Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the project, ***Implementing a “Ridge to Reef” approach to protect biodiversity and ecosystem functions in Nauru (PIMS # 5218).***

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

Project Summary Table

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Title: |  | | | | | |
| GEF Project ID: | | 5218 |  | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | | *at completion (Million US$)* |
| UNDP Project ID: | | 92583 | GEF financing: | 2,644,358 | | 2,644,358 |
| Country: | | Nauru | IA/EA own: | 40,000 | | 40,000 |
| Region: | | Asia & Pacific | Government: | 8,367,000 | | 100,000 |
| Focal Area: | | Land Degradation, Climate Change, Biodiversity, International Waters | Other: |  | | 8,000 |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): | |  | Total co-financing: |  | | 108,000 |
| Executing Agency: | | Department of Industry, Commerce and Environment | Total Project Cost: | 11,051,358 | |  |
| Other Partners involved: | | - Nauru Fisheries and Aquatic Resources Authority,  - Department of Environment & Projects -Department of Agriculture | ProDoc Signature (date project began): | | | April 2015 |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | | Proposed:  March 2019 | Actual:  September2020 |

Objective and Scope

The project was designed to preserve biodiversity, ecosystem services, improve climate resilience and sustain livelihoods in Nauru using a ridge-to-reef approach that combines functional, representative and sustainable national system of coastal and marine managed areas that are integrated with the adoption of appropriate SLM practices in adjoining / upstream watersheds. By also improving government capacity, the proposed project will effectively reduce land degradation and enhance protection for marine and coastal biodiversity and habitats, whilst improving coastal livelihoods and creating lasting management of Nauru’s natural resources.

The project will achieve this objective through the following set of outcomes.

Component 1: Conservation of marine biodiversity

Outcome 1.1: Improved management effectiveness of new marine conservation areas

Component 2: Sustainable land and water management

Outcome 2.1: Integrated landscape management practices adopted by local communities living within the ‘bottom-side’, and applicable ‘ridge’, and ‘topside’ areas not covered by mining

Component 3: Governance and institutions

Outcome 3.1: Biodiversity conservation and SLM mainstreamed in policy and regulatory frameworks

Component 4: Knowledge management

Outcome 4.1: Improved data and information systems on biodiversity and land management best practices

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

The objectives of the evaluation are to

* + - * assess the achievement of project results supported by evidence (i.e. progress of project’s outcome targets),
* assess the contribution and alignment of the project to relevant national development plan or environmental policies;
* assess the contribution of the project results towards the relevant outcome and output of the Sub Regional Programme Document (SRPD) & United Nation Pacific Strategy (UNPS/UNDAF)
* assess any cross cutting and gender issues
* examination on the use of funds and value for money
* and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

Evaluation approach and method

An overall approach and method[[1]](#footnote-1) for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact,** as defined and explained in the [UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/UNDP-GEF-TE-Guide.pdf)

1. Interviews using standard questionnaire

A set of standard questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR (*fill in* [*Annex C*](#_TOR_Annex_C:)) The evaluator is expected to amend, -final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence‐based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders.

1. In country Field Mission & validation

The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Nauru (but noting the current pandemic situation she/he may have to conduct this remotely until travel restrictions have been lifted)*,* including the project sites*.* Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

* Department of Commerce, Industry and Environment
* Division of Agriculture
* Division of Environment and Projects
* Nauru Rehabilitation Corporations
* Nauru Fisheries and Marine Resources Authority
* Nauru Community Councils (Community Leaders of Anabar, Anibare, Buada, Ijuw and Meneng)
* Nauru Environmental Coordination Committee,
* Department of Land Management and Survey
* Department of Justice
* Nauru Utilities Corporation
* Nauru Phosphate Commission
* Nauru Rehabilitation Corporation
* PAD Planning and Aid Division

1. Interviews of Concerned UNDP Staff

The evaluator is expected to conduct interviews of UNDP staff who have been involved in oversight of the project for context and information on how the project has evolved.

1. Literature/Desktop Review

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in [Annex B](#_TOR_Annex_B:) of this Terms of Reference.

1. Analysis and reporting

Data collated will be analyzed and presented based on the evaluation criteria and ratings. Analysis will be provided in matric, tables to be best present findings and key recommendations;

Reporting to be conducted in RBM (results based management) approach.

1. Presentation of final draft to country office and stakeholders

Evaluation Criteria & Ratings

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see  [Annex A](#_TOR_Annex_A:)), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact.** Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in  [Annex D](#_TOR_Annex_D:).

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Ratings:** | | | |
| **1. Monitoring and Evaluation** | ***rating*** | **2. IA& EA Execution** | ***rating*** |
| M&E design at entry |  | Quality of UNDP Implementation |  |
| M&E Plan Implementation |  | Quality of Execution - Executing Agency |  |
| Overall quality of M&E |  | Overall quality of Implementation / Execution |  |
| **3. Assessment of Outcomes** | **rating** | **4. Sustainability** | **rating** |
| Relevance |  | Financial resources: |  |
| Effectiveness |  | Socio-political: |  |
| Efficiency |  | Institutional framework and governance: |  |
| Overall Project Outcome Rating |  | Environmental : |  |
|  |  | Overall likelihood of sustainability: |  |

Project finance / cofinance

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Co-financing  (type/source) | UNDP own financing (mill. US$) | | Government  (mill. US$) | | Partner Agency  (mill. US$) | | Total  (mill. US$) | |
| Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Actual | Actual |
| Grants |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Loans/Concessions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * In-kind support | 40,000 | 40,000 | 8,367,000 | 100,000 |  |  | $0.00 |  |
| * Other |  |  |  | 8,000 |  |  |  |  |
| Totals |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Mainstreaming

UNDP supported GEF financed projects are key components in UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programmes. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender.

Impact

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.[[2]](#footnote-2)

Conclusions, recommendations & lessons

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions**, **recommendations** and **lessons**. Conclusions should build on findings and be based in evidence. Recommendations should be prioritized, specific, relevant, and targeted, with suggested implementers of the recommendations. Lessons should have wider applicability to other initiatives across the region, the area of intervention, and for the future.

Implementation arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Fiji*.* The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

Evaluation timeframe

The total duration of the evaluation will be *22* days according to the following plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Timing | Completion Date |
| **Preparation** | *2* days | *20th August 2020* |
| **Evaluation Mission/Desk Review** | *10* days | *28th September 2020* |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | 8 days | *01 October 2020* |
| **Final Report** | *2* days | *30th October 2020* |

Evaluation deliverables

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Deliverable | Content | Timing | Responsibilities |
| **Inception Report** | Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method | No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission. | Evaluator submits to UNDP CO |
| **Presentation** | Initial Findings | End of evaluation mission | To project management, UNDP CO |
| **Draft Final Report** | Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes | Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission | Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs |
| **Final Report\*** | Revised report | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft | Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC. |

\*When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluator is required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report.

Team Composition

The evaluation will be conducted by an *International consultant.* The consultant shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage*.* The evaluator selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The Consultant must present the following qualifications:

* Minimum 5 years of relevant professional experience and has the technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s)
* Knowledge of UNDP and GEF evaluation process and has lead evaluation process for at least 2-3 of UNDP/GEF funded projects
* Previous experience with results‐based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
* Experience working in Asia and the Pacific and has a good understanding of the biodiversity, conservation and climate change sector in the Pacific
* Experience working with communities, government sectors, NGOs and understands local protocols and customs and has excellent communication skills;
* Experience in the policy development processes associated with environment and sustainable development issues
* Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset

Evaluator Ethics

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex E) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the [UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'](http://www.unevaluation.org/ethicalguidelines)

Payment modalities and specifications

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| % | Milestone | Deadlines |
| *10%* | At contract signing and submission of detailed workplan | 20th July 2020 |
| *40%* | Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report | 01 October 2020 |
| *50%* | Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report | 30th October2020 |

Application process

Applicants are requested to apply online (indicate the site, such as http://jobs.undp.org, etc.) by (date). Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions. The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in English (Spanish in LAC, French in Francophone Africa, etc.) with indication of the e‐mail and phone contact. Shortlisted candidates will be requested to submit a price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs).

UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

**Annex 4: Project Logframe**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Objectives and Outcomes** | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | | **End of project Targets** | **Source of verification** | **Risks and Assumptions** |
| To preserve biodiversity, ecosystem services, improve climate resilience and sustainable livelihoods in Nauru using ridge to reef approach | Status of integrated land, water and coastal management in Nauru | Sectoral approach with minimal efforts towards coastal biodiversity conservation | | LMMA implementation and Land use management implementation | Project reports and government and community adoption | Supportive government and communities  Local capacity is harnessed for project implementation |
| **1.** **CONSERVATION OF MARINE BIODIVERSITY** | | | | | | |
| **Outcome 1.1**  **Improved Management**  **effectiveness of new marine conservation areas** | Area of coastal and | Zero=LMMA will introduced | | 33% of Nauru coastline | Management plans with | Communities are |
| marine water under | through this project | | incorporated into LMMA | attached budgets and | supporting of LMMA |
| active management as a |  | | with implementation of | implementation plans | development |
| LMMA |  | | management in 5 | Annual reporting on | Plans can be developed |
|  |  | | districts | progress against | in a timely manner |
|  |  | |  | management plans |  |
| Output 1.1.1 A network of locally managed marine areas (community-based) or locally managed marine areas (LMMA) established through community actions and supporting enabling government actions | Agreement between | Zero | | 5 agreements with 5 | Agreements signed | Surveys can be |
|  | Government and DCC |  | | districts | between government and | completed |
|  | on LMMA establishment |  | |  | DCC | Committees willing to |
|  | management |  | |  | Ecosystem health report | protect high value |
|  |  |  | |  | Communities/stakeholder | ecosystems |
|  |  |  | |  | consultations reports | Proper trainings for |
|  |  |  | |  | Government approval on | NFMRA occurs on the |
|  |  |  | |  | Fisheries Act | short and long-term |
|  |  |  | |  | LMM network conference | benefits of LMMA |
|  |  |  | |  | reports |  |
|  | Ecosystem health survey | Limited information exits | | Important marine | National LMMA system |  |
|  | identifying priority sites |  | | biodiversity protected | report |  |
|  | for protection and |  | | through zoning plans | Approved plans by |  |
|  | management |  | |  | government |  |
|  |  |  | |  | Approval by communities |  |
|  |  |  | |  | Minutes of meetings |  |
| Output 1.1.2 LMMA strengthened through development and implementation of management plans (following participatory approaches and integrated coastal management to address threats including climate change impacts, guidelines for utilisations of MMA’s including closed seasons and closed areas agreed on and implemented | Development of island | Zero National Plan developed | | National LMMA plan | Reports for 20 | Loss of main sources of |
|  | level LMMA Plan |  | | prepared and adopted | stakeholder consultations | livelihoods for district |
|  |  |  | |  | Approval of management | communities; lack of |
|  |  |  | |  | plans by government and | resources for |
|  |  |  | |  | DCC | implementation and |
|  |  |  | |  | Annual monitoring | conflicts between |
|  |  |  | |  | reports | districts |
|  |  |  | |  |  | Proper advocacy for |
|  |  |  | |  |  | district leaders and  community members on |
| Implementation of District Level LMMA Action Plans | Zero LMMA Action Plans | | 5 management plans developed and implement for each selected district |  |
|  |  | | short and long-term |
|  |  | | benefits of LMMA |
|  |  | |  |
|  |  | |  |
|  |  | |  |
|  |  | |  |
| **SUSTAINABLE LAND AND WATER MANAGEMENT** | | | | | |  |
| **Outcome 2.1** | Land management plans | | Currently Zero | 5 district land use | Plans | Lack of awareness by |
| Integrated landscape management practices adopted by local communities living | being actively | |  | management plans | Minutes of meetings | district community |
| implemented in all 5 | |  | being actively | Baseline surveys | members result in non- |
| districts | |  | implemented | Monitoring and | compliance of |
|  | |  |  | evaluation | integrated agricultural |
| within the bottom-side and application ridge and topside areas not covered by mining |  | |  |  | Annual technical reports | practices and waste |
|  | |  |  | Monthly monitoring | management practices |
|  | |  |  | reports | Community |
|  | |  |  |  | management of |
|  |  | |  |  |  | sustainable land and |
|  |  | |  |  |  | water management and |
|  |  | |  |  |  | associated scientific |
|  |  | |  |  |  | work is adequately |
|  |  | |  |  |  | resourced and function |
|  |  | |  |  |  | effectively |
| **Output 2.1.1** | Baselines for and use | | Rudimentary land use maps | National assessment | Reports for community | Conflict between |
| Biophysical demographic and socioeconomic | plans and terrestrial | | with limited district focus | completed with detailed | consultations | districts regarding land |
| environmental | | terrestrial | 5 district terrestrial | Review biophysical, | ownership |
|  | |  | profiles | demographic and |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| assessments conducted and reviewed in the project districts focusing on the bottom-side and applicable ridge areas and the topside not covered by mining | management established | |  |  | socioeconomic assessments reports for 5 districts | Ensuring full participation by community Information is available |
| **Output 2.1.2** | Integrated land use plan | |  | Island wide agricultural | Reports for stakeholder | Lack of political will |
| Integrated agriculture land use plan developed for the bottom side and  application ride and topside areas that are not covered by mining  through review of the draft land use plan and partners of land  ownership for the project districts/sites |  | | land use plans | consultations | Able to ensure |
|  | | developed with special | Approved integrated land | cooperation of all |
|  | | focus on priority | use plans | national agencies |
|  | | districts |  | National environment |
|  | |  |  | coordinating council |
|  | |  |  | (NECC) will complete |
|  | |  |  | approval process |
|  | |  |  |  |
|  | |  |  |  |
|  | |  |  |  |
|  | |  |  |  |
| **Output 2.1.3** | Number of households | | Less than 5% of each district | 20% of households in | Operational MOU and | Lack of access to water |
| Soil and water  conservation measures implemented including through rehabilitation of  degraded land in ridge and topside areas using economic species such  as fruit trees and increase of communal water storage facilities  in the 5 water stressed project districts to support home gardens  and household water supply | growing fruit trees to | | growing fruit trees | each of the 5 districts | LOA finalised (R2R-GCC- | will result in failure of |
| contribute to soil | |  |  | IWRM-Agriculture | intervention |
| conservation measures | |  |  | Number of households | Advanced planning for |
|  | |  |  | with more rain water | access to funding to |
|  | |  |  | catchment systems | ensure that water is |
|  | |  |  | Report on safe household | available and supply is |
| Water storage enhanced | | Approximately 195 water | 43 additional water | drinking water introduced | consistent for this |
| in selected communities | | harvesting storage facilities in | harvesting storage | Drought management | intervention |
|  | | place | facilities established | strategy | Households are |
|  | |  |  |  | interested to participate |
|  | |  |  |  |  |
|  | |  |  |  |  |
|  | |  |  |  |  |
|  | |  |  |  |  |
|  | |  |  |  |  |
| **Output 2.1.4** Drought and slat tolerant food crops tested and practices disseminated to districts building on initiatives of bilateral and multilateral organisations | Number of participating households using new crop varieties in all 5 districts | | toilets Zero households using new drought and salt tolerant crops not currently available | 20% of households in each of the 5 districts | Reports of community consultations  Nursery reports Training reports Activity monitoring reports  Able to view growing crops  Household surveys | Species of agricultural crop not able to be identified  Lack of community support  Lack of capacity Communication and extension materials are  not available |
| **Output 2.1.5** Innovative measures implemented to reduces pollution loads by at least 10% on LMMA’s to improve ecosystem health and sustain ecosystem health and sustain ecosystem services. This is based on success of pilot demonstrations of the IWRM project and as a way of implementing the National IWRM Plan | Number of composting toilets for reducing pollution established | | 6 composting operation in 5 districts | 28 new composting toilets operational in 5 districts | Monitoring reports on implementation of new waste management systems by households and farmers  Report of number of systems being implemented Activity monitoring reports | Community commitments overflow of waste; lack of stakeholder support and limited resources |
| **COMPONENT 3: GOVERNANCE AND INSTITUTIONS** | | | | | | |
| **Outcome 3.1** Biodiversity conservation and SLM mainstreamed in policy and regulatory frameworks | Same as output 3.1.1 | |  |  |  |  |
| **Output 3.1.1** Relevant policies developed for key sectors such as environment, waste management, natural resource management, coastal fisheries and agricultural land use developed | Number of policies developed for key sectors incorporating R2R considerations | | Various old and draft plans exist, but need urgent re- validation and revision to support JNAP and NBSAP  implementation | 4 sectoral plans/strategies developed | Policy and framework documents  Policy advise reports Meeting/review  discussions | Delay of approval of policy and framework documents  Requires revival of NECC |
| **Output 3.1.2** Capacity strengthening of national agencies associated with new policies and frameworks process development and formulation, including drafting of legislation, monitoring and evaluation, project implementation and oversight, GIS, land use planning, participation in relevant trainings organised through the regional R2R project | Number of trained government personnel on integrated R2R approaches | | Limited-Zero training on GIS project implementation/management and oversight in 2007 and 2008) and on vulnerable and adaptation assessment for JNAP | 45 staff from across ministries and fisheries authorities | Training TOR’s, training reports and evaluations, records of training sessions by training institutions, annual faculty reports, list of certificates awarded | Lack of interest and participation int raining, no training follows up Advance planning for training activities as well as follow up |
| **Output 3.1.3** Community leaders in 5 districts capacitated towards biodiversity conservation sustainable land management and climate change adaptation through appropriate trainings and other capacity building activities focusing on project management, land use planning, waste management and marine management | Number of district leaders trained on applying and enforcing skills in integrated R2R approaches with due consideration for gender distribution | | Zero | 15 community leaders in each of the 5 districts | Post training surveys Monitoring reports Household reports Training and workshop reports  Training evaluation Pre and post training surveys | Lack of interest and participation in training No training follow-up and delay in accessing funds for pilot site activities  Advance planning and advocacy for training activities as well as follow up and advance planning for access to funding |
| Proportion of population adopting specific actions to enhance R2R management in districts | | Approx. 20% of households | Up to 80% of households adopting specific actions |
| **4. KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT** | | | | | | |
| **Outcome 4.1** Improved data and information systems on biodiversity and land management best practices | | Same as 4.1.1 and 4.1.2.1 |  |  |  |  |
| **Output 4.1.1** Integrated data and information on biodiversity and sustainable land management and relevant sections on the Environment, provide inputs to the regional R2R program on monitoring and progress reporting on the Pacific R2R program | | Number of databases developed for DCIE | Zero | 1 | Operational and fully functional database Training materials for staff  Database accessible on a range of computers Training TOR, reports Pre and post training evaluation reports Number of requests for data from database | Delays in database set up due to limited stock of software and delays in shipment  Irregular internet service and loss of skills due to staff turnover Systematic planning for procurement of database software; subscription to regular internet option and include transfer of skills as part of staff handover  notes |
| Number of training courses conducted on database set up and maintenance | Zero | 4 per year |
| **Output 4.1.2** Knowledge products on all thematic areas and best practices developed and disseminated through various media. | | Number of community members receiving information on R2R management and actingto enhance the environment |  | 500 households | Community information programs  Radio and TV awareness programs  Training reports R2R videos | Delays in delivering products due to limited stock of knowledge management materials  and delays in shipment; irregular internet |
|  | | Number of knowledge products, including best practices produced on all thematic areas, disseminated through  various media | Zero (community households produce exist for water management, climate change and land management only but none integrated activities) | 12 (3 per year) | Photo stories Flyers, brochures | service; non- participation in global regional events due to unavailability of required visa and loss of skills due to staff turnover  Systematic planning for procurement of knowledge management materials; subscription to regular internet option; advance planning of travel and associated requirements; and include skills transfer as part of staff handover  notes. |
| Participation in regional R2R activities | Not applicable | Regular participation in regional R2R activities as may be requested by national and regional stakeholders in the areas of capacity building, knowledge management among  others |
| Project website | none | Project website that is accessible and regularly updated |

Annex B: List of Documents to be reviewed by the evaluators

1. **General documentation**

•UNDP Programme and Operations Policies and Procedures (POPP);

• UNDP Handbook for Monitoring and Evaluating for Results;

• UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects;

• GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy;

• GEF Guidelines for conducting Terminal Evaluations.

1. **Project Documentations:**

• Signed Project Documents

• Annual Project Reviews – 2017, 2018, 2019

• Quarterly Progress Reports – 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020

• Inception Workshop Report - 2015

* Annual Work Plans – 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020
* Mid-Term Review & Tracking Tools- 2018
* Minutes of the Board Meetings – 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020
* Minutes of the Technical Working Group (TWG) Meetings – 2019, 2020
* Financial Audit Reports- 2018 and 2019

Annex C: Evaluation Questions

*This is a generic list, to be further detailed with more specific questions by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on the particulars of the project.*

| **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 levels? | | | | |
|  | * Is the project relevant to Nauru’s environmental policies & Nauru development plan? |  |  |  |
|  | * Is the project relevant to United National Pacific Strategyfor the country? |  |  |  |
|  | * Is the project relevant to UNDP Pacific’s Sub Regional Programme Document? |  |  |  |
|  | * Is the project addressing the needs of the targeted beneficiaries? |  |  |  |
|  | * Is the project specifically addressing gender issues and any other |  |  |  |
|  | * • How is the project complementary to the actions of other stakeholders active in the country/region? |  |  |  |
|  | * • Is the project internally consistent in its design? |  |  |  |
| Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? | | | | | |
|  | * Are the activities and outputs of the project consistent with the project's goals and objectives? |  |  |  | |
|  | * To what extent has the delivered project outputs contributed to the achievement of its expected outcomes? |  |  |  | |
|  | * Were the project’s expected targets against the outcomes achieved? |  |  |  | |
|  | * How was risk managed during the project? |  |  |  | |
|  | * What are the lessons learnt from the project in terms of effectiveness? |  |  |  | |
|  | * Which changes could have been made in project’s design to improve its effectiveness? |  |  |  | |
|  | * How could the project have been more effective in achieving results? |  |  |  | |
| Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards? | | | | | |
|  | * Was adaptive management needed and used to ensure efficient use of resources? |  |  |  | |
|  | * Were the accounting and financial systems in place adequate? |  |  |  | |
|  | * • Were progress reports produced in a timely manner and in compliance to project reporting requirements? |  |  |  | |
|  | * Was project implementation as cost-effective as originally envisaged? |  |  |  | |
|  | * Was the expected co-finance leveraged as initially expected? |  |  |  | |
|  | * Were the reported lessons learnt shared among project stakeholders for subsequent improvement of project implementation? |  |  |  | |
|  | * Which partnerships and networking were facilitated among stakeholders? Be specific to mention any legal agreements or memorandum of understanding signed to ascertain partnership. |  |  |  | |
|  | * Was local capacity and know-how adequately mobilized? |  |  |  | |
| Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? | | | | | |
|  | * Were sustainability issues adequately addressed at project design? |  |  |  | |
|  | * Is there evidence that some partners and stakeholders will continue their activities beyond project termination? And if such partners/stakeholders were identified, which ones were they? |  |  |  | |
|  | * Which are the main risks to the continuation of policies and actions initiated by the projects? (financial, institutional, socioeconomic, environmental) |  |  |  | |
|  | * Are project actions and results being scaled up or replicated elsewhere in the region? |  |  |  | |
|  | * Did the project adequately address institutional and financial sustainability issues? |  |  |  | |
|  | * • How is the beneficiary planning to mainstream the lessons learnt to ensure quality reporting to the global platforms? |  |  |  | |
| **Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?** | | | | | |
|  | * How likely is the project to achieve its long-term goal? |  |  |  | |
|  | * Are stakeholders more aware about the project’s contribution towards setting up an EMIS and ensuring that it is operational? Which ones? |  |  |  | |
|  | * What is the impact of the project for the citizens of Nauru in terms of awareness about the government’s commitment to reporting its updated environmental data to the global platforms of the Rio conventions? |  |  |  | |
|  | * What are the level of influence and visibility of the project in Nauru in promoting sustainable development? |  |  |  | |

Annex D: Rating Scales

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

Annex E: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form

**Evaluators:**

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people’s right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people’s right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders’ dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form[[3]](#footnote-3)**

**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: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Annex F: Evaluation Report Outline[[4]](#footnote-4)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **i.** | Opening page:   * Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project * UNDP and GEF project ID#s. * Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report * Region and countries included in the project * GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program * Implementing Partner and other project partners * Evaluation team members * Acknowledgements |
| **ii.** | Executive Summary   * Project Summary Table * Project Description (brief) * Evaluation Rating Table * Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons |
| **iii.** | Acronyms and Abbreviations  (See: UNDP Editorial Manual[[5]](#footnote-5)) |
| **1.** | Introduction   * Purpose of the evaluation * Scope & Methodology * Structure of the evaluation report |
| **2.** | Project description and development context   * Project start and duration * Problems that the project sought to address * Immediate and development objectives of the project * Baseline Indicators established * Main stakeholders * Expected Results |
| **3.** | Findings  (In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) must be rated[[6]](#footnote-6)) |
| **3.1** | Project Design / Formulation   * Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators) * Assumptions and Risks * Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design * Planned stakeholder participation * Replication approach * UNDP comparative advantage * Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector * Management arrangements |
| **3.2** | Project Implementation   * Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation) * Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region) * Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management * Project Finance: * Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (\*) * UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (\*) coordination, and operational issues |
| **3.3** | Project Results   * Overall results (attainment of objectives) (\*) * Relevance(\*) * Effectiveness & Efficiency (\*) * Country ownership * Mainstreaming * Sustainability (\*) * Impact |
| **4.** | Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons   * Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project * Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project * Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives * Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success |
| **5.** | Annexes   * ToR * Itinerary * List of persons interviewed * Summary of field visits * List of documents reviewed * Evaluation Question Matrix * Questionnaire used and summary of results * Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form |

Annex G: Evaluation Report Clearance Form

*(to be completed by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and included in the final document)*

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

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

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

UNDP GEF RTA

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

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

Annex H: TE Report audit trail

The following is a template for the evaluator 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 included as an annex in the final TE report.

**To the comments received on (*date*) from the Terminal Evaluation of , Implementing a “Ridge to Reef” approach to protect biodiversity and ecosystem functions in Nauru (UNDP *PIMS #5218)***

*The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft Terminal Evaluation report; they are referenced by institution (“Author” column) and by comment number (“#” column):*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author** | **#** | **Para No./ comment location** | **Comment/Feedback on the draft TE report** | **Evaluator response and actions taken** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

1. For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](http://www.undp.org/evaluation/handbook), Chapter 7, pg. 163 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office:  [ROTI Handbook 2009](http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/M2_ROtI%20Handbook.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)