

## Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference (ToR) for UNDP-supported GEF-financed projects

Strengthening Capacity and Incentives for Wildlife Conservation in the Western  
Forest Complex (Project ID: 00090893)

### **BASIC CONTRACT INFORMATION**

**Location:** Bangkok, Uthai Thani Province, Thailand

**Type of Contract:** National Terminal Evaluation (TE) Consultant (Individual Consultant)

**Assignment Type:** Short-term

**Languages Required:** English

**Starting Date:** 21 May 2021

**Duration of Initial Contract:** 35 working days

**Expected Duration of Assignment:** 21 May 2021 – 10 July 2021

### **BACKGROUND**

#### **1. Introduction**

**UNDP Thailand Country Office is looking for a national consultant who will work together with an international consultant in conducting the Terminal Evaluation (thereafter referred to as the “Evaluation Team”).**

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 Strengthening Capacity and Incentives for Wildlife Conservation in the Western Forest Complex (PIMS 5436) implemented through Department of National Parks, Wildlife and Plant Conservation (DNP). The project started on the 15 July 2015 and is in its final 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’ ([Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluation of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects](#)).

Project Title:	Strengthening Capacity and Incentives for Wildlife Conservation in the Western Forest Complex			
GEF Project ID:	PIMS 5436		<i>at endorsement (Million US\$)</i>	<i>at completion (Million US\$)</i>
UNDP Project ID:	00090893	GEF financing:	7,339,450	
Country:	Thailand	UNDP:	500,000	
Region:	Asia-Pacific	Government (DNP):	22,864,427	

Focal Area:	Biodiversity, Climate Change and Multi- Focal Areas	Others: - Wildlife Conservation Society - Seub Nakasathien Foundation	500,000  370,000	
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	BD-1: Improve sustainability of protected area systems CCM-5: Promote Conservation and Enhancement of Carbon Stocks through Sustainable Management of Land Use, Land Use Change and Forestry SFM/REDD-2: promote sustainable management and use of forest resources	Total co-financing:	24,234,427	
Executing Agency:	Department of National Parks, Wildlife and Plant Conservation (DNP), Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MNRE)	Total Project Cost:	31,573,877	
Other Partners involved:		ProDoc Signature (date project began):		15 July 2015
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: 14 July 2020	Revised Closing Date: 14 July 2021

## 2. Project Description

Situated at the core of the Western Forest Complex (WEFCOM), the Huai Kha Khaeng-Thung Yai Naresuan World Heritage Site (HKK-TY WHS) consists of three contiguous Wildlife Sanctuaries: the Huai Kha Khang (HKK); the Thung Yai Naresuan East (TYE); and the Thung Yai Naresuan West (TYW). Totalling an area of 6,427 km<sup>2</sup>, the largely intact forest habitats of the HKK-TY WHS provide a protected refuge for approximately half of Thailand's tiger population.

There are no villages within the HKK, but there are 14 formally recognised enclave villages within the TYW (7 villages) and TYE (7 villages). There are further villages, together with mixed forest-agriculture, in a 5km buffer around the HKK-TY WHS with a particular concentration to the east of HKK where there is an estimated 29 villages. Many of the villagers living in the enclave and buffer villages are dependent on the use of forest resources.

The most significant threats to tiger survival in and around the HKK-TY WHS includes: i) habitat degradation and fragmentation; ii) poaching of the prey that tiger depend on; and iii) poaching of the

tigers themselves. These threats are further exacerbated by limited capacity and insufficient resources to effectively plan and administer the wildlife sanctuaries, and limited working relationships with enclave and buffer communities. The project has been organised into three components, and will be implemented over a period of five years.

The first component of the project is directed towards strengthening and scaling up existing best-practice management activities, and developing and testing innovative approaches to enforcement and compliance, in the HKK-TYN WHS. It will strive to reduce the direct threats to tigers and prey, improve effectiveness of wildlife sanctuary management, and enhance the use of data and information to support key management decision-making.

The second component of the project is focused on linking sustainable livelihood development in the enclave and buffer zone villages with specific conservation outcomes, and improving economic links between the buffer zone and enclave villages and the Wildlife Sanctuaries. It will seek to achieve these linkages by promoting incentives (including technical support and grant funding for sustainable livelihood initiatives, ecotourism development and sustainable financing solution (replacing REDD+ Wildlife Premium carbon project) for community-based sustainable forest management, environmentally-friendly agricultural practices, nature-based tourism and education and improved wildlife and habitat protection.

The third component of the project is directed towards raising the awareness in communities living in and around the WHS of the need to conserve, and the importance of protecting, the forest landscapes and associated wildlife. With the iterative recognition in these communities of the intrinsic value of the forest habitats and wildlife, work under this component will assist in strengthening the representation of the buffer and enclave communities in each of the Wildlife Sanctuary's Protected Area Committees (PACs). With improved community-based representation on the PAC, the project will assist in building the capacity (information, knowledge, skills) of each of the community representatives to assure a constructive and meaningful contribution to the co-management of the WSs. The total cost of investment in the project is estimated at US\$31,573,877, of which US\$7,339,450 constitutes grant funding from GEF and US\$24,234,427 comprises co-financing.

During the startup period after the Project Document was signed on 15 July 2015, the project faced multiple delays due mainly to lengthy settlement of the government's financial and regulatory systems related to managing the project budget (as part of the NIM modality). It was not until August 2016 when the inception workshop could be held and subsequent work plan and first year budget were approved by the project board. The enactment of the new Public Procurement Act with new required procedures also caused complications to government staff in completing procurement requests due to their unfamiliarity with the new requirements.

In 2018, a mid-term review (MTR) of the project implementation was conducted. It noted many progresses made toward successful achievement of the project indicators while also noted delays and challenges during the start-up period of the project and subsequent procurement issues. The MTR made 15 specific recommendations, focusing on improving M&E capacity of the results framework, financial management/sustainability, livelihoods development in the buffer zone, improved DNP/community relationship, and communication and knowledge sharing, as well as project extension

by 6-12 months (in lieu of the time lost during the start-up period) to better realize the project results at a higher quality and impact.

Most of the recommendations have been responded with actions, although those relating to project sustainability and capacity strengthening will require more time and be greatly benefited by the 12-month project extension.

A 12-month project extension was granted to enable the project to continue working on targeted activities to ensure successful achievement of its project objective and respective outcomes. The extension period compensates the multiple delays and slow start-up in the first year of the project (2015-2016). It also enables the project more time to fully achieve project financial sustainability and capacity strengthening objectives. The extension was endorsed by the project board on 29 November 2019.

Since 2020, the prolonged strict COVID-19 lockdown has significantly impacted the project implementation. Activities at the project locations have been postponed as all national parks had been temporarily closed and unauthorized people were not allowed to access the parks. Trainings have been delayed due to the shut-down of the training sites in the protected areas.

### **3. TE Purpose**

The TE report will assess the achievement of project results against what was expected to be achieved, and draw lessons 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.

The project is entering to the final phase of implementation. The project end date is on 14 July 2021. The Implementing Partner (DNP), Project Board members, and UNDP Thailand Country Office will use the project's evaluation results to ensure effectiveness of exit strategy during the 12-month project extension and take away key recommendations to embed into the National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plan (NBSAP).

Further to this, the objectives of the evaluation will be to:

- assess the achievement of project results supported by evidence (i.e. progress of project's outcome targets)
- assess the contribution and alignment of the project to relevant environmental management plans or climate and biodiversity management policies
- assess the contribution of the project results towards the relevant outcome and output of the Country Programme Document for Thailand (2017-2021) and recommendations on the way forwards
- assess any cross cutting and gender issues
- assess impact of the project in terms of its contribution to, or enabled progress toward reduced environmental stress

- examination on the use of funds and value for money and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming

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.

## **DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

### **4. TE Approach & Methodology**

The TE 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 team is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), Implementing Partners, the UNDP Country Office(s), the Regional Technical Advisors, 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. Additionally, the national TE consultant may require conducting field missions to: Huai Kha Khaeng-Thung Yai (HKK-TY) World Heritage Site (WHS) and its buffer areas in Uthai Thani Province (depending on travel restriction on COVID-19).

Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

#### **List of Stakeholders**

##### **Bangkok**

- UNDP Thailand Country Office
  - Biofin Programme Manager
  - Youth development programme leader

- Accelerator Lab – Head of Experiment
- Department of National Parks, Wildlife and Plant Conservation (Implementing Partner)
  - DNP Deputy Director General, Mr. Prakrit Wongsriwattanakul
  - Director of Wildlife Conservation Office, as the Project Director – Mr. Sompong Thongseekhem
  - Chief of Wildlife Research Division, Mr. Saksit Simcharoen
  - Chief of SMART Operation Center, Ms. Chatwarun Angkaew
- Director of Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS – Thailand), Mr. Anak Pattanapibul
- Team Leader on Sustainable Financing for wildlife conservation – Ms. Orapan Na Bangchang

### **Project Site**

- Superintendent of Huai Kha Kaeng Wildlife Sanctuary
- Superintendent of Tungyai Naresuan – East
- Superintendent of Tungyai Naresuan - West
- Chief of Huai Kha Kaeng Wildlife Breeding Station
- Chief of Khao Nang Ram Wildlife Research Station – Mr. Somphot Duanchantrasiri
- Deputy Superintendent of Huai Kha Kang Wildlife Sanctuary: Environment Education in the buffer zone areas, Mr.
- Director of HKK/TYN World Heritage Management – Ms. Weraya Ochakul
- Royal Forest Department, Regional office 4 for Forest Resources management – Mr. Kraisorn Wiriya
- Secretary General of Seub Foundation – Mr. Panudej Kerd mali
- Chairman of Rabbit in the Moon Foundation – Mr. Charnchai Bhindusen
- Kasetsart University Team Leader on Wildlife Tourism – Mr. Nunthachai Pongpattananurak
- Kasetsart University Team Leader on Network Centric Operation System – Mr. Anan Phonpoem
- Member of the Parliament, Uthai Thani province – Mr. Chada Thaiset
- Community leaders – Wildlife Friendly Community

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 interview schedule, field visits and data to be used in the evaluation should be clearly outlined in the inception report and be fully discussed and agreed between UNDP, stakeholders and the TE team.

*(Note: The TOR should retain enough flexibility for the evaluation team to determine the best methods and tools for collecting and analysing data. For example, the TOR might suggest using questionnaires, field visits and interviews, but the evaluation team should be able to revise the approach in consultation with the evaluation manager and key stakeholders. These changes in approach should be agreed and reflected clearly in the TE Inception Report.)*

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

In case that the International TE consultant cannot enter to Thailand due to the COVID-19 VISA protocol, the TE team should develop a methodology that reflects the adaptive management. It includes 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 governments and national and pilot site counterparts may be working from home. These limitations must be reflected in the final TE report.

## 5. 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 ([Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluation of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects](#)). 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 C.

The asterisk "(\*)" indicates criteria for which a rating is required.

### Findings

#### i. Project Design/Formulation

- National priorities and country driven-ness
- 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, improved governance, climate change mitigation and adaptation, disaster prevention and recovery, human rights, capacity development, South-South cooperation, knowledge management, volunteerism, etc., as relevant)
- GEF Additionality
- Catalytic Role / Replication Effect
- Progress to impact

### iv. 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

PE



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 (or see Annex F).

**ToR Table 2: Evaluation Ratings Table for “Strengthening Capacity and Incentives for Wildlife Conservation in the Western Forest Complex” Project**

Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E)	Rating <sup>1</sup>
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	

## 6. Expected Outputs and Deliverables

The TE consultant/team shall prepare and submit:

<sup>1</sup> 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)

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	TE Inception Report	TE team clarifies objectives, methodology and timing of the TE	No later than 2 weeks before the TE mission: <i>(by 31May2021)</i>	TE team submits Inception Report to Commissioning Unit and project management
2	Presentation	Initial Findings	End of TE mission: <i>(by 31 May2021)</i>	TE team presents to Commissioning Unit and project management
3	Draft TE Report	Full draft report <i>(using guidelines on report content in ToR Annex C)</i> with annexes	Within 3 weeks of end of TE mission: <i>(by 16June2021)</i>	TE team submits to Commissioning Unit; reviewed by BPPS-GEF RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP
4	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 H)</i>	Within 1 week of receiving comments on draft report: <i>(by 10 July2021)</i>	TE team submits both documents to the Commissioning Unit

\*The final TE report must be in English. If applicable, the Commissioning Unit may choose to arrange for a translation of the report into a language more widely shared by national stakeholders.

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.<sup>2</sup>

## 7. TE Arrangements

Commissioning Unit for this project's TE is UNDP Thailand Country Office. The Commissioning Unit will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the TE team, if the travel is permitted. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the TE team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

The UNDP Thailand Country Office and Project Team will provide logistic support in the implementation of remote/ virtual meetings if travel to project site is restricted. An updated

<sup>2</sup> Access at: <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/section-6.shtml>

stakeholder list with contact details (phone and email) will be provided by the UNDP Thailand Country Office to the TE team. The TE offer shall be all inclusive cost of travelling.

## 8. Duration of the Work

The total duration of the TE will be approximately 35 working days over a time period of approximately 8 weeks starting 21May21 and shall not exceed five months from when the TE team is hired. The tentative TE timeframe is as follows:

Timeframe	Activity
29 March-19May 2021	Selection of TE team
20-21 May 2021 (2 days)	Preparation period for TE team (handover of documentation)
20-24May 2021 (5 days)	Document review and preparation of TE Inception Report
-25May 2021 (1 day)	Finalization and Validation of TE Inception Report; latest start of TE mission
26-31May 2021 (6 days)	TE mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits, etc.
1-2 June 2021 (2 days)	Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings; earliest end of TE mission
3-15 June 2021 (13 days)	Preparation of draft TE report
16-19June 2021 (4 days)	Circulation of draft TE report for comments
20-25June 2021 (6 days)	Incorporation of comments on draft TE report into Audit Trail & finalization of TE report
26-29 June 2021 (4 days)	Preparation and Issuance of Management Response
30June 2021 (1 day)	Concluding Stakeholder Workshop (optional)
by 10 July 2021	Expected date of full TE completion

Options for site visits should be provided in the TE Inception Report. The expected date start date of contract is 21May2021 – 10 July2021.

## 9. Duty Station

The National Consultant will travel within Bangkok and to the project sites in Huai Kha Khaeng-Thung Yai (HKK-TY) World Heritage Site (WHS) and its buffer areas in Uthai Thani Province (approximately 6 days) in order to interview the local stakeholders and beneficiaries. Also, the National Consultant will interview the stakeholders in Bangkok as per the list provided by the UNDP Thailand Country Office. The travel plan shall be adjusted based on travel restriction of the government and UNDP. Subject to be approved by the Resident Representative for UNDP Thailand Country Office.

### Travel:

- The BSAFE course must be successfully completed prior to commencement of travel;
- Individual Consultants are responsible for ensuring they have vaccinations/inoculations when travelling to certain countries, as designated by the UN Medical Director.
- Consultants are required to comply with the UN security directives set forth under:

<https://dss.un.org/dssweb/>

PE

## **REQUIRED SKILLS AND EXPERIENCE**

### **10. TE Team Composition and Required Qualifications**

A team of *two independent evaluators* will conduct the TE – *one international team leader (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions) and one national expert from Thailand*. The international consultant will be designated as the team leader and will be responsible for the overall design and writing of the TE report. The national consultant 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 national consultant will work closely with the International Consultant in supporting any work that needs to be undertaken as laid out in this ToR, and other tasks, as required. The National Consultant will also act as a focal point for coordinating and working with relevant stakeholders in Thailand. In the case of international travel restriction and the mission is not possible, the TE team will use alternative means of interviewing stakeholders and data collection (i.e. Skype interview, mobile questionnaires, etc.) including the field visit by the National Consultant under the International Consultant's guidance.

The 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 national consultant will be aimed at maximizing the overall "team" qualities in the following areas:

#### Education

- At least a Master's degree in a discipline relevant to Natural Resource Management, Environmental Science, Development Studies, Economic or other closely related field (5 points);

#### Experience

- Minimum of two (2) years of supporting project evaluation and/or implementation experience in the result-base management framework, adaptive management (25 points);
- Previous experiences in project evaluation/project design/implementation in relevant thematic areas (i.e. wildlife conservation, species conservation, community-based management, livelihood, sustainable utilization, environmental conservation, land use planning, ecology) (25 points);
- Proven experiences in field level data collection with adequate knowledge of data collection tools and experience with implementing evaluations remotely (10 points);
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and biodiversity, experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis (5 point);
- Proven communication, facilitation, and writing skills;
- Evaluation skills, including conducting interviews, focus group discussions, desk research, qualitative and quantitative analysis;

PE

- Excellent command of English both writing and speaking;
- Familiarity with Thailand national development policies, programs and projects;
- Some project management experience in biodiversity conservation and sustainable utilization would be an advantage;
- Some knowledge of UNDP or GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy would be an advantage.

#### Language

- Fluency in written and spoken English.

#### **Responsibilities**

- Documentation review and data gathering
- Contributing to the development of the review plan and methodology
- Conducting those elements of the evaluation determined jointly with the international consultant and UNDP
- Contributing to presentation of the review findings and recommendations at the wrap-up meeting
- Contributing to the drafting and finalization of the review report

### **11. 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 collection of data and reporting on data. The evaluator must also ensure 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.

### **12. 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

PE

- 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.

## **APPLICATION PROCESS**

### **13. Scope of Price Proposal and Schedule of Payments**

#### ***Financial Proposal:***

- Financial proposals must be “all inclusive” and expressed in a lump-sum for the total duration of the contract. The term “all inclusive” implies all cost [professional fees, travel costs (Bangkok to Project Sites, land transport/trip, number of accommodation per night), living allowances etc.];
- For duty travels, the UN’s Daily Subsistence Allowance (DSA) rates are Uthai Thani Province (and Kanchanaburi or Tak Province if applicable), which should provide indication of the cost of living in a duty station/destination (*Note: Individuals on this contract are not UN staff and are therefore not entitled to DSAs. All living allowances required to perform the demands of the ToR must be incorporated in the financial proposal, whether the fees are expressed as daily fees or lump sum amount.*)
- The lump sum is fixed regardless of changes in the cost components.

### **14. Recommended Presentation of Proposal**

- Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](#) provided by UNDP;
- CV** and a **Personal History Form** ([P11 form](#));
- Brief description of 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)
- 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.

PE

All application materials should be submitted to the address: **UNDP Thailand Country Office, 12<sup>th</sup> floor, UN Secretariat Building, Rajdamnern Nok Avenue, Bangkok 10200, Thailand** in a sealed envelope indicating the following reference "Consultant for Terminal Evaluation of the Project on 'Strengthening Capacity and Incentives for Wildlife Conservation in the Western Forest Complex' or by email at the following address ONLY: [procurement.th@undp.org](mailto:procurement.th@undp.org) by **19 March, 12:00 PM (Bangkok Time)**. Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

## 15. Criteria for Selection of the Best Offer

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 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.

### Technical Evaluation Criteria for National Candidates (Maximum 70 points):

- Criteria-01: At least Master's degree in a discipline relevant to Natural Resource Management, Environmental Science, Development Studies, Economic or other closely related field - **Max Point 5;**
- Criteria-02: Minimum of two (2) years of supporting project evaluation and/or implementation experience in the result-based management framework, adaptive management - **Max Point 25;**
- Criteria-03: Previous experiences in project evaluation/project design/implementation in relevant thematic areas (i.e. wildlife conservation, species conservation, community-based management, livelihood, sustainable utilization, environmental conservation, land use planning, ecology) - **Max Point 25;**
- Criteria-04: Proven experiences in field level data collection with adequate knowledge of data collection tools and experience with implementing evaluations remotely - **Max Point 10;**
- Criteria-05: Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and community-based management - **Max Point 5.**

### Financial Evaluation (Total 30 marks)

All technical qualified proposals will be scored out 30 based on the formula provided below. The maximum points (30) will be assigned to the lowest financial proposal. All other proposals received points according to the following formula:

$$p = y (\mu /$$

Where:

- p = points for the financial proposal being evaluated;
- y = maximum number of points for the financial proposal;
- $\mu$  = price of the lowest priced proposal;
- z = price of the proposal being evaluated.

## 16. Annexes to the TE ToR

PE

- ToR Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework
- ToR Annex B: Project Information Package to be reviewed by TE team
- ToR Annex C: Content of the TE report
- ToR Annex D: Evaluation Criteria Matrix template
- ToR Annex E: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators
- ToR Annex F: TE Rating Scales
- ToR Annex G: TE Report Clearance Form
- ToR Annex H: TE Audit Trail
- Annex in a separate file: Relevant TE tracking tools (list)
- Annexed in a separate file: GEF Co-financing template (categorizing co-financing amounts by source as 'investment mobilized' or 'recurrent expenditure')

**Approved by** \_\_\_\_\_

**Lovita Ramguttee, Deputy Resident Representative, UNDP Thailand**

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_



## ToR Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework

### SECTION II: STRATEGIC RESULTS FRAMEWORK (SRF)

PROJECT OBJECTIVE AND OUTCOMES	INDICATOR	BASELINE	END OF PROJECT TARGETS	SOURCE OF INFORMATION	RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS
<b>Project Objective:</b> <b>To improve the management effectiveness of, and sustainable financing for, Huai Kha Khaeng-Thung Yai Naresuan (HKK-TYN) World Heritage Site and incentivise local community stewardship</b>	METT Scores of HKK, TYE and TYW Wildlife Sanctuaries	HKK: 67% TYE: 75% TYW: 60%	HKK: 71% TYE: 77% TYW: 68%	Project review of METT Scorecards	<p>Assumptions: The government continues to invest in improving the management of the WHS, as part of its strategy to conserve the forest ecosystems, forest habitats and rare and threatened forest fauna in the WEFCOM.</p> <p>Communities living in and around the three wildlife sanctuaries respect the sanctity, and derive value from the conservation, of these sanctuaries.</p> <p>Risks: Not all communities cooperate with the conservation authorities in addressing the key threats of deforestation and poaching in the WHS. The DNP is unable to solicit the support, and coordinate the efforts, of other organs of state, due its limited mandate in the villages around the WHS. Income-generating mechanisms do not generate</p>
	Financial sustainability scorecard for the WHS	Baseline = 79 [Baseline confirmed at mid-term]	TBD	Project review of Financial Sustainability Scorecard	
	Capacity development indicator score for DNP (Wildlife Conservation Office)	Systemic: 67% Institutional: 64% Individual: 61%	Systemic: 69% Institutional: 65% Individual: 68%	Project review of Capacity Development Indicator Scorecard	
	Number of villages (of the 43 targeted enclave and buffer zone villages) directly benefiting from community-based livelihood activities that contribute to reducing the extent and intensity of threats to the HKK-TY WHS	0	>28	Project record of technical support and sub-grant funding agreements	

PROJECT OBJECTIVE AND OUTCOMES	INDICATOR	BASELINE	END OF PROJECT TARGETS	SOURCE OF INFORMATION	RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS
					sufficient revenues for reinvestment back into the conservation of the WHS The effects of climate change further exacerbate the fragmentation of forest ecosystems, leading to an increase in the vulnerability of rare and threatened forest species.
<b>Outcome 1 Strengthening on-ground conservation actions and wildlife protection</b>	<b>Outputs:</b> 1.1. Wildlife and habitat protection. 1.2 Resource monitoring and information management. 1.3 Training and capacity development				
	Number of tigers/100 km <sup>2</sup> in the three wildlife sanctuaries	HKK: 2.3 TYE: 0.7 TYW: 1.3	HKK: 2.7 TYE: 0.9 TYW: 1.5	Wildlife monitoring survey reports	<b>Assumptions:</b> The SMART patrol system is maintained across the three wildlife sanctuaries The DNP allocates adequate budget for the ongoing running costs and maintenance of project-procured infrastructure and equipment. The wildlife sanctuaries sustain current ranger patrol and wildlife monitoring efforts in the WHS The security and integrity of the tiger DNA database is protected <b>Risks:</b>
	Aggregate occupancy index (number/km <sup>2</sup> ) of select tiger prey species (sambar; gaur; banteng) and elephant in the three wildlife sanctuaries	HKK: 6.5 TYE: 9 TYW: 13	HKK: 8 TYE: 11 TYW: 17	WHS wildlife monitoring survey reports	
	Number of poacher encounters per annum reported by ranger patrol staff from HKK, TYE and TYW	HKK: 84 TYE: 72 TYW: 96	HKK: 76 TYE: 65 TYW: 86	SMART patrol data Wildlife sanctuary monthly and annual reports	
	Areal coverage (as a % of total WHS area) of the ranger patrols in the WHS	60%	>90%	SMART patrol data	

PROJECT OBJECTIVE AND OUTCOMES	INDICATOR	BASELINE	END OF PROJECT TARGETS	SOURCE OF INFORMATION	RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS
	Area-based habitat management plan taking climate projection into consideration  [NEW. Indicator revised during inception phase and approved by Project Board; it was "Number of wildfire incidences per annum in the WHS"]	No plan	Plan operational at one site as model for replication		Not all communities cooperate with the conservation authorities in addressing the key threats of deforestation and poaching in the WHS. The effects of climate change further exacerbate the fragmentation of forest ecosystems, leading to an increase in the vulnerability of rare and threatened forest species.
	Number of tigers (captive and wild) with a documented DNA record	Captive: 0 Wild: 0	Captive: 1,250 Wild: 200  [Target for wild tigers revised during inception phase and approved by Project Board; it was 500]	DNA tiger database	
	Coverage (as a % of total area) of the wildlife monitoring program in the wildlife sanctuaries	HKK: 60% TYE: 30% TYW: 30%	HKK: >70% TYE: >50% TYW: >50%  [Targets for TYE and TYW revised during inception phase and approved by Project Board; targets were both >40% originally]	WHS wildlife monitoring survey reports	

PE

PROJECT OBJECTIVE AND OUTCOMES	INDICATOR	BASELINE	END OF PROJECT TARGETS	SOURCE OF INFORMATION	RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS
	Number of staff of HKK, TYE and TYW who receive (a) refresher training and (b) train-the-trainer training,	Refresher: 0 Train-the-trainer: 0	Referresher: 470 Train-the-trainer: 40	Record of training course Wildlife sanctuary monthly and annual reports	
	Percentage of temporary ranger staff across the three wildlife sanctuaries who have adequate death and disability insurance cover	36%	100%	Insurance policy documentation	
Outcome 2 Incentives and sustainable financing for wildlife conservation and forest protection	Outputs: 2.1 Community livelihood assistance. 2.2 Nature-based tourism development 2.3 REDD+ and Wildlife Premium Mechanism				
	Number of villages with signed Conservation Agreements	0	>28	Conservation agreements	Assumptions: Village leadership structures are stable and representative of the interests of the villages Village populations remain relatively stable The RFD registers community forests timeously Risks: Not all communities cooperate with the conservation authorities in addressing the key threats of deforestation and poaching in the WHS. The DNP is unable to solicit the support, and coordinate the efforts, of other organs of state,
	Area registered as community forest in the HKK buffer zone	1,029 ha	1,338 ha	Community forest registration certificates	
	Number of people (of which percentage are female) living in the enclave villages of TYE and TYW who are direct recipients of project grant funding support	0 (0)	175 (60)	Project record of sub-grant funding agreements	
	Direct project beneficiaries living in buffer villages (of which percentage are female) who are direct recipients of project grant funding support	0 (0)	300 (60)	Project record of sub-grant funding agreements	

PROJECT OBJECTIVE AND OUTCOMES	INDICATOR	BASELINE	END OF PROJECT TARGETS	SOURCE OF INFORMATION	RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS
	World Heritage Site strategic plan of which eco-tourism, sustainable financing are integrated into provincial development plan, with community participation in planning and financial management.  [NEW. Indicator revised during inception phase and approved by Project Board; it was 'Financial, Tourism and Integrated Fire Management plans for the WHS are in place']	Financial: No Tourism: No Provincial or DNP Strategic plan for financial management: No Provincial tourism plan: No	WHS strategic plan that covers: Sustainable financing: Yes Tourism: Yes WHS strategic plan integrated into provincial development plan.		due its limited mandate in the villages around the WHS. Income-generating mechanisms do not generate sufficient revenues for reinvestment back into the conservation of the WHS. The effects of climate change further exacerbate the fragmentation of forest ecosystems, leading to an increase in the vulnerability of rare and threatened forest species.
	Avoided forest and forest degradation (ha and tonnes of CO <sub>2</sub> eq.) in the WHS, enclave villages and HKK buffer areas	0 0	985 ha 277,731 tonnes of CO <sub>2</sub> eq.	Remote sensing data and ground-truthing reports Carbon monitoring reports	
	Annual deforestation rate (%) in the WHS, enclave villages and HKK buffer areas  [Indicator deleted following MTR]	0.76% per annum	0.62% per annum	Remote sensing data and ground-truthing reports	
	Establishment of sustainable financing mechanism	No sustainable financing mechanism	Sustainable financing mechanism via Conservation		

PROJECT OBJECTIVE AND OUTCOMES	INDICATOR	BASELINE	END OF PROJECT TARGETS	SOURCE OF INFORMATION	RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS
	[New indicator added following MTR]		License Plate and impact investment committed to fill the gap of the World Heritage budgeting		
<b>Outcome 3 Improved local education, awareness and participation</b>	<b>Outputs:</b> 3.1 Community education and outreach 3.2 Participatory management				
	Number of WS community liaison and outreach staff working in targeted enclave and buffer zone villages	<21	29	Wildlife sanctuary organograms and annual reports	Assumptions: DNP continues to support, and strengthen the role of, PACs for wildlife sanctuaries DNP encourages the adoption and expansion of outreach and extension programmes in wildlife sanctuaries Risks: Not all communities cooperate with the conservation authorities in addressing the key threats of deforestation and poaching in the WHS. The DNP is unable to solicit the support, and coordinate the efforts, of other organs of state, due its limited mandate in the villages around the WHS.
	Number of schools using WHS-based education and information materials	0	20	Project reports	
	Number of informational and educational road shows presented per annum using the mobile environmental education units	0	144/annum	Project reports	
	Number of PACs with full representation and involvement of enclave and buffer zone villages	0	3	Minutes of PAC meetings	

PE

## 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: Content of the TE report

- 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 rating<sup>3</sup>)

---

<sup>3</sup> See ToR Annex F for rating scales.



#### 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
- 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

PE

## ToR Annex D: Evaluation Criteria Matrix template

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF Focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national level?			
<i>(include evaluative questions)</i>	<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?			
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in line with international and national norms and standards?			
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-political, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
Gender equality and women's empowerment: How did the project contribute to gender equality and women's empowerment?			
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
<i>(Expand the table to include questions for all criteria being assessed: Monitoring &amp; Evaluation, UNDP oversight/implementation, Implementing Partner Execution, cross-cutting issues, etc.)</i>			

PE

## 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 imitations, 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: \_\_\_\_\_

PE

## ToR Annex F: TE Rating Scales & Evaluation Ratings Table

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

Evaluation Ratings Table	
Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E)	Rating <sup>4</sup>
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	

<sup>4</sup> 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)

Overall Project Outcome Rating	
Sustainability	Rating
Financial resources	
Socio-political/economic	
Institutional framework and governance	
Environmental	
Overall Likelihood of 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: \_\_\_\_\_

PE

## 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

PE