

Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference

Project No.: 00094106

Project Title: "Conservation of Ecuadorian Amphibian Biodiversity and Sustainable Use of its Genetic Resources"

Functional Title: Consultant for Independent Terminal Evaluation

Contract Type: Individual Consultant

Location: Quito - Ecuador

Duration: 60 days

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 **Conservation of Ecuadorian Amphibian Biodiversity and Sustainable Use of its Genetic Resources (PIMS #.5314)**

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

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	Conservation of Ecuadorian Amphibian Biodiversity and Sustainable Use of its Genetic Resources			
GEF Project ID:			<i>at endorsement (Million US\$)</i>	<i>at completion (Million US \$)</i>
UNDP Project ID:	00094106	GEF Financing:	2.726.908	2.726.908
Country	Ecuador	IA / AE own:		
Region:	LAC	Government:	9.160.380	9.160.380
Focal Area:	Environment and energy	Other:	5.055.744	5.055.744
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	Ecuador will be able to implement integrated emergency actions to conserve Ecuadorean amphibian diversity and use its genetic resources in a sustainable way. The three principal outcomes	Total co-financing:	14.216.124	14.216.124

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

	<p>expected from the project are: 1. Emergency actions to ensure the survival of endangered amphibian species of Ecuador for conservation and bio-prospecting purposes; 2. Discovery of active compounds derived from the skin secretions of Ecuadorian amphibians with potential applications in biomedicine; 3. Institutional strengthening for the implementation of biodiversity conservation measures and sustainable use of genetic resources in Ecuador, using amphibians as a pilot case study.</p>			
Executing Agency:	UNDP	Total expenditure of the project:	16.943.032	16.943.032
Other partners involved:	<p>Ministry of Environment Otonga Foundation Research Center, AMARU Biopark, ETAPA Municipal Telecommunications, Water and Sewerage Company of Cuenca, Decentralized Autonomous Government of Carchi, Decentralized Autonomous Government of Guayas. Ikiam University</p>	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		July 10, 2015
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: September, 2020	Actual: May, 2020

OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The project was designed to: Eliminate barriers and ensure long-term conservation of the country's biodiversity. The goal of the project is to safeguard Ecuador's globally significant biodiversity by building capacity in accessing its genetic resources and sharing the benefits, and at the same time improve the

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

sustainability of the protected areas system by strengthening the reserves of the decentralized autonomous governments (GAD).

The overall objective of the PARG project in the long term is the conservation of the biological and genetic resources of Ecuadorian amphibians at high risk of extinction, through an integrated strategy that links: i) *in situ* conservation actions (habitat protection); ii) *ex situ* conservation actions (the creation of a Life Bank that preserves specimens of genetic material, skin molecules, and germ cells and that raises genetically viable colonies of species in the laboratory); iii) multidisciplinary and cooperative research to discover active compounds derived from the skin secretions of Ecuadorian amphibians with potential applications in biomedicine; iv) monitoring species at high risk of extinction; and, v) institutional strengthening for the implementation of biodiversity conservation measures and the sustainable use of genetic resources in Ecuador, using amphibians as a pilot study case. Collectively, these actions will define the integrated approach required to launch a consolidated ABS framework in Ecuador.

The overall outcome of the project and the expected outcome of the UNPD Country Program both affirm that "Up to the year 2018 [the project] has contributed to strengthening institutional and civic capacities to promote the rights of nature, to create conditions for sustainable development and to improve resilience and risk management against the effects of climate change and disasters of natural and anthropic origin".

The main outcome for Environment and Sustainable Development from the UNDP Strategic Plan 2015 - 2019 establishes "inclusive and sustainable growth and development that incorporates production capacities to generate employment and a better lifestyle for the poor and excluded". The secondary outcome for Environment and Sustainable Development from the UNDP Strategic Plan states that "countries reduce the likelihood of conflict and reduce the risk from natural disasters, including climate change".

The strategies for the expected products from the UNDP Country Program Action Plan, plans, and budget instruments are formulated and applied focused on priority groups, with special emphasis on those affected by gender inequality, the conservation and sustainable management of natural resources, ecosystem goods and services, climate change, promulgation of resilience, dissemination of sustainable energy alternatives and proper handling of chemicals and contaminants.

The objective of the project is to enable Ecuador to implement integrated emergency actions for conserving the diversity of amphibians in Ecuador and to use its genetic resources in a sustainable way. The three principal expected results of the project, related to its three components of conservation, research and institutional strengthening, are: 1. Emergency actions to guarantee the survival of Ecuadorian amphibian species that are in danger of extinction, for the purposes of conservation and bioprospecting; 2. The discovery of active compounds, derived from the skin secretions of Ecuadorian amphibians, that possess potential applications in biomedicine; and 3. Institutional strengthening for the implementation of biodiversity conservation measures and the sustainable use of genetic resources in Ecuador, using amphibians as a pilot study case.

The resources allocated to the project by GEF reach US \$2,726,908 which, together with cash and in-kind counterpart resources, total US \$16,943,032, to be expended until May 2020.

In the PRODOC (p. 65, paragraph 196), it is stated that "as implementing agency of the GEF, UNDP will ultimately be responsible for delivering the results, which are subject to certification by MAE as the

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

Principal Implementing Entity. UNDP will provide the project cycle management services defined by the GEF Council, which include the following:

- 1) Provide financial and auditing services for the project,
- 2) Supervise the project's budgetary expenditures,
- 3) Guarantee that project activities, including procurement and financial services, are carried out in strict compliance with UNDP-GEF procedures,
- 4) Ensure that the provisioning of information to the GEF is performed in accordance with GEF requirements and procedures,
- 5) Facilitate the learning process, exchange and dissemination within the GEF family,
- 6) Contract the intermediate and final evaluations of the project, and conduct additional evaluations and/or reviews when necessary and in consultation with the counterparts of the project.

In the same document (p. 71, paragraph 254 and 255), it is noted that: " An independent Final Evaluation will take place three months prior to the final Project Board meeting and will be undertaken in accordance with UNDP and GEF guidance. The final evaluation will focus on the delivery of the project's results as initially planned (and as corrected after the mid-term evaluation, if any such correction took place). The final evaluation will look at impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental benefits/goals. The Terms of Reference for this evaluation will be prepared by the UNDP CO based on guidance from the Regional Coordinating Unit and UNDP-GEF.

The Terminal Evaluation should also provide recommendations for follow-up activities and requires a management response which should be uploaded to PIMS and to the [UNDP Evaluation Office Evaluation Resource Center \(ERC\)](#). The relevant GEF Focal Area Tracking Tools will also be completed during the final evaluation.

With these background, the Ministry of the Environment of Ecuador, through the Undersecretary of Natural Heritage – National Biodiversity Directorate, main implementing entity of the project "Conservation of Ecuadorian Amphibian Biodiversity and Sustainable Use of its Genetic Resources"– PARG, with the support of the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) as implementing agency of the Global Environment Facility (GEF), requires hiring a consultancy to perform the final evaluation of the PARG project, from the beginning of the project (October 2015), until the final-date of its execution.

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.

EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

An overall approach and method¹, 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

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

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 ([fill in 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 point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a virtual mission with all the counterparts in Quito and provinces of Carchi, Guayas and Azuay, including the following project sites: Acus Microcuenca del Río Chinambí (Carchi), APPC San Miguel (Guayas), Parque Nacional Cajas (Azuay), Centro Jambatu (Quito), Bioparque Amaru (Cuenca) and Bellavista (Quito). Interviews will be held virtually with at least the following organizations and individuals: (Ministry of the Environment of Ecuador (MAE), Secretary of Higher Education, Science, Technology and Innovation (SENESCYT), National Biodiversity Institute (INABIO), National Intellectual Rights Service (SENADI), Amazonian Regional University IKIAM, Decentralized Autonomous Governments (GAD Carchi and GAD Guayas), Municipal Public Telecommunications, Water, Sewerage and Sanitation Company (ETAPA EP), Otonga Foundation and Jambatu Center, Amaru Amphibian Rescue Center,; as well as other institutions, senior officials and managerial staff, technical and task team/component leaders, key experts and the consultants in the subject area, members of the project’s board of directors, academia, local governments and civil society organizations, etc.

Additionally, the consultant is expected to conduct virtual missions and meetings with officials and/or technical/specialist teams according to the following table:

Institution / actor	Location	Number of meetings
PARG Project	Quito	3
UNDP	Quito	2
Ministry of the Environment of Ecuador (MAE)	Quito	1
Secretary of Higher Education, Science, Technology and Innovation (SENESCYT),	Quito	1
National Biodiversity Institute (INABIO)	Quito	1
National Intellectual Rights Service (SENADI)	Quito	1
Amazonian Regional University IKIAM	Tena	1
Decentralized Autonomous Government (GAD) Carchi	Tulcán	1
Decentralized Autonomous Government (GAD) Guayas	Guayaquil	1

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

Municipal Public Telecommunications, Water and Sewerage Company (EP ETAPA)	Cuenca	1
Otonga Foundation	Quito	1
Amaru Amphibian Rescue Center	Cuenca	1
President of the Community of Chinambí and President of the community of San Jacinto	Carchi	1
Presidents of the Community of San Miguel.	San Miguel Cantón Naranjal	1
Bellavista Promotor	Quito	1

In addition, the consultant is expected to perform virtual missions in Pichincha, Azuay, Carchi, and Guayas to carry out field observations in the project's intervention areas, according to the following table:

Area of intervention	Province	City	Duration of visit
Otonga Foundation / Jambatu Center	Pichincha	Sangolquí	1 morning
Cajas National Park (PNC)	Azuay	Cuenca	2 days
Chinambí	Carchi	Tulcán	2 days
San Miguel	Guayas	Guayaquil	2 days

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information including all Global ABS documentation, 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.

EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see [Annex A](#)), 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](#).

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

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 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 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

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

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.¹

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 evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in **Ecuador**. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation consultant. Please note, that all travel and related expenses to field visits need to be excluded in the financial proposal, because of covi-19 situation all meetings will be done virtual. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the TR will be approximately 60 days and shall not exceed 3 months from when the consultant is hired.

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Contract signing		April 1st, 2020
Preparation	05 days	April 6, 2020
Evaluation Mission	20 days	April 21, 2020
Draft Evaluation Report	20 days	May 6, 2020
Final Report	15 days	May 16, 2020

These are tentative dates. MAE and UNDP will send comments on deliverables within 8 business days after their reception.

EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluation consultant is expected to deliver the following:

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](#)

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

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
Inception Report	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission.	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
Presentation	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission	To project management, UNDP CO
Draft Final Report	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs
Final Report*	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Approved by the Steering Committee before being sent to CO to upload it to the 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, also delivering the management response matrix.

CONSULTANT PROFILE

The consultant shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The selection of the consultant will be done following the next criteria:

Education

- Master's degree in environmental sciences, biology, social sciences or economics.
- Undergraduate degree in science, economics, administration, or similar fields.
- Fluency in reading, speaking and writing Spanish and English.

General experience:

- Work experience in the area of biological sciences of at least 10 years.
 - Recent experience of at least five (5) years on result-based management evaluation methodologies.

Specific experience:

- Experience in at least one (1) process applying SMART indicators and reconstructing and validating baseline scenarios in the last five years.
- Verifiable experience of participation in at least two (2) UNDP or GEF project evaluation processes, either midterm or final reviews, in the last five years.

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

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

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

%	Milestone
20%	Upon approval of Inception Report as an advance to cover costs of administration.
30%	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

EVALUATION CRITERIA

Technical proposals (CV and technical offer) will weight a maximum of 70% and only the consultants that meet the technical phase with a minimum score of 50/70 or more, will continue to the review of economic proposal, which will weight a maximum of 30%.

The evaluation criteria are the following:

<i>Rating parameter</i>	<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Score</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
CV	Knowledge:		30%
	University degree in environmental sciences, biology, social sciences or economics.	10	
	Undergraduate degree in science, economics, administration, or similar fields.	5	
	Fluency in reading, speaking and writing Spanish and English.	10	
	General experience:		
	Work experience in relevant technical areas (biology) of at least 10 years	15	
	Recent experience of at least five (5) years on result - based management evaluation methodologies.	10	
	Specific experience:		
Experience in at least one (1) process applying SMART indicators and reconstructing and validating baseline scenarios in the last five years.	40		

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

Rating parameter	Criteria	Score	Percentage
	Verifiable experience of participation in at least two (2) UNDP or GEF project evaluation processes, either midterm or final reviews, in the last five years.	10	
	TOTAL:	100	
Technical Proposal	Methodology, agenda and implementation schedule:		
	How much the offeror understands the nature of the work and conforms to the Terms of Reference?	25	40%
	Does the offeror's portfolio demonstrate experience in the development and elaboration of products similar to those described in the ToRs?	25	
	Is the methodology, established to achieve the products defined for the consultancy, described in depth?	20	
	Is the methodology adequate to achieve the products defined for the consultancy?	15	
	Has a clear presentation been made? Is the sequence of activities and their planning logical and realistic? Does it lead to an efficient implementation of the consulting objective?	15	
	TOTAL:	100	

Economic proposal	Score	Percentage
<p>The highest score (30%) will be awarded to the most economical offer and the inverse proportional to the other offers.</p> <p>Only the technical proposal that meet the technical phase with a minimum score of 50/70 or more, will continue to the review of economic proposal, which will weight a maximum of 30%.</p>	100	30%

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

ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Objective	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Means of Verification	Risks & Assumptions
Project Objective: Ecuador implements integrated emergency actions to conserve the diversity of amphibians of Ecuador and use its genetic resources in a sustainable way	1. Increase in additional hectares of habitat critical for conservation of target amphibian species that is under legal protection thereby closing conservation gaps.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 ha of <i>humid premontane forest</i> conserved in GAD reserves Conservation gap is 8,328 hectares² 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2,200 ha <i>humid premontane forest</i> conserved in GAD reserves Conservation gap reduced by 25% 	Creation ordinance of new Protected Areas (PAs)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Search & rescue of sufficient individuals of each gender
	2. Replication of in <i>situ</i> amphibian conservation measures tested by project further reducing conservation gaps	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 PA within SNAP 0 Socio Bosque 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 1 PA within SNAP At least 1 Socio Bosque (hectares to be measured once replication sites determined) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project reports Management plans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rescued individuals remain healthy in captivity
	3. Number of amphibian species on updated IUCN red list <ul style="list-style-type: none"> under successful captive breeding with cryopreserved sperm samples viable for reproductive with skins or secretions preserved in the Ecuadorian Amphibian Genome Bank (EAGB) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18 rescued and maintained <i>ex situ</i> 0 species 0 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 20 rescued and under successful captive breeding programmes At least 1 sample from 2 target species Approx. 70 (40%) 	Centro Jambatu & Amaru websites PA reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relevant governments entities continue to show willingness to adopt policy measures for amphibian conservation
	4. Increase in the flow of resources to amphibian conservation/ABS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TBD –based on the findings of the case study and economic valuation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 10% increase from case study base line By midterm case study and baselines established 	Case study report and annual budgets of relevant institutions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Capacity strengthening efforts in MAE continue including the completion of the centralized data management system and necessary policies to ensure the
	5. Degree of compliance in environmental licensing with regards to official guidelines on amphibian conservation in sites prioritized in the National Strategic Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 100% once official By mid-term guidelines defined By Year 4 guidelines made official in secondary Norm 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MAE reports and audits Guidelines Ministerial accord 	
	6. % Reduction in processing times for Collection Permits, Framework Contracts, and Access Contracts	<u>Processing times:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collection Permits: 2 weeks to 6 months. Framework Contracts: 2 	<u>Processing times:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collection Permits: 1 week Framework Contracts: 1 month 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Genetic Resources Module published online via SUIA portal Approval reports 	

² A gap analysis of critical habitat covered within the Natural Protected Areas Heritage of Ecuador (PANE) calculates that 8,328 hectares of critical habitat to the project's target species (*A. balios*, *A. coynei* and *Atelopus sp. aff. longirostris*) are unprotected.

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

Objective	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Means of Verification	Risks & Assumptions
		months • Access Contracts: more than 2 years	• Access Contracts: in compliance with established Norm (approx. 6 months)	of Collection Permits, and Contracts	exchange of information online
Outcome 1. Emergency actions to ensure the survival of highly endangered amphibian species of Ecuador for conservation and bio-prospecting purposes	7. # of protected areas and hectares of habitat critical for amphibians with specific conservation measures for highly endangered amphibian species legally-recognized and integrated in the SNAP.	• 0 Provincial GAD reserves declared with focus on amphibian conservation • 0 Management Plans include amphibian conservation measures.	• 2 Provincial GAD reserves declared with focus on amphibian conservation: - Carchi PA (1400 ha) - Guayas PA (800 ha) • 3 Management Plans covering total of 2,961 ha. Critical Habitat include amphibian conservation measures: Carchi PA; Guayas PA and Cajas NP (761 hectares)	• Creation ordinances of new PAs • Management Plans with Financial Sustainability Programs • SNAP reports	• Provinces continue to show interest and political will to declare reserves, and complete requirements for formal integration into the SNAP.
	8. Increase in management effectiveness of 3 legally-recognized PAs with conservation measures for highly endangered amphibian species (METT)	METT Score • Carchi PA: 0 • Guayas PA: 0 • Cajas NP: 62	METT Score • Carchi PA: TBD • Guayas PA: TBD • Cajas NP: 82	• METT applied at midterm and end project	• Conservation interventions have a positive impact on PAs and their management
	9. Successful captive breeding programmes measured by: • # of reproductive events (egg mass) of target species • % survival of rescued individuals in captivity	• <u># reproductive events</u> - <i>Atelopus nanay</i> : 2 - <i>A.sp. aff palmatus</i> 0 - <i>Dendrobates condor</i> : 0 • <u>%survival</u> - <i>Atelopus nanay</i> : 66% - <i>sp. aff. palmatus</i> : 0% - <i>Dendrobates condor</i> : 0%	• <u># reproductive events</u> - <i>Atelopus nanay</i> : 22 - <i>A.sp. aff. palmatus</i> : 20 - <i>Dendrobates condor</i> :20 • <u>%survival</u> - <i>Atelopus nanay</i> : 80% - <i>A. sp. aff. palmatus</i> : 80% - <i>Dendrobates condor</i> : 80%	Centro Jambatu & Amaru reports and websites	• Collection permits granted within established time frames • Rescued individuals remain healthy in captivity
Output 1.1 <i>Ex situ</i> conservation through breeding actions to protect highly endangered amphibian species					
Output 1.2 <i>In situ</i> conservation of critical habitats of unique species at high risk of extinction, <i>Atelopus coynei</i> , <i>Atelopus balius</i> , <i>Atelopus sp.</i> (<i>Aff. longirostris</i>), in Decentralized Autonomous Governments (GAD) reserves and <i>Atelopus nanay</i> in one existing PANE area.					

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

Objective	Indicator	Baseline					Target					Means of Verification	Risks & Assumptions
Outcome 2. Discovery of active compounds derived from the skin secretion of Ecuadorian amphibians with potential applications in biomedicine	10. Active compounds ³ isolated and structurally characterized (peptides and natural proteins sequenced) from the skin secretions of 4 amphibians: 1= <i>Agalychnis spurelli</i> 2= <i>Cruziohylla calcarifer</i> 3= <i>Hypsiboas picturatus</i> 4= <i>Atelopus nanay</i>		1	2	3	4		1	2	3	4	Laboratory reports, publications Laboratory reports, publications Scholarship documents Reports generated by laboratory Publications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Permits and contracts granted for collection and exportation of specimens and samples within established time frames Availability of sufficient samples of secretions to perform analyses Synthetic peptides have biological activity and resemble natural peptides Sufficient qualified candidates for scholarships Availability of biological material.
		A	1*	1*	0	0	A	25	25	25	1		
		B	0	0	0	0	B	4	4	1	1		
		A= Active compound isolated and characterized by mass spectrometry (*insulin tropic peptide) B= New peptides molecularly characterized (sequence of amino acids) by molecular cloning and sequencing by mass spectrometry											
	11. # of new peptides synthesized and pharmacologically tested from the skin secretions of 4 amphibian species	2					4						
	12. # of students with Senescyt scholarships pursuing graduate studies in amphibian bio-prospecting	1 Student					At least 5 Students						
	13. Ecuadorian bio-prospecting laboratory equipped with appropriate technology and conducting research on amphibian bio-prospecting	0					At least 1						
	14. # of publications in peer review scientific journals on bio-prospecting research on amphibian skin secretions by Ecuadorian Institutions	0					10						

³ In this context an active compound is synonymous with peptide or protein.

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

Objective	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Means of Verification	Risks & Assumptions
	15. % Ecuadorian amphibian species ⁴ with tissues preserved in the Ecuadorian Amphibian Genome Bank (EAGB)	0%	50%	Genome Bank catalog accessible on Centro Jambatu's webpage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Timely availability of equipment and materials
<p>Output 2.1 Institutional procedures completed to foster amphibian bio-prospecting research</p> <p>Output 2.2 Research on skin secretions for new peptides with bioactive properties from four species of Ecuadorian amphibians</p> <p>Output 2.3 Technical and scientific capabilities for bio-prospecting improved in Ecuador</p> <p>Output 2.4 BioBanking of genetic resources of Ecuadorian amphibians strengthened</p>					
Outcome 3. Institutional strengthening for the implementation of biodiversity conservation measures and sustainable use of its genetic resources in Ecuador, using amphibians as a pilot case study.	16. Strengthened policy and regulations measured by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> % implementation of the Strategic Action Plan for Conservation of Ecuadorian Amphibians Nagoya Protocol ratified Regulation 905 aligned with national, sub-regional and international legislation⁵ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0% (draft Strategic Plan, no Action Plan) Nagoya Protocol signed and under discussion in National Assembly Regulation 905 not aligned 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 20% implementation by MAE of Action Plan (plan approved by Midterm) Nagoya Protocol ratified Regulation 905 updated and aligned 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strategic Plan and Action Plan MAE work plans include components of Action Plan Ratification of Nagoya Protocol Updated/aligned Regulation 905 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government continues to show political will to align regulatory framework for genetic resources and ABS with national, sub-regional and international regulations. Training programmes are institutionalized and staff increased
	17. Improved capacities of national ABS implementing agencies, measured by the ABS Capacity Development Scorecard	ABS Capacity Development Scorecard: 35 3 areas to improve: CR 1: 3 ⁶	ABS Capacity Development Scorecard: 49 3 areas improved CR 1: 6	ABS Scorecard	

⁴ As of January 2015, 546 amphibian species have been recorded in Ecuador, distributed across three groups: Anuros (represented by frogs and toads) comprise 514 species, Salamanders (Caudata order) comprise 8 species, and Caecilians (Gymnophiona order) comprise 24 species.

⁵ e.g. National Plan for Good Living, Decree 391, Nagoya Protocol, ITPGR, CONVEMAR

⁶ CR 1: 3 Capacity to conceptualize and formulate policies, laws, strategies and programmes;

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

Objective	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Means of Verification	Risks & Assumptions
		CR2: 14 CR5: 7 - <u>Capacity to conceptualize:</u> The institution(s) has financial resources but has limited personnel and expertise. - <u>Capacity to Apply:</u> The ABS institution(s) has weak leadership and provides little guidance. - <u>Capacity to Monitor:</u> The institution(s) has financial resources but has limited personnel and expertise 0% - Genetic Resources Permit Module does not exist in the National Environmental Data base (SUIA)	CR2: 19 CR5: 13 <u>Capacity to conceptualize:</u> - Increased capacity to conceptualize policy and related instruments for ABS, in particular to ensure the rules are more efficient and clearer. <u>Capacity to Apply</u> - ABS decision-making Institutions have expanded knowledge on ABS issues and ability to act on it. <u>Capacity to Monitor:</u> - Improved capacities of ABS Institutions to execute, monitor and evaluate requests for access to genetic resources 100% - SUIA Genetic Resources Permit Module established and producing quality updated reports.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approval of the norm that defines the procedures for Access Contract for Genetic Resources The MAE completes the centralized data management system and necessary policies to ensure the exchange of information online.
	18. % Reduction in processing times for Collection Permits, Framework Contracts, and Access Contracts	Processing times: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collection Permits: 2 weeks to 6 months. Framework Contracts: 2 months Access Contracts: more than 2 years 	Processing times: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collection Permits: 1 week Framework Contracts: 1 month Access Contracts: in compliance with established Norm (approx. 6 months) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Genetic Resources Module published online via SUIA portal Approval reports of Collection Permits, and Contracts 	
	19. Increase in awareness on	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ABS-CH website does 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > 5% annual increase once 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ABS-CH website 	

CR2: 14 Capacity to implement policies, legislation, strategies and programmes;

CR5: 7 Capacity to monitor, evaluate, report and learn

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

Objective	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Means of Verification	Risks & Assumptions
	amphibian conservation as measured by <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase in users accessing ABS-CH Platform • Increase in records of amphibians from unofficial sources 	not have a user counter <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 317 records of 107 species from 40 members of the Science Citizen portal 	interconnected platform established <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • > 5% annual increase once interconnected platform established and connected to Science Citizen portal 	online <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amphibian factsheets available online via ABS-CH portal and Centro Jambatu website 	
<p>Output 3.1. National and local frameworks aligned for conservation and sustainable use of genetic resources of amphibians</p> <p>Output 3.2 Improved capacities of National Competent Authority and related agencies on ABS, including procedures and Prior Informed Consent & Mutually Agreed Terms</p> <p>Output 3.3 National information improved and available for effective decision making on protection and sustainable use of genetic resources of endangered amphibians</p>					

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

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. Mid Term 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 (specific TT's for this project's focal area)
10. Oversight mission reports
11. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
12. Financial and Administration guidelines used by project Team
13. ProDoc – Global ABS Project
14. Nagoya Protocol
15. Community protocols

The following documents will also be available:

16. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
17. UNDP country programme document(s)
18. Minutes of the *Conservation of Ecuadorian Amphibian Biodiversity and Sustainable Use of its Genetic Resources - PARG* Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
19. Project site location maps.

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

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
Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at 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 results?		
•	•	•
•	•	•
•	•	•
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and improved environmental status?		
•	•	•
•	•	•

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

ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

<p>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution</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>Sustainability ratings:</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>Relevance ratings</p> <p>2. Relevant (R) 1.. Not relevant (NR)</p> <p>Impact Ratings:</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>		

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

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.

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

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form⁷

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: _____

⁷www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

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

ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE⁸

- 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 Manual⁹)
 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

⁸The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

⁹ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

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

(In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (*) must be rated¹⁰)

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

¹⁰ 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.

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

- 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

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

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: _____

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