investors and donors do not accept the testing of output metrics over 2 years as reliable proxies for outcome metrics in a 5–10-year RIB, and do not endorse the mechanism The media profile of rhinoceros conservation declines and potential investors lose interestGovernments (and/or relevant park management agencies) fail to support the mechanismAssumptionInternational interest in rhinoceros conservation remains high and investors, donors and governments are willing to participate in and support the RIB |
| **Component 1: Testing and modelling a pay-for-performance mechanism for improved rhinoceros conservation at selected sites** |
| **Outcome 1.1:** **Proof of concept of the pay-for-performance mechanism in three pilot sites is contributing to the development of the RIB** | **Outputs:****1.1.1:** Performance monitoring and management framework for developing theory of change developed and tested with buy-in of global conservation community **1.1.2:** Quantified output metrics developed for interventions in three Key 1 rhinoceros sites**1.1.3:** Three sites are prepared for piloting of performance monitoring and management **1.1.4:** Performance monitoring and management piloted in Tsavo West National Park, Kenya, based on the theory of change developed in 1.1.1 (including implementation of priority interventions).**1.1.5:** Performance monitoring and management piloted in Chitwan National Park, Nepal, based on the theory of change developed in 1.1.1 (including co-financed management interventions).**1.1.6:** Performance monitoring and management piloted in Hluhluwe-iMfolozi Park, South Africa, based on the theory of change developed in 1.1.1 (including co-financed management interventions).**1.1.7:** Site-level financing, performance management and performance metrics monitored, reported and independently verified to learn lessons for the full RIB. **1.1.8:** Full feasibility study conducted of RIB including lessons learned from three pilot sites |
| Feasibility of each pilot site for a RIB determined based on information gathered from pilot sites | Zero feasibility studies for a RIB conducted | One feasibility study conducted based on lessons from each pilot site  | One full feasibility report completed  | Risks:Political and/or governance challenges external to the project affect the ability of PA managers and staff to engage in project activities. Assumption: PA managers and staff are able to participate in training and improve monitoring systems as part of the project’s planned activities. |
| Key stakeholders in range states understand the RIB concept | Stakeholders have not been fully introduced to the RIB mechanism –‘understanding of RIB’ to be defined at start of project | At least 2 key rhinoceros conservation stakeholders within each range state understands the RIB concept | Questionnaire surveys and interviews |
| Performance-based payment triggers simulated | Zero performance-based payment triggers simulated  | At least 1 performance-based payment trigger has been simulated per pilot site | Project M&E reports |
| Stakeholder endorsement of the performance monitoring and management framework by relevant conservation agencies involved in pilot | Zero endorsement by stakeholders (since the framework has not been fully developed – however, stakeholders have endorsed the development of this framework) | All key stakeholders of the pilot sites (to be defined at the start of project) endorse the framework | Stakeholder endorsement letters |
| Change in protected area management effectiveness (PAME) in three pilot sites totalling 1,970,982 ha (specific aspects of management effectiveness to be determined during project inception, but likely to include: *Law enforcement**Protection systems**Staff training**Management of budget**Monitoring and evaluation*) | METT scores for the three pilot sites:Tsavo West: 53Chitwan: 69Hluhluwe-iMfolozi: 84 | PAME has improved in three pilot sites, totaling 1,970,982 ha of protected landTarget METT scores:Tsavo West: 62Chitwan: 78Hluhluwe-iMfolozi: 90  | GEF Biodiversity Tracking Tools (METT) |
| Change in financial sustainability of three pilot sites, totaling 1,970,982 ha, with regards to:*Business planning and tools for cost-effective management;**Tools for revenue generation* | Scores for relevant aspects of financial sustainability scores for the three pilot sites:Tsavo West: 6Chitwan: 11Hluhluwe-iMfolozi: 11(out of a possible 30) | Financial sustainability has improved in three pilot sites, totaling 1,970,982 ha of protected landTarget scores (for relevant aspects of financial sustainability):Tsavo West: 16Chitwan: 20Hluhluwe-iMfolozi: 19*NB. Improving the financial sustainability of PAs is not a specific aim of this project and may not be a reliable indicator of the project’s overall success* | GEF Biodiversity Tracking Tools (Protected Area Financial Sustainability Scorecard):Component 2, Element 5:Training and support to enable PA managers to operate more cost-effectively; Component 3, Element 5: Operational PES schemes for PAs (The project will pilot performance-based funding for conservation) |
| Change in capacity of three pilot sites, totaling 1,970,982 ha; specific aspects of capacity to be determined during project inception | Total scores for capacity of the three pilot sites:Tsavo West: 20Chitwan: 81Hluhluwe-iMfolozi: 24 | Capacity has improved in three pilot sites, totaling 1,970,982 ha. Target scores to be identified during project inception | Capacity Development Scorecards |
| **Component 2:** **Development of the pay-for-performance structure and enabling conditions for a RIB**  |
| **Outcome 2.1:** **Between five and 10 priority rhinoceros sites selected, assessed and prepared for RIB investment**  | **Outputs:****2.1.1.** Between five and 10 priority rhinoceros sites selected based on assessment against specific readiness criteria (to be defined at start of project) to participate in RIB investment readiness activities **2.1.2.** On-site capacity assessments conducted of each site using performance monitoring and management framework **2.1.3.** Performance monitoring and management capacity built in selected sites **2.1.4.** Intervention plansfor rhinoceros conservationdesigned for each site **(**using framework) for implementation under a RIB.  |
| Percentage of relevant stakeholders (to be defined at start of project) in selected sites who understand and support the RIB mechanism | 0% of relevant stakeholders understand and support the RIB mechanism (however, following the PPG, stakeholders support the *development* of the RIB mechanism (see letters of support) | 100% of relevant stakeholders understand and support the RIB mechanism | Questionnaire surveys/ interviews; project M&E reports | Risks:The lack of certainty of RIB investment may cause PA site managers to lose interest in investment readiness activitiesGovernments and site managers do not support the hiring of Portfolio Managers and independent verifiers and separate financial management and refuse to participate in investment readiness Assumption: PA site managers are willing and committed to improving monitoring and management capacity where necessary, whether or not it results in RIB investment |
| Willingness of key stakeholders (to be defined at start of project) to engage with the Rhino Impact Partnership  | 0% of key stakeholders are willing to engage with the Rhino Impact Partnership (this stage of the process has not been reached yet, since the project is to develop and test the exact structure of the RIB first) | 100% of key stakeholders are willing to engage with the Rhino Impact Partnership | Endorsement letters from stakeholders |
| Percentage of selected sites verified as having met investment readiness criteria (to be defined at start of project) | Baseline level to be assessed during the project | 100% of selected sites meet criteria for investment readiness (assumption: 5 – 10 sites selected) | Capacity evaluation reports; project M&E reports |
| PAME in all selected sites (specific aspects of ME to be determined during project inception, but likely to include: *Law enforcement**Protection systems**Staff training**Management of budget**Monitoring and evaluation*) | Baseline to be determined during project | PAME in all selected sites has improved (assumption: 5 – 10 sites selected)  | GEF Biodiversity Tracking Tools (METT) |
| Change in financial sustainability of all selected sites, with regards to:*Business planning and tools for cost-effective management;**Tools for revenue generation* | Baseline to be determined during project (out of a possible 30) | Financial sustainability in all selected sites has improved (assumption: 5 – 10 sites selected)*NB. Improving the financial sustainability of PAs is not a specific aim of this project and may not be a reliable indicator of the project’s overall success* | GEF Biodiversity Tracking Tools (Protected Area Financial Sustainability Scorecard):Component 2, Element 5:Training and support to enable PA managers to operate more cost-effectively; Component 3, Element 5: Operational PES schemes for PAs (The project will pilot performance-based funding for conservation) |
| Change in capacity of all selected sites; specific aspects of capacity to be determined during project inception | Baseline to be determined during the project | Capacity has improved in all selected sites | Capacity Development Scorecards |
| **Outcome 2.2: The pay-for-performance structures and processes are established and the RIB is ready for market** | **Outputs:****2.2.1:** Financial structure, payment mechanism and MRV system developed for the RIB**2.2.2:** Management, legal and governance structures developed for the RIB |
| Financial, payment and MRV structures of RIB endorsed by relevant stakeholders | No financial, payment or MRV structures have been established for the RIB | Financial, payment and MRV structures finalised for RIB and endorsed by at least 2 potential investors, 1 potential outcomes funder and both project technical committees | Stakeholder endorsement letters; Project M&E reports | Risk:Different stakeholders have different concerns and priorities and cannot agree on the appropriate structures of the RIB and do not endorse the final productMeasurability of results is inadequate for investor requirementsThe integrity of the performance monitoring and payment mechanism is undermined by inaccurate reportingAssumption: Through engagement with all stakeholders throughout the project, structures will be developed which satisfy the interests and requirements of all stakeholders  |

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

*Note: This checklist is for the Commissioning Unit, Project Team to use for collecting documentation to be given to the TE consultant for their review during the Preparation Phase of the TE. The list should be adjusted, as needed, for each TE.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Item # | Item (electronic versions preferred if available) | Comments |
| 1 | Project Identification Form (PIF) |  |
| 2 | UNDP Initiation Plan |  |
| 3 | Final UNDP Project Document with all annexes |  |
| 4 | Request for CEO Endorsement |  |
| 5 | UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) and associated management plans (if any) |  |
| 6 | Inception Workshop Report |  |
| 7 | Mid-Term Review |  |
| 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 and/or 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 ~$5,000 USD (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 |  |
| 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 |  |
| 25 | List/map of project sites, highlighting suggested visits |  |
| 26 | List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Board members, and other partners to be consulted |  |
| 27 | Confirmation on list of names and titles of stakeholders actually met on TE mission (include after the TE mission) |  |

**ToR Annex C: Content of the TE report[[1]](#footnote-1)**

1. Title page
* Tile 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 consultant name
1. Table of Contents
2. Acronyms and Abbreviations

*(See UNDP Editorial Style Manual[[2]](#footnote-2))*

1. Executive Summary *(3-4 pages)*
* Project Information Table[[3]](#footnote-3)
* Project Description (brief)
* Evaluation Rating Table
* Concise summary of findings, conclusions and lessons learned
* Recommendations summary table
1. 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
1. 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
* Baseline indicators established
* Expected results
* Main stakeholders: summary list
* Theory of Change
1. Findings

*(in addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) must be given a rating[[4]](#footnote-4))*

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
* 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 Finance and Co-finance
* Monitoring & Evaluation: design at entry (\*), implementation (\*), and overall assessment of M&E (\*)
* Implementing Agency (UNDP) implementation (\*) and Executing Agency execution (\*), overall project implementation/execution (\*), coordination, and operational issues
	1. Project Results
* Progress towards objective and expected outcomes (\*)
* Relevance (\*)
* Effectiveness (\*)
* Efficiency (\*)
* Country ownership
* Gender
* Other Cross-cutting Issues
* Social and Environmental Standards
* Sustainability: financial (\*), socio-economic (\*), institutional framework and governance (\*), environmental (\*), and overall likelihood (\*)
* Additionality
* Catalytic Role / Replication Effect
* Impact
1. Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons
* Main Findings
* Conclusions
* Recommendations
* Lessons Learned
1. Annexes
* TE ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
* TE Mission itinerary
* List of persons interviewed
* List of documents reviewed
* Summary of field visits
* Evaluation Question Matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology)
* Questionnaire used and summary of results
* Co-financing tables
* 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 a the local, regional and national levels? |
| (include evaluative questions) | (i.e. relationships established, level of coherence between project design and implementation approach, specific activities conducted, quality of risk mitigation strategies, etc.) | (i.e. project documentation, national policies or strategies, websites, project staff, project partners, data collected throughout the TE mission, etc.) | (i.e. document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc.) |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in line wit international and national norms and standards? |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status? |
|  |  |  |  |

**ToR Annex E: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators**

**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 imitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.
8. Evaluators must ensure that independence of judgement is maintained and that evaluation findings and recommendations are independently presented.

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form**

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: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**ToR Annex F: TE Rating Scales**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution, Relevance*** | ***Sustainability ratings:***  |
| 6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings 5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS)3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems | 4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks1. Unlikely (U): severe risks |
| *Additional ratings where relevant:*Not Applicable (N/A) Unable to Assess (U/A |

**ToR Annex G: TE Report Clearance Form**

**Terminal Evaluation Report for ‘Rhino Impact Bonds: An Innovative Financing Mechanism for Site-Based Rhinoceros Conservation’ (UNDP PIMS 5382) Reviewed and Cleared By:**

**Commissioning Unit (M&E Officer/Focal Point)**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**ToR Annex H: TE Audit Trail**

*The Commissioning Unit will consolidate all comments into this Audit Trail template. The TE consultant will complete the Audit Trail by showing 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 ‘Rhino Impact Bonds: An Innovative Financing Mechanism for Site-Based Rhinoceros Conservation’ (UNDP PIMS 5382)**

*The following comments were provided to the draft TE report; they are referenced by institution (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 consultant****response and actions taken** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

**ToR Annex I: Project Information Table**

|  |
| --- |
| Project Details |
| Project Title |  |
| UNDP Project ID (PIMS #): |  |
| GEF Project ID (PMIS #): |  |
| Atlas Business Unit, Award ID, Project ID: |  |
| Country(ies): |  |
| Region: |  |
| Focal Area: |  |
| GEF Focal Area Strategic Objective: |  |
| Trust Fund: | *[indicate GEF TF, LDCF, SCCF, NPIF]* |
| Executing Agency / Implementing Partner: |  |
| Other execution partners: |  |
| Geospatial coordinates of project sites: | *[Coordinates are available in the annual PIRs]* |
| Financial Information |
| PDF/PPG | at approval (US$) | at PDF/PPG completion (US$) |
| [1] GEF PDF/PPG grants for project preparation |  |  |
| [2] Co-financing for project preparation |  |  |
| Project | at CEO Endorsement (US$) | at Terminal Evaluation (US$) |
| [1] GEF Financing: |  |  |
| [2] UNDP contribution: |  |  |
| [3] Government: |  |  |
| [4] Other partners: |  |  |
| [5] Total co-financing[2 + 3 + 4]: |  |  |
| Project Total Costs [1 + 5] |  |  |
| Project Milestones |
| PIF Approval Date: | 31 March 2014 |
| CEO Endorsement/Approval Date: | 09 October 2015 |
| ProDoc Signature Date: | 11 March 2016 |
| Date Project Manager hired: |  |
| Inception Workshop Date: |  |
| Mid-Term Review Completion Date: | N/A |
| Planned Operational Closure Date: |  |

**ToR Annex J: Co-Financing Tables**

The TE consultant, with assistance from the Commissioning Unit and project team, should complete two co-financing tables with confirmed sources of co-financing at the TE stage.

**Co-financing Table #1**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Co-financing(type/source) | UNDP own financing (mill. US$) | Government(mill. US$) | Partner Agency(mill. US$) | Total(mill. US$) |
| Planned | Actual  | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Actual | Actual |
| Grants  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Loans/Concessions  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * In-kind support
 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * Other
 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Co-financing Table #2**

(Word template to be provided as a separate file.)

**ToR Annex K: Suggested questions to address in ‘Findings’ section of the TE report**

Project Design/Formulation

* National priorities and country drivenness:
	+ Was the project concept in line with national development priorities and plans of the country (or of participating countries in the case of multi-country projects)?
* Theory of Change:
	+ Was there a clearly defined and robust Theory of Change? Did the Theory of Change include: a clear definition of the problem to be addressed and its root causes, desired outcomes, an analysis of barriers to and enablers for achieving outcomes, consideration of how to address barriers, a plan for a phased withdrawal of the project, and responses for the project to focus on?
* Gender:
	+ Evaluate the project’s results in advancing gender equality and women’s empowerment, including delivery of its gender action plan and the relevance of its gender analysis. See ‘Section C) Project Results’ for further guidelines on evaluating gender in project design and formulation, and gender results
	+ Extent to which a gender mainstreaming strategy and/or human rights-based approach were incorporated in the design and implementation of the intervention
	+ Extent to which the Theory of Change and results framework of the intervention integrated gender equality and human rights
* Social and Environmental Safeguards
	+ Assess any environmental and social risks as identified through the SESP in line with UNDP Social and Environmental Standards[[5]](#footnote-5) and the management measures outlined in the Project Document, SESP and any management plans
* Analysis of Results Framework: project logic and strategy, indicators
* Were the project’s objectives and components clear, practicable and feasible within its time frame?
* Were outcomes and outputs consistent with the Theory of Change?
* Was the Results Framework well-defined? *(*If the Results Framework was revised - for example, during the project’s Inception Workshop or as a result of MTR recommendations - the TE report should assess the approved version but also whether the revisions to the results framework were sound and made sense given the context of the project.)
* Did the project aim to capture broader development impacts (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women’s empowerment, improved governance, livelihood benefits, etc.) by using socioeconomic co-benefits and sex-disaggregated/gender-responsive indicators and targets, where relevant?
* Were the indicators in the Results Framework SMART? Include a SMART analysis of the objective and outcome indicators.
* Assumptions and Risks
* Were the assumptions and risks in the results framework well-articulated in the PIF and project document?
* Were the stated assumptions and risk logical and robust, and did they help to determine activities and planned outputs?
* Were there any externalities (i.e. effects of climate change, global economic crisis, etc.) which are relevant to the findings?
* Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g. same focal area) incorporated into project design
	+ Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated in the project design?
* Planned stakeholder participation
* Were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?
* What were the planned stakeholder interactions, as set out in the project document Stakeholder Engagement Plan?
* Were the partnership arrangements properly identified and roles and responsibilities negotiated prior to project approval?
* Replication approach
* Was a replication approach identified during the project design?
* UNDP comparative advantage
* What is the basis of UNDP’s comparative advantage as a GEF Agency that supported the project being evaluated? Include a discussion of UNDP’s global network of country offices, its experience in integrated policy development, human resources development, institutional strengthening, and non-governmental and community participation. Provide information on UNDP’s experience working in the country and/or its support to other projects within the same focal area in other countries/regions, as relevant.
* Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
	+ Were linkages established with other complementary interventions? Was there planned coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects and/or other initiatives?
* Management arrangements
* Were the capacities of the executing institution(s) and its counterparts properly considered when the project was designed?
* Were counterpart resources (funding, staff, and facilities), enabling legislation, and adequate project management arrangements in place at project entry?

Project Implementation

* Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
	+ Did the project undergo significant changes as a result of recommendations from the Mid-Term Review? Or as a result of other review procedures? Explain the process and implications. If the changes were extensive, did they materially change the expected project outcomes? Were the project changes articulated in writing and then considered and approved by the project steering committee?
* Actual stakeholder participation and partnership arrangements
	+ Project management:
		- Did the project develop and leverage the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?
	+ Participation and country-driven processes:
		- Did local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? Did they have an active role in project decision-making that supported efficient and effective project implementation?
	+ Participation and public awareness:
		- How did stakeholder involvement and public awareness contribute to the progress towards achievement of project objectives? Were there any limitations to stakeholder awareness of project outcomes or to stakeholder participation in project activities? Was there invested interest of stakeholders in the project’s long-term success and sustainability?
	+ Extent of stakeholder interaction:
		- How did actual stakeholder interaction compare to what was planned in the project document and Stakeholder Engagement Plan? Include challenges and outcomes on stakeholder engagement, as evolved from the time of the MTR.
	+ Gender:
		- Were women’s groups, NGOs, civil society orgs and women’s ministries adequately consulted and involved in project design? If not, should they have been?
		- Were stakeholder engagement exercises gender responsive?
		- For any stakeholder workshops, were women-only sessions held, if appropriate, and/or were other considerations made to ensure women’s meaningful participation?
* Project Finance and Co-finance
	+ Variances between planned and actual expenditures, and the reasons for those variances
	+ Identification of potential sources of co-financing as well as leveraged and associated financing;
	+ Whether strong financial controls were established to allow the project management to make informed decisions regarding the budget at any time, and allow for the timely flow of funds and for the payment of satisfactory project deliverables;
	+ Whether the project demonstrated due diligence in the management of funds, including periodic audits
	+ Observations from financial audits, if any, and a presentation of major findings from audits
	+ Any changes made to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions
	+ Co-financing:
		- whether there was sufficient clarity in the reported co-financing to substantiate in-kind and cash co-financing from all listed sources.
		- the reasons for differences in the level of expected and actual co-financing.
		- the extent to which project components supported by external funders was well integrated into the overall project
		- the effect on project outcomes and/or sustainability from the extent of materialization of co-financing.
		- whether there is evidence of additional, leveraged resources that have been committed as a result of the project. Leveraged resources can be financial or in-kind and may be from other donors, NGOs, foundations, governments, communities or the private sector.
* Monitoring & Evaluation: design at entry (\*), implementation (\*), and overall assessment of M&E (\*)
* M&E design at entry:
	+ Were baseline conditions, methodology and roles and responsibilities well-articulated? Was the M&E plan well-conceived, practical and sufficient at the point of CEO Endorsement? Was it articulated sufficiently to monitor results and track progress toward achieving objectives? Did it specify clear targets and SMART indicators to track environmental, gender, and socio-economic results?
	+ Comment on the appropriateness of the M&E systems to the project’s specific context.
* M&E implementation:
	+ Was the M&E plan sufficiently budgeted and funded during project preparation and implementation? Did the M&E system operate as per the M&E plan? Where necessary, was the M&E plan revised in a timely manner? Was data on specified indicators, relevant Tracking Tools/Core Indicators gathered in a systematic manner? Were appropriate methodological approaches used to analyze data?
	+ Did the monitoring tools provide the necessary information? Were they aligned or mainstreamed with national systems? Are they efficient and cost effective? Were additional tools required?
	+ compliance with the progress and financial reporting requirements/ schedule, including quality and timeliness of reports;
	+ the value and effectiveness of the monitoring reports and evidence that these were discussed with stakeholders and project staff;
	+ whether the GEF OFP was kept informed of M&E activities.
	+ the extent to which the Project Team used inclusive, innovative, and participatory monitoring systems[[6]](#footnote-6)
	+ the extent to which follow-up actions, and/ or adaptive management, were taken in response to monitoring reports (i.e. PIRs);
	+ How were perspectives of women and men involved and affected by the project monitored and assessed? How were relevant groups’ (including women, indigenous peoples, children, elderly, disabled, and poor) involvement with the project and the impact on them monitored?
	+ Was there adequate monitoring of environmental and social risks as identified through the UNDP Social and Environmental screening procedure and in line with any safeguards management plan’s M&E section;
	+ whether the Theory of Change was reviewed and refined during implementation
	+ check whether PIR self-evaluation ratings were consistent with MTR and TE findings. If not, were these discrepancies identified by the project steering committee and addressed?
	+ Terminal Evaluations for full-sized projects should also consider whether changes were made to project implementation as a result of the MTR recommendations.
	+ The extent of the Project Steering Committee’s role in M&E activities
* Implementing Agency (UNDP) (\*) and Executing Agency (\*), overall project implementation/execution (\*), coordination, and operational issues
* Assess the overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Were changes made and were they effective? Were responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Was decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner?
* Assess the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s)
* Assess the quality of support provided by the GEF Partner Agency (UNDP)

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[[7]](#footnote-7) | 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 (\*)
* Alignment with national priorities, UNDP strategic priorities, and GEF strategic priorities
* Extent to which relevant stakeholders participated in the project
* Extent to which perspectives of those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the attainment of stated results, were taken into account during the project design processes
* Extent to which the project was formulated according to the needs and interests of all targeted and/or relevant stakeholder groups
* Extent to which the intervention is informed by needs and interests of diverse groups of stakeholders through in‐depth consultation
* Extent to which lessons learned from other relevant projects were considered in the project’s design
* Effectiveness (\*)
	+ Extent to which the project contributed to the country programme outcomes and outputs, the SDGs, the UNDP Strategic Plan, GEF strategic priorities, and national development priorities; and factors that contributed to the achieving or not achieving intended outcomes and outputs
	+ Extent to which the project’s actual outcomes/outputs were commensurate with what was planned
	+ Areas in which the project had the greatest and fewest achievements; and the contributing factors
	+ Extent to which the intervention achieved, or expects to achieve, results (outputs, outcomes and impacts, including global environmental benefits) taking into account the key factors that influenced the results.
	+ Constraining factors and how they were overcome
	+ Any alternative strategies that would have been more effective in achieving the project’s objectives
	+ Extent to which stakeholders were involved in project implementation
	+ Extent to which the project was appropriately responsive to the needs of the national constituents and changing partner priorities
	+ Extent to which the project contributed to gender equality, the empowerment of women and a human rights-based approach?
	+ Extent to which a gender mainstreaming strategy and/or human rights-based approach were incorporated in the design and implementation of the intervention
	+ Presence of key results on gender equality
* Efficiency (\*)
* resource allocation and cost effectiveness:
	+ Extent to which there was an efficient and economical use of financial and human resources and strategic allocation of resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) to achieve outcomes
	+ Comparison of the project cost/time versus output/outcomes equation to that of similar projects
	+ Costs of not providing resources for integrating gender equality and human rights (e.g. enhanced benefits that could have been achieved for modest investment)
	+ Provision of adequate resources for integrating gender equality and human rights in the project as an investment in short‐term, medium‐term and long‐term benefits
	+ Extent to which the allocation of resources to targeted groups takes into account the need to prioritize those most marginalized.
* Project management and timeliness
	+ Extent to which a project extension could have been avoided (for cases where a no-cost extension was approved)
	+ Extent to which the project management structure as outlined in the project document was efficient in generating the expected results
	+ Extent to which project funds and activities were delivered in a timely manner
	+ Extent to which M&E systems ensured effective and efficient project management
* Synergies and complementarities:
	+ Extent to which the project made efficient use of existing partnerships, agreements, sources of data, etc.
* Country ownership
	+ Was the project concept in line with development priorities and plans of the country (or countries)?
	+ Were the relevant country representatives from government and civil society involved in project implementation, including as part of the project steering committee?
	+ Was an intergovernmental committee given responsibility to liaise with the project team, recognizing that more than one ministry should be involved?
	+ Have the government(s), enacted legislation, and/or developed policies and regulations in line with the project’s objectives?
* Gender
* Discuss how effective the project was in contributing to gender equality and women’s empowerment.
* Describe how gender results advanced or contributed to the project’s environment, climate and/or resilience outcomes.
* Indicate whether the gender results achieved are short-term or long term.
* Is there any potential negative impact on gender equality and women’s empowerment? What can be done do to mitigate this?
* Indicate which of the following results areas the project contributed to: Indicate as many results areas as applicable and describe the specific results that were attributed to the project:
	+ Contributing to closing gender gaps in access to and control over resources;
	+ Improving the participation and decision-making of women in natural resource governance;
	+ Targeting socio-economic benefits and services for women.
* Other Cross-cutting Issues
* positive or negative effects of the project on local populations (e.g. income generation/job creation, improved natural resource management arrangements with local groups, improvement in policy frameworks for resource allocation and distribution, regeneration of natural resources for long term sustainability).
* extent to which the project objectives conform to agreed priorities in the UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD) and other country programme documents.
* whether project outcomes have contributed to better preparations to cope with disasters or mitigate risk
* extent to which poor, indigenous, persons with disabilities, women and other disadvantaged or marginalized groups benefited from the project
* the poverty-environment nexus: how the environmental conservation activities of the project contributed to poverty reduction
* 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 (\*)
* What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GEF assistance ends (consider potential resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and other funding that will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project’s outcomes)?
* What opportunities for financial sustainability exist?
* What additional factors are needed to create an enabling environment for continued financing?
* Has there been the establishment of financial and economic instruments and mechanisms to ensure the ongoing flow of benefits once the GEF assistance ends (i.e. from the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and market transformations to promote the project’s objectives)?
	+ - Socio-economic (\*)
* Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes?
* What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow?
* Is there sufficient public/ stakeholder awareness in support of the objectives of the project?
* Are lessons learned being documented by the Project Team on a continual basis?
* Are the project’s successful aspects being transferred to appropriate parties, potential future beneficiaries, and others who could learn from the project and potentially replicate and/or scale it in the future?
* Indicate whether the gender results achieved are short-term or long term.
	+ - Institutional framework and governance (\*)
* Do the legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize project benefits?
* Has the project put in place frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes that will create mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and technical knowledge transfer after the project’s closure?
* How has the project developed appropriate institutional capacity (systems, structures, staff, expertise, etc.) that will be self-sufficient after the project closure date?
* How has the project identified and involved champions (i.e. individuals in government and civil society) who can promote sustainability of project outcomes?
* Has the project achieved stakeholders’ (including government stakeholders’) consensus regarding courses of action on project activities after the project’s closure date?
* Does the project leadership have the ability to respond to future institutional and governance changes (i.e. foreseeable changes to local or national political leadership)? Can the project strategies effectively be incorporated/mainstreamed into future planning?
* Is the institutional change conducive to systematically addressing gender equality and human rights concerns?
	+ - Environmental (\*)
* Are there environmental factors that could undermine and reverse the project’s outcomes and results, including factors that have been identified by project stakeholders?
* GEF Additionality
* Are the outcomes related to the incremental reasoning?
	+ Are there quality quantitative and verifiable data demonstrating the incremental environmental benefits?
	+ Do self-evaluations provide evidence of the outcomes achieved in creating a more supportive environment as envisaged at the endorsement stage?
* Can the outcomes be attributed to the GEF contribution as originally anticipated?
* Do monitoring and evaluation documents provide evidence of the causality between the rationale for GEF involvement and the incremental environmental and other benefits directly associated with the GEF-supported project?
* Are the outcomes sustainable?
* Is there evidence that project outcomes, both environmental and otherwise, are likely to be sustained beyond the project end?
* If broader impact was anticipated, is there evidence at the completion stage that such a broadening is beginning to occur, or actions towards the broadening have been taken?
* Catalytic Role / Replication Effect
* What are project lessons learned, failures/lost opportunities to date? What might have been done better or differently?
* Did the project have an effective exit strategy?
* What factors of the project achievements are contingent on specific local context or enabling environment factors?
* What needs remain to improve the scalability or replication of project outcomes?
* List key knowledge products that were used to help share lessons and experiences
* 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.
1. The report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. [UNDP Editorial Style Manual](https://intranet.undp.org/unit/pb/communicate/tagline/_layouts/15/WopiFrame.aspx?sourcedoc=/unit/pb/communicate/tagline/Shared%20Documents/UNDP%20Editorial%20Style%20Manual_11Feb2014.pdf&action=default&Source=https%3A%2F%2Fintranet%2Eundp%2Eorg%2Funit%2Fpb%2Fcommunicate%2Ftagline%2FSitePages%2FHome%2Easpx%3FInitialTabId%3DRibbon%252EDocument%26VisibilityContext%3DWSSTabPersistence%26GroupString%3D%253B%2523English%253B%2523UNDP%2520Editorial%2520Style%2520Manual%253B%2523%26IsGroupRender%3DTRUE&DefaultItemOpen) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. See ToR Annex I for the Project Information Table template [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. See ToR Annex F for rating scales. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. [UNDP Social and Environmental Standards](https://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/operations1/undp-social-and-environmental-standards.html) [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. For more ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see [UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results](http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/capacity-building/discussion-paper--innovations-in-monitoring---evaluating-results/), November 2013. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. 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-7)