

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

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 medium-sized project titled Supporting Sustainable Ecosystems by Strengthening the Effectiveness of Dominica's Protected Areas (*PIMS # 5089*) implemented through the *Executing Agency, (United Nations Development Programme) with Implementing Partner, the Government of the Commonwealth of Dominica*. The project started on the 14th April 2016 and is in its *fourth* 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' (<http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/UNDP-GEF-TE-Guide.pdf>).

2. PROJECT BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

The Commonwealth of Dominica has a national Protected Area (PA) consisting of six (6) terrestrial and one marine park, however, the reality is that only three (3) of the PA are legally constituted, while two of the noted sites have been partially developed commercially and are no longer considered suitable as national parks while the other site is a potential marine protected area that has yet to be designated. This PA estate is supported by The National Parks and Protected Areas Act No. 16 of 1975, amended by Acts 54 of 1986, Act 12 of 1990, and Act 8 of 2001 is the principal piece of legislation relating to the management of national parks in Dominica. The Act provides for the declaration of both national parks and protected areas, leasing of land for protected areas, the establishment of a system of National Parks and Protected Areas. The Act also makes provisions for the creation of a National Parks service to manage a system of National Parks and Protected Areas. Despite the Act, there is no PA Management system, the designated World Heritage Site has no buffer zone, hence the core zone is threatened as is the case for all PAs Systems. Also, the site management of the PAs is poor, and the revenue generation potential is not maximized hence PAs is undercapitalized and local and global benefits are at risk.

The Supporting Sustainable Ecosystems by Strengthening the Effectiveness of Dominica's Protected Areas Project (SSE), will use GEF incremental support to build Dominica's national capacity to manage its PA systems, with emphasis on the Morne Trois Pitons National Park (MTPNP) and its buffer zone. The Project aims to; improve management effectiveness, create sustainable livelihood activities, and improve biodiversity conservation. Project implementation will ensure replication dissemination of lessons learnt at the other sites (Parks, trails and nature sites), and other GEF funded activities locally and regionally. This project will develop a protected areas management system in keeping with recommendations from previous initiatives like the OECS Protected Areas and Associated Livelihoods (OPAAL) project and the National Parks Consortium Studies. Using the GEF funding, this project will strengthen the sustainability of Dominica's PA systems by legal establishment of a buffer zone for MTPNP, create community atlases for

local communities in and around the buffer zone thus establishing living landscapes. GEF funding will also be used to build capacity at the systematic and community level to effectively manage PAs and their buffer zones.

The Government of the Commonwealth of Dominica obtained grant funding of approximately US 1.7 million dollars under the Global Environment Facility Fifth Replenishment (GEF-5) to implement the aforementioned project with implementation starting in April 2016 and is scheduled to end in April 2021, owing to a one-year extension. Hence, as a project using a nationally implemented modality (NIM), the main responsibility for this project rests with the Government of the Commonwealth of Dominica. Under this arrangement, the Implementing Partner (IP) assumes full responsibility for the effective use of project resources and the delivery of outputs.

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 TE will serve to analyze project results against the indicators that have been outlined in the project document to ensure that project intention has been achieved. This will encompass the impact and the sustainability namely: (financial, environmental and social) of the results and achievement in terms of capacity building and global environmental benefits as defined by GEF. In addition, the effectiveness of the Project's interventions in meeting the Project objectives will be assessed and key findings highlighted.

The findings of the TE will serve as an evaluation of UNDP's accountability as to how resources are used, the results achieved and social impact. In addition, UNDP, GEF, the Government of Dominica (IP), stakeholders and the public stand to benefit and act accordingly from the results emanating from the TE as per the evaluation criteria as defined by UNDP which serves to:

- *Design or validate a development strategy*
- *Determine improvement in project design and implementation*
- *Increase knowledge and understanding of project's as it relates to human development*
- *Determine funding decisions by GEF and duplication of projects*
- *Determine development partners*
- *Improve project design and implementation*

The TE results will therefore be used by the Commissioning Unit, Donor, implementing partner and stakeholders to strengthen funding decisions, improve design and implementation practices and maximize positive social impact. TE results will be used to increase knowledge and understanding

of the benefits and challenges of development programmes and projects intended for the enhancement of human development as per the UNDP evaluation criteria and thus fitting in with the Commissioning Unit's Evaluation plan.

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. The following is an indicative list of the individuals/institutions whose views should be fully reflected in the final report.

Name	Agency/Department	Contact Information
Mr. Mohammad Nadgee	Programme Manager, Sustainable Solutions and Energy	mohammad.nadgee@undp.org
Ms. Nickez McPherson	Interim Project Coordinator (SSE)	Nickez.mcpherson@undp.org
Ms. Elizabeth Robinson	Project Associate (SSE)	Elizabeth.Robinson@undp.org
Ms. Mandra Fagan	Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Environment, Rural Modernization and Kalinago Upliftment	psenvironment@dominica.gov.dm
Ms. Careen Prevost	Former Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Environment	psgovernance@undp.org

Ms. Claudia Ortiz	Regional Technical Adviser	claudia.ortiz@undp.org
Mr. Luis Francisco Thais Santa Cruz	Head, Dominica Project Office	luis.francisco.thais@undp.org
Anderson Parillon	UNDP Focal Point	parillona@dominica.gov.dm
Jacquelyn Andre	<i>Division of Forestry, Wildlife and Parks</i>	andrej@dominica.gov.dm
Rickey Brumant	<i>Ministry of Agriculture</i>	Brumantr@dominica.gov.dm
Lyn Baron	<i>Physical Planning Division</i>	Lyn_baron@yahoo.com
Arun Madisetti	<i>Local management authority for Soufriere Scott's Head Marine Reserve (LAMA)</i>	izzydiving@gmail.com
Magnus Williams	<i>Dominica Water and Sewerage Company (DOWASCO)</i>	m.williams@dowasco.dm
George Maxwell	<i>Ministry of Tourism, International Transport and Maritime Initiatives</i>	maxwellg@dominica.gov.dm
Kent Coipel	<i>Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture (IICA)</i>	kent.coipel@iica.int
Dawn Francis	<i>Central Universal Farmer's Group</i>	dawnymfrancis@gmail.com
Shirley George	<i>South East Women Farming Organic Group</i>	1-767-6160722
Delroy Registe	<i>Bellevue Chopin Organic Farmers Movement Inc</i>	delroyregiste@gmail.com
Alberta Sorhaindo	<i>Toloma Women in Action Inc</i>	1-767-265-7642

William Sabroache	<i>Cochrane United Farmers Group</i>	1-767-616-9117/1-767-225-6078
Dylan Williams	<i>Velvet Fragrance Essentials</i>	1-767-285-8106

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.

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 Standards (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 (Safeguards)

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

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 incorporate gender equality and empowerment of women.

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

ToR Table 2: Evaluation Ratings Table for *Supporting Sustainable Ecosystems by Strengthening the Effectiveness of Dominica's Protected Area System*

Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E)	Rating ¹
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	

¹ Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, Implementation/Oversight & Execution, Relevance are rated on a 6-point 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)

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

6. TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the TE will be approximately *35 working days* starting on *February 24th 2021*. The tentative TE timeframe is as follows:

Timeframe	Activity
Feb 24 2021	Selection of TE team Direct contract/Limited competitive procurement Preparation period for TE team (handover of documentation) Document review and preparation of TE Inception Report
March 10 2021	Finalization and Validation of TE Inception Report; latest start of TE mission TE Stakeholder Engagement: meetings and interviews Stakeholder Engagement wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings; earliest end of TE mission
Mar 26 2021 (7 days)	Preparation of draft TE report Circulation of draft TE report for comments

Incorporation of comments on draft TE report into Audit Trail & finalization of TE report

Preparation and Issuance of Management Response

Concluding Stakeholder Workshop (optional)

Apr 13 2021

Expected date of full TE completion

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

7. TE DELIVERABLES

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	TE Inception Report	TE team clarifies objectives, methodology and timing of the TE	No later than 2 weeks before the	TE team submits Inception Report to Commissioning Unit and project management
2	Presentation	Initial Findings	End of TE engagement:	TE team presents to Commissioning Unit and project management
3	Draft TE Report	Full draft report with annexes	Within 3 weeks of end of TE stakeholder engagement: <i>by Mar 26 2021</i>	TE team submits to Commissioning Unit; reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFF
5	Final TE Report* + Audit Trail	Revised final report and TE Audit trail in which the TE details how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final TE report	Within 1 week of receiving comments on draft report: <i>by April 13 2021</i>	TE team submits both documents to the Commissioning Unit

*All final TE reports will be quality assessed by the UNDP Independent Evaluation Office (IEO). Details of the IEO's quality assessment of decentralized evaluations can be found in Section 6 of the UNDP Evaluation Guidelines.²

8. TE ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing the TE resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's TE is the UNDP Multi-Country Office for Barbados and the OECS in Barbados

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. 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.

9. TE TEAM COMPOSITION

A team of two independent evaluators will conduct the TE –*One team leader (International Consultant) and one team expert (National Consultant)*. The team leader will be responsible for the overall design, coordinating the data collection and analysis phase of the evaluation and drafting the main report among other relevant tasks. The team leader will also ensure that all evaluation criteria are adequately covered by the evaluation team. The team expert will assist the team leader in timely completion of TE deliverables including, but not limited to developing the TE itinerary and assessing emerging trends in policy development, capacity building, budget allocations, regulatory frameworks.

The international consultant will be designated as the Team Leader and will be responsible for finalizing the report. The national consultant will be the team member in the evaluation team and will provide supportive roles both in terms of professional back up, translation etc. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

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

Education

- Master's degree in Environmental Science, Protected Areas Management, Environment and Sustainable Development or other closely related field (20%);

Experience

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

- **Minimum of 10 years professional experience in evaluations, with a specific emphasis on results-based monitoring and impact evaluations for sustainable development programmes/projects (Relevant experience with results-based management/logical framework approach);(20%)**
- Experience working with the UNDP or another GEF agency or GEF project evaluations, including experience with SMART based indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios (20%);
- Experience working in the Commonwealth of Dominica or within the Caribbean; (10%)
- At least 5-10 years of proven experience in local development planning with strong elements of biodiversity conservation and environmental assessment and management (10%)
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and Biodiversity Conservation/ Sustainable Use; 5-10 years' experience in gender responsive evaluation and analysis;(10%)
- Excellent communication skills;(5%)
- Demonstrable analytical skills; (5%)

Language

- Fluency in written and spoken English.

10. EVALUATOR ETHICS

The TE team will be held to the highest ethical standards and is required to sign a code of conduct upon acceptance of the assignment. This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'. The evaluator must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing 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.

11. PAYMENT SCHEDULE

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

Criteria for issuing the final payment of 40%³:

- 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.

Percentage of Contract	Milestone
20%	On submission and approval of Inception Report and work plan
40%	On presentation of draft TE report to the Commissioning Unit
40%	Following submission of the final TE report and approval by the Commissioning Unit and RTA

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

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

12. APPLICATION PROCESS⁴

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

- a) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](#)⁵ provided by UNDP;
- b) **CV** and a **Personal History Form** ([P11 form](#))⁶;

³ The Commissioning Unit is obligated to issue payments to the TE team as soon as the terms under the ToR are fulfilled. If there is an ongoing discussion regarding the quality and completeness of the final deliverables that cannot be resolved between the Commissioning Unit and the TE team, the Regional M&E Advisor and Vertical Fund Directorate will be consulted. If needed, the Commissioning Unit's senior management, Procurement Services Unit and Legal Support Office will be notified as well so that a decision can be made about whether or not to withhold payment of any amounts that may be due to the evaluator(s), suspend or terminate the contract and/or remove the individual contractor from any applicable rosters. See the UNDP Individual Contract Policy for further details:

https://popp.undp.org/_layouts/15/WopiFrame.aspx?sourcedoc=/UNDP_POPP_DOCUMENT_LIBRARY/Public/PSU_Individual%20Contract_Individual%20Contract%20Policy.docx&action=default

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

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

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

- c) 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)
- d) **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc), supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the [Letter of Confirmation of Interest template](#). If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

All application materials should be submitted to the address (UNDP Barbados and the Eastern Caribbean, UN House, Marine Gardens, Hastings, Christ Church, Barbados) in a sealed envelope indicating the following reference "Consultant for Terminal Evaluation of Supporting Sustainable Ecosystems by Strengthening the Effectiveness of Dominica's Protected Areas" or by email at the following address ONLY: (procurement.bb@undp.org) by (5:00 pm, Jan 26, 2021). Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

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

13. TOR ANNEXES

- 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

ToR Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework

This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPAP # 1: Enhanced capacity of national, sub-regional and regional institutions and stakeholders to: effectively manage natural resources; build resilience to the adverse impacts of climate change and natural and anthropogenic hazards; improved energy efficiency and use of renewable energy; improved policy, legal, regulatory and institutional frameworks for environmental and energy governance.

Country Programme Outcome 1 Indicators: Percent of budget allocated to environmental protection; hectares of forest cover; greenhouse gas emissions per capita; number of updated and tested contingency plans; volume of savings from reduced fossil fuel imports; multilateral environmental agreements incorporated into national legislation; energy efficiency and renewable energy policies.

Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area (same as that on the cover page, circle one):

1. Solutions at local level for sustainable management of natural resources, ecosystems and environmental services, for expanded jobs and livelihoods; and
3.5. Transparent and non-discriminatory legal and regulatory frameworks and policies enabled for sustainable management of natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystems (in line with international conventions and national legislation)
2. Unlocking the potential of PAs, including indigenous and community conserved areas, to conserve biodiversity while contributing to sustainable development

Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program: BD 1 Improve the sustainability of Protected Area Systems

Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes 1.1: Improved management effectiveness of existing and new protected areas

Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators: Buffer zone developed around protected area improving protected area by 2,030 ha.

Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	Targets at end of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
Project Objective: To demonstrate a model for effective integrated landscape management encompassing the strengthening of an existing protected area (Morne Trois Pitons National Park) and establishment of its buffer zone in order to reduce threats to biodiversity and ecological functioning					
Component 1: Strengthening the core zone management of Protected Areas at systemic level and scale up innovative interventions at core zone of selected PAs to improve Sustainability					

<p>Outcome 1. (Activity in Atlas) Biodiversity Assessment, monitoring and conservation. Develop approve and operationalize management plan for MTPNP</p>	<p>Monitoring and assessment plan. Persons trained to carry out assessment Improve METT scores of MTPNP and other targeted PAs A legally recognized management structure with guidelines;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revised National Biodiversity Assessment and 5th National Report on Biodiversity available. • Current METT scores for MTP is 59 • Draft management plan available but not in use 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual biodiversity reports used in decision making in Agriculture and planning. Conservation strategies being implemented. • Target METT score at end of project 75 • Implementation of approved management plan; 75% of staff (recommended in plan) hired. Improved financial and technical management. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Biodiversity reports available. • Management effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT) prepared at mid-term review and terminal evaluation • Management plan in document form available 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decision makers approve the management plan
<p>2. Resource MTPNP management. Develop Operational Capacity. Develop and implement surveillance plan to control hunting, and</p>	<p>A financial plan and trained staff to implement the plan. Increased financing in place to address the sustainability of the NP as measured by the UNDP Financial Scorecard. Increased area of MTP NP from 6,342 ha to</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing management plan lack resource component; need to be revised and updated. • Core zone legally recognized and protected. A 200 m Buffer zone around MTP NP proposed • To be developed during first year of project cycle 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dedicated financing for MTP NP identified and applied. • At least 530 ha added as buffer zone within existing park. • Staff adequately trained by the end of year two. • BD threat minimized and illegal actions reduced by 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financial report from PA operations • Physical maps of Dominica showing new boundaries • Staff list showing performance levels and financial reports. • Training reports surveillance records 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Private land owners in the proposed buffer zone agree to the terms of the project as it pertains to land use and management

Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	Targets at end of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
<p>harvesting of wild plants and animals, land clearing and tilling on slopes >15%, and land development.</p>	<p>8, 372 ha including buffer zone (530 ha within and 1500 ha outside). Trained staff managing 8,372 ha of integrated landscape (MTPNP core and buffer zone) No of MTP NP staff with specialized training in surveillance techniques resulting in reduced incidences of fires, hunting and tilling on slopes >15% in buffer zone.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Park wardens currently perform spot checks, no systematic monitoring 	<p>70 % by year 4. Surveillance, monitoring and fire management programme developed and implemented.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced erosion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacity Development Scorecard prepared at mid-term review and terminal evaluation 	

<p>3. Establish PA coordinating Unit.</p> <p>Strengthen PA policy.</p> <p>Develop PA legislation.</p> <p>Improve financial stability of PA.</p> <p>Develop PA system plan.</p>	<p>PA management Unit staffed with trained staff.</p> <p>PA Management capacity strengthened</p> <p>PA controls established</p> <p>PA legislation approved and registered</p> <p>PA management adequately financed</p> <p>Improved coordination among PA site</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PA managed by staff of Forestry that will be upgraded to PA unit • PA management scorecard rating at 67% • Draft policies with no regulations. • PA designation legislation in place but management issues missing • User fees are in place but management very weak • PA units are independently managed with different standards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PA Unit in place with adequate staff and finance. • PA management scorecard rating improved to 85% • PA policies with regulations approved and enforced. • PA legislation registered and enforced • Sustainable Finance plan. PA generating 100% of its financial needs. • A coordinate PA system plan with legal and financial considerations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PA unit office with equipment and staff • Management scorecard available • Policy document available • Document available with registration number. • Financial management plan. PA audit report • Financial Sustainability Scorecard prepared at mid-term review and terminal evaluation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approval given for PA system to manage its finance with supervision from Ministry of Finance.
---	---	---	---	--	---

Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	Targets at end of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
<p>Consolidate PA information system.</p> <p>Develop financial sustainability strategy.</p> <p>Standardized administrative and financial processes in co- management arrangement</p>	<p>A single database and information system for Dominica's PA</p> <p>PA financial plan</p> <p>Functional Co-management arrangement</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ministry of Tourism provides site specific information. PA sites generate finance but unsustainable Community organizations have an umbrella organization but no connection to existing PA management authorities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A unified information system and database PA financing strategically managed; funds collection and used efficiently. A functional co-management arrangement between stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Systems plan document available Data dissemination through information System Strategy document available Documented management arrangement and financial plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A stakeholder agreement that meet everyone's approval.
<p>Component 2: Establish and manage Buffer Zone as a key component of National Protected Area System and select experiences to be scaled up beyond the buffer zone</p>					

<p>Outcome 2 (Activity in Atlas)</p> <p>1. Establish an Inter-sectorial committee for the management of integrated PA landscapes (2,030 ha buffer zone).</p> <p>Identify and define boundaries of buffer zone</p> <p>Legally establish buffer zone as managed landscape with restrictions on hunting,</p>	<p>A legally constituted inter-sectorial committee with mandate and authority for Pa management.</p> <p>2,030 ha of buffer zone marked on maps</p> <p>Approved Buffer zone Legislation supports zero hunting, charcoal burning and road development.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responsible agencies exist but no coordination practiced. • Preliminary buffer zone identified in studies but not established or approved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Committee established and functioning using management plan (Component 1) • 1,500 ha of buffer zones outside the existing PA boundary identified, demarcated and mapped. • Legislation governing buffer drafted and approved. 2,030 ha of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TORs for agency representatives on inter-sectorial committee. • GIS map showing buffer zone available 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Private land owners agree to management policy. • The degree of restriction to which private land owners
--	--	--	---	--	---

Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	Targets at end of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
<p>charcoal burning, tilling on slopes > 15% and infrastructure development</p> <p>Demarcate sites in the buffer zone with signpost</p>	<p>Sign posts in place around buffer</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Landscape around buffer- zone managed in an ad hoc way with some charcoal burning, hunting, land tilling on slopes and building construction Conceptual boundary advanced but not approved or marked 	<p>buffer zone under active management; greater limits on hunting and development, prohibition of charcoal burning and tilling on slopes > 15%.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Buffer zone legally established and demarcated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Legislation published in gazette Legal instrument establishing Buffer zone. 	<p>will agree is uncertain</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Private land owners agree to function within a buffer zone context
<p>2. Support CRMP</p> <p>Develop land tenure and compensation review process</p> <p>Expand the scope of current outreach program for farmers</p>	<p>Environmental and land use standards for development in buffer zones.</p> <p>Land tenure review process in place.</p> <p>Number of farmers helped by outreach program increased, disaggregated by age and gender</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EIA for select development activities required by Physical Planning Department Least arrangement exists for use of state lands. Ministry of Agriculture has an outreach to farmers (extension program) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operating standards and guidelines in place for development of livelihood activities in buffer zone. Clear and acceptable review process for land tenure 100% of persons farming in and around buffer zone supported by outreach program and adhere to land use restrictions – no charcoal burning, no tilling on slopes >15 %, no land conversion to road. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Published EIA standards for buffer zone. Land tenure model document Farmers practicing skills received from outreach program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> State approves use of land for agriculture

Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	Targets at end of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
<p>3. Develop 4 Community resource management plans</p> <p>Engage local residents within buffer zone in livelihood activities</p> <p>Strengthen Community organization capacity to effectively manage the buffer zone.</p> <p>Community based education program</p>	<p>Vulnerability Atlases for 4 communities listed</p> <p>Livelihoods activities in buffer zone confirms to land use restrictions: no hunting, no tilling on slopes > 15%, no clear cutting and no charcoal burning policy.</p> <p>Number of persons trained in BD friendly agriculture and land management practices, disaggregated by age and gender</p> <p>Stakeholder awareness of project progress and PA management strategy. Information on management controls – no burning of charcoal, no tilling on slopes >15%, zero land conversion to road disseminated on all media.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community Vulnerability Atlas for 10 communities exists. Unregulated farming in parts of the buffer zone. Agriculture practice in proposed buffer zone is unsustainable (include clear cut and burning) ECU has ongoing environmental education in schools and community 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Four community resource management plans developed and 50% implementation. All farmer in buffer zone practice BD friendly agriculture All Stakeholders in buffer zone involve in management (co management) 100% Buffer zone effectively managed- no charcoal burning, no road construction or tilling on slopes > 15% 70% of Dominicans supporting PA agenda All Dominicans knowledgeable about and practice controls on charcoal burning, harvesting and hunting restriction. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community resource management plans approved by Ministries and available. Manual on BD management available, Organic fertilizer available to farmers in buffer zone. Organic farming and GAP standards practiced in PA Documents and media program 	<p>?</p>

U87

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 and spot check 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
	<i>Additional documents, as required</i>

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 rating⁷)

4.1 Project Design/Formulation

- Analysis of Results Framework: project logic and strategy, indicators
- Assumptions and Risks
- Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g. same focal area) incorporated into project design
- 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
- Risk Management, including Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)

4.2 Project Results and Impacts

- Progress towards objective and expected outcomes (*)
- Relevance (*)
- Effectiveness (*)
- Efficiency (*)
- Overall Outcome (*)
- 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/Replication Effect
- Progress to Impact

5. Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons

- Main Findings
- Conclusions
- Recommendations
- Lessons Learned

6. Annexes

⁷ See ToR Annex F for rating scales.

- TE ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
- TE Mission itinerary, including summary of field visits
- List of persons interviewed
- List of documents reviewed
- 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 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>
Were the project's objectives and implementation strategies in keeping	Level of coherence between project design and implementation, quality of risk mitigation strategies	Project Documentation, National Policies, Consultants	Project Document analysis,

with GEF focal area (Biodiversity Conservation/Sustainable Use) at the time of design and implementation. Was this relevant on a national level?			Interviews with Stakeholders
Were the implementation strategies in keeping with the priorities of beneficiaries	Improvement of beneficiary data from baseline, level of coherence between priorities of beneficiaries vs implementation strategies	Project Documentation, Beneficiaries, consultants, data collected on beneficiaries	Interviews with beneficiaries/consultants
Has any aspect of the project been adapted to the deal with the adverse impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic?	Quality of risk mitigation strategy	Project Staff, Beneficiaries, consultants	Interviews with project staff/consultant/stakeholders
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
Were there any factors which affected the project's outcomes? Was project cost effectiveness achieved	Analysis of Project documentation, budgets, AWP's against project spend	Project Documentation, budgets, AWP's, Project Staff/Consultants, Stakeholders	Interviews with Project staff/consultant/stakeholders, analysis of project documentation, budget, AWP's, actual spend

Were activities and delivery methods developed in Project Document effective in producing expected outputs and outcomes	Level of coherence with project documentation against success/limitations as defined by project staff	Project Documentation, TE data collected as pertaining to outputs and outcomes	Project Document, interviews with project staff
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in line with international and national norms and standards?			
Give analysis of how delays may have affected project execution, costs and overall effectiveness. Were any cost or time saving mitigation measures implemented	Identification and analysis of cost measures, project delays, comparison ratio of cost and time with other similar projects locally and regionally. Outcomes/Impacts Analysis	Data Collection as pertaining to Outcome	Interviews with project staff, stake holders, data collection
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-political, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
Is project heavily dependent on financial support for continued sustenance after project end. Have any mechanisms been put in place to	Sustainability of financial reports, policy framework, management plans etc..	Data collection, financial documents, financial policy	Data collection, Interviews with consultants, project staff, stakeholders

address this dependency?			
<p>Are there social or political factors that may influence the sustenance of project. Is the level of public and stakeholder ownership, interest and incentives sufficient to allow for project sustenance? Have any measures been put in place for project users to continue to operate and maintain the project's investment</p>	<p>Sustenance of project as it relates to social and political climate, Assessment of potential impact. Sustenance of Management plans, Increase in project capacity, training, staff</p>	<p>Project staff, stakeholders, park wardens, trained staff, public, IP</p>	<p>Interviews with project staff, stakeholders, questionnaires for trained staff, public etc., PS – implementing partner</p>
<p>Are there any environmental factors activities etc...in or around PAs, which can affect sustenance/continued impact of project?</p>	<p>Analysis of EIA codification against project sustenance</p>	<p>Project stakeholders</p>	<p>Interviews with stakeholders</p>

Contribution of project by implementation of policy frameworks. To what extent is the sustenance of Project dependent on issues relating to institutional and policy frameworks?	Analysis of Project document, review of policy framework, management plans against Project sustainability	Project documentation, management plans, policies, legal framework, stakeholders	Interviews with stakeholders,
Gender equality and women's empowerment: How did the project contribute to gender equality and women's empowerment?			
What strategies were put in place to ensure gender equality and continued gender inclusion?	Level of coherence in implementation strategies as outlined in project document and overall effectiveness of strategies	Project staff, consultants, communities, data	Interviews with communities, women's groups, project staff, consultants, gender data analysis, project document
Was there a percentage increase in relation to gender inclusion in capacity training, empowerment etc. from baseline	Increase in TE data against baseline data re gender involvement, training, capacity building	TE data, baseline data	Interviews with consultants, project staff
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
What project activities were	Project activities as defined in Project Document	Project Document, Management plans, EIA	Interviews with project staff,

geared at reducing environmental stress particularly during the long term		codification, training sessions for communities, public	consultants, stakeholders, project document review
<p><i>Monitoring and Evaluation: Project monitoring and evaluation will be conducted in accordance with established UNDP and GEF procedures. The project performance will be monitored and evaluated according to the Project Results Framework (log-frame). Effectiveness of monitoring and plans based on the Project Document and how information obtained during the Monitoring and Evaluation was used to adapt and Improve Project Execution, sustainability etc...</i></p>			
Quality of the project log-frame as a planning and monitoring instrument; i.e. are there SMART indicators etc..?	Quality of Project log-frame based on UNDP and other quality assurance standards; Identification of SMART indicators in Project Document	Project documentation,	Review of project log-frame
Adequate budget for M&E activities	Level of coherence between necessary M& E activities vs. budget	Project documentation, AWP budget,	Interview with project staff, project document and AWP budget review
Was baseline information on performance indicators provided	Validation of Baseline information	Project documentation, Project staff	Interview with project staff

from reliable sources?			
Was methodology, data sources and data collection instruments appropriate and was monitoring adequate?	Validation of methodology, data sources and collection instrument based on project impact	Project staff, project documentation, PIRs, Quarterly, semi-annual Reports,	Interview with project staff, review of quarterly, semi-annual, PIR reports
UNDP Oversight Implementation: How effective was UNDP oversight implementation			
Was the UNDP instrumental in providing support to Project Coordinator in providing clarity and timely support where needed, removing any roadblocks etc to allow for keeping the project on track	On-track project progress, timely communication and support with activities	UNDP, project staff, documentation outlining support	Interview with project staff, Review of documentation/ communication
Implementing Partner (IP) Execution			
How effective were the functions and processes by Implementing Partner to contribute to the successful and timely implementation of the Project	On-track project progress related to Implementing partner execution of activities, timely communication and support with activities	IP, project staff, documentation outlining support	Interview with project staff, PS implementing partner, Review of documentation/ communication
Cross Cutting Issues			

Were cross cutting issues given special attention and integrated into all stages of the project	Validation of cross cutting issues into different stages of project	Project documentation, project staff	Interview with project staff, project document review
---	---	--------------------------------------	---

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

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

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:

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

BASIC CONTRACT INFORMATION

Location: Roseau, Dominica

Application Deadline: February 3rd 2021

Type of Contract: IC

Assignment Type:

Languages Required: English

Starting Date: February 5th 2021

Duration of Initial Contract:

Expected Duration of Assignment: 10 weeks

BACKGROUND

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 medium-sized project titled Supporting Sustainable Ecosystems by Strengthening Effectiveness of Dominica's Protected Areas (SSE) (PIMS 5089#) implemented through the *UNDP/Government of the Commonwealth of Dominica*. The project started on the 14th April 2016 and is in its fourth 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' <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/UNDP-GEF-TE-Guide.pdf>.

2. Project Description

The Commonwealth of Dominica has a national Protected Area (PA) consisting of six (6) terrestrial and one marine park, however, the reality is that only three (3) of the PA are legally constituted, while two of the noted sites have been partially developed commercially and are no longer considered suitable as national parks while the other site is a potential marine protected area that has yet to be designated. This PA estate is supported by The National Parks and Protected Areas Act No. 16 of 1975, amended by Acts 54 of 1986, Act 12 of 1990, and Act 8 of 2001 is the principal piece of legislation relating to the management of national parks in Dominica. The Act provides for the declaration of both national parks and protected areas, leasing of land for protected areas, the establishment of a system of National Parks and Protected Areas. The Act also makes provisions for the creation of a National Parks service to manage a system of National Parks and Protected Areas. Despite the Act, there is no PA Management system, the

designated World Heritage Site has no buffer zone, hence the core zone is threatened as is the case for all PAs Systems. Also, the site management of the PAs is poor, and the revenue generation potential is not maximized hence PAs is undercapitalized and local and global benefits are at risk.

The Supporting Sustainable Ecosystems by Strengthening the Effectiveness of Dominica's Protected Areas Project (SSE), will use GEF incremental support to build Dominica's national capacity to manage its PA systems, with emphasis on the Morne Trois Pitons National Park (MTPNP) and its buffer zone. The Project aims to; improve management effectiveness, create sustainable livelihood activities, and improve biodiversity conservation. Project implementation will ensure replication dissemination of lessons learnt at the other sites (Parks, trails and nature sites), and other GEF funded activities locally and regionally. This project will develop a protected areas management system in keeping with recommendations from previous initiatives like the OECS Protected Areas and Associated Livelihoods (OPAAL) project and the National Parks Consortium Studies. Using the GEF funding, this project will strengthen the sustainability of Dominica's PA systems by legal establishment of a buffer zone for MTPNP, create community atlases for local communities in and around the buffer zone thus establishing living landscapes. GEF funding will also be used to build capacity at the systematic and community level to effectively manage PAs and their buffer zones.

The Government of the Commonwealth of Dominica obtained grant funding of approximately US 1.7 million dollars under the Global Environment Facility Fifth Replenishment (GEF-5) to implement the aforementioned project with implementation starting in April 2016 and is scheduled to end in April 2021, owing to a one-year extension. Hence, as a project using a nationally implemented modality (NIM), the main responsibility for this project rests with the Government of the Commonwealth of Dominica. Under this arrangement, the Implementing Partner (IP) assumes full responsibility for the effective use of project resources and the delivery of outputs.

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 TE will serve to analyze project results against the indicators that have been outlined in the project document to ensure that project intention has been achieved. This will encompass the impact and the sustainability namely: (financial, environmental and social) of the results and achievement in terms of capacity building and global environmental benefits as defined by GEF. In addition, the effectiveness of the Project's interventions in meeting the Project objectives will be assessed and key findings highlighted.

The findings of the TE will serve as an evaluation of UNDP's accountability as to how resources are used, the results achieved and social impact. In addition, UNDP, GEF, the Government of Dominica (IP), stakeholders and the public stand to benefit and act accordingly from the results emanating from the TE as per the evaluation criteria as defined by UNDP which serves to:

- *Design or validate a development strategy*
- *Determine improvement in project design and implementation*

- *Increase knowledge and understanding of project's as it relates to human development*
- *Determine funding decisions by GEF and duplication of projects*
- *Determine development partners*
- *Improve project design and implementation*

The TE results will therefore be used by the Commissioning Unit, Donor, implementing partner and stakeholders to strengthen funding decisions, improve design and implementation practices and maximize positive social impact. TE results will be used to increase knowledge and understanding of the benefits and challenges of development programmes and projects intended for the enhancement of human development as per the UNDP evaluation criteria and thus fitting in with the Commissioning Unit's Evaluation plan.

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. The following is an indicative list of the individuals/institutions whose views should be fully reflected in the final report.

Name	Agency/Department	Contact Information
------	-------------------	---------------------

Mr. Mohammad Nadgee	Programme Manager, Sustainable Solutions and Energy	mohammad.nadgee@undp.org
Ms. Nickez McPherson	Interim Project Coordinator (SSE)	Nickez.mcpherson@undp.org
Ms. Elizabeth Robinson	Project Associate (SSE)	Elizabeth.Robinson@undp.org
Ms. Mandra Fagan	Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Environment, Rural Modernization and Kalinago Upliftment	psenvironment@dominica.gov.dm
Ms. Careen Prevost	Former Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Environment	psgovernance@undp.org
Ms. Claudia Ortiz	Regional Technical Adviser	claudia.ortiz@undp.org
Mr. Luis Francisco Thais Santa Cruz	Head, Dominica Project Office	luis.francisco.thais@undp.org
Anderson Parillon	UNDP Focal Point	parillona@dominica.gov.dm
Jacquelyn Andre	<i>Division of Forestry, Wildlife and Parks</i>	andrej@dominica.gov.dm
Rickey Brumant	<i>Ministry of Agriculture</i>	Brumantr@dominica.gov.dm
Lyn Baron	<i>Physical Planning Division</i>	Lyn_baron@yahoo.com
Arun Madisetti	<i>Local management authority for Soufriere Scott's Head Marine Reserve (LAMA)</i>	izzydiving@gmail.com
Magnus Williams	<i>Dominica Water and Sewerage Company (DOWASCO)</i>	m.williams@dowasco.dm
George Maxwell	<i>Ministry of Tourism, International Transport and Maritime Initiatives</i>	maxwellg@dominica.gov.dm
Kent Coipel	<i>Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture (IICA)</i>	kent.coipel@iica.int

Dawn Francis	<i>Central Universal Farmer's Group</i>	dawnymfrancis@gmail.com
Shirley George	<i>South East Women Farming Organic Group</i>	1-767-6160722
Delroy Registe	<i>Bellevue Chopin Organic Farmers Movement Inc</i>	delroyregiste@gmail.com
Alberta Sorhaindo	<i>Toloma Women in Action Inc</i>	1-767-265-7642
William Sabroache	<i>Cochrane United Farmers Group</i>	1-767-616-9117/1-767-225-6078
Dylan Williams	<i>Velvet Fragrance Essentials</i>	1-767-285-8106

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 should be clearly outlined in the inception report and be fully discussed and agreed between UNDP, stakeholders and the TE team.

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.

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

iv. 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

v. 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

vi. 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

vii. 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 team shall prepare and submit:

- TE Inception Report: TE team clarifies objectives and methods of the TE no later than 2 weeks before the TE mission. TE team submits the Inception Report to the Commissioning Unit and project management. Approximate due date: February 8 2021.
- Presentation: TE team presents initial findings to project management and the Commissioning Unit at the end of the TE mission. Approximate due date: March 1 2021
- Draft TE Report: TE team submits full draft report with annexes *within 3 weeks* of the end of the TE mission. Approximate due date: March 8 2021
- Final TE Report* and Audit Trail: TE team submits revised report, with Audit Trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final TE report, to the Commissioning Unit *within 1 week* of receiving UNDP comments on draft. Approximate due date: April 13 2021

*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.⁸

7. TE Arrangements

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

8. Duration of the Work

The total duration of the TE will be approximately 35 working days over a time period of 10 weeks starting February 5 2021 and shall not exceed five months from when the TE team is hired. The tentative TE timeframe is as follows:

- *Jan 26 2021*: Application closes
- *Jan 27- Feb 3 2021*: Selection of TE Team
- *Feb 5 2021*: Prep the TE team (handover of project documents)
- *Feb 8 2021*: 3 days: Document review and preparing TE Inception Report
- *Feb 11 2021*: 2 days: Finalization and Validation of TE Inception Report- latest start of TE mission
- *Feb 15 2021*: 15 days: TE Stakeholder Engagement: meetings and interviews
- *Mar 1 2021*: Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of TE mission
- *Mar 8 2021*: 7 days: Preparation of draft TE report
- *Mar 15 2021*: Circulation of draft TE report for comments
- *Mar 22 2021*: 2 days: Incorporation of comments on draft TE report into Audit Trail & finalization of TE report
- *Apr 2 2021*: Preparation & Issue of Management Response
- *Apr 5 2021*: Concluding Stakeholder Workshop
- *Apr 13 2021*: Expected date of full TE completion

The expected date start date of contract is Feb 5 2021.

9. Duty Station

Travel:

- International travel will be required the Commonwealth of Dominica during the TE mission;
- The BSAFE course must be successfully completed prior to commencement of travel;

⁸ Access at: <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/section-6.shtml>

- Individual Consultants are responsible for ensuring they have vaccinations/inoculations when travelling to certain countries, as designated by the UN Medical Director.
- Consultants are required to comply with the UN security directives set forth under: <https://dss.un.org/dssweb/>
- All related travel expenses will be covered and will be reimbursed as per UNDP rules and regulations upon submission of an F-10 claim form and supporting documents.

REQUIRED SKILLS AND EXPERIENCE

10. TE Team Composition and Required Qualifications

A team of *two independent evaluators* will conduct the TE – *one team leader (International Consultant) and one team expert, National Consultant*. The team leader will be responsible for the overall design, coordinating the data collection and analysis phase of the evaluation and drafting the main report among other relevant tasks. The team leader will also ensure that all evaluation criteria are adequately covered by the evaluation team. The team expert will assist the team leader in timely completion of TE deliverables including, but not limited to developing the TE itinerary and assessing emerging trends in policy development, capacity building, budget allocations, regulatory frameworks.

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 evaluators will be aimed at maximizing the overall “team” qualities in the following areas:

Education

- Master's degree in Environmental Science, Protected Areas Management, Environment and Sustainable Development or other closely related field (20%);

Experience

- **Minimum of 10 years professional experience in evaluations, with a specific emphasis on results-based monitoring and impact evaluations for sustainable development programmes/projects (Relevant experience with results-based management/logical framework approach);(20%)**
- Experience working with the UNDP or another GEF agency or GEF project evaluations, including experience with SMART based indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios (20%);
- Experience working in the Commonwealth of Dominica or within the Caribbean; (10%)
- At least 5-10 years of proven experience in local development planning with strong elements of biodiversity conservation and environmental assessment and management (10%)
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and Biodiversity Conservation/ Sustainable Use; 5-10 years' experience in gender responsive evaluation and analysis;(10%)
- Excellent communication skills;(5%)

- Demonstrable analytical skills; (5%)

Language

- Fluency in written and spoken English.

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
- 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.

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

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

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.);
- *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

- a) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](#) provided by UNDP;
- b) **CV** and a **Personal History Form** ([P11 form](#));
- c) **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)
- d) **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc.), supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the [Letter of Confirmation of Interest template](#). If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

All application materials should be submitted to the address (UNDP Barbados and the Eastern Caribbean, UN House, Marine Gardens, Hastings, Christ Church, Barbados) in a sealed envelope indicating the following reference “Consultant for Terminal Evaluation of Supporting Sustainable Ecosystems by Strengthening the Effectiveness of Dominica’s Protected Areas” or by email at the following address ONLY: (procurement.bb@undp.org) by (5:00 pm January 26). 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.

16. Annexes to the TE ToR

- 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

Annexes to Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference

- **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

This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPAP # 1: Enhanced capacity of national, sub-regional and regional institutions and stakeholders to: effectively manage natural resources; build resilience to the adverse impacts of climate change and natural and anthropogenic hazards; improved energy efficiency and use of renewable energy; improved policy, legal, regulatory and institutional frameworks for environmental and energy governance.

Country Programme Outcome 1 Indicators: Percent of budget allocated to environmental protection; hectares of forest cover; greenhouse gas emissions per capita; number of updated and tested contingency plans; volume of savings from reduced fossil fuel imports; multilateral environmental agreements incorporated into national legislation; energy efficiency and renewable energy policies.

Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area (same as that on the cover page, circle one):

3. Solutions at local level for sustainable management of natural resources, ecosystems and environmental services, for expanded jobs and livelihoods; and
 - 3.5. Transparent and non-discriminatory legal and regulatory frameworks and policies enabled for sustainable management of natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystems (in line with international conventions and national legislation)
4. Unlocking the potential of PAs, including indigenous and community conserved areas, to conserve biodiversity while contributing to sustainable development

Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program: BD 1 Improve the sustainability of Protected Area Systems

Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes 1.1: Improved management effectiveness of existing and new protected areas

Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators: Buffer zone developed around protected area improving protected area by 2,030 ha.

Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	Targets at end of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
Project Objective: To demonstrate a model for effective integrated landscape management encompassing the strengthening of an existing protected area (Morne Trois Pitons National Park) and establishment of its buffer zone in order to reduce threats to biodiversity and ecological functioning					
Component 1: Strengthening the core zone management of Protected Areas at systemic level and scale up innovative interventions at core zone of selected PAs to improve Sustainability					

<p>Outcome 1. (Activity in Atlas) Biodiversity Assessment, monitoring and conservation. Develop approve and operationalize management plan for MTPNP</p>	<p>Monitoring and assessment plan. Persons trained to carry out assessment Improve METT scores of MTPNP and other targeted PAs A legally recognized management structure with guidelines;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revised National Biodiversity Assessment and 5th National Report on Biodiversity available. Current METT scores for MTP is 59 Draft management plan available but not in use 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual biodiversity reports used in decision making in Agriculture and planning. Conservation strategies being implemented. Target METT score at end of project 75 Implementation of approved management plan; 75% of staff (recommended in plan) hired. Improved financial and technical management. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Biodiversity reports available. Management effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT) prepared at mid-term review and terminal evaluation Management plan in document form available 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decision makers approve the management plan
<p>2. Resource MTPNP management. Develop Operational Capacity. Develop and implement surveillance plan to control hunting, and</p>	<p>A financial plan and trained staff to implement the plan. Increased financing in place to address the sustainability of the NP as measured by the UNDP Financial Scorecard. Increased area of MTP NP from 6,342 ha to</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing management plan lack resource component; need to be revised and updated. Core zone legally recognized and protected. A 200 m Buffer zone around MTP NP proposed To be developed during first year of project cycle 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dedicated financing for MTP NP identified and applied. At least 530 ha added as buffer zone within existing park. Staff adequately trained by the end of year two. BD threat minimized and illegal actions reduced by 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Financial report from PA operations Physical maps of Dominica showing new boundaries Staff list showing performance levels and financial reports. Training reports surveillance records 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Private land owners in the proposed buffer zone agree to the terms of the project as it pertains to land use and management

Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	Targets at end of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
<p>harvesting of wild plants and animals, land clearing and tilling on slopes >15%, and land development.</p>	<p>8, 372 ha including buffer zone (530 ha within and 1500 ha outside). Trained staff managing 8,372 ha of integrated landscape (MTPNP core and buffer zone) No of MTP NP staff with specialized training in surveillance techniques resulting in reduced incidences of fires, hunting and tilling on slopes >15% in buffer zone.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Park wardens currently perform spot checks, no systematic monitoring 	<p>70 % by year 4. Surveillance, monitoring and fire management programme developed and implemented.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced erosion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacity Development Scorecard prepared at mid-term review and terminal evaluation 	

<p>3. Establish PA coordinating Unit.</p> <p>Strengthen PA policy.</p> <p>Develop PA legislation.</p> <p>Improve financial stability of PA.</p> <p>Develop PA system plan.</p>	<p>PA management Unit staffed with trained staff.</p> <p>PA Management capacity strengthened</p> <p>PA controls established</p> <p>PA legislation approved and registered</p> <p>PA management adequately financed</p> <p>Improved coordination among PA site</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PA managed by staff of Forestry that will be upgraded to PA unit • PA management scorecard rating at 67% • Draft policies with no regulations. • PA designation legislation in place but management issues missing • User fees are in place but management very weak • PA units are independently managed with different standards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PA Unit in place with adequate staff and finance. • PA management scorecard rating improved to 85% • PA policies with regulations approved and enforced. • PA legislation registered and enforced • Sustainable Finance plan. PA generating 100% of its financial needs. • A coordinate PA systems plan with legal and financial considerations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PA unit office with equipment and staff • Management scorecard available • Policy document available • Document available with registration number. • Financial management plan. PA audit report • Financial Sustainability Scorecard prepared at mid-term review and terminal evaluation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approval given for PA system to manage its finance with supervision from Ministry of Finance.
---	---	---	--	--	---

Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	Targets at end of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
<p>Consolidate PA information system.</p> <p>Develop financial sustainability strategy.</p> <p>Standardized administrative and financial processes in co- management arrangement</p>	<p>A single database and information system for Dominica's PA</p> <p>PA financial plan</p> <p>Functional Co-management arrangement</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ministry of Tourism provides site specific information. • PA sites generate finance but unsustainable • Community organizations have an umbrella organization but no connection to existing PA management authorities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A unified information system and database • PA financing strategically managed; funds collection and used efficiently. • A functional co-management arrangement between stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Systems plan document available • Data dissemination through information System • Strategy document available • Documented management arrangement and financial plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A stakeholder agreement that meet everyone's approval.
<p>Component 2: Establish and manage Buffer Zone as a key component of National Protected Area System and select experiences to be scaled up beyond the buffer zone</p>					

<p>Outcome 2 (Activity in Atlas)</p> <p>1. Establish an Inter-sectorial committee for the management of integrated PA landscapes (2,030 ha buffer zone).</p> <p>Identify and define boundaries of buffer zone</p> <p>Legally establish buffer zone as managed landscape with restrictions on hunting,</p>	<p>A legally constituted inter-sectorial committee with mandate and authority for Pa management.</p> <p>2,030 ha of buffer zone marked on maps</p> <p>Approved Buffer zone Legislation supports zero hunting, charcoal burning and road development.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responsible agencies exist but no coordination practiced. • Preliminary buffer zone identified in studies but not established or approved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Committee established and functioning using management plan (Component 1) • 1,500 ha of buffer zones outside the existing PA boundary identified, demarcated and mapped. • Legislation governing buffer drafted and approved. 2,030 ha of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TORs for agency representatives on inter-sectorial committee. • GIS map showing buffer zone available 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Private land owners agree to management policy. • The degree of restriction to which private land owners
--	--	--	---	--	---

Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	Targets at end of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
<p>charcoal burning, tilling on slopes > 15% and infrastructure development</p> <p>Demarcate sites in the buffer zone with signpost</p>	<p>Sign posts in place around buffer</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Landscape around buffer- zone managed in an ad hoc way with some charcoal burning, hunting, land tilling on slopes and building construction Conceptual boundary advanced but not approved or marked 	<p>buffer zone under active management; greater limits on hunting and development, prohibition of charcoal burning and tilling on slopes > 15%.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Buffer zone legally established and demarcated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Legislation published in gazette Legal instrument establishing Buffer zone. 	<p>will agree is uncertain</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Private land owners agree to function within a buffer zone context
<p>2. Support CRMP</p> <p>Develop land tenure and compensation review process</p> <p>Expand the scope of current outreach program for farmers</p>	<p>Environmental and land use standards for development in buffer zones.</p> <p>Land tenure review process in place.</p> <p>Number of farmers helped by outreach program increased, disaggregated by age and gender</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EIA for select development activities required by Physical Planning Department Least arrangement exists for use of state lands. Ministry of Agriculture has an outreach to farmers (extension program) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operating standards and guidelines in place for development of livelihood activities in buffer zone. Clear and acceptable review process for land tenure 100% of persons farming in and around buffer zone supported by outreach program and adhere to land use restrictions – no charcoal burning, no tilling on slopes >15 %, no land conversion to road. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Published EIA standards for buffer zone. Land tenure model document Farmers practicing skills received from outreach program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> State approves use of land for agriculture

Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	Targets at end of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
<p>3. Develop 4 Community resource management plans</p> <p>Engage local residents within buffer zone in livelihood activities</p> <p>Strengthen Community organization capacity to effectively manage the buffer zone.</p> <p>Community based education program</p>	<p>Vulnerability Atlases for 4 communities listed</p> <p>Livelihoods activities in buffer zone confirms to land use restrictions: no hunting, no tilling on slopes > 15%, no clear cutting and no charcoal burning policy.</p> <p>Number of persons trained in BD friendly agriculture and land management practices, disaggregated by age and gender</p> <p>Stakeholder awareness of project progress and PA management strategy. Information on management controls – no burning of charcoal, no tilling on slopes >15%, zero land</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community Vulnerability Atlas for 10 communities exists. • Unregulated farming in parts of the buffer zone. • Agriculture practice in proposed buffer zone is unsustainable (include clear cut and burning) • ECU has ongoing environmental education in schools and community 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Four community resource management plans developed and 50% implementation. • All farmer in buffer zone practice BD friendly agriculture • All Stakeholders in buffer zone involve in management (co management) 100% Buffer zone effectively managed- no charcoal burning, no road construction or tilling on slopes > 15% • 70% of Dominicans supporting PA agenda • All Dominicans knowledgeable about and practice controls on charcoal burning, harvesting and hunting restriction. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community resource management plans approved by Ministries and available. • Manual on BD management available, Organic fertilizer available to farmers in buffer zone. • Organic farming and GAP standards practiced in PA • Documents and media program 	<p>?</p>

	conversion to road disseminated on all media.				
--	---	--	--	--	--

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
<i>Add documents, as required</i>	

ToR Annex C: Content of the TE report

- v. 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
- vi. Acknowledgements
- vii. Table of Contents
- viii. Acronyms and Abbreviations
7. 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
8. 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
9. 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
10. Findings
(in addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (*) must be given a rating⁹)
- 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
- 4.3 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
 - Risk Management incl. Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)
- 4.4 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
11. Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons
- Main Findings

⁹ See ToR Annex F for rating scales.

- Conclusions
- Recommendations
- Lessons Learned

12. 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 Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF Focal area, and to the environment and development priorities a the local, regional and national level?			
<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>
Were the project's objectives and implementation strategies in keeping with GEF focal area (Sustainable Forest	Level of coherence between project design and implementation, quality of risk mitigation strategies	Project Documentation, National Policies, Consultants	Project Document analysis, Interviews with Stakeholders

Management) at the time of design and implementation. Was this relevant on a national level?			
Were the implementation strategies in keeping with the priorities of beneficiaries	Improvement of beneficiary data from baseline, level of coherence between priorities of beneficiaries vs implementation strategies	Project Documentation, Beneficiaries, consultants, data collected on beneficiaries	Interviews with beneficiaries/co nsultants
Has any aspect of the project been adapted to the deal with the adverse impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic?	Quality of risk mitigation strategy	Project Staff, Beneficiaries, consultants	Interviews with project staff/consultant/ stakeholders
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
Were there any factors which affected the project's outcomes? Was project cost effectiveness achieved	Analysis of Project documentation, budgets, AWP's against project spend	Project Documentation, budgets, AWP's, Project Staff/Consultants, Stakeholders	Interviews with Project staff/consultant/ stakeholders, analysis of project documentation, budget, AWP's, actual spend
Were activities and delivery methods developed in Project Document effective in producing expected outputs and outcomes	Level of coherence with project documentation against success/limitations as defined by project staff	Project Documentation, TE data collected as pertaining to outputs and outcomes	Project Document, interviews with project staff
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in line with international and national norms and standards?			
Give analysis of how delays may have affected project execution, costs and overall effectiveness. Were any cost or	Identification and analysis of cost measures, project delays, comparison ratio of cost and time with other similar projects locally and regionally. Outcomes/Impacts Analysis	Data Collection as pertaining to Outcome	Interviews with project staff, stake holders, data collection

time saving mitigation measures implemented			
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-political, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
Is project heavily dependent on financial support for continued sustenance after project end. Have any mechanisms been put in place to address this dependency?	Sustainability of financial reports, policy framework, management plans etc..	Data collection, financial documents, financial policy	Data collection, Interviews with consultants, project staff, stakeholders
Are there social or political factors that may influence the sustenance of project. Is the level of public and stakeholder ownership, interest and incentives sufficient to allow for project sustenance? Have any measures been put in place for project users to continue to operate and maintain the project's investment	Sustenance of project as it relates to social and political climate, Assessment of potential impact. Sustenance of Management plans, Increase in project capacity, training, staff	Project staff, stakeholders, park wardens, trained staff, public, IP	Interviews with project staff, stakeholders, questionnaires for trained staff, public etc., PS – implementing partner
Are there any environmental factors activities etc...in or around PAs, which can affect sustenance/continu	Analysis of EIA codification against project sustenance	Project stakeholders	Interviews with stakeholders

ed impact of project?			
Contribution of project by implementation of policy frameworks. To what extent is the sustenance of Project dependent on issues relating to institutional and policy frameworks?	Analysis of Project document, review of policy framework, management plans against Project sustainability	Project documentation, management plans, policies, legal framework, stakeholders	Interviews with stakeholders,
Gender equality and women's empowerment: How did the project contribute to gender equality and women's empowerment?			
What strategies were put in place to ensure gender equality and continued gender inclusion?	Level of coherence in implementation strategies as outlined in project document and overall effectiveness of strategies	Project staff, consultants, communities, data	Interviews with communities, women's groups, project staff, consultants, gender data analysis, project document
Was there a percentage increase in relation to gender inclusion in capacity training, empowerment etc. from baseline	Increase in TE data against baseline data re gender involvement, training, capacity building	TE data, baseline data	Interviews with consultants, project staff
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
What project activities were geared at reducing environmental stress particularly during the long term	Project activities as defined in Project Document	Project Document, Management plans, EIA codification, training sessions for communities, public	Interviews with project staff, consultants, stakeholders, project document review

<p><i>Monitoring and Evaluation: Project monitoring and evaluation will be conducted in accordance with established UNDP and GEF procedures. The project performance will be monitored and evaluated according to the Project Results Framework (log-frame). Effectiveness of monitoring and plans based on the Project Document and how information obtained during the Monitoring and Evaluation was used to adapt and Improve Project Execution, sustainability etc...</i></p>			
Quality of the project log-frame as a planning and monitoring instrument; i.e. are there SMART indicators etc..?	Quality of Project log-frame based on UNDP and other quality assurance standards; Identification of SMART indicators in Project Document	Project documentation,	Review of project log-frame
Adequate budget for M&E activities	Level of coherence between necessary M& E activities vs. budget	Project documentation, AWP budget,	Interview with project staff, project document and AWP budget review
Was baseline information on performance indicators provided from reliable sources?	Validation of Baseline information	Project documentation, Project staff	Interview with project staff
Was methodology, data sources and data collection instruments appropriate and was monitoring adequate?	Validation of methodology, data sources and collection instrument based on project impact	Project staff, project documentation, PIRs, Quarterly, semi-annual Reports,	Interview with project staff, review of quarterly, semi-annual, PIR reports
UNDP Oversight Implementation: How effective was UNDP oversight implementation			
Was the UNDP instrumental in providing support to Project Coordinator in providing clarity and timely support	On-track project progress, timely communication and support with activities	UNDP, project staff, documentation outlining support	Interview with project staff, Review of documentatio

where needed, removing any roadblocks etc to allow for keeping the project on track			n/communication
Implementing Partner (IP) Execution			
How effective were the functions and processes by Implementing Partner to contribute to the successful and timely implementation of the Project	On-track project progress related to Implementing partner execution of activities, timely communication and support with activities	IP, project staff, documentation outlining support	Interview with project staff, PS implementing partner, Review of documentation/communication
Cross Cutting Issues			
Were cross cutting issues given special attention and integrated into all stages of the project	Validation of cross cutting issues into different stages of project	Project documentation, project staff	Interview with project staff, project document review

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:

10. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
11. 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.
12. 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.
13. 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.
14. 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.
15. 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.
16. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.
17. Must ensure that independence of judgement is maintained, and that evaluation findings and recommendations are independently presented.
18. 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:
<p>6 = Highly Satisfactory (HS): exceeds expectations and/or no shortcomings</p> <p>5 = Satisfactory (S): meets expectations and/or no or minor shortcomings</p> <p>4 = Moderately Satisfactory (MS): more or less meets expectations and/or some shortcomings</p> <p>3 = Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): somewhat below expectations and/or significant shortcomings</p> <p>2 = Unsatisfactory (U): substantially below expectations and/or major shortcomings</p> <p>1 = Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe shortcomings</p> <p>Unable to Assess (U/A): available information does not allow an assessment</p>	<p>4 = Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability</p> <p>3 = Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks to sustainability</p> <p>2 = Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks to sustainability</p> <p>1 = Unlikely (U): severe risks to sustainability</p> <p>Unable to Assess (U/A): Unable to assess the expected incidence and magnitude of risks to sustainability</p>

Evaluation Ratings Table	
Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E)	Rating ¹⁰
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	

¹⁰ 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)

Effectiveness	
Efficiency	
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: _____

ToR Annex H: TE Audit Trail

To the comments received on *(date)* **from the Terminal Evaluation of** Supporting Sustainable Ecosystems by Strengthening the Effectiveness of Dominica's Protected Areas *(UNDP Project PIMS 5089#)*

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