

Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference (ToR) Template for UNDP-supported GEF-finance projects

Template 2 - formatted for the [UNDP Jobs website](#)

BASIC CONTRACT INFORMATION

Location: Seychelles

Application Deadline: 30th March 2021

Type of Contract: IC

Assignment Type: Short term National Consultancy

Languages Required: English

Expected Duration of Assignment: 30 days over 4 months

Open only to residents (locals/GOP holders) in Seychelles

1. 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 ***Seychelles' Sustainable Protected Areas Finance (PIMS 4656)*** implemented through the Programme Coordinating Unit of the *Ministry of Agriculture Climate Change and Environment (MACCE)**.

The project started on the **18th March 2016** and is in its *5th* 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' (Link below)

http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/GEF/TE_GuidanceforUNDP-supportedGEF-financedProjects.pdf

(Previously the Ministry of Environment Energy and Climate Change -MEECC- was changed to MACCE following the October 2020 elections and subsequent restructuring of the new Cabinet)*

2. Project Background and Context

The Seychelles consist of over 100 islands of granitic and coralline origin with a total land area of 455 km² and a coastal length of 151 km. Coral reefs surround the granitic islands. Coral islands are rich in marine life, and due to their size and homogeneity are considered part of the coastal zone. Tourism and fishing are the main industries, with light manufacturing and service sectors also contributing to the economy. Prior the Covid-19 pandemic, Tourism directly employed 40% of the work force and provided the population with 60% of foreign currencies. The country's tourism industry and socio-economic development mainly depends on its environment, more specifically its unique biodiversity and its high landscape value. The needs to extend Protected Areas and to strengthen the Protected Areas System are stressed in the 2013 PA Policy. Seychelles is in the process of operationalizing a major PA expansion on the basis of the new PA Policy. The project aims at securing the financing for PA more sustainably and it is organized into two components:

The first component of the project is focused on enabling planning and legal framework for an improved use of

existing and new PA finance. This component will support the Government of Seychelles, SNPA and other entities managing PAs in evaluating the financial performance of the PAS, determining financial gaps and identifying opportunities for improving overall functionality of both the current and the proposed expanded PA estate. It focuses on the delivery side of the conservation equation.

Under this component there are four key outcomes:

The **first** will focus on the PA System Financing & Investment Plan. The **second** one will strengthen the links between improved financial management within the PAs and conservation results (effectiveness). The **third** and **fourth** outputs will focus on legal and institutional capacity enabling conditions. Most activities will be implemented by MEECC in close collaboration with SNPA, the Minister of Finance, Trade and the Blue Economy (MFTBE) and other PA managing entities. One activity will be under the responsibility of MCSS.

The second component of the project is focused on increasing and securing revenue generation for PA management. The project will improve the financial sustainability of the PAS and the individual PAs to ensure that they have adequate financial resources to cover the full costs of their management at an optimal level. Among other things, this project will be used to support the building and renovating infrastructures, introducing new cost-effective practices, systems and schemes, all aimed at making sites more attractive to visitors and increasing their own revenue generation capacity. Thorough site-level and PA finance assessments have been carried out in connection with the project.

Under this component there are three key outcomes:

The **first** will focus on changing the status of SNPA from a budget dependent authority to a more autonomous one. The **second** output includes a stream of activities, some are like 'mini-projects' within themselves, aimed at building and renovating infrastructures and introducing new cost-effective practices, systems and schemes, all aimed at making sites more attractive to visitors and increasing their own revenue generation capacity. A total of 14 activities are foreseen under it, under the responsibility of SNPA, SIF, NS, GIF and MEECC/DoE. The **third** and last output involves the operationalization of Seychelles' Conservation and Climate Adaptation Trust (the SCCAT). TNC has advanced proposals for it.

This five-year project started in 2016 has been granted a 6 months extension, will now end in September 2021. It is being implemented in association with a number of conservation organizations and stakeholders, namely; *Seychelles National Parks Authority, Seychelles Island Foundation, North Island Seychelles, Banyan Tree Seychelles, Denis Private Island. Green Island Foundation, Marine Conservation Society of Seychelles, Nature Seychelles and The Nature Conservancy.*

The project has a budget of US\$ 17,876,554, comprised of a GEF grant of US\$ 2,776,900 and planned co-financing of US\$15,099,654.

COVID 19 in Seychelles

The first recorded case of Covid-19 in Seychelles was on March 11th 2020 and the Government of Seychelles undertook stringent measures including closure of borders to safeguard against the pandemic. However by June the Seychelles undertook partial reopening of borders and tourism in Seychelles prompting a spike in the number of imported cases. By December 2020, community transmission of Covid-19 was confirmed with the spike in cases. The current number of total cases has exceeded 2400 cases with a total of 11 deaths between January -February 2021. The vaccination programme is ongoing and roughly 60% of the target population have received at least their first vaccine dose. The Assessment of Socio-Economic impact of Covid-19 in Seychelles, prepared by UNDP, can be found on the link below:

https://www.mu.undp.org/content/mauritius_and_seychelles/en/home/library/an-assessment-of-the-socio-economic-impact-of-covid-19-in-seyche.html

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 results of TE will be incorporated into future project planning and design and provide key insights for the national partners to incorporate recommendations and lessons learned for the management of PAs in Seychelles.

4. 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 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 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 **Ministry of Agriculture, Climate Change and Environment, Seychelles National Parks Authority, Seychelles Island Foundation, North Island Seychelles, Banyan Tree Seychelles, Denis Private Island. Green Island Foundation, Marine Conservation Society of Seychelles, Nature Seychelles and The Nature Conservancy, Seychelles Marine Spatial Planning, Seychelles Climate and Conservation Trust**; 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 TE team is expected to conduct field missions to *the Protected Areas* including the following project sites **Curieuse, Cousin, Copolia and Veuve**.

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 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 must be clearly outlined in the TE Inception Report and be fully discussed and agreed 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 guidance

Although Travel to Seychelles is permitted, there rules and regulations may be subject to change. All visitors having had their vaccines may be permitted or those presenting a negative PCR test at least 72 hrs prior to travel.

More information on travel to Seychelles can be found on <http://www.health.gov.sc/wp-content/uploads/Entry-and-Stay-Conditions-for-Arrivals-v1.0.pdf>

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; http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/GEF/TE_GuidanceforUNDP-supportedGEF-financedProjects.pdf

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 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 in the ToR Annex.

6. Expected Outputs and Deliverables

The TE *consultant* shall prepare and submit:

#	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 10th May 2021)</i>	TE team submits Inception Report to Commissioning Unit and project management
2	Presentation	Initial Findings	End of TE mission: <i>(by 31st May 2021)</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 25th June 2021)</i>	TE team submits to Commissioning Unit; reviewed by RTA, Project

				Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP
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 H</i>)	Within 1 week of receiving comments on draft report: (<i>by 15th July 2021</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.¹

7. TE Arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing the TE resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's TE is UNDP Mauritius and Seychelles Country Office will contract the consultants and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the TE team. 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 coordinate with the Government partners. The Project coordinator will designate a focal point at each PA to assist in facilitating the process (e.g., providing relevant documentation, arranging visits/interviews with key informants in the respective sites, etc.). The Project Steering Committee (PSC) and CO Management will take responsibility for the approval of the final evaluation report, with involvement of the relevant UNDP Regional Technical Advisor. The CO management will liaise with the project implementation team to develop a management response to the evaluation within two weeks of report finalization.

8. Timeframe

The total duration of the TE will be approximately **30 working days** over a time period of **15 weeks** starting **April 25th** and shall not exceed four months from when the TE consultant is hired. The tentative TE timeframe is as follows:

- **30th March 2021:** Application closes
- **25th April 2021 :** Selection of TE Consultant
- **30th April 2021:** Prep the TE team (handover of project documents)
- **05th May 2021:** 4 days (recommended 2-4): Document review and preparing TE Inception Report
- **10th May 2021:** 2 days days: Finalization and Validation of TE Inception Report- latest start of TE mission
- **17th May 2021:** 14 days TE mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits if applicable

¹ Access at: <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/section-6.shtml>

- *31st May 2021:* Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of TE mission
- *15th June 2021:* 7 days Preparation of draft TE report
- *25th June 2021:* Circulation of draft TE report for comments
- *30th June 2021:* 3 days: Incorporation of comments on draft TE report into Audit Trail & finalization of TE report
- *10th July 2021:* Preparation & Issue of Management Response
- *15th July 2021:* Expected date of full TE completion

The expected date start date of contract is **25th April 2021**.

9. Duty Station

Identify the consultant's duty station/location for the contract duration, mentioning ALL possible locations of field works/duty travel in pursuit of other relevant activities, specially where traveling to locations at security Phase I or above will be required.

Travel:

- International travel ***may be required to Seychelles*** during the TE mission if prevailing travel restrictions in country are lifted and quarantine measures are relaxed;
- 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. ***Visitors are currently permitted to enter Seychelles if they have received their full dose of Covid-19 vaccinations or undertake a negative PCR prior to 72 hours before travel. These rules may change at short notice.***
- Consultants are required to comply with the UN security directives set forth under: <https://dss.un.org/dssweb/>
- All related travel expenses will be covered and will be reimbursed as per UNDP rules and regulations upon submission of an F-10 claim form and supporting documents.

10. TE Team Composition and Required Qualifications

A team of two independent evaluators will conduct the TE - one team leader, international consultant (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions and one team expert, a national consultant with technical/policy skills on the project focus area. The international consultant will be designated as a team leader and shall be responsible for the overall design and writing of the TE report and ensure quality of the final report submitted to UNDP. **The National Team Expert will be required to support the Independent evaluator in setting up meetings with stakeholders, make detailed record of meetings and provide local perspectives where applicable in the narrative of the TE report.**

This TOR is for the national consultant who is required to have the following qualifications and experience

Education

- Master's degree or higher in Environment, Natural Resource Management or related fields,
- A Bachelor's degree in related field may be considered if the applicant has demonstrated at least 5 years experience in related field

Experience

- A minimum of 5 years of relevant working experience in environment or conservation related fields is important.
- Must have demonstrated knowledge of environmental policy and national initiatives.
- Demonstrated ability to work in a diverse environment and with wide range of stakeholders
- Demonstrated analytical skills.
- Excellent report writing skills. Ability to deliver quality reports within the given time
- Must have excellent organizational and communications skills.

Language

- Fluency in written and spoken English.
- Fluency in creole would be an advantage

11. Evaluator Ethics

The Evaluator 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
- 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 MTR 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, living allowances 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.
- For duty travels, the UN’s Daily Subsistence Allowance (DSA) rates are (fill for all travel destinations), 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.

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 (*project title*)” or by email at the following address ONLY: (procurement.mu@undp.org) by (*midnight New York Time and 30th March 2021*). 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.

Education	Background	Stakeholder Engagement	Report Writing/Other	Language
-----------	------------	------------------------	----------------------	----------

Master's degree or higher in Environment, Natural Resource Management or related fields,	A minimum of 5 years of relevant working experience in environment or conservation related fields is important. Must have demonstrated knowledge of environmental policy and national initiatives.	Demonstrated ability to work in a diverse environment with a wide range of stakeholders	Demonstrated analytical skills and excellent report writing skills. Must have excellent organizational and communications skills.	Fluency in written and spoken English.
Max: 15 points	Max:30 (15+15) points	Max: 25 points	Max:20 points	Max: 10 points

16. Annexes to the TE ToR

Suggested ToR annexes include:

- 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 and TE Ratings Table
- ToR Annex G: TE Report Clearance Form
- ToR Annex H: TE Audit Trail template

ToR Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework

Protected Area Finance Project

#	Indicator*	Baseline	Targets by End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
Project Objective: To improve the financial sustainability and strategic cohesion of Seychelles protected area system, while also dealing with emerging threats and risks to biodiversity in a shifting national economic environment.					
1	Evolution in key scores from the Financial sustainability scorecard for national system of protected areas: [broken down as below]	Total points, total possible points and % achieved, based on the application of the scorecard in 2015: [broken down as below]	Percentage scores across the board see an increase of at least 40% and 80% from the baseline, by mid-term and EOP respectively. Increases show a balanced and steady progress verified across the components and PA sub-systems: [broken down as below]	Periodic and participative application of the Financial Sustainability Scorecard for Seychelles' PAS covering, the same sub-subsystems as at the baseline PRODOC Annex 3 (Links to Tracking Tools), in particular Objective 1, SECTION III: Financial Sustainability Scorecard	<u>Assumptions:</u> Financial Scorecard and METT methodologies are adopted as key metrics for the PA system
1a	Scores for the entire PA System and for the three components of the scorecard: Total: for all three components) Component 1) Legal, regulatory and institutional frameworks Component 2) Business planning and tools for cost-effective management Component 3) Tools for revenue generation by PAs	Absolute and percentage scores from 2015: Total: 37 (out of 225) = 17% Component 1) 16 (out of 95) = 17% Component 2) 11 (out of 59) = 19% Component 3) 10 (out of 71) = 14%	Percentage scores reach at least the following by mid-term and EOP respectively: Total: Reaching at least 22% and 28% Component 1) Reaching at least 22% and 28% Component 2) Reaching at least 26% and 34% Component 3) Reaching at least 17% and 22%	Validation of scorecard data and analysis by the MTR and TE. The financial analysis of main sub-systems of PAs at the baseline includes the sites and financial flows managed by SNPA, DOE, SIF, ICS, NS and GIF. They cover 88% of the PA estate and likely 80-90% of all PA finance flows. The six main	<u>Risk:</u> Adverse policy and regulatory environment prevails (e.g. Government does not support proposals for PA revenue retention, undermining a key element in the project's strategy the effective and strategic use of government finance to PAs)

#	Indicator*	Baseline	Targets by End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
1b	Overall scores for each of the six main sub-subsystems, as assessed separately by PA managing entities:	Absolute and percentage scores from 2015:	Percentage scores reach at least the following by mid-term and EOP respectively:	sub-systems function therefore as a proxy for the overall PAS.	Downturn in tourist numbers.
	SNPA DoE SIF ICS NS GIF	21 (9%) 16 (7%) 41 (18%) 62 (28%) 50 (22%) 16 (7%)	13% and 18% 10% and 13% 26% and 33% 39% and 50% 31% and 40% 10% and 13%	Project reports and studies on PA finance.	
2	Absolute and relative annual financing gap for the entire PAS (using the six main PA sub-systems as a proxy):	Annual financing gap as calculated in 2015 and referring to Baseline Year 2013:	Annual financing gap decreases to the following by EOP (regardless of the absolute amount):	Periodic and participative application of the Financial Sustainability Scorecard for Seychelles' PAS covering, the same sub-subsystems as at the baseline	The MTR and TE provide an independent validation of scorecards
	(a) under a basic PA management scenario	(a) \$2.7 million, or 51% of total finances available to the PAS	(a) less than 30% of total finances available to the PAS		
	(b) under an optimal PA management scenario	(b) \$6.7 million, or 124% of total finances available to the PAS	(b) less than 50% of total finances available to the PAS		
	(c) projected over 5 years under a basic PA management scenario	(c) \$13.6 million	(c) less than \$8 million		

#	Indicator*	Baseline	Targets by End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
3	<p>Evolution in METT Scores for indicator sites (listed here) reflect improvements in conservation security in terrestrial and marine ecosystems:</p> <p>SIF, Vallée de Mai NS, Cousin Island Special Reserve GIF, Denis Island GIF, North Island ICS, Silhouette Is. Nat/Marine Park DOE, Recif Island Spec Res SNPA, Curieuse National/Marine Park SNPA, La Digue Veuve Spec Res SNPA, Morne Seychellois Nat. Park</p>	<p>Absolute and percentage METT scores in 2015 (out of 102 points):</p> <p>81 (79%) 76 (75%) 65 (64%) 71 (70%) 59 (58%) 57 (56%) 74 (73%) 49 (48%) 47 (46%)</p>	<p>METT scores expressed in percentages by EOP:</p> <p>- All scores below 50% at the baseline, increase to at least 60%;</p> <p>- All scores between 50% and 60% at the baseline, increase to at least 65%; and</p> <p>- All scores above 60% at the baseline, increase with at least 5 additional percent points</p>	<p>Periodic application of METT methodology to indicator sites.</p> <p>The MTR and TE provide an independent validation of METT scoring</p>	
Outcome 1: Protected Area (PA) investment is fostered and capacity for PA management, at site, institutional and systemic levels, is improved for directing the long-term sustainable financing of the PA system and generating conservation benefits.					
Outputs: <p>1.1 A PA System (PAS) Financing & Investment Plan for Seychelles is adopted at the national-level, along with subsidiary investment plans at the site of sub-system levels, and these become a key instrument for implementing the 2013 PA Policy</p> <p>1.2 Site-level cost-effectiveness and conservation-effectiveness benchmarks are established to guide decisions on investment, co-management, delegation and cross-subsidization</p> <p>1.3 An adequate legal framework is emplaced for implementing the PAS-wide investment program with a multi-funding approach, adaptable to each PA</p> <p>1.4 Institutional capacity-building of SNPA and other key PA managing entities for the implementation of the Seychelles PA System Financing & Investment Plan in enhance</p>					

#	Indicator*	Baseline	Targets by End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
4	Total finances available to the PA system from various sources (based on financial analysis of the six main sub-systems, covering 88% of the PA estate, and functioning as a proxy for the overall PAS)	\$5.4 million p.a., as measured in 2015 and referring to Baseline Year 2013	Increases by at least 50% by EOP and meets the financing needs for a basic management scenario (i.e. \$8 million p.a. or more)	Periodic and participative application of the Financial Sustainability Scorecard for Seychelles' PAS covering, the same sub-subsystems as at the baseline The MTR and TE provide an independent validation of scorecards	<u>Assumptions:</u> Project interventions focusing on capacity building can effectively contribute to institutional development Cooperative governance arrangements for the Protected Areas System is possible
5	On the adoption of financial planning as a key tool for improving PAS financial sustainability [broken down as below]	[broken down as below]	[broken down as below]	Results from the PIR outlining progress Other project reports and studies on PA finance	The 2014 PA Policy remains relevant for guiding PAS development
5a	Existence and effective application of a PA System (PAS) Financing & Investment Plan for Seychelles	Only 1 PA financing plan (though not an investment plan) is being implemented in Seychelles, namely for the SIF PA sub-system; it was prepared in 2013 on the basis of a study carried out under another GEF project and it is probably outdated now	The PAS Financing & Investment Plan for Seychelles has been completed, approved by government and it is under implementation – as independently assessed by the TE by EOP	The MTR and TE provide an independent validation of studies, scorecards, reports and PIR results	<u>Risk:</u> Conflicts and misunderstandings between PA managing
5b	Number of subsidiary investment or financing plans at the site or at the sub-system's level	There are no financing or investment plan at the PAS level	At least 4 PA investment plans are actively implemented in Seychelles and they may either focus on the site level or at the system / sub-system level		

#	Indicator*	Baseline	Targets by End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
6	Independent application of the Capacity Development Scorecard for PA system management with analytical notes shows steady improvements in capacity levels	Overall score was 60% in 2013 ²	70% by EOP and with capacity areas for PAS management that are important for Seychelles duly identified	Periodic application of the Capacity Development Scorecard for PA system using a similar methodology as the one applied in 2013 The MTR and TE provide an independent validation of studies, scorecards, reports and PIR results	entities undermine efforts
Outcome 2: The overall ability of the PA system to generate reliable revenue is improved, both in view of improving its overall management effectiveness and of catering for the needs of an expanded estate					
Outputs: 2.1 Institutional and policy barriers for an effective site-level revenue generation, collection and retention into the PA system are lifted, creating better conditions and incentives for reducing the PA finance gap 2.2 Essential touristic or other relevant infrastructure in selected PAs are developed and new cost-effective practices, systems and schemes are implemented, all with the aim of making these PAs more attractive to visitors, increasing their own revenue generation capacity, while safeguarding and protecting their conservation value 2.3 The operationalization of planned and possibly other relevant innovative funding mechanisms (such as the SCCAT to be created in connection with the debt-for-nature swap initiative) makes clear provisions for biodiversity considerations, in particular to address the PAS financing gap					

² Refer to Capacity Development Scorecard results in 2013 [[Link](#)]. Break-down: *individual* 48%; *institutional* 67%; *systemic* 60%.

#	Indicator*	Baseline	Targets by End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
7	<p>Percentage of PA generated revenues retained in the PA system for re-investment across the main sub-systems and for each individual sub-systems:</p> <p>Across the 6 main PA sub-systems*</p> <p>SNPA sub-system</p> <p>DoE sub-system</p> <p>SIF sub-system</p> <p>ICS sub-system</p> <p>NS sub-system</p> <p>GIF sub-system</p> <p>* which covers 88% of the PA estate and likely 80-90% of all PA finance flows.</p>	<p>As assessed in 2015 through the application of the Financial Sustainability Scorecard for Seychelles' PAS and referring to Baseline Year 2013:</p> <p>67%</p> <p>0%</p> <p>100%</p> <p>100%</p> <p>100%</p> <p>100%</p> <p>100%</p>	Reaches 100% across all sub-systems by EOP	<p>Periodic and participative application of the Financial Sustainability Scorecard for Seychelles' PAS covering, the same sub-subsystems as at the baseline</p> <p>The MTR and TE provide an independent validation of scorecards</p>	<p><u>Assumptions:</u></p> <p>Institutional and policy barriers for an effective site-level revenue generation, collection and retention into the PA system can be lifted</p>
8	<p>SNPA's ability to retain its site-level revenues</p> <p><u>Note:</u> SNPA's financial autonomy is dictated by the category of parastatal that it falls under, which in turn defines whether it is a budget dependent institution or not</p>	<p>(a) Since 2008, SNPA has been downgraded to being a budget-dependent institution;</p> <p>(b) 100% of SNPA's site-generated revenues are reversed to Treasury and not retained by the entity</p>	<p>(a) SNPA status is upgraded and it reaches more financial autonomy;</p> <p>(b) at least 50% of SNPA' site-generated revenue can be retained by the institution</p>	<p>Relevant regulatory texts on SNPA status and the fate of its site-based revenue</p>	<p><u>Assumptions (continued):</u></p> <p>The needed regulatory framework for successfully exploiting old and new PA finance mechanisms will be put in place according to the needs of the PAS.</p>
9	<p>Number of revenue sources for the PA system in the form of PES and their full exploitation in Seychelles</p> <p>[broken down as below]</p>	[broken down as below]	[broken down as below]	<p>Main reference is to PRODOC Table 19, which was in turn derived from PPG study # 2) "Payments for ecosystem services", by Mr Moran (Feb 2015)</p>	

#	Indicator*	Baseline	Targets by End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
9a	<p>Current domestic revenue sources:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Existing (environment and conservation) sector budgets Existing government levies destined wholly or partly for PA funding Park entry fees Public-private finance initiatives Forms of cross-subsidization initiatives based on public-public or public-private ownership structures. 	<p>All 5 mechanisms are currently in use in Seychelles, but for all of them the full potential for revenue generation is only partially exploited, as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The budget is insufficient to minimally cover the gap Government levies do not benefit the PAS A significant portion of park entry fees are not retained by the system The legal environment does not encourage PPP initiatives PA finance cross-subsidization initiatives remain few and <i>ad hoc</i> 	<p>All 5 mechanisms are maintained and at least 2 of them are fully exploited by EOP, as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The conservation sector budget is enough to cover the gap for the state-run sub-system. Park entry fees generated at SNPA sites will be full retained by the entity 	<p>Other PAS analysis and studies</p> <p>Results from the PIR outlining progress</p> <p>The MTR and TE provide an independent validation of studies, scorecards, reports and PIR results</p> <p>Periodic and participative application of the Financial Sustainability Scorecard for Seychelles' PAS assessing the contribution of different PES revenue sources</p>	<p><u>Risk:</u></p> <p>SNPA reform is slow and the parastatal does not can meet the requirements for ceasing to be a budget-dependency institution</p> <p>Climate finance remains restrictive in its applications for PAS finance</p>
9b	<p>International revenue sources:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> More general arrival charge to cover all entries or a modest "PA access passport" of around 5-10 USD per passenger. Debt for Nature/Adaptation Swap Other donor sources including linking PA to climate funding 	<p>There are 3 discernable mechanisms and they are not being exploited for PA finance, of these:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> No "PA access passport" has been conceived. The Debt for Nature/Adaptation Swap is still in its infancy. It is not obvious that climate finance can effectively benefit the PAS. 	<p>At least 1 mechanism is operational by EOP, as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The SCATT is fully operational and disbursing 		

#	Indicator*	Baseline	Targets by End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
9c	<p>Novel/innovative sources incl. PES:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Payments for water services related to PAs (e.g. direct water abstractions by water bottling plants, and agricultural producers) 2. Payments for flood and sedimentation control (this option might legitimately be linked to Debt for adaptation swap). In this case revenues used to support this form of “ecosystem-based adaptation” as provisioned by PAs 3. Carbon sequestration credits 4. Biodiversity offsets (separate project input) 5. Hydropower potential related to PAs 	None of the 5 potential mechanisms have been trialed in Seychelles	<p>At least 1 mechanism have been trialed by EOP, most likely the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Biodiversity offset or compensation for damage shows promise after a pilot implementation supported by the project 	<p>PAS analysis and studies</p> <p>Results from the PIR outlining progress and results from the MTR and TE validating them</p>	

ToR Annex B: Project Information Package to be reviewed by TE team***All documents to be uploaded on shared folder via Dropbox/Other***

#	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 rating³)
 - 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

³ See ToR Annex F for rating scales.

- 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
- Risk Management incl. Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)

4.2 Project Results

- Progress towards objective and expected outcomes (*)
- Relevance (*)
- Effectiveness (*)
- Efficiency (*)
- Overall Outcome (*)
- Country ownership
- Gender
- Other Cross-cutting Issues
- 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 D: Evaluation Criteria Matrix template

Evaluative Questions	Criteria	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 & Evaluation, UNDP oversight/implementation, Implementing Partner Execution, cross-cutting issues, etc.)</i>				

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: _____

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

Evaluations Ratings Table for (project title)

Evaluation Ratings Table	
Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E)	Rating ⁴
M&E design at entry	
M&E Plan Implementation	
Overall Quality of M&E	
Implementing Agency (IA) Implementation & Executing Agency (EA) 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	

⁴ 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)

Date:

[illegible]
