



*Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.*

**GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY
UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME**

**TERMS OF REFERENCE
FOR TERMINAL EVALUATION:**

- Project Title:** “Transboundary Cooperation for Snow Leopard and Ecosystem Conservation”
- Functional Title:** International Consultant for Terminal Evaluation
- Duration:** 20 working days during May-June 2020
- Terms of Payment:** Lump sum payable upon satisfactory completion and approval by UNDP of all deliverables, including the Evaluation Report
- Duty station:** Home based

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 Transboundary Cooperation for Snow Leopard and Ecosystem Conservation (PIMS 5413, PID 00102964).

The Terminal evaluation aims to determine the potential impacts and sustainability of the project results, including its contribution to capacity building and achievement of Global and National environmental initiatives. The terminal evaluation will determine and describe lessons learned and will develop recommendations to be used by project partners in order to strengthen their capacity in planning and implementation of similar projects.

The Terminal evaluation will:

- Identify factors, which have had positive or negative impacts on project implementation;
- Assess the correlation of project activities with local and national development priorities and organizational policy, including progressive changes;
- Assess the project efficiency, i.e. level of project goal achievement;
- Assess sustainability and project results;
- Present lessons learned from project implementation and management.

Findings of this evaluation will be considered as lessons learned and will assist in developing recommendations to strengthen institutional sustainability of project outputs (possible implementation of such activities in other countries of the region).

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

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	"Transboundary Cooperation for Snow Leopard and Ecosystem Conservation"			
GEF Project ID: UNDP GEF Project ID (PIMS):	#5413		at endorsement (US\$)	at completion (US\$)
Atlas award ID: Atlas project ID:	00099684 00102964	GEF financing:	1,000,000	1,000,000
Country:	Kazakhstan, Kyrgyz Republic, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan	IA/EA own:	400,000	400,000
Region:	ECIS	Government:	Kyrgyz Republic 900,000 Republic of Tajikistan 700,000	Kyrgyz Republic 900,000 Republic of Tajikistan 700,000
Focal Area:	Biodiversity	Other:	SLT 600,000 NABU 616,000 Panthera 300,000 FFI 80,000 WWF-US 600,000	SLT 600,000 NABU 616,000 Panthera 300,000 FFI 80,000 WWF-US 600,000
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):		Total co-financing:	4,196,000	4,196,000

Executing Agency:	UNDP	Total Project Cost:	5,196,000	5,196,000
Implementing Partner (based on Project Cooperation Agreement)	The International Snow Leopard Trust			
Other Partners involved:	Stakeholders listed in the Project Document	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		7 February 2017
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: December 31, 2020	Actual: December 31, 2020

PROJECT OVERVIEW (OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE)

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, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

“Transboundary Cooperation for Snow Leopard and Ecosystem Conservation” project if fully NGO implemented. In August 2017 following the microassessment, Project Cooperation Agreement (PCA) was signed between UNDP in Kyrgyzstan and the International Snow Leopard Trust (SLT)- international NGO.

The project aimed to strengthen transboundary conservation for snow leopards and their high mountain ecosystems to ensure stability of global snow leopard population by addressing drivers of existing and emerging threats with special focus on Central Asia. The project will specifically target four Central Asian countries (Kazakhstan, Kyrgyz Republic, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan), with approaches being piloted in one transboundary snow leopard landscape: the Sarychat / Northern Tien Shan landscape (39,500 km²) which is shared between Kyrgyz Republic and Kazakhstan. Direct GEF funding will only go to these four Central Asian countries. It builds upon, and supports, the efforts of the 12 snow leopard range countries who have committed to the Global Snow Leopard and Ecosystem Protection Program (GSLEP). The project will achieve its objective by gathering, developing and making available best practices to support transboundary actions for snow leopard ecosystem conservation, establishing a common monitoring framework and strengthening global coordination mechanisms. The results will be relevant for four countries of Central Asia but also for all 12 snow leopard range countries.

The snow leopard is classified by IUCN as Endangered, with an estimated global population of 3500-7000. As an apex predator, snow leopards are indicators of healthy high-mountain ecosystems in Central and South Asia that provide essential ecosystem services to millions of people. Ensuring healthy populations of snow leopards will therefore secure both the rich biodiversity of these areas, as well as other multiple benefits. Current threats include illegal wildlife trade, habitat degradation and climate change. A high degree of international cooperation is essential to address such threats, particularly as snow leopards range across many international borders.

The project is designed to produce three main outcomes:

Component 1: Knowledge generation and sharing for transboundary landscapes

Component 2: Global and national monitoring framework for snow leopard ecosystems.

Component 3: Ensuring sustainability of snow leopard conservation

The project will thus develop and demonstrate best practice approaches, build capacity and facilitate national implementation for trans-boundary collaboration for snow leopard ecosystem conservation at the global level. It builds upon the already significant baseline of the GSLEP and will be fully integrated with GEF-financed activities relating to snow leopards in the relevant countries

The Project has primary results summarized below:

1. Illegal Wildlife Trade Database, network and processes
2. Ecotourism Principles and Recommendations
3. Climate Smart Management Planning Guidelines along with advice documents
4. PARTNERS Principles training toolkit and manual
5. Training module on species distribution and monitoring
6. Snow leopard population data analysis cheat sheets
7. Snow leopard identification evaluation toolkit
8. Population Assessment of the World's Snow leopards (PAWS): Inception, Action plans, training workshops, periodic meetings, guidelines and manuals
9. Prey population assessment manual
10. Central Tien Shan Management Plan
11. Snow Leopard and Ecosystem Forum 2017
12. Bishkek Declaration 2017
13. Thematic Background Papers For Snow Leopard And Ecosystem Conservation Forum Policy Recommendations
14. Issykkul Statement 2018
15. Shenzhen Consensus for snow leopard conservation 2018
16. New Delhi Statement 2019
17. Economic valuation of ecosystem services from snow leopard landscapes
18. Balanced Acceptance Sampling (using Halton's Iterative Partitioning) and other methodological cheat sheets for designing surveys
19. CITES Training workshops in Bishkek bringing representatives and frontline staff from Central Asian range countries
20. Formation of Kyrgyz NEST
21. SMART adaptation to snow leopard landscapes including possible use of drones for monitoring snow leopard prey and anti-poaching patrolling
22. Design and implementation of surveys in Kyrgyz compliant to PAWS processes through collaboration between prominent snow leopard organizations in the country and SAEPP
23. Green Economy Strategy Document
24. MoUs with entrepreneurs and businesses
25. Celebrity engagement for publicity
26. Trans-boundary MoU for snow leopard and ecosystem conservation between Central Asian countries
27. Engagement with relevant agencies and partner organizations in other snow leopard range countries to develop sustainable conservation plans
28. Development of Snow Leopard Genome
29. Conservation Monitoring Guideline
30. Spatial datasets for management plans
31. Resource and Capacity center within GSLEP website

EVALUATION OBJECTIVES

The purpose of TE are:

- To assess overall performance against the project objective and outcomes as set out in the Project Document, project's Logical Framework and other related documents;
- To assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the project;
- To analyze critically the implementation and management arrangements of the project;

- To assess the progress to date towards achievement of the outcomes;
- To review planned strategies and plans for achieving the overall objective of the project within the timeframe;
- To assess the sustainability of the project’s interventions;
- To list and document initial lessons concerning project design, implementation and management;
- To assess project relevance to national priorities (including achieving gender equality goals);
- To provide guidance for the future project activities and, if necessary, for the implementation and management arrangements.

EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

An overall approach and method¹ for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects have been 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](#). A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR ([see 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, in particular the GEF operational focal points, UNDP Country Offices, SLT project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

Key stakeholders:

- UNDP Kyrgyzstan Senior Management (Principal Office);
- UNDP COs in Kazakhstan, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan;
- GEF Operational Focal Points in Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan;
- UNDP IRH in Istanbul;
- GSLEP Secretariat based in Bishkek;
- Snow Leopard Trust (SLT);
- Global Tiger Initiative (GTI) Council, New Delhi;
- Intergovernmental organizations, conventions and multilateral agencies;
- Academic and research institutions;
- International NGOs working in Central Asia;
- National NGOs engaged in snow leopard conservation in Central Asia;
- Private sector organizations;
- Local level stakeholders in pilot landscape;
- Other stakeholders as requested by the Evaluator.

It is recommended that the evaluation methodology include the following:

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information (desk review), 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

¹ For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](#), Chapter 7, pg. 163

• 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 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

CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

The evaluation report ([Annex F](#)) 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 **Kyrgyzstan (Principal Office)**. The Principal UNDP CO will contract the evaluator and ensure the timely support to the Evaluator. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluator to set up online stakeholder interviews, coordinate with the Government etc.

EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

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

Activity	Timing (indicative)	Completion Date (indicative)
Preparation (desk review)	3 days (May 2020)	7 May 2020
Evaluation (interviews and presentation of preliminary findings)	7 days (May, 2020)	20 May 2020
Draft Evaluation Report	5 days (May, 2020)	29 May 2020
Final Report	5 days (May-June 2020)	10 June 2020

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](#)

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 1 week before the interviews (by 7 May 2020)	Evaluator submits to Principal UNDP CO and SLT
Presentation	Initial Findings	After the interviews completed (by 20 May 2020)	Evaluator makes a presentation for the UNDP COs, SLT, key stakeholders and members of the Project Board
Draft Final Report	Draft evaluation report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 2 weeks after the interviews completed (by 29 May 2020)	Evaluator submits to Principal UNDP CO and SLT. Reviewed by COs, SLT, IRH RTA, GEF OFPs
Final Report*	Final report addressing and integrating feedback and comments	Within a week time after receiving comments on the draft (by 10 June 2020)	CO uploads 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. See Annex [Annex G and H](#) for an evaluation clearance form and an audit trail template.

TEAM COMPOSITION

The evaluation team will be composed of *1 international consultant. The consultant shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects.* The international Consultant has responsibility over submission of a final report. 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 Project will provide an interpreter for the interviews with the stakeholders (if needed).

The International Consultant will be responsible to deliver the expected output of the assignment. Specifically, he/she will perform the following tasks:

- Manage the evaluation
- Design the detailed evaluation plan
- Conduct desk reviews and interviews in order to obtain objective and verifiable data to substantive evaluation assessment
- Draft the evaluation report and share for comments
- Finalize the evaluation report based on inputs from key stakeholders

The International Consultant must present the following qualifications:

- University degree in natural resource management / environmental management / related areas;
- Minimum 5 years of professional experience in the field of environmental management;

- Proven track record of evaluation of projects focusing on conservation of biodiversity and/or land degradation confirmed with at least two project evaluations;
- At least one project evaluation with GEF M&E policies and procedures;
- Familiarity with UNDP Gender Equality Strategy is an asset;
- Experience in working in Central Asian or CIS countries is an asset;
- Fluency in English. Knowledge of Russian is an asset;

MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENT

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 [UNEP 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'](#)

PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

The service provider will be responsible for all personal administrative and travel expenses associated with undertaking this assignment including office accommodation, printing, stationary, telephone and electronic communications, and report copies incurred in this assignment. For this reason, the contract is prepared as a lump sum contract.

The remuneration of work performed will be conducted as follows: lump sum payable in 1 installment, upon satisfactory completion and approval by Principal UNDP-CO and UNDP-RTA of the Final TE Report.

Consultant's Independence:

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

APPLICATION PROCESS

Scope of Price Proposal and Schedule of Payments

Financial Proposal (home based):

- Financial proposals must be "all inclusive" and expressed in a lump sum for the total duration of the contract. The term "all inclusive" implies all cost (professional fees and etc.);
- The lump sum is fixed regardless of changes in the cost components.

Schedule of Payments:

The service provider will be responsible for all personal administrative and other associated costs with undertaking this assignment including office accommodation, printing, stationary, telephone and electronic communications, and report copies incurred in this assignment. For this reason, the contract is prepared as a lump sum contract.

The remuneration of work performed will be conducted as follows: lump sum payable in one installment, upon satisfactory completion and approval by Principal UNDP-CO and UNDP-RTA of the Final TE Report.

Recommended Presentation of Offer

Candidates meeting the minimum ToR requirements will be sourced from the [UNDP IRH vetted roster of experts](#) and will be invited to submit the following documents:

- a) Completed **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](#) provided by UNDP;
- b) Personal CV or a **P11 Personal History form**, indicating all past experience from similar projects, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the Candidate;
- c) **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price, supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template provided - "Letter of Confirmation of Interest template for financial proposal template".

Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

Application documents should be submitted no later than **18:00 (Bishkek time), April 26, 2020** to email: procurement.env.kg@undp.org

K. Criteria for Selection of the Best Offer

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. The award of the contract will be made to the Individual Consultant who offers the best value for money.

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR THE RECOMMENDED CONTRACTOR

Statement of Medical Fitness for Work

Individual Consultants/Contractors whose assignments require travel and who are over 65 years of age are required, at their own costs, to undergo a full medical examination including x-rays and obtaining medical clearance from UN –approved doctor, prior to taking up their assignment.

Where there is no UN office nor a UN Medical Doctor present in the location of the Individual Contractor prior to commencing the travel, either for repatriation or duty travel, the Individual Contractor may choose his/her own preferred physician to obtain the required medical clearance.

Inoculations/Vaccinations

Individual Contractors are required to have vaccinations/inoculations when travelling to certain countries, as designated by the UN Medical Director. The cost of required vaccinations/inoculations, when foreseeable, must be included in the financial proposal. Any unforeseeable vaccination/inoculation cost will be reimbursed by UNDP.

No TRAVELS (home based)

SECURITY CLEARANCE

THE CONSULTANT WILL BE REQUESTED TO UNDERTAKE

The BSAFE, Basic Security in the Field II and Advanced Security in the Field courses must be successfully completed prior to commencement of travel;

UNDP will provide the Consultant with the following:

1. Project documents (see list of documents on page 15);
2. Contact details of Project partners and stakeholders;
3. Interpreter for online interviews, as necessary.

ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK³

Project Title:
“Transboundary Cooperation for Snow Leopard and Ecosystem Conservation”

Objective/ Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	End of Project target	Source of Information	Risks and assumptions
Objective: To strengthen transboundary conservation of snow leopard ecosystems and landscapes that ensure stability of global snow leopard population by addressing drivers of existing and emerging threats with special focus in Central Asia.	Stable and viable snow leopard population in 4 countries of the project participants	According to expert estimates: Kazakhstan: 100-110 Kyrgyz Republic: 300-350 Tajikistan: 180-220 Uzbekistan: 30-45	No decline from baseline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Monitoring reports 	Risks: Range countries unwilling to establish transboundary cooperation agreements Lack of consensus among key stakeholders on best practice methods and tools Assumptions: The governments remain committed to conservation of snow leopards & their critical ecosystems There is no upsurge in the key Central Asian states in activity by international criminal syndicates trading in snow leopard furs and other parts Co-financing is mobilised from international partners and government allocations
	Transboundary landscapes of the snow leopard habitat with a program of conservation / cooperation, formalized / approved by the sides	0	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Signed MOUs ▪ Project progress reports 	
	Level of key threats in pilot transboundary landscape (poaching, retaliatory killing, habitat destruction)	Poaching: Snow Leopard (2014) – 1 individual <u>Retaliatory killing:</u> <u>0 (Zero)</u> <u>Habitat destruction:</u> <u># mines in the area: 1</u> <u>Total area of the mine: 8-10km²;</u> <u>(concession: 263 km²)</u>	Reduction in poaching and maintain zero cases of retaliatory killing of snow leopards Habitat loss reduced and quality snow leopard habitat maintained	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PA guard and customs reports ▪ Community interviews ▪ Rapid habitat suitability assessment results or results of assessment of transboundary landscapes (methodology developed under GSLEP process) 	

³ Project logical framework from the Inception Report

Objective/ Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	End of Project target	Source of Information	Risks and assumptions
		Kokjaylau Ski Resort (planned):420 km2			
Outcome 1: Key stakeholders have sufficient knowledge, capacity and tools for effective transboundary conservation of snow leopard ecosystems	Outputs: <u>Output 1.1:</u> Tools, methods and guidelines for effective transboundary cooperation developed, tested and made available to stakeholders <u>Output 1.2:</u> Training materials and methods developed and disseminated, including through an on-line platform <u>Output 1.3:</u> Effective enforcement mechanisms developed and introduced to enforcement agencies				
	Global knowledge toolkit available	0	Toolkit available through on-line platform	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Toolkit ▪ On-line platform ▪ Project reports 	<u>Risks:</u> Lack of consensus among key stakeholders on best practice methods and tools <u>Assumptions:</u> Cooperation is forthcoming from enforcement agencies
	SL crime enforcement guidance and mechanisms	0	Model systems developed and operationalised in at least 2 countries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Model system and guidance for implementation ▪ Implementation reports 	
	Level of institutional capacity for transboundary snow leopard ecosystem conservation as indicated by Capacity scorecard	23 out of a possible 96 = 24%	Improved capacity indicated by an increase of at least 30% over baseline (ie. a score of 30 = 31%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project progress reports ▪ Capacity Scorecard assessments at Mid-term and in Terminal Evaluation report ▪ Training reports 	
Outcome 2. Global monitoring framework developed for snow leopard ecosystems, demonstrated and adopted by range countries	Outputs: <u>Output 2.1:</u> An inventory of existing methods and indicators has been carried out, the testing and piloting of the snow leopards has been finalized and carried out. <u>Output 2.2:</u> Inventory of existing databases for monitoring and management of one transboundary landscape is developed <u>Output 2.3:</u> Sustainable landscape management measures are identified and presented to stakeholders for implementation				
	# Countries using approved/adopted common monitoring indicators/framework	None	At least 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Common monitoring framework ▪ Approval document 	<u>Risks:</u> Monitoring framework is not used because it is not aligned with existing national monitoring frameworks <u>Assumptions:</u> Stakeholder institutions are willing to share information with other countries
	# transboundary snow leopard landscapes with sustainable management measures agreed to reduce key threats	0	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Geospatial assessment ▪ Agreed management priorities with M&E system ▪ Project reports 	
	# women in the pilot landscape directly benefiting	0 Kyrgyz part 0 Kazakhstan part	20% 2%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project reports 	

Objective/ Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	End of Project target	Source of Information	Risks and assumptions
	from new sustainable management measures:				
Outcome 3. Effective and sustainable transboundary conservation mechanism for snow leopard ecosystems	Outputs: <u>Output 3.1:</u> Global coordination mechanism for technical support, resource development and knowledge-sharing is strengthened <u>Output 3.2:</u> Global and national tools for financing snow leopard ecosystem conservation developed, piloted and shared <u>Output 3.3:</u> Private sector dialogue platforms established				
	Capacity of, and satisfaction with, GSLEP coordination	To be determined during inception phase	20% increase on the baseline score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Capacity/Satisfaction surveys of GSLEP coordination from focal points and international partners 	<u>Risks:</u> Long-term core funding for the GSLEP Secretariat does not materialise Further economic downturn hinders private sector commitment to environmental sustainability <u>Assumptions:</u> Government of Kyrgyz Republic will continue its support for GSLEP after the elections.
	Level of financing for GSLEP Secretariat and at least 2 national programmes (NSLEPs)	GSLEP Secretariat: \$ 93,300 p.a. Kazakhstan: \$123,857 p.a. Kyrgyzstan: \$252,857 p.a. Tajikistan: \$34,286 p.a. Uzbekistan: : \$107,000 p.a	25-30% increase on the baseline (at least 5% of which from private sector)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Financing records ▪ Agreements with private sector 	

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

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.

Project documentation

- List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Boards, and other partners to be interviewed;
- Project document;
- Inception report;
- LPAC meeting minutes;
- Annual Work Plans;
- Annual Project Reports;
- Project Implementation Review (PIR);
- GEF Operational Quarterly Reports;
- UNDP ROAR;
- Project budgets and financial data;
- Project Board Meetings' minutes;
- Knowledge and legislation related products;
- Back to Office Reports;
- Reports of involved consultants;
- And other.

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?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•		•	•
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•

ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

<p><i>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution</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>Relevance ratings</i></p> <p>2. Relevant (R) 1. Not relevant (NR)</p> <p><i>Impact Ratings:</i></p> <p>3. Significant (S) 2. Minimal (M) 1. Negligible (N)</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 Form⁴

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: _____

⁴⁴www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE⁵

- 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 Manual⁶)
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 rated⁷)
- 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

⁵The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

⁶ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

⁷ Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Moderately Satisfactory, 3: Moderately Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see Guidelines for conducting Terminal evaluations: <http://www.thegef.org/gef/node/1905>.

- 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
 - Co-financing table
 - Report Clearance Form
 - *Annexed in a separate file:* TE Audit Trail
 - *Annexed in a separate file:* Terminal GEF Tracking Tool, if applicable

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 in the Kyrgyz Republic	
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 **(Transboundary Cooperation for Snow Leopard and Ecosystem Conservation) (UNDP PIMS # 5413)**

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