

Terms of Reference

Terminal Evaluation of the Project:

“Conservation, sustainable use of biodiversity, and maintenance of ecosystem services in protected wetlands of international importance”

I. INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full- and medium-sized UNDP-supported GEF-financed projects are required to undergo a Terminal Evaluation (TE) at the end of the project. This Terms of Reference (ToR) sets out the expectations for the TE of the full-sized project titled “Conservation, sustainable use of biodiversity, and maintenance of ecosystem services in protected wetlands of international importance” (PIMS 5257) implemented through the Ministry of the Environment and Natural Resources (MARN). The project started on July 12th, 2016 and is in its 4th year of implementation. The TE process must follow the guidance outlined in the document [‘Guidance For Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects’](#).

1. PROJECT BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT`

The project, Conservation, Sustainable Use of Biodiversity and Maintenance of Ecosystem Services in Protected Wetlands of International Importance was developed to support the implementation of the national biodiversity strategy. It is funded with a Global Environment Facility (GEF) grant of US\$2,191,781.00. The project responds to the GEF biodiversity strategy and the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) Conference of the Parties (COP) mandate, as well as the United Nations Development Assistance Fund (UNDAF) 2016–2021

The project is implemented in three wetlands of international importance located in the eastern part of El Salvador: Olomega Lagoon, El Jocotal Lagoon and Jiquilisco Bay, with specific interventions in the protected wetlands of international importance (PWII) Jaltepeque Complex, the Gulf of Fonseca and Cerrón Grande Reservoir.

The project strategy has two outcomes (components): the extension of the national system of protected areas in the wetlands; and the management and control of threats by pollution and invasive species. These two outcomes are to be achieved through 18 outputs leading to the achievement of the project’s four main objectives:

- To increase the coverage of the protected areas to 37,710 ha, including the marine waters adjacent to the wetlands.

- To increase the management effectiveness score by 10 per cent in the wetlands of international importance of Jocotal and Olomega Lagoons and Jiquilisco Bay.

- To achieve stability of populations of four threatened species and one of economic relevance.

- To increase the financial sustainability score by 100 per cent for Jocotal, Jiquilisco and Olomega.

In March 2014, the GEF approved the project concept. The preparation phase was developed between May 2014 and December 2015, when the ProDoc was approved by the GEF Board. The implementation of the project began in 2016. The start-up workshop took place in November 2016. The mid term review (MTR) was conducted in March 2019. The project was originally scheduled to end between April and June of 2020. As recommended by the MTR an extension was granted to end between June and September 2021. The total budget amounts to US\$ 11,106,447.55 (US\$2,191,781.00 from GEF; and US\$8,066,666.55 from co-financing)

The project is implemented under the national implementation modality (NIM) of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). The Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources (MARN¹) is the implementing partner and is accountable for project's results. The Project Board is chaired by the MARN, with the participation of UNDP and the Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock (MAG), which includes the fisheries authority. The MAG had a key role in the project given its agricultural and fisheries components. In addition, an advisory body composed of the MAG, the Ministry of Tourism (MITUR) and the Environmental Investment Fund for El Salvador (FIAES), would have to be established.

The UNDP responsibilities include the disbursement and accountability of project funds (according to annual work plans) and quality control. UNDP carries out its responsibilities through its Country Office and its Regional Coordination Unit (RCU).

The project management structure is flexible to adapt to possible changes during the implementation of the project. The project coordinator, hired by MARN, manages the project on daily basis and to ensure the achievement of the expected products complying with the required quality standards and within the established time limitations.

The project coordinates activities with other initiatives related to wetlands, including: the *Call To Action of FIAES* in 2012 to finance activities to solve environmental issues in wetlands of international importance; the National Program for the Restoration of the Ecosystem and Landscapes of MARN, in particular for the management of micro-wetlands in the lower part of the *Rio Grande de San Miguel* basin; the Water Fund project (Spanish Agency for International Development Cooperation -AECID), for the restoration of mangroves, the management of micro-wetlands related to this hydrographic basin, and the acquisition of a barge to mechanically extract the Hyacinth from water from affected HPIL; and with the initiative financed by JICA (2015) for the sustainable management of the Protected Wetlands of International Importance (PWII) *Laguna de Olomega* and *Laguna El Jocotal*.

The project was born as a solution to the multiple threats of the PWII of El Salvador and its biodiversity.

Despite of the limited territorial extension, the country has numerous wetlands of regional and global importance, including six marine-coastal and inland wetlands of international importance, or RAMSAR sites. El Salvador's wetlands provide numerous ecosystem services, such as habitat for biodiversity, carbon storage, provision of food, wood and firewood, recreation and scenic beauty, and flood control and storm protection. El Salvador's coastal-marine wetlands include important mangrove areas in northern Central America, as well as various types of inland lakes.

Since 1950, it is estimated that the mangrove forest area has decreased by 100,000 ha. in the 1950s to about 40,000 ha. at present, leading the loss of a significant amount of habitat for highly vulnerable species and a wide range of biodiversity.

The main threats to PWII and their biodiversity include: a) the expansion of agricultural and livestock activities, including logging and burning, as well as the contamination and eutrophication of water bodies; b) the illegal transformation of wetlands due to the demand for land for housing, agricultural crops and grazing areas for livestock; c) the uncontrolled use of agrochemicals that cause eutrophication and contamination of wetlands due to discharges that also promote the development of algae and invasive plants at levels that literally suffocate the wetlands, therefore, affecting biodiversity, traditional fishing and other activities; d) the accumulation of solid waste generated in urban areas, which represents a threat to wildlife when they ingest toxic particles from the waste; e) the presence of invasive species; f) unsustainable extraction of resources, including fishing with destructive methods such as the use of explosives; g) floods related to climate change that cause the loss of forest cover, reduction of populations of threatened or endangered species, as well as the loss of human life, infrastructure and crops; and h) salinization of surface water due to the alteration of the hydrographic basins and the influence of the Pacific Ocean.

¹ As its acronym in Spanish

Before the COVID-19 Pandemy, the country has undergone significant changes in the recent years. The Salvadoran has had a moderate growth that has not exceeded 2.6 per cent of annual GDP since 2013. The slow economic growth implies a slow reduction in the incidence of poverty. Although poverty incidence fell by 6 points between 2015 and 2017, from 34.9 per cent to 29.2 per cent, almost 40 per cent of the rural population are poor. Emigration, mainly to the United States, remains an attractive option for a large part of the rural population. Since the beginning of the 2000s, the population has grown at a rate of 0.5 per cent per year. In the project's wetlands, the populations are clearly concentrated in the urban centers. The COVID-19 pandemic has hit and generated the entire world.

El Salvador, like many countries, established social distancing measures in March 2020, which lasted until August 2020. As in other places, the measures generated economic and social crises that have not yet been fully quantified. Although a slow and gradual recovery is expected between different sectors, at the macroeconomic level, possible transmission routes have already been indicated by which emerging economies may be affected.

Salvadoran society continues to be threatened by criminal violence. Although the incidence of the homicides has decreased significantly since 2015, when it reached 105 per 100,000 inhabitants. Despite the significant reduction in homicidal violence, it is important to remember that other unaddressed forms of violence persist in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic.

The MTR pointed out that the last municipal elections, held in March 2018, did not result in changes in the implementation of the project or in the work with the municipal environmental units, despite the victory of the opposing party. However, the presidential elections held in February 2019, disrupted the national political scene with the defeat of the two main national parties.

2. TE PURPOSE

Consistent with the UNDP Evaluation Guidelines, the evaluation is part of the UNDP Evaluation Plan for the period 2016-2021. As the project is entered in the final phase of implementation, the TE process is scheduled for the first semester of the year.

The TE report will assess the achievement of project results against what was expected to be achieved and draw lessons (lessons learned and successful practices) that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming. The TE report promotes accountability and transparency and assesses the extent of project accomplishments.

It is expected that the TE report will synthesize lessons that can help UNDP and its partners to improve the selection, design and implementation of future GEF-funded initiatives supported by UNDP.

3. TE APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

The TE report must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable, and useful.

The TE team will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure/SESP) the Project Document, project reports including annual PIRs, project budget revisions, lesson learned reports, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based evaluation. The TE team will review the baseline and midterm GEF focal area Core Indicators/Tracking Tools submitted to the GEF at the CEO endorsement and midterm stages and the terminal Core Indicators/Tracking Tools that must be completed before the TE field mission begins.

The TE approach will center on participatory and consultative process ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), Implementing Partners, the UNDP Country Office(s), the Regional Technical Advisor, direct beneficiaries and other stakeholders

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful TE. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to executing agencies, senior officials and task team/component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project beneficiaries, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. (See Annex C. Preliminary List of key stakeholders).

Additionally, the TE team is expected to conduct field missions, including the following project sites :

- PWII Jiquilisco bay (Montecristo Island-La Pita), Usulután
- PWII Olomega Lagoon, El Carmen, San Miguel/La Unión
- NPA La Unión Bay, La Unión.
- NPA Nancuchiname, Usulután
- NPA El Jocotal Lagoon, El Tránsito, San Miguel.

Data collection and analysis methods should be rigorously selected to produce reasonable empirical evidence to meet the evaluation criteria, answer the evaluation questions, and meet its purpose. It is expected to include a mix of qualitative and quantitative methods to ensure gender responsive evaluation methodology and analysis, credibility, relevance, and validity of the evaluation results.

The proposal should outline how various forms of evidence will be employed vis-à-vis each other to triangulate the information collected.

Methodologies for data collection may include:

Document review of all relevant sources of information.

Semi-structured interviews with key stakeholders

Surveys and questionnaires.

Field Visit and on-site

The Independent Evaluator is encouraged to employ innovative online data collection and analysis methods by taking advantage of diverse methods by which technology can be used to support the TE, such as on-line interviews and surveys, mobile data collection, on-line panels.

The specific design and methodology for the TE should emerge from consultations between the TE team and the above-mentioned parties regarding what is appropriate and feasible for meeting the TE purpose and objectives and answering the evaluation questions, given limitations of budget, time and data. The TE team must, however, use gender-responsive methodologies and tools and ensure that gender equality and women's empowerment, as well as other cross-cutting issues and SDGs are incorporated into the TE report.

The final methodological approach including the interview schedule, field visits and data to be used in the evaluation must be clearly outlined in the TE Inception Report and be fully discussed and agreed upon between UNDP, stakeholders and the TE team.

The final report must 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.

COVID-19 MEASURES

As of 11 March 2020, the World Health Organization (WHO) declared COVID-19 a global pandemic as the new coronavirus rapidly spread to all regions of the world. Even though travel to the country is not restricted at this time, due to the spread of the virus, it may not be possible to travel to or within the country for the TE mission; the TE team should develop a methodology that takes into account conducting the TE virtually and remotely, including the use of remote interview methods and extended desk reviews, data analysis, surveys and evaluation questionnaires. This should be detailed in the TE Inception Report and agreed with the Commissioning Unit.

If all or part of the TE is to be carried out virtually then consideration should be taken for stakeholder availability, ability or willingness to be interviewed remotely. In addition, their accessibility to the internet/computer may be an issue as many government and national counterparts may be working from home. These limitations must be reflected in the final TE report.

If a data collection/field mission is not possible then remote interviews may be undertaken through telephone or online (skype, zoom etc.). International consultants can work remotely with national support personnel in the field if it is safe for them to operate and travel. No stakeholders, consultants or UNDP staff should be put in harm's way and safety is the key priority.

A short validation mission may be considered if it is confirmed to be safe for staff, consultants, stakeholders and if such a mission is possible within the TE schedule. Equally, qualified, and independent national consultants can be hired to undertake the TE and interviews in the country as long as it is safe to do so.

4. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE TE

The TE will assess project performance against expectations set out in the project's Logical Framework/Results Framework (see ToR Annex A). The TE will assess results according to the criteria outlined in the [Guidance for TEs of UNDP-supported GEF-financed Projects](#).

The Evaluation will focus on expected and achieved accomplishments, critically examining the presumed causal chains, processes, and attainment of results, as well as the contextual factors that may enhance or impede the achievement of results. It will determine the relevance, impact, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the project, its contribution to Gender equality and Human Rights realization. It will be assessed to additional criteria as per GEF guidelines, including poverty and environment nexus, climate change mitigation and adaptation, capacity development, the results framework, progress to impact, monitoring and evaluation; UNPD oversight, Implementing partner execution, GEF additionality, Adaptive management, stakeholder engagement, financing and co-financing, Social and Environmental Standards.

The evaluation should assess how the project adapted to the new normality COVID-19.

The temporal scope is from October 2016 to June 2021 and it will comprise all components and activities. The TE will examine each criteria at three levels of analysis: design, implementation and results.

The Findings section of the TE report will cover the topics listed below (A full outline of the TE report's content is provided in ToR Annex D. The asterisk "*" indicates criteria for which a rating is required).

Findings

i. Project Design/Formulation

- National priorities and country driven needs
- Theory of Change
- Gender equality and women's empowerment
- Social and Environmental Safeguards
- Analysis of Results Framework: project logic and strategy, indicators
- Assumptions and Risks
- Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g. same focal area) incorporated into project design
- Planned stakeholder participation
- Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
- Management arrangements

ii. Project Implementation

- Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
- Actual stakeholder participation and partnership arrangements
- Project Finance and Co-finance
- Monitoring & Evaluation: design at entry (*), implementation (*), and overall assessment of M&E (*)
- Implementing Agency (UNDP) (*) and Executing Agency (*), overall project oversight/implementation and execution (*)
- Risk Management, including Social and Environmental Standards

iii. Project Results

- Assess the achievement of outcomes against indicators by reporting on the level of progress for each objective and outcome indicator at the time of the TE and noting final achievements
- Relevance (*), Effectiveness (*), Efficiency (*) and overall project outcome (*)
- Sustainability: financial (*), socio-political (*), institutional framework and governance (*), environmental (*), overall likelihood of sustainability (*)
- Country ownership
- Gender equality and women's empowerment
- Cross-cutting issues (poverty alleviation, climate change mitigation and adaptation, human rights, capacity development)
- GEF Additionality
- Catalytic Role / Replication Effect
- Progress to impact

Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons Learned

- The TE team will include a summary of the main findings of the TE report. Findings should be presented as statements of fact that are based on analysis of the data.
- The section on conclusions will be written in light of the findings. Conclusions should be comprehensive and balanced statements that are well substantiated by evidence and logically connected to the TE findings. They should highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project, respond to key evaluation questions and provide insights into the identification of and/or solutions to important problems or issues pertinent to project beneficiaries, UNDP and the GEF, including issues in relation to gender equality and women's empowerment.

- Recommendations should provide concrete, practical, feasible and targeted recommendations directed to the intended users of the evaluation about what actions to take and decisions to make. The recommendations should be specifically supported by the evidence and linked to the findings and conclusions around key questions addressed by the evaluation.
- The TE report should also include lessons that can be taken from the evaluation, including best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success that can provide knowledge gained from the particular circumstance (programmatic and evaluation methods used, partnerships, financial leveraging, etc.) that are applicable to other GEF and UNDP interventions. When possible, the TE team should include examples of good practices in project design and implementation.
- It is important for the conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned of the TE report to include results related to gender equality and empowerment of women.

The TE report will include an Evaluation Ratings Table, as shown below:

ToR Table 2: Evaluation Ratings Table for project “*Conservation, sustainable use of biodiversity, and maintenance of ecosystem services in protected wetlands of international importance*”

Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E)	Rating ²
M&E design at entry	
M&E Plan Implementation	
Overall Quality of M&E	
Implementation & Execution	Rating
Quality of UNDP Implementation/Oversight	
Quality of Implementing Partner Execution	
Overall quality of Implementation/Execution	
Assessment of Outcomes	Rating
Relevance	
Effectiveness	
Efficiency	
Overall Project Outcome Rating	
Sustainability	Rating
Financial resources	
Socio-political/economic	
Institutional framework and governance	
Environmental	
Overall Likelihood of Sustainability	

5. EVALUATION QUESTIONS

² Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution, Relevance are rated on a 6-point rating scale: 6 = Highly Satisfactory (HS), 5 = Satisfactory (S), 4 = Moderately Satisfactory (MS), 3 = Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), 2 = Unsatisfactory (U), 1 = Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). Sustainability is rated on a 4-point scale: 4 = Likely (L), 3 = Moderately Likely (ML), 2 = Moderately Unlikely (MU), 1 = Unlikely (U)

The evaluation questions to be answered are based on UNDP-Supported GEF financed projects criteria, and UN Assessment Group standards (including standards cross-cutting issues), which have been adapted to the context of the initiative to evaluate. The TE Independent Evaluator must adapt these questions and itemize them in their methodological proposal to gather evidence to address the topics required in the descriptive analysis (findings). The TE Independent Evaluator must complete the Evaluation matrix presented in Annex E. The TE Independent Evaluator must consider the three level of analysis (design, implementation, and results) as was described above).

Criteria	Main questions
Relevance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent are the project's objectives consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country needs, national priorities and policies, global priorities and partners' and GEF policies and priorities?
Effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? To what extent did the project contribute to the Country Programme outcomes and outputs, the SDGs, the UNDP Strategic Plan and Country Programme, GEF strategic priorities, and national development priorities? What factors have contributed to the achieving or not achieving intended outcomes and outputs? Could the project include alternative strategies? Has the project produced unintended results -positive or negative? If there are negative results, what mitigation activities are in place? To what extent the project has demonstrated: a) scaling up, b) replication, c) demonstration, and/or d) production of public good?
Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent has the project completed the planned activities and met or exceeded the expected outcomes in terms of achievement of global environmental and development objectives according to schedule, and as cost-effective as initially planned? To what extent were project funds and activities delivered in a timely manner?
Financing and co-financing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are there variances between planned and actual expenditures? What are the main reasons? To what extent did financial controls allow the project management to make informed decisions regarding the budget? How many resources have the project leveraged? How have they contributed to the project's ultimate objective?
Implementation, Oversight and execution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent has UNDP delivered effectively on activities related to project identification, concept preparation, appraisal, preparation of detailed proposal, approval and start-up, oversight, supervision, completion and evaluation? To what extent has the Implementing Partner effectively managed and administered the project's day-to-day activities? How was UNDP's overall oversight and supervision?
Sustainability and ownership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-political, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? Have been the country representatives (e.g., governmental official, civil society, etc.) actively involved in project identification, planning and/or implementation? Do they maintain commitment to the project and its results?

Criteria	Main questions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How have the implementing partner and UNDP contributed to ensure national ownership?
Contribution to impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?
Gender Equality and human rights	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How were gender and human rights considerations integrated in the project's design, including analysis, implementation plan, indicators, targets, budget, timeframe and responsible party? To what extent have the project contributed to gender equality, the empowerment of women and a human rights of disadvantaged or marginalized groups? To what extent did women, poor, indigenous, persons with disabilities, and other disadvantaged or marginalized groups participate and benefit from the project? Was the UNDP Gender Marker rating assigned to the project document realistic and backed by the findings of the gender analysis? Is there any potential negative impact on gender equality, women's empowerment, disadvantaged or marginalized groups? If so, what can be done to mitigate this?
Other cross-cutting issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How have the project activities contributed to poverty reduction and sustaining livelihoods? To what extent has the project contributed to better preparations to cope with disasters or mitigate risk, and/or addressed climate change mitigation and adaptation? To what extent has the project incorporated capacity development activities? Were results achieved?
Stakeholder engagement and partnership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent do project stakeholders share a common understanding and are involved in the decision-making process of the project? To what extent did stakeholder's participation mechanisms in place lead to empowerment and joint ownership of the project? What should be done better to increase their participation and engagement?
Results framework	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent the project's objectives and components are clear, practicable and feasible within its time frame? Was there a clearly defined and robust Theory of Change? Were the indicators in the Results Framework SMART?
Monitoring and evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent did the Monitoring systems allow the collection, analysis and use of information to track the project's progress, risks and opportunities toward reaching its objectives and to guide management decisions? Were the budget and responsibilities clearly identified and distributed?
Risk Management, Social and Environment Standards and Adaptive management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent were risks (both threats and opportunities) properly identified and managed? To what extent did the project maximized social and environmental opportunities and benefits and ensured that adverse social and environmental risks and impacts were avoided, minimized, mitigated, and managed? What "safeguards" did the project implement? Were the project's changes based on evidence? Were they properly managed?

Criteria	Main questions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How did the project adapt to the new normality COVID-19? Did the project contribute to minimizing the socioeconomic effects of the Pandemic?
GEF additionality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent has the project lead to additional outcomes? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Global Environmental Benefits Livelihood improvements and/or social benefits Innovation Additionality

6. TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the TE will be approximately 35 working days over a time period of 17 weeks starting on Apr 26, 2021. The tentative TE timeframe is as follows:

Timeframe	Activity
<i>March 31, 2021</i>	Application closes
<i>April 9, 2021</i>	Selection of TE team
<i>Apr 12 - -23, 2021</i>	Preparation period for TE team (handover of documentation)
<i>Apr 26 - May 7, 2021 (10 days)</i>	Document review and preparation of TE Inception Report
<i>May 17, 2021</i>	Finalization and Validation of TE Inception Report; the latest start of TE mission
<i>May 17-27 (10 days)</i>	TE mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits, etc.
<i>May 28, 2021</i>	Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings; earliest end of TE mission
<i>May 31-June 21 (15 days)</i>	Preparation of draft TE report
<i>June 21, 2021</i>	Circulation of draft TE report for comments
<i>June 25-30, 2021</i>	Incorporation of comments on draft TE report into Audit Trail & finalization of TE report
<i>July 7, 2021</i>	Preparation and Issuance of Management Response
<i>July 9, 2021</i>	Expected date of full TE completion

Options for site visits should be provided in the TE Inception Report.

7. TE DELIVERABLES

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	TE Inception Report	TE team clarifies objectives, methodology and timing of the TE	No later than 1 week before the TE mission: May 17 2021.	TE Independent Evaluator submits Inception Report in English to Commissioning Unit and project management
2	Presentation	Initial Findings	End of TE mission: May 28, 2021	TE Independent Evaluator presents to Commissioning Unit and project management. Presentation and

				discussion will be held in Spanish.
3	Draft TE Report	Full draft report (<i>using guidelines on report content in ToR Annex D</i>) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of end of TE mission: June 21, 2021	TE Independent Evaluator submits full draft report in English to Commissioning Unit; reviewed by BPPS-GEF RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFF.
5	Final TE Report* + Audit Trail	Revised final report and TE Audit trail in which the TE details how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final TE report (<i>See template in ToR Annex I</i>)	Within 1 week of receiving comments on draft report: June 30, 2021	TE Independent Evaluator submits both documents in English to the Commissioning Unit

*All final TE reports will be quality assessed by the UNDP Independent Evaluation Office (IEO). Details of the IEO's quality assessment of decentralized evaluations can be found in Section 6 of the UNDP Evaluation Guidelines.³

8. TE ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing the TE resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's TE is UNDP Country Office in El Salvador.

The Commissioning Unit will contract the TE Independent Evaluator and ensure the timely provision of travel arrangements within the country for the Evaluator. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the TE Independent Evaluator to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits. The Project Team will provide to the TE Independent Evaluator and updated stakeholder list with contact details (phone and email) in case the context does not allow to realize the field mission and/or remote/ virtual meetings are included in the technical proposal.

The TE Independent Evaluator is responsible to design, conduct and write the reports. All deliverables will be written in English. However, the field mission and interviews should be held in Spanish.

9. TE INDEPENDENT EVALUATOR

An independent Evaluator will conduct the TE. The TE Independent Evaluator has to have experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in Latin America and/or other regions; He/she will be responsible for the overall design of the methodology and writing of the Inception and TE reports. He/she will assess emerging trends with respect to regulatory frameworks, budget allocations, capacity building, work with the Project Team in developing the TE itinerary, etc. The TE Independent Evaluator can be accompanied by a support team member(s) to perform interviews, financial analysis, editing or other administrative tasks. These members won't be assessed to meet the characteristics presented in the requirements below.

³ Access at: <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/section-6.shtml>

The TE Independent Evaluator(s) cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation and/or implementation (including the writing of the project document), must not have conducted this project's Mid-Term Review and should not have a conflict of interest with the project's related activities.

The selection of the TE Independent Evaluator will be aimed at maximizing the overall "team" qualities in the following areas:

Requirements	Points
• <i>Recent experience with results-based management evaluation methodologies (at least five evaluations carried out in the last five years). Experience in project evaluation / review within the United Nations system will be additionally valued. (10 additional points for experience in project evaluation / review within the United Nations System)</i>	20 points
• <i>Work experience in evaluation, or project design in Latin America in at least two projects in areas of biodiversity, ecosystems, natural resources or similar (5 additional points for experience with remote evaluations)</i>	15 points
• <i>Work experience with the GEF or with evaluations carried out by this entity;</i>	10 points
• <i>Minimum of 10 years of professional experience in the relevant technical areas (environment, biodiversity, ecosystems, natural resources or similar);</i>	10 points
• <i>Demonstrated knowledge of issues related to gender and biodiversity management; (Experience in gender-sensitive evaluations and analysis will be valued).</i>	10 points
• <i>Excellent communication skills (two recent reports will be reviewed);</i>	10 points
• <i>Demonstrable analytical skills (two recent reports will be reviewed);</i>	10 points
• <i>Master's degree in Ecology, Biodiversity or another closely related field.</i>	5 points
<i>Fluency in written and spoken in English and Spanish</i>	10 points
TOTAL	100 points

10. EVALUATOR ETHICS

The TE team will be held to the highest ethical standards and is required to sign a code of conduct upon acceptance of the assignment. This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'. The evaluator must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing the collection of data and reporting on data. The evaluator must also ensure the security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses without the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

11. PAYMENT SCHEDULE

- 20% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final TE Inception Report and approval by the Commissioning Unit
- 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the draft TE report to the Commissioning Unit
- 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final TE report and approval by the Commissioning Unit and RTA (via signatures on the TE Report Clearance Form) and delivery of completed TE Audit Trail

Criteria for issuing the final payment of 40%:

- The final TE report includes all requirements outlined in the TE TOR and is in accordance with the TE guidance.
- The final TE report is clearly written, logically organized, and is specific for this project (i.e. text has not been cut & pasted from other TE reports).
- The Audit Trail includes responses to and justification for each comment listed.

In line with the UNDP's financial regulations, when determined by the Commissioning Unit and/or the consultant that a deliverable or service cannot be satisfactorily completed due to the impact of COVID-19 and limitations to the TE, that deliverable or service will not be paid.

Due to the current COVID-19 situation and its implications, a partial payment may be considered if the consultant invested time towards the deliverable but was unable to complete to circumstances beyond his/her control.

12. APPLICATION PROCESS⁴

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

- a) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](#)⁵ provided by UNDP;
- b) **CV and a Personal History Form** ([P11 form](#))⁶;
- c) Brief description **of the approach to work/technical proposal** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)
- d) **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc), supported by a breakdown of costs, 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 to the address (insert mailing address) in a sealed envelope indicating the following reference "Consultant for Terminal Evaluation of the project "Conservation, sustainable use of biodiversity, and maintenance of ecosystem services in protected wetlands of international importance)" or by email at the following address ONLY: Adquisiciones.sv@undp.org by March 31th, 2021, at 5:00 p.m. CST. 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% and the price proposal will

⁴ Engagement of evaluators should be done in line with guidelines for hiring consultants in the POPP
<https://popp.undp.org/SitePages/POPPRoot.aspx>

⁵<https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/psa/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx>

⁶ http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc

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.

13.TOR ANNEXES

(Add the following annexes to the final ToR)

- ToR Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework
- ToR Annex B: Project Information Package to be reviewed by TE team
- ToR Annex C: List of Stakeholders
- ToR Annex D: Content of the TE report
- ToR Annex E: Evaluation Criteria Matrix template
- ToR Annex F: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators
- ToR Annex G: TE Rating Scales
- ToR Annex H: TE Report Clearance Form
- ToR Annex I: TE Audit Trail

ToR Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework

	Indicator	Baseline	Goal (of the Indicator)	Verification Mechanisms	Risks and Assumptions
Project Objective: Promote the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and the maintenance of ecosystem services through the creation of new protected wetlands of international importance (PWII) and the improved management of existing protected wetlands.	Coverage (ha) of the National System of Protected Areas resulting from the creation of three (3) new multiple-use protected areas (MUPAs)	– 95,785.61 ha	– 133,495.07 ha (37,709.46 new ha)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Official gazette – Technical reports and publications of the MARN – Project monitoring and evaluation reports – National Registration Center (CNR) cadastral records 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – There is a local and national commitment to create three new multiple-use PAs – Environmental variability, including climate change within normal ranges
	Presence of key indicator species in four (4) PAs in the Jiquilisco Bay and Jocotal Lagoon HPIL Complex in the lower watershed of the San Miguel Río Grande	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Normandía and Chaguantique PA: <i>Amazona auropalliata</i>, <i>Ateles geoffroyi</i> – El Tercio PA: <i>Crocodylus acutus</i> – Jiquilisco Bay Area (includes San Sebastián Island): <i>Andara grandis</i>, <i>Amazona auropalliata</i>, <i>Eretmochelys imbricata</i> and <i>Crocodylus acutus</i> – Jocotal Lagoon Area: <i>Amazona auropalliata</i>, <i>Crocodylus acutus</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Normandía and Chaguantique PA: <i>Amazona auropalliata</i>, <i>Ateles geoffroyi</i> – El Tercio PA: <i>Crocodylus acutus</i> – Jiquilisco Bay Area (includes San Sebastián Island): <i>Andara grandis</i>, <i>Amazona auropalliata</i>, <i>Eretmochelys imbricata</i> and <i>Crocodylus acutus</i> – Jocotal Lagoon Area: <i>Amazona auropalliata</i>, <i>Crocodylus acutus</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Biological censuses and field notes – Monitoring reports/databases 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Effective protection and control measures – Sampling efforts are optimal
	Change in the management effectiveness of three (3) PWIIs measured through the METT scorecard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Jiquilisco Bay PWII: 49% – Olomega Lake PWII: 33% – Jocotal Lagoon PWII: 31% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Jiquilisco Bay PWII: 59% – Olomega Lake PWII: 43% – Jocotal Lagoon PWII: 41% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Updated METT – Project monitoring and evaluation reports: PIR/APR, mid-term and final evaluations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Interest is maintained by the Government of El Salvador, local stakeholders, and the productive sectors to improve the management of the PAs
	Change in the financial sustainability of three	– Legal, regulatory, and institutional framework: 30%	– Legal, regulatory, and institutional framework: 46%	– Updated Financial Sustainability Scorecard	

	Indicator	Baseline	Goal (of the Indicator)	Verification Mechanisms	Risks and Assumptions
	(3) PWIIs according to that established through the total average score in the UNDP/GEF Financial Sustainability Scorecard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Business planning and tools for managing cost-effectiveness: 8% – Tools for income generation and allocation: 17% – Total: 20% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Business planning and tools for managing cost-effectiveness: 42% – Tools for income generation and allocation: 34% – Total: 41% 	– Project monitoring and evaluation reports: PIR/APR, mid-term and final evaluations	– Stable national and international economic conditions
Outcome 1: Expanded protected wetland coverage and strengthened institutional and individual capacities for the effective management of PWIIs.	Representativeness (%) of the wetland ecosystems in the National System of Natural Protected Areas by wetland type	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – X% (The baseline and target will be determined during the first year of project implementation using LIDAR images obtained as part of the MARN cofinancing) 	– Baseline + X%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – GIS databases and maps – Technical reports and scientific publications – Executive decrees declaring PAs 	– There is a willingness by the decision-makers to declare new wetland PAs
	Number of new wetland PAs that form part of the National System of Natural Protected Areas	– Zero (0)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Three (3): <u>1. Jiquilisco Bay Islands:</u> 40 islands and the water body surrounding them; <u>2. Olomega Complex:</u> Olomeguita Island, Tierra Blanca, and the La Chiricana or San Antonio Silva area; <u>3. Islas del Golfo de Fonseca Gulf Islands:</u> Four (4) islands (Martín Pérez, Pirigallo or Meanguerita, Ilca, and Isla Periquito islands) and areas surrounding the Meanguera Island 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Proposals for the creation of new wetland PAs – Official gazette 	

	Indicator	Baseline	Goal (of the Indicator)	Verification Mechanisms	Risks and Assumptions
	Change in the capacity development indicators for the sustainable management of the PWIs according to the total score of the UNDP-GEF Capacity Development Scorecard	<u>National Government</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MARN*: 45.24% - MAG**: 54.76% <u>Local Government</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Jiquilisco MEU: 30.95% - San Dionisio MEU: 35.71% - Concepción Batres MEU: 28.57% - Jucuarán MEU: 28.57% - El Tránsito MEU: 33.33% - ASIBAHIA: 33.33% <u>Multi-stakeholder platforms</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Jiquilisco Bay Territorial Action Group (GAT-CBJ): 40.48% <p>*General Directorate of Ecosystems and Wildlife (DGEVS); Wetlands, Natural Protected Areas, and Biological Corridor Unit; Resources Protection Unit; General Directorate of Environmental Governance (DGGA); Environmental Assessment and Compliance; General Directorate of Citizen and Municipal Services</p> <p>** General Directorate of Forest, Watershed, and Irrigation Planning</p>	<u>National Government</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MARN*: 66.67% - MAG**: 66.67% <u>Local Government</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Jiquilisco MEU: 57.14% - San Dionisio MEU: 57.14% - Concepción Batres MEU: 54.76% - Jucuarán MEU: 57.14% - El Tránsito MEU: 59.52% - ASIBAHIA: 54.76% <u>Multi-stakeholder platforms</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Jiquilisco Bay Territorial Action Group (GAT-CBJ): 57.14% <p>* DGEVS; Wetlands, Natural Protected Areas, and Biological Corridor Unit; Resources Protection Unit; DGGA; Environmental Assessment and Compliance; General Directorate of Citizen and Municipal Services</p> <p>** General Directorate of Forest, Watershed, and Irrigation Planning</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Updated Capacity Development Scorecard updated - Project monitoring and evaluation reports: PIR/APR, mid-term and final evaluations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - National technical staff apply new knowledge and skills in an appropriate manner - The human resources are stable within the national agencies that benefit from the capacity-building activities

	Indicator	Baseline	Goal (of the Indicator)	Verification Mechanisms	Risks and Assumptions
	Number of staff from the MARN, municipalities, the MAG, and local organizations, including women, trained in the sustainable management of the PWIIs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MARN: 0 - MAG: 0 <u>Local Government</u> - Jiquilisco MEU: 0 - Puerto El Triunfo MEU: 0 - San Dionisio MEU: 0 - Concepción Batres MEU: 0 - Jucuarán MEU: 0 - El Tránsito MEU: 0 - San Miguel MEU: 0 - Chirilagua MEU: 0 - El Carmen MEU: 0 - Local Environmental Police: 10 - Navy: 0 - ASIBAHIA: 0 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MARN: 20 - MAG: 6 <u>Local Government</u> - Jiquilisco MEU: 2 - Puerto El Triunfo MEU: 2 - San Dionisio MEU: 2 - Concepción Batres MEU: 2 - Jucuarán MEU: 2 - El Tránsito MEU: 2 - San Miguel MEU: 2 - Chirilagua MEU: 2 - El Carmen MEU: 2 - Local Environmental Police: 10 - Navy: 4 - ASIBAHIA: 2 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Minutes and databases from project training events - Project monitoring and evaluation reports: PIR/APR, mid-term and final evaluations 	
	Change in the financial gap (USD) to cover the basic management costs of the three (3) PWIIs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Jiquilisco Bay PWII: \$222,160 - El Jocotal Lagoon PWII: \$173,199 - Olomega Lagoon PWII: \$244,677 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Jiquilisco Bay PWII: \$166,620 - HPIL Laguna El Jocotal: \$129,899 - Olomega Lagoon PWII: \$183,508 (Reduction of 25% in each of the three cases)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Updated Financial Sustainability Scorecard - Annual financial balances - Project monitoring and evaluation reports: PIR/APR, mid-term and final evaluations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Stable national and international economic conditions allow a sustained flow of new resources - Effective capture and channeling of new resources to finance PWII management, including agreement by MARN that new revenues from gate fees and PPPs can be
	Number of environmental compensation agreements established	- 0	- 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Signed agreements - Execution reports - Technical documents (economic valuations, analysis of protocols) 	

	Indicator	Baseline	Goal (of the Indicator)	Verification Mechanisms	Risks and Assumptions
	Total annual revenue generation for three (3) PWIIs disaggregated by source	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Environmental economic compensation: \$0 – Entry fees for visitors: \$0 – PPP: \$0 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Environmental economic compensation: \$100,000 – Entry fees for visitors: \$30,000 – PPP: \$30,000 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Financial Sustainability Scorecard updated – Annual financial balances – Project monitoring and evaluation reports: PIR/APR, mid-term and financial evaluations 	<p>fully retained by the individual PAs in which they are generated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Income from compensation is also reinvested inside the target PAs and includes sufficient surplus for proactive management of PAs beyond what is needed to prevent negative impacts from new developments.
<p>Outputs:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.1. Three (3) new multiple-use PAs gazetted: a) Jiquilisco Bay wetland (40 islands and surrounding waters); b) Islas de Golfo de Fonseca (Martín Pérez Island, Pirigallo or Meanguerita Island, Ilca Island, Periquito Island and part of the surroundings of Meangua Island); c) Olomega Complex (Olomeguita Island, Tierra Blanca, and sectors of the La Chiricana or San Antonio Silva). 1.2. Management plans for up to three (3) PWIIs updated or developed. 1.3. Wetlands inventory for El Salvador is updated. 1.4. The institutional and individual capacities of the MARN and other relevant institutions within the SIMANA (municipalities and the MAG) strengthened, contributing to the sustainable management of the PWIIs. 1.5. Properly equipped wetland staff and volunteers enable the timely detection and notification of floods and landslides associated with climate change in three (3) PWIIs. 1.6. Local governance program empowers local communities and municipal authorities to sustainably manage the PWIIs. 1.7. Economic environmental compensation from local development projects that alter the surrounding environment support PWII management. 1.8. Business plans for new and existing wetland PAs developed. 1.9. Financial mechanisms are validated onsite and serve to increase the level of funding for three (3) PWIIs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visitor entrance fee scheme piloted and revenues channelized into existing wetland PAs. • PPP increases revenues from tourism in wetland PAs. 					

	Indicator	Baseline	Goal (of the Indicator)	Verification Mechanisms	Risks and Assumptions
Outcome 2: Addressing threats to biodiversity, including the presence of invasive species and solid waste and agrochemicals originating in the buffer areas of the PWIs.	Number of inter-institutional cooperation agreements established and operating for the management of the PWIs.	– Three (3) municipal agreements for managing invasive species.	– Three (3) municipal agreements for managing invasive species and solid waste. – Three (3) new agreements with MAG, MOP, and CEL.	– Agreements signed and made official (MARN, MAG, MOP, CEL, and municipalities) – Meeting minutes (attendance list, photographs, and event notes developed)	– There is a will among the parties for inter-institutional cooperation (signing of agreements and implementation) for the management of the PWIs. – Changes in the municipal administrations involved do not affect the established agreements.
	Number of farms implementing best practices for the management of cattle ranching wastes in three (3) PWIs, including farms run by women.	– 0	– 20	– Reports and field notes/measurements, including information about women's participation in initiatives to control contamination – Databases of the benefitting farms	– Sampling efforts are optimal – Effective monitoring, control, and surveillance – Community leaders, NGOs, the private sector, and the municipalities provide support for the control of invasive species
	Number of farms implementing best practices for the management of agricultural wastes in three (3) PWIs, including farms run by women.	– 0	– 60	– Technical reports about the quality of the sites	

	Indicator	Baseline	Goal (of the Indicator)	Verification Mechanisms	Risks and Assumptions
	Solid waste accumulated (kg/ha) in the Jiquilisco Bay PWII	– X (Baseline and target will be established during the first year of the project)	– Baseline - X (a reduction of 50% is estimated)		
	Volume (tons/year) of water hyacinth (<i>Eichornia crassipes</i>) removed from the Olomega Lagoon and Jocotal Lagoon PWIIs	– 0	– 2,000 tons/year per wetland	– Reports and field notes/measurements – Databases – Project annual technical reports	
	Abundance (number of individuals) of the cormorant duck (<i>Phalacrocorax brasilianus</i>) in the Olomega Lagoon, the Jocotal Lagoon, and the Jiquilisco Bay PWIIs	– Jocotal Lagoon PWII: X – Jiquilisco Bay PWII: X – Olomega Lagoon PWII: X (Baseline and target will be established during the first year of the project)	– Jocotal Lagoon PWII: Baseline - X – Jiquilisco Bay PWII: Baseline - X – Olomega Lagoon PWII: Baseline - X	– Reports and field notes/measurements – Databases – Project technical reports	
	Coverage of mangroves in the Jiquilisco Bay PWII and associated freshwater lagoons	– 18,720 ha	– 18,720 ha	– Remote sensing data – Maps – Technical documents (FIR)	– There is a commitment at the local level and by the productive sectors for the conservation and sustainable use of mangroves in the Jiquilisco Bay PWII and associated freshwater lagoons – Environmental variability, including climate change, is

	Indicator	Baseline	Goal (of the Indicator)	Verification Mechanisms	Risks and Assumptions
					within the normal range – Effective control and surveillance
Outputs:					
<p>2.1. Six (6) inter-institutional cooperation agreements (MARN, MAG, CEL, MOP, and the municipalities) established, including conservation and management committees for monitoring the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in at least three (3) PAs of the Jocotal and the Jiquilisco Bay PWIs.</p> <p>2.2. Program for the prevention, reduction, and control of contamination stemming from agricultural activities (e.g., agrochemicals and manure) and human settlements (solid wastes) in two PWIs (Jiquilisco Bay and Jocotal Lagoon) and their buffer areas defined jointly with the municipalities, local communities, and the private sector.</p> <p>2.3. Incentives program, including green certification for reduced use of agrochemicals in sugar cane cultivation and sustainable livestock management, promotes biodiversity-friendly agricultural practices and water-related resource use in the buffer areas of five (5) PAs of the Jocotal Lagoon and the Jiquilisco Bay PWIs.</p> <p>2.4. Standards in place to regulate human activities that affect the PWIs.</p> <p>2.5. Information monitoring system in place facilitates decision making to reduce the threats to three (3) PWIs and articulated with the EIS of the MARN.</p> <p>2.6. Protocol developed to reduce the threats to biodiversity in PWIs, including contamination from agrochemicals, livestock waste, and household and urban solid waste.</p> <p>2.7. Strategies for controlling invasive species (water hyacinth [<i>Eichornia crassipes</i>] and the Neotropic cormorant [<i>Phalacrocorax brasilianus</i>]) piloted in three (3) PWIs and their buffer areas: Jiquilisco Bay Complex, the Olomega Lake, and the Jocotal Lagoon.</p> <p>2.8. Participatory plans developed for the conservation and sustainable use of mangroves and floodplain forest in the Jiquilisco Bay and associated freshwater lagoons in the lower Rio Grande de San Miguel watershed.</p> <p>2.9. Participatory rehabilitation of at least 500 ha of dry forest associated with mangroves allows the protection of key habitat for migratory species.</p>					

ToR Annex B: Project Information Package to be reviewed by TE team

#	Item (electronic versions preferred if available)
1	Project Identification Form (PIF)
2	UNDP Initiation Plan
3	Final UNDP-GEF Project Document with all annexes
4	CEO Endorsement Request
5	UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) and associated management plans (if any)
6	Inception Workshop Report
7	Mid-Term Review report and management response to MTR recommendations
8	All Project Implementation Reports (PIRs)
9	Progress reports (quarterly, semi-annual or annual, with associated workplans and financial reports)
10	Oversight mission reports
11	Minutes of Project Board Meetings and of other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
12	GEF Tracking Tools (from CEO Endorsement, midterm and terminal stages)
13	GEF/LDCF/SCCF Core Indicators (from PIF, CEO Endorsement, midterm and terminal stages); for GEF-6 and GEF-7 projects only
14	Financial data, including actual expenditures by project outcome, including management costs, and including documentation of any significant budget revisions
15	Co-financing data with expected and actual contributions broken down by type of co-financing, source, and whether the contribution is considered as investment mobilized or recurring expenditures
16	Audit reports
17	Electronic copies of project outputs (booklets, manuals, technical reports, articles, etc.)
18	Sample of project communications materials
19	Summary list of formal meetings, workshops, etc. held, with date, location, topic, and number of participants
20	Any relevant socio-economic monitoring data, such as average incomes / employment levels of stakeholders in the target area, change in revenue related to project activities
21	List of contracts and procurement items over ~US\$5,000 (i.e. organizations or companies contracted for project outputs, etc., except in cases of confidential information)
22	List of related projects/initiatives contributing to project objectives approved/started after GEF project approval (i.e. any leveraged or "catalytic" results)
23	Data on relevant project website activity – e.g. number of unique visitors per month, number of page views, etc. over relevant time period, if available
24	UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD)
25	List/map of project sites, highlighting suggested visits
26	List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Board members, RTA, Project Team members, and other partners to be consulted
27	Project deliverables that provide documentary evidence of achievement towards project outcomes

ToR Annex C: List of Stakeholders

Socios	Nombres	Papel en Implementación del Proyecto
Ministerio de Medio Ambiente y Recursos Naturales (MARN)	Fernando Andrés López Larreynaga – Ministro Miguel Gallardo - Director General de Ecosistemas y Vida Silvestre / Director del Proyecto Carlos Giovanni Rivera – Gerente de Áreas Naturales Protegidas, a.i. Jaime Espinoza – Jefe Unidad de Humedales Oscar Garza – Jefe Unidad Guardarecursos Jorge Ernesto Quezada Díaz - Especialista de Gabinete Técnico Diana Celeste Meléndez Huezo - Asesora de Gabinete Técnico Xiomara Henríquez, Técnica territorial Bahía de Jiquilisco	Entidad principal para la ejecución correcta. Por mandamiento de ley, el MARN administra los humedales y las AP del país. La agencia actúa como un punto focal para la Convención RAMSAR y el CDB, y está a cargo de la ejecución técnica y financiera del proyecto.
Ministerio de Agricultura y Ganadería (MAG)	Pablo Anliker – Ministro Alejandro Flores – Director CENDEPESCA	Diseña e implementa las políticas agrícolas del país. Es un socio clave en la regulación de actividades productivas alrededor y dentro de las AP y los humedales. El MAG participa en acuerdos y comités conjuntos de conservación/gestión para supervisar los esfuerzos de conservación y la efectividad de gestión de las AP, y da seguimiento a la reducción de desechos sólidos y del uso controlado de agroquímicos en las zonas de amortiguamiento de las AP. La agencia incluye al Centro para el Desarrollo de la Pesca y Acuicultura (CENDEPESCA), el cual es la autoridad nacional para la acuicultura.
Ministerio de Obras Públicas (MOP)	Romeo Herrera – Ministro Francisco Alvarado, Dirección de Construcción y Mantenimiento de la Obra Pública (San Miguel) Earl Tansy Gomez, técnico Dirección de Construcción y Mantenimiento de la Obra Pública (San Miguel)	El MOP de El Salvador es la entidad que supervisa las áreas de obras públicas, transporte y desarrollo de viviendas y urbano. Desarrolla programas y proyectos diseñados para beneficiar a la población por medio de la provisión de infraestructura básica, sistemas de transporte y asentamientos humanos. El MOP establecerá acuerdos de cooperación interinstitucional con el MARN para abordar las amenazas en los HPIL.
Ministerio de Turismo (MITUR)	Morena Valdez - Ministra	Otros ministerios que participan en el proyecto son MITUR y MTPS. Estos ministerios darán asistencia técnica para desarrollar mecanismos financieros para la sostenibilidad de los HPIL y sus AP relacionadas, y en la implementación de un programa de certificación para el cultivo sostenible de caña de azúcar en las zonas de amortiguamiento de las HPIL prioritarias. Administrarán, especialmente, la certificación de condiciones adecuadas de trabajo para hombres y mujeres
Ministerio de Trabajo y previsión Social (MTPS)	Rolando Castro - Ministro	
Instituto Salvadoreño para el Desarrollo de la Mujer (ISDEMU)	María Liliana López – Directora Ejecutiva	
		ISDEMU es responsable de formular, administrar, implementar y dar seguimiento al cumplimiento de la Política Nacional de las Mujeres. A nivel local, ISDEMU dará apoyo técnico con su personal de

Socios	Nombres	Papel en Implementación del Proyecto
		campo para los asuntos de género durante la implementación.
Fondo de iniciativa para las Américas (FIAES)	Jorge Oviedo Gerente General FIAES	La participación de FIAES es fundamental en el seguimiento y evaluación de las iniciativas para la validación de los mecanismos relacionados con la compensación ambiental en el marco de los Acuerdos de Cooperación con el MARN.
Comisión Ejecutiva del Río Lempa (CEL)	Daniel Alejandro Álvarez Campos, Director Ejecutivo. Juan Carlos Rosales Pinto - Jefe de Unidad Ambiental	CEL es la empresa de servicios de El Salvador y está comprometida en desarrollar proyectos de generación eléctrica hídricos y eólicos. CEL establecerá acuerdos de cooperación interinstitucionales con el MARN para abordar amenazas en los HPPII, en lo relacionado a la compensación ambiental.
Centro Nacional de Registros (CNR)	José Mauricio Cardoza. Registrador Jefe RPRH San Miguel. María Olivia Ramírez de Flores. Jefe de Oficina Departamental de Mantenimiento Catastral San Miguel Manuel Mauricio Reyes Villegas, Jefe de Oficina Departamental de Mantenimiento Catastral La Unión Lic. René Mauricio Piche Benavides, Registrador Jefe RPRH La Unión	La participación del CNR es muy relevante para el proceso de delimitación y declaración de las nuevas ANPs
Fiscalía General de la República	Raúl Melara, Fiscal General Luis Mateo Marroquín, Jefe de la Unidad de Medio Ambiente y Salud	La FGR y la PNC deben ser considerados como socios en el diseño del programa de gobernanza, las normas para la regulación de actividades humanas que afectan al HPPII, y en el diseño de protocolos para reducir las amenazas a la biodiversidad en el HPPII.
Policía Nacional Civil	Hugo Adiel Bonilla jefe de la División de Medio Ambiente	
Alcaldía de Jiquilisco	Loida Eunice Loza de Pérez - Alcaldesa	Las municipalidades participarán en la definición de planes sobre uso de tierras para abordar amenazas a la biodiversidad, especialmente aquellas relacionadas al uso de agroquímicos, desechos generados por ganado y desechos sólidos que contaminen los humedales y las AP. Las municipalidades son socios clave en la ejecución del proyecto y se beneficiarán con capacitaciones.
Alcaldía de Usulután	Miguel Ángel Jaime – Alcalde José Manuel Sánchez Arriaza, Jefe de la Unidad Ambiental de la Alcaldía de Usulután	
Alcaldía El Tránsito	Armando Cisneros, Jefe Unidad Ambiental El Tránsito	
Asociaciones de productores de caña de azúcar	Tomás Regalado Papini, Presidente de Fundación del Azúcar Rosa Vilma Rodríguez Amaya, Directora Ejecutiva Fundación del Azúcar Rafael Cerros, Implementación de BPA en caña de Azúcar, Jiquilisco	Compañías y asociaciones del cultivo y procesamiento de la caña de azúcar, agrícolas y ganaderas, y los sectores de pesca artesanal serán los objetivos de las campañas para crear conciencia nivel nacional (zona marino-costera) así como en los HPPII. Los productores agrícolas, ganaderos y compañías dedicadas al cultivo y procesamiento de la caña de azúcar estarán involucrados en el desarrollo y la aplicación de nuevos protocolos para administrar sus sistemas de producción y los estándares para regular
Sectores pesqueros y agrícolas	Asociación Cooperativa de Producción Agropecuaria y	

Socios	Nombres	Papel en Implementación del Proyecto
	<p>Servicios Múltiples La Marañonera</p> <p>Héctor Pineda Saravia, Presidente de ADESCOMAR y beneficiario del proyecto Laguna de Olomega</p> <p>Israel Ventura Rosa, beneficiario del proyecto Laguna de Olomega</p> <p>Verónica Liseth Vásquez, beneficiaria del proyecto Laguna de Olomega</p> <p>Manuel Maravilla, beneficiario del proyecto Laguna El Jocotal</p> <p>Miguel Ángel Ruiz, beneficiario del proyecto Laguna El Jocotal</p> <p>José Luciano Maradiaga, beneficiario del proyecto Bahía de Jiquilisco</p> <p>Maira Xiomara Guevara, beneficiaria del proyecto Bahía de Jiquilisco</p>	<p>las actividades humanas, especialmente para el control de contaminación que amenace a la biodiversidad. Serán beneficiarios de un programa de incentivos para promover prácticas agrícolas amigables con la biodiversidad, incluyendo la certificación del cultivo amigable con la biodiversidad de la caña de azúcar.</p>
Comunidades locales	<p>Rudy López, Com. Borbollón, El Jocotal</p> <p>Héctor Pineda Saravia, Asociación de Desarrollo Comunal de Olomega</p> <p>Oscar Josael Matamoros Álvarez, Asociación de Desarrollo Comunal Puerto Viejo</p>	<p>El proyecto involucrará a las comunidades locales que usan los HPPII y sus AP relacionadas, incluyendo comunidades indígenas (los lenca, kakawira y pipiles). Las comunidades participarán como tomadoras de decisiones en la planificación y ejecución de las actividades del proyecto; el uso sostenible de humedales; y como beneficiarios de actividades de capacitación y de apoyo técnico, incluyendo la participación activa de las mujeres.</p>
Organizaciones de la sociedad civil (OSC)	<p>Erick Isaías Montoya Rivera, Miembro Red de Observadores Locales Ambientales (ROLA) en Tierra Blanca, Jiquilisco, Usulután</p> <p>José Guillermo Guerrero Vásquez, Miembro de la Red de Observadores Locales Ambientales (ROLA) en Concepción Batres, Usulután</p> <p>María Elena Rivas de Palacios Comité Local Ramsar Bahía de Jiquilisco</p> <p>Alberto Enrique Mendoza, Presidente Comité Local Ramsar Laguna El Jocotal</p> <p>José María Pineda Díaz, Presidente Comité Local Ramsar Laguna de Olomega</p>	<p>El proyecto trabajará muy de cerca con OSC en la administración de HPPII y sus AP relacionadas, incluyendo el desarrollo de mecanismos financieros para la sostenibilidad de los HPPII (p. ej. el esquema de cobro a visitantes y APP) y asuntos de género durante la implementación. Se consultó a varias OSC durante la fase de diseño del proyecto, incluyendo a la Asociación Cooperativa de Producción Agropecuaria y Pesquera de Servicios Múltiples El Jocotal, a la Asociación Cooperativa de Producción Pesquera “Peces de Oro” de R. L. de la Laguna de Olomega y la Asociación de Mujeres Comercializadoras de Productos de Pesca de El Espino, Laguna de Olomega.</p>
Sector académico y Organizaciones No Gubernamentales (ONG)	<p>Juan Carlos Fernandez Saca Decano Facultad de Posgrados y Educación Continua Universidad Dr. José Matías Delgado</p>	<p>El proyecto establecerá sociedades con instituciones académicas (p. ej. Universidad Centroamericana José Simeón Cañas, Universidad de El Salvador y el Centro Nacional de Tecnología Agropecuaria y Forestal [CENTA]) y ONG (ECOVIVA, CATIE, CESTA y MSM) que darán apoyo técnico y científico al proyecto, incluyendo información relacionada al punto de partida de los HPPII.</p>

Socios	Nombres	Papel en Implementación del Proyecto
	José Ismael Rivas Ferrera, presidente de la Asociación Cincahuite Ada Ruth González de Nieto Directora de Relaciones Nacionales e Internacionales Universidad Luterana Salvadoreña	
Instituto Salvadoreño de Transformación Agraria	Óscar Enrique Guardado Calderón, Presidente Karen Yamileth Orellana Cruz, Jefe Unidad Ambiental	
Programa de las Naciones Unidas para el Desarrollo (PNUD)	Mónica Merino – Representante Residente Adjunta Rafael Pleitez – Representante Residente Auxiliar Ryna Avila – Oficial de Programa Silvia Guzmán – Punto focal de evaluación.	El PNUD dará asistencia técnica general y administrativa, herramientas de gestión y conocimiento teórico y práctico a las agencias ejecutantes para ayudar en la ejecución de las actividades del proyecto y la entrega oportuna y eficiente de los resultados deseados.

ToR Annex D: Content of the TE report

For further details on the key issues to be addressed in the TE report see Section 4 of the

- i. Title page
 - Title of UNDP-supported GEF-financed project
 - UNDP PIMS ID and GEF ID
 - TE timeframe and date of final TE report
 - Region and countries included in the project
 - GEF Focal Area/Strategic Program
 - Executing Agency, Implementing partner and other project partners
 - TE Team members
- ii. Acknowledgements
- iii. Table of Contents
- iv. Acronyms and Abbreviations
1. Executive Summary (3-4 pages)
 - Project Information Table
 - Project Description (brief)
 - Evaluation Ratings Table
 - Concise summary of findings, conclusions and lessons learned
 - Recommendations summary table
2. Introduction (2-3 pages)
 - Purpose and objective of the TE
 - Scope
 - Methodology
 - Data Collection & Analysis
 - Ethics
 - Limitations to the evaluation
 - Structure of the TE report
3. Project Description (3-5 pages)
 - Project start and duration, including milestones
 - Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope
 - Problems that the project sought to address threats and barriers targeted
 - Immediate and development objectives of the project
 - Expected results
 - Main stakeholders: summary list
 - Theory of Change
4. Findings
(in addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (*) must be given a rating⁷)
 - 4.1 Project Design/Formulation
 - Analysis of Results Framework: project logic and strategy, indicators
 - Assumptions and Risks
 - Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g. same focal area) incorporated into project design

⁷ See ToR Annex F for rating scales.

- Planned stakeholder participation
 - Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
- 4.1 Project Implementation
- Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
 - Actual stakeholder participation and partnership arrangements
 - Project Finance and Co-finance
 - Monitoring & Evaluation: design at entry (*), implementation (*), and overall assessment of M&E (*)
 - UNDP implementation/oversight (*) and Implementing Partner execution (*), overall project implementation/execution (*), coordination, and operational issues
- 4.2 Project Results
- Progress towards objective and expected outcomes (*)
 - Relevance (*)
 - Effectiveness (*)
 - Efficiency (*)
 - Overall Outcome (*)
 - Country ownership
 - Gender
 - Other Cross-cutting Issues
 - Social and Environmental Standards
 - Sustainability: financial (*), socio-economic (*), institutional framework and governance (*), environmental (*), and overall likelihood (*)
 - Country Ownership
 - Gender equality and women's empowerment
 - Cross-cutting Issues
 - GEF Additionality
 - Catalytic Role / Replication Effect
 - Progress to Impact
5. Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons
- Main Findings
 - Conclusions
 - Recommendations
 - Lessons Learned
6. Annexes
- TE ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
 - TE Mission itinerary
 - List of persons interviewed
 - List of documents reviewed
 - Summary of field visits
 - Evaluation Question Matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology)
 - Questionnaire used and summary of results
 - Co-financing tables (if not include in body of report)
 - TE Rating scales
 - Signed Evaluation Consultant Agreement form

- Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form
- Signed TE Report Clearance form
- *Annexed in a separate file:* TE Audit Trail
- *Annexed in a separate file:* relevant terminal GEF/LDCF/SCCF Core Indicators or Tracking Tools, as applicable

ToR Annex E: Evaluation Criteria Matrix template

The TE Independent Evaluator must complete the Evaluation matrix considering the three level of analysis (design, implementation, and results)

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 a the local, regional and national level?			
To what extent are the project's objectives consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country needs, national priorities and policies, global priorities and partners' and GEF policies and priorities?	<i>(i.e. relationships established, level of coherence between project design and implementation approach, specific activities conducted, quality of risk mitigation strategies, etc.)</i>	<i>(i.e. project documentation, national policies or strategies, websites, project staff, project partners, data collected throughout the TE mission, etc.)</i>	<i>(i.e. document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc.)</i>
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
To what extent did the project contribute to the Country Programme outcomes and outputs, the SDGs, the UNDP Strategic Plan and Country Programme, GEF strategic priorities, and national development priorities?			
What factors have contributed to the achieving or not achieving intended outcomes and outputs? Could the project include alternative strategies?			
Has the project produced unintended results -positive or negative? If there are negative results, what mitigation activities are in place?			
To what extent the project has demonstrated: a) scaling up, b) replication, c) demonstration, and/or d) production of public good?			
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in line with international and national norms and standards?			
To what extend has the project completed the planned activities and met or exceeded the expected outcomes in terms of achievement of global environmental and development objectives according to schedule, and as cost-effective as initially planned?			
To what extent were project funds and activities delivered in a timely manner?			
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-political, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
Have been the country representatives (e.g., governmental official, civil society, etc.) actively			

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
involved in project identification, planning and/or implementation? Do they maintain commitment to the project and its results?			
How have the implementing partner and UNDP contributed to ensure national ownership?			
Gender equality, women's empowerment and Human Rights: To what extent have the project contributed to gender equality, the empowerment of women and a human right of disadvantaged or marginalized groups?			
How were gender and human rights considerations integrated in the project's design, including analysis, implementation plan, indicators, targets, budget, timeframe and responsible party?			
To what extent did women, poor, indigenous, persons with disabilities, and other disadvantaged or marginalized groups participate and benefit from the project			
Was the UNDP Gender Marker rating assigned to the project document realistic and backed by the findings of the gender analysis?			
Is there any potential negative impact on gender equality, women's empowerment, disadvantaged or marginalized groups? If so, what can be done to mitigate this?			
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 there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
Financing and co-financing. How many resources have the project leveraged? How have they contributed to the project's ultimate objective?			
Are there variances between planned and actual expenditures? What are the main reasons?			
To what extent did financial controls allow the project management to make informed decisions regarding the budget?			
Implementation, oversight and execution. To what extent UNDP and the Implementing Partner have delivered effectively their roles?			

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
To what extent has UNDP delivered effectively on activities related to project identification, concept preparation, appraisal, preparation of detailed proposal, approval and start-up, oversight, supervision, completion and evaluation?			
To what extent has the Implementing Partner effectively managed and administered the project's day-to-day activities? How was UNDP's overall oversight and supervision?			
Other cross-cutting issues			
How have the project activities contributed to poverty reduction and sustaining livelihoods?			
To what extent has the project contributed to better preparations to cope with disasters or mitigate risk, and/or addressed climate change mitigation and adaptation?			
To what extent has the project incorporated capacity development activities? Were results achieved?			
Stakeholder engagement and partnership. To what extent did stakeholder's participation mechanisms in place lead to empowerment and joint ownership of the project?			
To what extent do project stakeholders share a common understanding and are involved in the decision-making process of the project?			
What should be done better to increase their participation and engagement?			
Results framework. To what extent the project's objectives and components are clear, practicable and feasible within its time frame?			
Was there a clearly defined and robust Theory of Change?			
Were the indicators in the Results Framework SMART?			
Monitoring and evaluation. To what extent did the Monitoring systems allow the collection, analysis and use of information to track the project's progress, risks and opportunities toward reaching its objectives?			
To what extent did the Monitoring systems guide management decisions?			

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Were the budget and responsibilities clearly identified and distributed?			
Risk Management, Social and Environment Standards and Adaptive management. To what extent did the project maximize social and environmental opportunities and benefits and ensure that adverse social and environmental risks and impacts were avoided, minimized, mitigated, and managed?			
To what extent were risks (both threats and opportunities) properly identified and managed?			
What "safeguards" did the project implement?			
Were the project's changes based on evidence? Were they properly managed?			
How did the project adapt to the new normality COVID-19? Did the project contribute to minimizing the socioeconomic effects of the Pandemic?			
GEF additionality. To what extent has the project led to additional outcomes?			
Is there any additional outcome in the following areas? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Global Environmental Benefits • Livelihood improvements and/or social benefits • Innovation Additionality 			

ToR Annex E: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators

Independence entails the ability to evaluate without undue influence or pressure by any party (including the hiring unit) and providing evaluators with free access to information on the evaluation subject. Independence provides legitimacy to and ensures an objective perspective on evaluations. An independent evaluation reduces the potential for conflicts of interest which might arise with self-reported ratings by those involved in the management of the project being evaluated. Independence is one of ten general principles for evaluations (together with internationally agreed principles, goals and targets: utility, credibility, impartiality, ethics, transparency, human rights and gender equality, national evaluation capacities, and professionalism).

Evaluators/Consultants:

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 limitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.
8. Must ensure that independence of judgement is maintained, and that evaluation findings and recommendations are independently presented.
9. Must confirm that they have not been involved in designing, executing or advising on the project being evaluated and did not carry out the project's Mid-Term Review.

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

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

Name of Evaluator: _____

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: _____

ToR Annex F: TE Rating Scales

Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, Implementation/Oversight, Execution, Relevance	Sustainability ratings:
6 = Highly Satisfactory (HS): exceeds expectations and/or no shortcomings 5 = Satisfactory (S): meets expectations and/or no or minor shortcomings 4 = Moderately Satisfactory (MS): more or less meets expectations and/or some shortcomings 3 = Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): somewhat below expectations and/or significant shortcomings 2 = Unsatisfactory (U): substantially below expectations and/or major shortcomings 1 = Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe shortcomings Unable to Assess (U/A): available information does not allow an assessment	4 = Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3 = Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks to sustainability 2 = Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks to sustainability 1 = Unlikely (U): severe risks to sustainability Unable to Assess (U/A): Unable to assess the expected incidence and magnitude of risks to sustainability

ToR Annex G: TE Report Clearance Form

Terminal Evaluation Report for (Project Title & UNDP PIMS ID) Reviewed and Cleared By:	
Commissioning Unit (M&E Focal Point)	
Name: _____	
Signature: _____ _____	Date: _____
Regional Technical Advisor (Nature, Climate and Energy)	
Name: _____	
Signature: _____ _____	Date: _____

ToR Annex H: TE Audit Trail

The following is a template for the TE Team to show how the received comments on the draft TE report have (or have not) been incorporated into the final TE report. This Audit Trail should be listed as an annex in the final TE report but not attached to the report file.

To the comments received on (date) from the Terminal Evaluation of (project name) (UNDP Project PIMS #)

The following comments were provided to the draft TE report; they are referenced by institution/organization (do not include the commentator's name) and track change comment number ("#" column):

Institution/ Organization	#	Para No./ comment location	Comment/Feedback on the draft TE report	TE team response and actions taken