

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) set out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the Conserving Biodiversity and reducing habitat degradation in Protected Areas and their areas of influence project (PIMS 5088)

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

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	Conserving Biodiversity and reducing habitat degradation in Protected Areas and their areas of influence			
GEF Project ID:	00080909		<i>at endorsement</i> (Million US\$)	<i>at completion</i> (Million US\$)
UNDP Project ID:	Atlas ID 00090420 PIMS 5088	GEF financing:	3,371,630.00	
Country:	St. Kitts Nevis	IA/EA own:		
Region:	Latin America and the Caribbean	Government:	17,140,000.00	
Focal Area:	Biodiversity	Other:		
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	To expand and strengthen the terrestrial and marine protected area system, and reduce habitat destruction in areas of influence that negatively impact PA ecological functioning	Total co-financing:	17,140,000.00	
Executing Agency:	Ministry of Agriculture et al	Total Project Cost:	20,511,630.00	
Other Partners involved:	Ministry of Sustainable Development Ministry of Communication et al	ProDoc Signature (date project began):	19 th November 2014	
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: 19 th November 2018	Actual: 19 th May 2020

OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The existing system of protected areas in St. Kitts and Nevis is limited to 3 terrestrial PA units on the island of St. Kitts; of these, only the Central Forest Reserve National Park was established primarily for ecological conservation greater. There are no terrestrial protected areas on the island of Nevis, nor are there any marine protected areas anywhere in the country. In addition, apart from one historic site, there is no active management of protected areas in the country at either the system or site level.

The project proposed to improve ecosystem representation in the PA system; establish / strengthen PA management operations at key sites; and strengthen institutional, policy, legal/regulatory, information, and financing frameworks at the PA system level. At the site level, the GEF investment will enable the legal establishment of five new PAs (two terrestrial and three marine) and the operationalization of these sites as well as the two existing terrestrial PAs that currently have no management. In so doing, the project will expand the PA system from two terrestrial sites totalling 5,260 hectares without any effective management, to four terrestrial sites totalling 8,810 hectares and three marine sites totalling 11,693 hectares, all of which will be actively managed.

The project will specifically support: assessments of the current state (biodiversity, ecosystem functions, resource uses, etc.) of the proposed PA units; the gazetting, boundary setting and zoning of the new PA units; the preparation of management plans for each PA Unit, as well as a strategic business plan for the overall PA system; and the establishment and capacity building of PA staff at the system and site levels, as well as capacity building and collaboration with NGO, CSO and private sector partners. At the systemic level, the project will assist the Government of St. Kitts and Nevis in establishing, staffing and equipping a Protected Areas Agency, the first government unit dedicated to protected areas in the country's history, which will oversee and manage the overall PA system as well as the specific PA units. The project also will assist in the revising and updating of key laws and regulations to support PA management; the establishment of inter-institutional and multi-stakeholder coordination and information sharing mechanisms; and the creation and operation of sustainable financing mechanisms and business planning strategies that will ensure sufficient long-term funding support for management of the PA system.

To achieve this overarching objective of expanding and strengthening the terrestrial and marine protected area system and reducing habitat destruction, the project will focus on the following components and outputs.

Outcome 1: Strengthened Protected Area System Framework and Capacities

Under this outcome, the PA laws and regulations will be strengthened through update and approval of draft National Conservation and Environment Management Bill, strengthening of Protected Areas Policies, the establishment of Protected Areas Agency (PAA) and Capacity Building of PAA Staff, the establishment and operation of National Environmental Committee (NEC), the provision of support for NGO Involvement in PA Management. Under this outcome, the Financial sustainability framework for Protected Areas System will also be strengthened through the development of Sustainable Financing Mechanisms and Strategies for PA System and the development of financial Management Systems to support cost-effective PA management.

In support of data-driven decision-making, the project will also focus on the consolidation of information system supporting PA management objectives through the development and operation of a Protected Areas Information System. Finally, under Outcome 1, the project will seek to increase Awareness and Support for Protected Areas through a series of structured public Education and Awareness Programs regarding the national system of protected areas.

Outcome 2: Protected Area System Expansion and Strengthened Management of Existing and New Protected Areas

To achieve the terrestrial objectives under Outcome 2, the project will support the establishment and operationalization of terrestrial protected areas including the operationalization of terrestrial protected area units, the development and implementation of terrestrial protected area management plans, updating, approval and implementation of the Nevis Physical Development Plan (NPDP), development and implementation of site-based financing mechanisms for terrestrial PAs, support the development of systems for community participation and development in and around terrestrial PA sites and will support the development and deployment of ecological conservation and management programs at terrestrial PA sites.

The marine-related interventions under Outcome 2 will take a similar course and will include the establishment and operationalization of marine protected areas to include the operationalization of marine protected area units, the establishment and zoning of marine protected areas with attendant development and implementation of marine protected area management plans and the development and implementation of site-based financing mechanisms for marine protected areas. The project will also support increased community participation and development in and around marine PAs, ecological conservation and management programs at marine PA sites and fisheries production and pressure reduction strategies.

These objectives will be achieved through the removal of systemic barriers at the national level, through the following project components:

EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

An overall approach and method 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. In addition, the evaluator must address gender equality and women's empowerment and other cross-cutting issues within the Terminal Evaluation's scope.

The evaluation must analyse the project through the lens of these five criteria and provide comprehensive recommendations based on findings in each of these areas, as relevant. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR

(Annex C) The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

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, including GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders.

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](#) of this Terms of Reference.

The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to St. Kitts Nevis to undertake site visits and carry out relevant data collection. There are over 15 sites where interventions have been made under the Conserving Biodiversity Project and the following is a representative list proposed for site visits:

No.	Site Name	Description of System Installed
1.	Department of Environment, New Street, Basseterre, St. Kitts	Project Office, one pick up truck and one clientele shuttle van, public washroom at Central Forest Reserve National Park Office, CIIMS Firewall
2.	Department of Economic Affairs, PSIP, Bladen Commercial Site, Basseterre, St. Kitts	Finance and accounting
3.	Department of Physical Planning, Bladen, Basseterre, St. Kitts	GIS Workstation
4.	Department of Information Technology, Paul Southwell Industrial Site, Basseterre, St. Kitts	CIIMS – Data management server and software
5.	Royal Basseterre Valley National Park, Kim Collins Highway, Basseterre, St. Kitts	Park benches, park signs and naming signs for well stations
6.	Department of Marine Resources, Paul Southwell Industrial Site, Basseterre, St. Kitts	Monitoring vessel, computers, dive gears, dive camera and computer,
7.	Department of Physical Planning and Environment, Main Street, Charlestown, Nevis	Interpretation Center at Hard Times, one pick up truck, GIS workstation and computers
8.	Department of Information Technology, Craddock Road, Charlestown, Nevis	CIIMS – Data management server and software
9.	Keys Beach	Marine Species Rehabilitation and Interpretation Center

10.		
11.		
12.		
13.		

The following is an indicative list of the individuals/institutions whose views should be fully reflected in the final report.

Name	Agency/Institution	Email Address
Ms. June Hughes	Department of Environment	June.hughes@gov.kn
Ms. Ills Watts	GEF Small Grants Programme	lliswatts@unops.org
Ms. Danielle Evanson	UNDP	Danielle.evanson@undp.org
Ms. Phynora Ible	Project Coordinating Unit	Phynora.ible@undp.org
Ms. Pauline Ngunjiri	Nevis Historical and Conservation Society	pauline.skn@gmail.com
Ms. Lavern Queeley	GEF Operational Focal Point / Department of Economic Affairs and Public Sector	lavernqueeleyskn@gmail.com
Mr. Paul Benjamin	Department of Agriculture	paanben@gmail.com
Mr. McClean Hobson	Department of Maritime Affairs	McClean.Hobson@govt.kn
Dr. Leighton Naraine	Clarence Fitzroy Bryant College	leightonnaraine@yahoo.com
Ms. Tricia Greaux	Department of Marine Resources	tricia.greaux@dmrskn.com
Mr. Randy Morton	Department of Marine Resources	morton.t.randy@gmail.com
Mr. Ryan Khadou	Department of Physical Planning and Environment	ryan.khadou@niagov.com
Ms. Ryllis Percival	St. Christopher National Trust	ryllis@stchristophernationaltrust.kn
Mr. Brian Swanston	Department of Agriculture	bdevonb@hotmail.com
Dr. Kimberly Stewart	St. Kitts Sea Turtle Monitoring Network	cturtlegirl@gmail.com
Ms. P' Della 'P Stanley	The Ripple Institute/Caribbean Youth Environment Network	pdellapstanley@gmail.com
Lieutenant Gidell	St. Christopher and Nevis Defence Force	ckgarnette@icloud.com
Mrs. Karen Douglas	Department of Economic Affairs and Public Sector Investment Programme	karendouglas.stk@gmail.com

Mrs. Claudia Drew	Project Coordinating Unit	Claudia.drew@undp.org
Ms. Phynora Ible	Project Coordinating Unit	Phynora.ible@undp.org
Ms. Fiona Francis	Department of Economic Affairs and Public Sector Investment Programme	fionaffrancis@gmail.com
Ms. Thema Ward	Department of Physical Planning and Environment	jamila_w60@hotmail.com

EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS

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

Evaluation Ratings:			
1. Monitoring and Evaluation	<i>rating</i>	2. IA& EA Execution	<i>rating</i>
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	<i>rating</i>	4. Sustainability	<i>rating</i>
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 Multi-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								
Other								
Totals								

MAINSTREAMING

UNDP supported GEF financed projects are key components in UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programmes. The evaluation will comprehensively 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. The project should be comprehensively reviewed and critically assessed with reference to the relevant UNDP Gender Strategy (2014-2017). This analysis should provide a basis for understanding how effectively the project addressed gender and other cross-cutting issues and the extent to which it reflected an appreciation of the nexus between biodiversity and sustainable human development.

IMPACT

The evaluators will assess the degree 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, c) leveraged new sources of financing and investment** and/or e) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.¹

CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions, recommendations and lessons**. In order for these recommendations and lessons to be useful, they should be presented with a clear, logical connection to the findings and results of the evaluation. This section should therefore reflect on the triangulation of information from various sources, including document reviews, inclusive stakeholder feedback and strategic site visits. Recommendations should be categorized for key stakeholders, including UNDP, with proposed actions and responsibilities identified to enhance the impact of the current project as well as inform the design and implementation of future interventions.

IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP Multi-Country Office for Barbados and the OECS in Barbados. The UNDP MCO 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.

¹ 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](#)

EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the evaluation will be 20 days according to the following plan:

Activity	Time Required	Deadline
Preparation (Inception Report)	3 days	<i>5 business days after contract signature</i>
Evaluation Mission	5 days	<i>15 business days after contract signature</i>
Draft Evaluation Report	8 days	<i>30 business days after contract signature</i>
Final Report	4 days	<i>40 business days after contract signature</i>

EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluator is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Responsibilities
Inception Report	Following the inception meeting, the Evaluator provides a report on the discussion and agreements on timing, methodology and coverage	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
Preliminary Findings	Presentation of initial feedback from the triangulation of document reviews, field mission, remote interviews and other data collected.	To project management, UNDP CO
Draft Final Report	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs
Final Report*	Revised report	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.**

All reports must be presented in **English**.

TEAM COMPOSITION

The evaluation will be undertaken by one (1) international evaluator with experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience in conducting evaluations in the Caribbean is an asset. 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 Evaluator must meet the minimum requirements: present the following qualifications:

- Minimum of 10 years of professional experience in evaluations, with a specific emphasis on results-based monitoring and impact evaluations for sustainable development programmes/projects; At least 5 years of experience and knowledge in evaluating development cooperation projects related to biodiversity conservation and protected area management; Technical knowledge in biodiversity conservation and protected area management is an asset;
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and biodiversity; experience in gender responsive evaluation and analysis;
- Project evaluation experience within the United Nations system will be considered an asset;
- Prior experience working in the Caribbean is 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'](#)

PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

Payment will be remitted to the Evaluator based on the following schedule:

Percentage of Contract	Milestone
10%	On submission and approval of Inception Report and work plan
20%	On presentation of preliminary findings
30%	Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report
40%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report and completed Audit Trail

APPLICATION PROCESS

Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions. The application should contain a current and complete Curriculum Vitae (C.V.) in English 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 A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

<p>Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area (same as that on the cover page, circle one): 1. Mainstreaming environment and energy OR 2. Catalyzing environmental finance OR 3. Promote climate change adaptation OR 4. <u>Expanding access to environmental and energy services for the poor.</u></p>
<p>Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program: GEF-5 CC4 Strategic Program SP3: Improve the sustainability of Protected Area Systems</p>
<p>Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes: 1.1 Improved management of existing and new protected areas</p>
<p>Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators: METT scores for 7 PA sites will improve from an average of 24 to an average of 54 - 5 new Protected Areas encompassing 3,550 hectares of terrestrial ecosystems and 11,693 hectares of marine ecosystems</p>

INDICATOR FRAMEWORK – Strategic Results Framework

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets	Means of verification	Risks and Assumptions

Project Objective: To expand and strengthen the terrestrial and marine protected area system, and reduce habitat destruction in areas of influence that negatively impact PA ecological functioning	Area of terrestrial ecosystems in St. Kitts and Nevis under official protection	5,260 hectares at 2 existing sites	8,810 hectares (3,550 ha. added at 2 new sites) by end of project	Legal gazettement of 2 new terrestrial PAs
	Area of marine ecosystems in St. Kitts and Nevis under official protection	0 hectares	11,693 hectares (11,693 ha. added at 3 new sites) by end of project	Legal gazettement of 3 new marine PAs
	Capacity development indicator score for protected area system:			Review of Capacity Development Indicator Scorecard
	• Systemic	50%	65%	
	• Institutional	38%	55%	
	• Individual	48%	65%	
	Improved management effectiveness of protected area units as measured by METT:		By end of project:	METT applied at Mid-Term and Final Evaluation
	• Central Forest Reserve National Park	39	60	
	• Royal Basseterre Valley Park	28	40	
	• Nevis Peak Forest Reserve National Park	30	60	
• Booby Island Nature Reserve	14	40		
• Narrows Marine Park	25	60		
• Keys Marine Park	15	60		
• Sandy Point Marine Park		60		

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets	Means of verification	Risks and Assumptions
Component 1: Strengthened Protected Area System Framework and Capacities	Legal authority in place for the collection and retention (within the PA system) of visitor / user / concession fees and other financing mechanisms for protected areas, including the proposed National Conservation Trust Fund (NCTF)	Only 1 PA unit (Brimstone Hill NP) has authority to collect or retain fees	By end of year 2, legal authority established (under existing NCEPA and/or new NCEMA and Marine Resources Act) for all official PA units to collect and retain fees and receive allocations from the NCTF	Approved legal documents	
	Consolidated and effectively functioning institutional management of protected areas in St. Kitts and Nevis	Existing PA units and sites of proposed new PA units currently are managed by multiple government agencies and non-governmental organizations	Protected Areas Agency (PAA) formally established and actively implementing functions across PA system (planning; financing; monitoring, enforcement) by end of year 3	Cabinet memorandum establishing PAA	
	Effective coordination between institutions / personnel responsible for protected areas and for adjacent / upstream areas of influence on PA units	No coordination or information sharing mechanisms among resource management agencies are current functional in St. Kitts and Nevis	National Environmental Committee (NEC) overseeing protected areas management throughout the country by end of year 1	Cabinet memorandum establishing NEC	
	Number of PA staff with specialised training and/or skills development in the following PA management functions:		Staff of PAA, as well as partner institutions (DPPE, DPPNRE, DMR, NDF), trained by end of project:	Project training reports Annual reports of PAA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PA planning processes and tools • Creation / enforcement of PA regulations • Ecotourism development • Business and financial planning • Database management and decision support tools 	0 2 (specific to fisheries) 0 0	6 6 6 6		
	Increased funding support for protected areas in St. Kitts and Nevis through the National Conservation Trust Fund (NCTF) and Caribbean Biodiversity Fund (CBF) (US\$/year)	US\$0	US\$429,000/year (50% from the NCTF and 50% from the CBF) by end of project	NCTF annual report; PA Annual Reports	

Component 2: Protected Area System Expansion and Strengthened	# of Protected Areas legally established and demarcated in St. Kitts and Nevis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Terrestrial Protected Areas • Marine Protected Areas 	3 existing PA units 0 existing PA units	2 additional PA units by end of year 2 3 additional PA units by end of year 2	Legal documents and PA annual reports	
--	--	--	--	---------------------------------------	--

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets	Means of verification	Risks and Assumptions
--	------------------	-----------------	----------------	------------------------------	------------------------------

Management of Existing and New Protected Areas	Conservation of critical habitat within the Protected Areas targeted by the project:				
	• Forest health at 4 terrestrial PAs, as measured by # of hectares	8,790 hectares (forest)		No net loss (in # of hectares) by end of project	Monitoring survey reports
	• Coral reef health at 3 MPA sites, as measured by:				
	• Percent live hard coral cover	TBD during Year 1		No decrease by project end	
	• Percent dead hard coral cover	TBD during Year 1		No increase by project end	
	• Number of coral recruits (per m2)	TBD during Year 1		No decrease by project end	
	• Seagrass bed health, as measured by # of hectares	TBD during Year 1		No net loss (in # of hectares) by end of project	
• Health of selected reef fish stocks, as measured by:					
• Abundance per m ³	TBD during Year 1		No decrease by project end		
• Species diversity	TBD during Year 1		No decrease by project end		
Increased PA management funds for PA units targeted by the project from visitor, user and concession fees	US\$0		US\$200,000/year for 3 marine PA sites and US\$35,000/year 2 terrestrial PA sites by end of project (targets will be validated and possibly revised during the first year of the project)	Annual reports of PAA and/or PA units	
Number of site-level PA staff, with specialised training in PA management					
• Terrestrial PA Sites (enforcement; conservation, monitoring; community empowerment, outreach, etc.)	0		At least 5 trained staff managing 2 terrestrial PA sites by end of project	Project training reports Annual reports of PAA	
• Marine PA Sites (ecological monitoring; deploying mooring buoys and FADs; enforcement; boat safety and navigation; extension / stakeholder engagement, etc.)	0		At least 6 trained staff managing 3 Marine Parks by end of project		
Reduced impact of invasive alien species (lionfish) at targeted PA units	Baseline population of lionfish (tbd in year 1 of project)		25% reduction in lionfish population at targeted sites by end of project	Ecological survey reports of MPA units	
Conservation of priority endemic species at terrestrial protected areas (Central Forest Reserve NP and Nevis Peak NP)	Targeted species to be determined through biodiversity inventories during years 1-2 of project		No net decline in populations of selected species by end of project	Ecological survey reports of PA units	

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

The following is an indicative list of documents that must be reviewed as part of the evaluation process. These documents will be made available to the Evaluator following contract signature and prior to the Inception meeting.

1. *Project Document*
2. *PIF*
3. *Completed GEF Tracking Tool*
4. *Mid-Term Evaluation*
5. *Project Document*
6. *HACT Assessment*
7. *Inception Report*
8. *CDRs*
9. *FACE Forms*
10. *Quarterly Narrative Progress Reports*
11. *Financial Audit Reports*
12. *Asset Registry*
13. *Annual Reports (PIRs)*
14. *Site Visit/Field Reports*
15. *News/Media Reports*
16. *Training Reports (including participant feedback)*
17. *Sustainability Plan/Exit Strategy*
18. *Steering Committee Meeting Minutes*

ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

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?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the project relate to the GEF Biodiversity focal area and has it been designed to deliver global environmental benefits in line with relevant international biodiversity conservation objectives? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project includes the relevant GEF outcomes, outputs and indicators The project makes explicit links with global conservation action/national conservation goals (e.g. CBD, CITES, etc.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Document GEF 5 Focal Area Strategies PIF 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the project aligned to National development objectives, broadly, and to national conservation priorities specifically? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project design includes explicit links (indicators, outputs, outcomes) to the national development policy/national conservation strategies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Document National development strategies, conservation plans, etc. PIF 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the project relevant to stated regional development objectives as defined by CARICOM, OECS and other regional frameworks? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explicit links are made within the project to regional development policies, action plans and associated initiatives such as the CARICOM Strategic Plan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Document CARICOM Strategic Plan, Caribbean Challenge Initiative PIF 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the project's Theory of Change relevant to addressing the development challenge(s) identified? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Theory of Change clearly indicates how project interventions and projected results will contribute to the reduction of the three major barriers to low carbon 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Document PIF 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents

	development (Policy, institutional/technical capacity and financial)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the project directly and adequately address the needs of beneficiaries at local and regional levels? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Theory of Change clearly identifies beneficiary groups and defines how their capabilities will be enhanced by the project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Document PIF 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the project's results framework relevant to the development challenges and are results at the appropriate level? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project results framework adequately measures impact The project indicators are SMART Indicator baselines are clearly defined and populated and milestones and targets are The results framework is comprehensive and demonstrates systematic links to the theory of change 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Document PIF 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the project appropriately aligned with relevant UN system priorities, including thematic objectives at the national/regional and international levels? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project's results framework includes relevant thematic outcomes and indicators from the UNDP Strategic Plan, the UNDAF, UNDP CPD and other relevant corporate objectives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Document UNDP CPD, UNDAF, SP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have the relevant stakeholders been adequately identified and have their views, needs and rights been considered during design and implementation? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The stakeholder mapping and associated engagement plan includes all relevant stakeholders and appropriate modalities for engagement. Planning and implementation have been participatory and inclusive 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholder mapping/engagement plan and reporting Quarterly Reports Annual Reports (PIR) Stakeholder Consultation Reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents Stakeholder Interviews

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have the interventions of the project been adequately considered in the context of other development activities being undertaken in the same or related thematic area? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Partnership framework has been developed that incorporates parallel initiatives, key partners and identifies complementarities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Document • Quarterly Reports • Annual Reports (PIR) • Stakeholder mapping/engagement plan and reporting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents • Stakeholder Interviews
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have relevant lessons learned from previous projects informed the design, implementation, risk management and monitoring of the project? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lessons learned are explicitly identified and integrated into all aspects of the Project Document 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Document • PIF 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did the project design adequately identify, assess and design appropriate mitigation actions for the potential social and environmental risks posed by its interventions? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SES checklist was completed appropriately and all reasonable risks were identified with appropriate impact and probability ratings and risk mitigation measures specified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Document • SES Annex 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the project achieved its output and outcome level objectives? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project has met or exceeded the output and outcome indicator end-of-project targets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarterly Reports • Annual Reports (PIR) • Monitoring Reports • Beneficiary testimony • Site visit/field reports • Pilot Data Analysis/Reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents • Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries • Site visits
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Were lessons learned captured and integrated into project planning and decision-making? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lessons learned have been captured periodically and/or at project end 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Steering Committee Meeting Minutes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarterly Reports • Annual Reports (PIR) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How well were risks (including those identified in the Social and Environmental Screening (SES) Checklist), assumptions and impact drivers being managed? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A clearly defined risk identification, categorization and mitigation strategy (updated risk log in ATLAS) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ATLAS Risk Log • M&E Reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents • Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Were relevant counterparts from government and civil society involved in project implementation, including as part of the project steering committee? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The steering committee participation included representatives from key institutions in Government 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Steering Committee Meeting Minutes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the project contributed directly to any changes in legislation or policy in line with the project's objectives? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft legislation has been developed or enacted to catalyse the reduction of barriers to the improved effectiveness of protected area management and biodiversity conservation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft legislation • Policy Documents • Action/Implementation Plans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there evidence that the project outcomes have contributed to better preparations to cope with natural disasters? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project has directly contributed to reductions in one or more vulnerabilities associated with natural disasters 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarterly Reports • Annual Reports (PIR) • Stakeholder/beneficiary testimony 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents • Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the project carefully considered the thematic issues related to human rights? In particular, has the project sought to and actively pursued equality of access to ecosystem services and opportunities for women and men (e.g. by ensuring that beneficiary selection that does not reinforce existing inequalities, ensuring the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A gender mainstreaming plan was completed • The project results framework has incorporated gender equality considerations, as relevant. • Multi-dimensional poverty reduction is an explicit objective 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gender Mainstreaming Plan • Project Document • Stakeholder analysis and engagement plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> inclusion of women and men in decision-making roles within the project, including as part of management and stakeholder groups, etc.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project prioritized the most vulnerable as key beneficiaries 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards? 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Did the project adjust dynamically to reflect changing national priorities/external evaluations during implementation to ensure it remained relevant? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project demonstrated adaptive management and changes were integrated into project planning and implementation through adjustments to annual work plans, budgets and activities Changes to AWP/Budget were made based on mid-term or other external evaluation Any changes to the project's planned activities were approved by the Steering Committee Any substantive changes (outcome-level changes) approved by the Steering Committee and donor, as required 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual Work Plans Steering Committee Meeting Reports Quarterly Reports Annual Reports (PIR) Stakeholder/beneficiary testimony Revised Project Results Framework 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent were the Project results delivered with the greatest value for money? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Value for money analyses, requests for information, market surveys and other market intelligence were undertaken for key procurements. Procurement is done on a competitive basis, where relevant. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> VFM, RFI, Market Surveys Procurement Evaluation Documents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents Interviews with project staff and government stakeholders
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Was co-financing adequately estimated during project design (sources, type, value, relevance), tracked during implementation and what were the reasons for any differences between expected and realised co-financing? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Co-financing was realized in keeping with original estimates Co-financing was tracked continuously throughout the project lifecycle and deviations identified and alternative sources identified Co-financiers were actively engaged throughout project implementation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual Work Plans Steering Committee Meeting Reports Quarterly Reports Annual Reports (PIR) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was the level of implementation support provided by UNDP adequate and in keeping with the implementation modality and any related agreements (i.e. LOA)? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical support to the Executing Agency and project team were timely and of acceptable quality. • Management inputs and processes, including budgeting and procurement, were adequate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LOA (s)/Cooperation Agreement(s) • UNDP project support documents (emails, procurement/recruitment documents) • Quarterly Reports • Annual Reports (PIR) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents • Interviews with project staff, UNDP personnel
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have the capacities of the executing institution(s) and counterparts been properly considered when the project was designed? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An ex-ante analysis was undertaken of the internal control framework and internal capacities of the IP • An ex-ante capacity analysis was undertaken of key partners with explicit responsibilities for implementation of project funds • The cash transfer modality and implementation modality appropriately reflected the findings of any ex-ante analyses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HACT Assessment(s) • Capacity Assessments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the M&E plan been well-formulated, and has it served as an effective tool to support project implementation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The M&E plan has an adequate budget and was adequately funded • The logical framework was used during implementation as a management and M&E tool • There was compliance with the financial and narrative reporting requirements (timeliness and quality) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Document • M&E Plan • AWP • FACE forms • Quarterly Narrative Reports • Site visit reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents • Interviews with project staff and government stakeholders

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitoring and reporting has been at both the activity and results levels 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has the project adequately used relevant national systems (procurement, recruitment, payments) for project implementation where possible? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use of national systems was in keeping with relevant national requirements and internal control frameworks Management of financial resources has been in line with accounting best practice Management of project assets has been in line with accounting best practice 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Procurement/Recruitment reports FACE forms CDRs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents Interviews with project staff and government stakeholders
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Were financial audit/spot check findings adequately addressed and relevant changes made to improve financial management? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriate management responses and associated actions were taken in response to audit/spot check findings. Successive audits demonstrated improvements in financial management practices 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Audit Reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are there financial risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outcomes? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The exit strategy includes explicit interventions to ensure financial sustainability of relevant activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Exit Strategy Risk Log 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do the legal frameworks, policies, and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project benefits? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The exit strategy identifies relevant socio-political risks and includes explicit interventions to mitigate same 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Exit Strategy Risk Log 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have key stakeholders identified their interest in project benefits beyond project-end and accepted responsibility for ensuring that project benefits continue to flow? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key stakeholders are assigned specific, agreed roles and responsibilities outlined in the exit strategy MOU(s) exist for on-going monitoring, maintenance and oversight of phased down or phased over activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Exit Strategy Risk Log MOU(s) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there ongoing activities that may pose an environmental threat to the sustainability of project outcomes? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The exit strategy identifies relevant environmental risks and includes explicit interventions to mitigate same 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Exit Strategy • Risk Log 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents
<p>Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?</p>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there verifiable improvements in ecological status, or reductions in ecological stress, that can be linked directly to project interventions? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project has contributed directly to improved ecological conditions, including through reduced expanded and improved management of protected areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarterly Reports • Annual Reports (PIR) • Monitoring Reports • Pilot Data Analysis/Reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents • Site visits

ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

<p><i>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution, Relevance</i></p> <p>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</p>	<p><i>Sustainability ratings:</i></p> <p>4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks</p>	
<p><i>Additional ratings where relevant:</i> Not Applicable (N/A) Unable to Assess (U/A)</p>		

ANNEX E: EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT AND AGREEMENT FORM

Evaluators:

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

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form²

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

Name of Consultant: _____

²www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

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 OUTLINE³

- 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 Manual⁴)
- 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 rated⁵)
- 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

³The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

⁴ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

⁵ 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.

- 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: _____