Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the following projects:“International Waters Learning Exchange and Resource Network (IW:LEARN)” - PIMS no. 5337; and (2) “Strengthening Global Governance of Large Marine Ecosystems and Their Coasts through Enhanced Sharing andApplication of LME/ICM/MPA Knowledge and Information Tools” (LME:LEARN)” – PIMS no. 4481.

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

IW:LEARN Project Summary Table

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Project Title:  | International Waters Learning Exchange and Resource Network (IW:LEARN) |
| GEF Project ID: | 5729 |   | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | *at completion (Million US$)* |
| UNDP Project ID: | 5337 | GEF financing:  | 4,987,500 |       |
| Country: |       | IA/EA own: | 5,006,526 | 1,715,442 |
| Region: | Global | Government: |       |       |
| Focal Area: | International Waters | Other: | 7,145,790 | 12,236,352 |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): |       | Total co-financing: | 12,152,316 | 13,951,794 |
| Executing Agency: | IOC/UNESCO | Total Project Cost: | 17,109,816 |       |
| Other Partners involved: | UN Environment,GRID Arendal,CI, GWP, ICPDR, International River Foundation, IUCN, The Nature Conservancy, UNECE, UNESCO-WWAP, UNIDO, UNESCO-IHP, WWF | ProDoc Signature (date project began):  | 16 March 2016 |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | Proposed:16 March 2020 | Actual:16 March 2020 |

LME:LEARN

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Project Title:  | Strengthening Global Governance of Large Marine Ecosystems and Their Coasts through Enhanced Sharing andApplication of LME/ICM/MPA Knowledge and Information Tools |
| GEF Project ID: | 5278 |   | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | *at completion (Million US$)* |
| UNDP Project ID: | 4481 | GEF financing:  | 2,500,000 |  |
| Country: |  | IA/EA own: | 3,530,500 | 3,183,070 |
| Region: | Global | Government: |       |       |
| Focal Area: | International Waters | Other: | 9,824,099 | 1,868,249 |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): |       | Total co-financing: | 13,354,599 | 5,051,319 |
| Executing Agency: | IOC/UNESCO | Total Project Cost: | 15,854,599 |       |
| Other Partners involved: | ICES, NOAA,IUCN, CI | ProDoc Signature (date project began):  | 17 March 2016 |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | Proposed:17 March 2020 | Actual:17 March 2020 |

**PROJECTS BACKGROUND**

For seventeen years, **IW:LEARN** has helped strengthen transboundary water management around the globe by collecting and sharing best practices, lessons learned, and innovative solutions to common problems across the GEF International Waters portfolio. The latest round of the project, started in 2016, marks the beginning of the new phase of IW:LEARN and the start of its co-executed sister project, **LME:LEARN**. Together, the two projects help promote learning among project managers, country officials, implementing agencies, and other partners in GEF International Waters projects.

Both projects offer a suite of technical and financial assistance that have become standardized as IW:LEARN enters into its seventeenth year of operations. While IW:LEARN provides support to the entire portfolio of GEF International Waters projects, this phase contains additional support aimed at building the capacity of river and lake basin projects in areas such as the water-energy-food nexus, climate change and variability, benefit sharing, legal and institutional support for basin organizations, sustainable infrastructure, and conjunctive management of surface and groundwater. For its part, LME:LEARN will undertake additional activities in support of the marine portfolio. In order to carry out proper regional governance of Large Marine Ecosystem regions, coordination between LME, Marine Protected Area, and Integrated Coastal Management projects will be supported.

The outcomes of the IW:LEARN are as follows:

* **Outcome 1:** Increased experience sharing and replication of successes throughout and beyond the IW portfolio, as well as enhanced stakeholder buy‐in to GEF IW project interventions
* **Outcome 2a:** Enhanced portfolio and partner capacity at the regional and global levels, and portfolio‐wide dialogue opportunities for increased transboundary cooperation
* **Outcome 2b:** Increased global awareness of GEF results and additional partner collaboration with GEF projects
* **Outcome 3:** External partnerships mobilized and working together for improved learning and knowledge management, through an enhanced global freshwater Community of Practice—to impact results and advance conjunctive management of water resources
* **Outcome 4:** Increased capacity of beneficiary governments, intergovernmental bodies and GEF projects to implement agreed actions identified in existing Strategic Action Programs, with an eye to long‐term sustainability

The outcomes of LME:LEARN are as follows:

* **Outcome 1:** Global and regional network of partners to enhance ecosystem-based management and to provide support for the GEF LME/ICM/MPA projects to address their needs and incorporate climate variability and change.
* **Outcome 2:** Synthesis and incorporation of knowledge into policy-making, capture of best LME governance practices, and development of new methods and tools to enhance the management effectiveness of LMEs andto incorporate ICM, MPAs and climate variability and change including the 5 LME modules.
* **Outcome 3:** Capacity and partnership building through twinning and learning exchanges, workshops, and training among LMEs and similar initiatives (e.g., Seascapes).
* **Outcome 4:** Communication, dissemination and outreach of GEF LME/ICM/MPA project achievements and lessons learned.

The focal point of the projects is the IW:LEARN website which serves as the premiere results archive and data collection service for the GEF International Waters portfolio. The site makes available case studies and best practices, Transboundary Diagnostic Analyses and Strategic Action Programmes from projects around the world, news and events related to International Waters, and targeted knowledge sharing tools to practitioners and the wider public. The website also hosts a unique Portfolio Visualization Tool and Portfolio Results Archive that allows users to quickly discover and analyze the impacts of GEF interventions across the world. Guidance documents and other resources are also made available here to further disseminate the experiences of International Waters projects. LME:LEARN holds a special section of that web site, with a structure that is similar to IW:LEARN but adapted to marine issues.

In addition to the website, both IW:LEARN and LME:LEARN support GEF International Waters projects through activities such as face-to-face training and knowledge sharing activities. The GEF Biennial International Waters Conference (IWC) is the signature learning event for the GEF International Waters portfolio. Bringing together a broad range of stakeholders, the conference aims to facilitate cross-sectoral and portfolio-wide learning and experience sharing, and to assist in building capacity in key management and technical areas. The Ninth GEF IWC took place in 2018 in Marrakech, Morocco. In addition to the IWC, both projects also support Targeted Training activities on water resources management and capacity building, Regional Dialogues and Workshops to help foster transboundary cooperation, Project Twinning for face-to-face engagement between project sharing common objectives or challenges and Global Dialogue Participation support to build partnerships with organizations working outside the immediate GEF IW portfolio

IW:LEARN has been a leader in designing and delivering new management tools, guidance and approaches for International Waters projects. The new phase of IW:LEARN undertook activities to support gender mainstreaming by introducing systematic consideration of gender equity, women's empowerment, and social inclusion into International Waters projects for the improved management of transboundary waters. IW:LEARN will also supported private sector engagement to help facilitate effective partnerships between projects and private enterprises. Activities included training on water stewardship and risk tools, dialogues on business participation in water resource management, and multi-stakeholder basin funds. IW:LEARN has also worked to integrate the economic valuation of natural resources into the Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis/Strategic Action Plan (TDA/SAP) process to influence decision-making and helping to bridge the science-policy gap. IW:LEARN also aimed to improve the quality of the SAPs to ensure that they focus on actions that can realistically be implemented through new guidance. LME:LEARN has provided additional value-added support in terms of governance, ecosystem-based management, environmental economics, data and information management, marine spatial planning and stakeholder engagement.

A joint Project Coordination Unit (PCU) for IW:LEARN and LME:LEARN was established at IOC of UNESCO in Paris, France. The PCU has a joint Project Manager, Deputy Project Manager and the Administrative Assistant, while a Chief Technical Advisor has been hired as a long-term consultant to assist implementation of LME:LEARN.

EVALUATION ObjectiveS 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 **purpose** of the TE is to provide an impartial review of both projects in terms of their relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability, overall performance, management and achievements. The information, findings, lessons learned, and recommendations generated by the TE will be used by the UNDP and the executing partners to strengthen the remaining projects’ implementation and inform prospects for eventual replication and sustainability of the intervention.

The **objectives** of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of projects’ results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from these projects, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

The TE will assess the extent to which planned project results have been achieved since the beginning of the projects in March 2016 and likelihood for their full achievement by the end of the projects in March 2020 (based on their Project Document and Project Results Framework). Also, the TE will assess the monitoring and evaluation aspect of both projects and their compliance with UNDP and GEF minimum standards, including SMART criteria for indicators.

The **scope** of the evaluation covers the following specific aspects, integrating the GEF’s Operational Principles[[1]](#footnote-1) as appropriate:

* Project design, risk assessment/management;
* Progress toward results, outputs, outcomes and impacts;
* Implementation and execution arrangements, including GEF Agency oversight;
* Partnership approach and stakeholder participation;
* Communications and public awareness;
* Work planning, financial management/planning, co-financing;
* Flexibility, innovation and adaptive management;
* Gender and human rights integration and mainstreaming in implementation;
* Catalytic role: Replication and up-scaling.

EvaLuation approach and method

An overall approach and method[[2]](#footnote-2) 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. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR ([*Annex C*](#_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, in particular Project Coordination Unit (PCU), project partners, UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor, and other key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Cartagena, Colombia in September 2019 during the 21st LME Annual Consultative Meeting. The meeting will be the opportunity to meet stakeholders FOR BOTH PROJECTS. If necessary, the consultant will carry out other missions agreed with the PCU.

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

As a part of the evaluation **inception report**, the evaluator will propose a detailed evaluation methodology and agree on a plan for the assignment. The proposed methodology may employ any relevant and appropriate quantitative, qualitative or combined methods to conduct the TE.

As a part of **desk review,** the evaluator will review for each project all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – incl. Annual PIR and other reports, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, and any other material that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the PCU will provide to the evaluator for review is included in Annex A of this Terms of Reference. **Data analysis** should be conducted in a systematic manner to ensure that all the findings, conclusions and recommendations are substantiated by evidence. Appropriate tools should be used to ensure proper analysis (e.g. data analysis matrix).

The final TE report should describe the full TE approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the evaluation.

Evaluation Criteria & Ratings

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

|  |
| --- |
| **Evaluation Ratings (to be developed for each project separately):** |
| **1. Monitoring and Evaluation** | ***rating*** | **2. IA& EA Execution** | ***rating*** |
| M&E design at entry |       | Quality of UNDP Implementation |       |
| M&E Plan Implementation |       | Quality of IOC/UNESCO Execution  |       |
| Overall quality of M&E |       | Overall quality of Implementation / Execution |       |
| **3. Assessment of Outcomes**  | **rating** | **4. Sustainability** | **rating** |
| Relevance  |       | Financial resources |       |
| Effectiveness |       | Socio-economic |       |
| Efficiency  |       | Institutional framework and governance |       |
| Overall Project Outcome Rating |       | Environmental |       |
|  |  | Overall likelihood of risks to sustainability |       |
| **5. Impact**  | **rating** | **6. Overall Project Results** | **rating** |
| Contribution to knowledge and experience exchange |  | Enabling environment for knowledge management improved |       |
| Contribution to capacity development |  | Capacities improved |       |
| Progress towards status change |  | Progress towards better management and implementation of international waters projects |       |

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 will receive assistance from the PCU 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 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 projects are achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the projects have demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.[[3]](#footnote-3)

Conclusions, recommendations & lessons

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions**, **recommendations** and **lessons**.

Implementation arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this TE resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for these projects’ TE is IOC of UNESCO.

The Commissioning Unit will contract the consultant and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements for the TE consultant. The PCU will be responsible for liaising with the TE consultant to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange the mission.

**Travel:**

* International travel will be required to travel to attend the 21st LME Annual Consultative Meeting (Cartagena, Colombia).
* The Basic Security in the Field II, Advanced Security in the Field and UNESCO Security in the Field courses must be successfully completed prior to commencement of travel;
* Individual Consultants are responsible for ensuring they have vaccinations/inoculations when travelling to certain countries, as designated by the UN Medical Director.
* Consultants are required to comply with the UN security directives set forth under <https://dss.un.org/dssweb/>
* All related travel expenses will be covered and will be reimbursed as per IOC/UNESCO rules and regulations upon submission of a travel claim form and supporting documents.

Evaluation timeframe

The total duration of the evaluation will be *30* days according to the following plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Timing | Completion Date |
| **Preparation (Inception Report)** | *4* days | 7 September 2019 |
| **Evaluation Mission** | *7* days | 21 September 2019 |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | *15* days | 26 October 2019 |
| **Final Report** | *4* days | 15 November 2019 |

Evaluation deliverables

The evaluator is expected to deliver the following:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Deliverable | Content  | Timing | Responsibilities |
| **Inception Report** | Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method  | No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission. (by 7 September 2019) | Evaluator submits to PCU  |
| **Presentation** | Initial Findings  | End of evaluation mission (by 21 September 2019) | To PCU, UNDP CTA |
| **Draft Final Report**  | Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes | Within 5 weeks of the evaluation mission (by 26 October 2019) | Sent to PCU, reviewed by RTA, PCU |
| **Final Report\*** | Revised report  | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft  | Sent to PCU, UNDP 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.

REQUIRED EVALUATOR’S SKILLS AND EXPERIENCE

One independent consultant will conduct the TE. The consultant cannot have participated in either of the projects’ preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with projects’ related activities.

The selection of consultant will be aimed at maximizing the overall qualities in the following areas:

|  |
| --- |
| **Consultant’s experiences/qualification related to the services** |
| Criteria | Maximum Points |
|  | Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies  | 20 |
|  | Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios | 10 |
|  | Competence in adaptive management, as applied to GEF International Waters Focal Area | 10 |
|  | Experience working with the GEF or GEF evaluations | 10 |
|  | Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years | 10 |
|  | Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and GEF International Waters Focal Area; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis | 5 |
|  | Excellent communication skills | 5 |
|  | Demonstrable analytical skills | 5 |
|  | Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset | 5 |
|  | A Master’s degree in water resource management, environmental management, international waters, climate change, transboundary monitoring, and other environmental issues, marine spatial planning, integrated coastal zone management or other closely related field | 20 |
| **TOTAL** | 100 |

Evaluator Ethics

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

Payment modalities and specifications

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| % | Milestone |
| *10%* | At contract signing |
| *40%* | Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report |
| *50%* | Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report  |

Application process

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

1. **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx)[[4]](#footnote-4) provided by UNDP;
2. **CV** and a **Personal History Form** ([P11 form](http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc)[[5]](#footnote-5));
3. **Brief description of approach to work/technical proposal** of why the individual considers himself/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how he/she will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)
4. **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price, exclusive of travel cost, as per template attached to the Letter of Confirmation of Interest template. If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

All application materials should be submitted by email at the following address ONLY: (j.barbiere@unesco.org with CC to i.chavez@unesco.org) This email address is being protected from spam bots, you need Javascript enabled to view it by **26 August 2019.** Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

**Criteria for Evaluation of Proposal:** Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated. Offers will be evaluated according to the Combined Scoring method – where the educational background and experience on similar assignments will be weighted at 70%(based on the critera in Table 5) and the price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring. The applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score that has also accepted UNDP’s General Terms and Conditions will be awarded the contract.

Annex A: Project Logical Framework

**IW:LEARN**

**LME:LEARN**

|  | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Targets** **End of Project** | **Source of verification** | **Risks and Assumptions** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Objective[[6]](#footnote-6)** To improve global ecosystem-based governance of Large Marine Ecosystems and their coasts by generating knowledge, building capacity, harnessing public and private partners, and supporting south-to-south learning and north-to-south learning. (equivalent to output in ATLAS) |  | Multiple initiatives by numerous different organizations which support ecosystem-based approaches to the management of marine and coastal environment at different management and governance scales (and sectors), duplicates effort, wastes limited funding resources, and creates a drain on host nation staff time that can ultimately result in confusion and hinder the progress in achieving ecosystem-based management and governance. | The GEF increment will enable the establishment of a functional, fully-facilitated governance network of ecosystem based and learning practices for GEF IW Large Marine Ecosystems and their coasts which will strengthen existing alliances and build new relationships at both the global and regional level to create a network of learning partners to support the delivery of coherent advice on the best tools and techniques to achieve adaptive ecosystem-management of marine and coastal environment. The LME/ICM/MPA Governance project will provide the opportunity to achieve coherence with partner initiatives, increase consistency in the advice provided to host States, improve performance of projects within the IW LME/ICM/MPA portfolio, and increase the achievement of ecosystem-based management of marine and coastal environments. |  |  |
| **Outcome 1[[7]](#footnote-7)**Global and regional network of partners to enhance ecosystem-based management and to provide support for the GEF-IW LME/ICM/MPA projects to address MPA needs and incorporate climate variability and change.  | Enhanced network of partners working together to provide consistent management and ecosystem-based methods and technical support to GEF-LME/ICM/MPA projects.Increased interaction between GEF- LME, MPA and ICM projects and other marine and coastal initiatives supported by GEF and partner organizations.Increased collaboration and coordination between GEF-LME, ICM and MPA projects and partners, within the geographic boundaries of LMEs.Progress towards fully integrated ‘ridge to reef’ ecosystem-based management of freshwater and marine transboundary water systems, based on good governance practices, through increased generation of knowledge and enhanced coordination between GEF-IW surface, ground water and LME and ICM projects. | Best-practice ecosystem-based assessment and management and governance techniques to support the recovery of LME goods and services from the IW projects and other analogous initiatives would not be captured or codified. States would therefore not derive maximum benefits from the lessons learned over the past 15 years and the technical expertise of public and private partners that have engaged in the projects to date and are willing to engage with the LME/ICM/MPA-Governance project. States would not benefit from new tools to help embed ICM into the LME framework, to build adaptive institution and reduce vulnerability to climate variability and change, or to integrate actions with other transboundary water systems.  | Established network (community of practice) of GEF IW Large Marine Ecosystems and their coasts projects, and other marine and coastal initiatives supported by GEF and partner organizations. Technical and Policy-level LME Governance project Steering Committee established.Technical Working Groups established to develop new LME governance tools in partnership with GEF- LME/ICM/MPA projects, and other marine and coastal initiatives.Regional Networks established to enhance interactions and harmonization between GEF- LME, ICM and MPA and other GEF-IW transboundary surface and ground water projects.(jointly with IW:LEARN)  | Terms of Reference for Partner Network.Annual partner network meeting reportsGlobal directory of LME/ICM/MPA projects, practitioners and institutions.Annual Steering Committee meeting reports.Web-based access to database directory available on Project Website and linked to Google maps.Completed LME strategic approach and assessment toolkits completed. | Assumes that key partner organizations will engage in the project, despite possible competing agendas. Assumes all entities are willing to collect and share data in a transparent way. |
| **Outcome 2**Synthesis and incorporation of knowledge into policy-making, capture of best LME governance practices, and development of new methods and tools to enhance the management effectiveness of LMEs and to incorporate ICM, MPAs and climate variability and change within the 5 LME modules. | GEF LME/ICM/MPA projects equipped with new tools that incorporate ICM, MPAs and climate variability and change. Innovative approaches captured and available for use by LME, MPA and ICM practitioners in LME governance. LME/ICM/MPA projects accessing and using the tools to address the emerging priorities and new requirements for GEF.Facilitate the exchange of experiences between LME’s on data and information management issues, and promote the development of common data management approaches for LME/ICM/MPA projects. | LME governance would continue on an ad hoc basis without the benefit of experience sharing and the incorporation of best practices and shared data. | Series of validated methods and new tools to address priority transboundary issues and national governance reforms (LME/ICM/MPA and climate variability and change). An LME/ICM/MPA Toolkit for adaptive ecosystem-based governance which incorporates tools on best practice and new GEF6 requirements. Codification of experiences and best practices from GEF LME/ICM/MPA projects and other coastal and marine initiatives supported by GEF and partner organisations for inclusion in LME toolkit of assessment and governance practices.Establishment of an "LME/ IW environmental data management committee". | Key partners identified and working groups formed to complete each toolkit.Toolkits on environmental economics analysis, social aspects of environmental policy, nutrient over-enrichment, LME valuation and satellite remote sensing completed. Governance Handbook completed and disseminated to Project Partners.Toolkits and Governance Handbook available on the internet.Environmental Data Management Committee established.Training tools for Data and Information Management developed. |  |
| **Outcome 3****Capacity and partnership building through twinning and learning exchanges, workshops and training among LMEs and similar initiatives (e.g. Seascapes).**  | Increased collaboration and learning exchanges South-to-South between the GEF LME, MPA and ICM projects, and North-to-South and South-to-North partnerships with non-GEF marine and coastal initiatives (e.g. Seascapes) to build capacity and develop training and education materials. GEF LME/ICM/MPA practitioners trained in new techniques and approaches for ecosystem-based 5-modular assessment, management and governance practices for ecosystem and mitigation of effects of climatic variability and change in LMEs. Increased capacity of GEF LME, ICM and MPA project staff and practitioners, to address the new ecosystem-based governance priorities in GEF6 built through portfolio learning, partnerships, and training. | Training within the LME/ICM/MPA projects provided on an ad-hoc and inequitable basis between regions, host States and stakeholders, dependent on the project and partner resources available in the region. Delivery of the individual projects delayed by lack of capacity and availability of trained practitioners. Project costs increased due to the lack of easily accessible training and educational materials. Existing training materials prepared by learning partners not fully mobilized. No strategy in place to be able to train the number of practitioners needed to be able scale up the Coordination of ecosystem-based management and governance practices. Existing LME projects not be able to build the capacity of participating countries to apply ICM or adapt to climate change and maintain ecosystem resilience. Reduced impact and the level of consistency in the achievable performance of the IW portfolio. | Functional dialogue, project twinning, learning exchanges, and training workshops in ecosystem-based governance among GEF LME/ICM/MPA projects and other GEF and non-GEF funded marine and coastal initiatives, such as Seascapes,, to build capacity and for portfolio learning.GEF LME/ICM/MPA practitioners fully trained in ecosystem-based governance techniques and approaches including adaptation to climatic variability and change.New training materials developed in collaboration with learning partners (e.g. IUCN, FAO, IOC, ICES, NOAA, IOI, Conservation International, UNU-INWEH) and through learning exchanges and workshops to address priority issues in GEF6. | Internet portal operational.Completed twinning training materials.Twinning experiences occurring. Twinning experiences tracked and evaluated and lessons learned included in training materials.Training strategy based on short-term capacity building needs assessment developed and implemented.Training sessions held and reports written.  | Assumes that GEF LME/ICM/MPA project staff and practitioners will have time and willingness to engage in learning and experience sharing activities. |
| **Outcome 4****Communication, dissemination and outreach of GEF LME/ICM/MPA project achievements and lessons learned.** | Communication of results to stakeholders, increased awareness of LME issues and engagement in networks through global and regional LME /COPsStrategy developed for showcasing LME and ICM assessment and governance best practices among project partners, stakeholders, resource managers, broader scientific community, government representatives, private companies, universities, schools and the public. Global policy discussions informed and impacted by knowledge and experience of GEF- ecosystem based LME/ICM/MPA governance project. | The global awareness, impact, and legacy of the LME/ICM/MPA projects amongst different stakeholder groups and partners would remain at current levels. | Global LME/ICM/MPA- communication platform linking GEF LME, ICM and MPA projects with other relevant initiatives. Lessons from GEF ecosystem-based LME/ICM/MPA projects disseminated through IW:LEARN website, partners and project website.(1% of the overall budget will be spend on IW:Learn related activities)Publication of findings from LME/ICM/MPA projects in peer-reviewed scientific, coastal and ocean management journals.Participation of GEF ecosystem-based LME/ICM/MPA project staff and practitioners in regional and global conferences (e.g, Global Ocean Forum, ICES Science Conferences, etc.). | Interactive web site operational.Report on strategy for showcasing LME, ICM, and MPA assessment and governance best practices.Regional science-to-management workshops held.Journal publications of findings from LME/ICM/MPA projects. Biennial conferences on ecosystem management and ocean governance held.Published conference and workshop proceedings. |  |
| **Outcome 5****Project Management: establish a functioning Project Coordination Unit at IOC, encouraging participation by Partner Network, including short-time visits, seconding of personnel, etc. Work closely with NOAA in transitioning their non-science and technical support capacity to the Project Unit.** | Functioning, minimalistic Project Coordination Unit focusing management of partner activities established.Strategy for LME Governance best practices for the long-term for the GEF portfolio, with overlapping interests within LME, ICM, and MPA domains prepared. | Governance of LMEs would remain at status quo, with no long-term strategy incorporating best practices to guide LME management.  | Monitoring and Evaluation (mid-term and terminal evaluations) conducted.Establishment of unit that will manage project, ensuring cooperation with partner network.Development of a long-term LME global governance strategy. | Staff hired and office operational.Completed Long-term LME Governance strategy.Mid-term and terminal evaluation reports. |  |

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

1. PIF
2. UNDP Initiation Plan
3. UNDP Project Document
4. UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results
5. Project Inception Report
6. All Project Implementation Reports (PIR’s)
7. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
8. Audit reports
9. Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools at CEO endorsement and midterm
10. Oversight mission reports
11. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
12. Financial and Administration guidelines used by PCU
13. Midterm Review

The following documents will also be available:

1. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
2. Minutes of the Project Steering Committee Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)

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?  |
|  | * To what extent are the projects in line with international and national priorities in transboundary water governance?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * Do the projects’ objectives fit GEF and UNDP strategic priorities?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * To what extent do the projects contribute to gender equality, empowerment of women and human rights of target groups?
 |  |  |  |
| Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? |
|  | * What are the positive or negative, intended or unintended, changes brought about by the projects’ interventions?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving the intended specific objective/outcome and outputs/results?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * To what extent have the projects increased knowledge & understanding of partners and beneficiaries on transbuoundary water ecosystems?
 |  |  |  |
| Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards? |
|  | * Are there any weaknesses in programme design, management, human resource skills, and resources?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * Have resources (financial, human, technical) been allocated strategically to achieve the programme results? Were projects implementation as cost effective as originally proposed (planned vs. actual)?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * Did the leveraging of funds (co-financing) happen as planned?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * How was the results-based management used during projects’ implementation? Was the projects’ communication strategy sufficient to influence projects’ results ?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * To what extent have the projects adhered to set guidelines for GEF, UNDP in achieving results?
 |  |  |  |
|  Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? |
|  | * To what extent have the risks identified within the projects influenced the project results?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * To what extent is the sustainability of projects’ results likely to depend on continued financial support? What is the likelihood that any additional financial resources will be available to sustain the projects’ results once the GEF assistance ends?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * To what extent has the programme approach (intervention strategy) managed to create ownership of the key international and national stakeholders?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * Do relevant stakeholders have the relevant capacities to ensure sustainability of the results achieved by the projects?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * What is the projects’ potential for scaling-up and replication in terms of the need expresses by institutional partners and stakeholders?
 |  |  |  |
| **Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?**  |
|  | * To what extent are key stakeholders/final beneficiaries satisfied with the benefits generated by the projects?
 |  |  |  |

Annex D: Rating Scales

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution*** | ***Sustainability ratings:***  | ***Relevance ratings*** |
| 6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings 5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS)3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems | 4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability | 2. Relevant (R) |
| 3. Moderately Likely (ML):moderate risks | 1.. Not relevant (NR) |
| 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks1. Unlikely (U): severe risks | ***Impact Ratings:***3. Significant (S)2. Minimal (M)1. Negligible (N) |
| *Additional ratings where relevant:*Not Applicable (N/A) Unable to Assess (U/A |

Annex E: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form

**Evaluators:**

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

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form[[8]](#footnote-8)**

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

**Name of Consultant:** \_\_     \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Name of Consultancy Organization** (where relevant)**:** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.**

Signed at *place* on *date*

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

Annex F: Evaluation Report Outline[[9]](#footnote-9)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **i.** | Opening page:* Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
* UNDP and GEF project ID#s.
* Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report
* Region and countries included in the project
* GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program
* Implementing Partner and other project partners
* Evaluation team members
* Acknowledgements
 |
| **ii.** | Executive Summary* Project Summary Table
* Project Description (brief)
* Evaluation Rating Table
* Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons
 |
| **iii.** | Acronyms and Abbreviations(See: UNDP Editorial Manual[[10]](#footnote-10)) |
| **1.** | Introduction* Purpose of the evaluation
* Scope & Methodology
* Structure of the evaluation report
 |
| **2.** | Project description and development context* Project start and duration
* Problems that the project sought to address
* Immediate and development objectives of the project
* Baseline Indicators established
* Main stakeholders
* Expected Results
 |
| **3.** | Findings (In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) must be rated[[11]](#footnote-11))  |
| **3.1** | Project Design / Formulation* Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)
* Assumptions and Risks
* Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design
* Planned stakeholder participation
* Replication approach
* UNDP comparative advantage
* Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
* Management arrangements
 |
| **3.2** | Project Implementation* Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
* Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)
* Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management
* Project Finance:
* Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (\*)
* UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (\*) coordination, and operational issues
 |
| **3.3** | Project Results* Overall results (attainment of objectives) (\*)
* Relevance(\*)
* Effectiveness & Efficiency (\*)
* Country ownership
* Mainstreaming
* Sustainability (\*)
* Impact
 |
| **4.**  | Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons* Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
* Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
* Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
* Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success
 |
| **5.**  | Annexes* ToR
* Itinerary
* List of persons interviewed
* Summary of field visits
* List of documents reviewed
* Evaluation Question Matrix
* Questionnaire used and summary of results
* Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form
 |

Annex G: Evaluation Report Clearance Form

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

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

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

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

UNDP GEF RTA

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

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

1. <https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meeting> documents/C.31.12\_Operational\_Guidelines\_for\_Incremental\_Costs\_4.pdf [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](http://www.undp.org/evaluation/handbook), Chapter 7, pg. 163 [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office:  [ROTI Handbook 2009](http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/M2_ROtI%20Handbook.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. <https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx> [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. <http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc> [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. *Objective (Atlas output) monitored quarterly ERBM and annually in APR/PIR* [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. *All outcomes monitored annually in the APR/PIR. It is highly recommended not to have more than 4 outcomes.* [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)