

Terms of Reference

Terminal Evaluation for the UNDP-GEF Project South Africa: Mainstreaming Biodiversity into Land Use Regulation and Management at the Municipal Scale

Location: South Africa
Application Deadline: 19 July 2021
Type of Contract: Individual Contract
Languages Required: English
Duration of Initial Contract: eight weeks
Expected Duration of Assignment: eight weeks

1. INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full- and medium-sized UNDP-supported GEF-financed projects are required to undergo a Terminal Evaluation (TE) at the end of the project. This Terms of Reference (ToR) sets out the expectations for the TE of the full-sized project titled *Mainstreaming Biodiversity into Land Use Regulation and Management at the Municipal Scale, known locally as the Biodiversity and Land Use Project* (PIMS #4719, for ease of use, hereinafter referred to as the 'Biodiversity Land Use' Project, BLU Project, implemented through the South African National Biodiversity Institute. The project started on the 10 March 2015 and is in its 6th year of implementation. The project has undergone two extensions.

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/guideline/documents/GEF/TE_GuidanceforUNDP-supportedGEF-financedProjects.pdf

2. PROJECT BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

South Africa has exceptional biodiversity of global significance. Since 1994 it has made major strides in protecting that biodiversity. However, it still experiences very high rates of biodiversity loss due to development pressure and habitat degradation. Furthermore, South Africa has persistently high levels of poverty and unemployment.

Municipalities play an important role as centers of economic growth and service delivery; they regulate land use at local scale and are also important users and managers of biodiversity and ecosystem services. However, municipalities are often faced with many burgeoning and often conflicting tasks, with poverty alleviation, local economic development and service provision justifiably occupying top priority on most local council agendas. Awareness amongst decision makers of the positive links between improved biodiversity management, human well-being and sustainable development is often low, as are levels of capacity for meaningful incorporation of biodiversity priorities into integrated development planning and land-use management. Since less than 7% of land in South Africa is formally protected, critical biodiversity is under threat from degradation and transformation. There is thus a need to strike a balance between development and job creation, and conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity.

The 'Biodiversity and Land Use' (BLU) project was designed to address these challenges by (a) strengthening cooperation, coordination and capacity of municipal and other regulatory authorities that regulate land use decisions to incorporate criteria to avoid/ prevent, minimize and/or offset impacts on biodiversity, and improve compliance monitoring and enforcement, and (b) introducing mechanisms in collaboration with private and communal land owners to better protect critical biodiversity areas and

manage land, while demonstrating the potential of biodiversity to create jobs and contribute to economic growth.

The project's overall objective is to mitigate multiple threats to biodiversity by increasing the capabilities of authorities and landowners to regulate land use and manage priority biodiversity at the municipal scale. The project has two components:

Component 1: *Land-use regulation and environmental management.* This component deals with land-use management, regulation, compliance and enforcement. The project aims to encourage the uptake of biodiversity considerations into municipal planning and decision-making, with an emphasis on strengthening biodiversity content in Integrated Development Plans and Spatial Development Frameworks. The project aims to illustrate the possible financial gains from biodiversity and ecosystem services, to promote increased budget allocation for relevant investments by municipalities.

Component 2: *Incentives on private and communal land.* This component focuses on improving the management of land and natural resources. Most of the biodiversity priority areas in the target districts are on land that is either privately or communally owned. Thus, the project involves the implementation of biodiversity stewardship agreements on both private and communal land. Other interventions deal with for example certification, tax incentives and other mechanisms to incentivise or enable land users to sustainably manage biodiversity.

The BLU Project has been complex, working in an environment of uneven capacity, operating across a range of sectors and in diverse environments with a wide set of partners, some of whom were very new to the mainstreaming approach.

The project has been at work in four district municipalities in South Africa's global biodiversity hotspots and national biodiversity priority areas, with very high rates of habitat degradation and conversion, high levels of poverty, and other pressing needs for action: Amathole (Eastern Cape Province), uMgungundlovu and Ehlanzeni District Municipalities are located in the Maputaland-Pondoland-Albany hotspot (Kwa-Zulu Natal Province); and the Cape Winelands District Municipality is located between the Succulent Karoo and the Cape Floristic Region hotspots (Western Cape Province).

The COVID-19 pandemic and the resultant lockdown in March 2020 followed by the phased lifting of restrictions halted certain project activities. The lockdown affected the following activities and the linked targets: engagement with landowners for securing biodiversity stewardship and land under better management sites; fieldwork and stakeholder engagement for the development of the Biodiversity Management Plans for heavily traded Medicinal Plant Species and a priority Ecosystem; and project capacity development activities. To this end, the project was granted a second extension, the most recent being for 6 months from 01 March 2021- 31 August 2021.

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 report results will be utilized by UNDP, SANBI and project implementation partners to focus in on the aspects of the project's work that need to be continued into the future, and will guide how this is done.

4. TE APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

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

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

The TE team is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), Implementing Partners, the UNDP Country Office(s), the Regional Technical Advisor, direct beneficiaries and other stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful TE. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to: executing agencies, senior officials and task team/component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project beneficiaries, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. Additionally, the TE team is expected to conduct field missions to Amathole, Cape Winelands, Ehlanzeni and uMgungundlovu District Municipalities (COVID-19 situation permitting).

The stakeholders include but are not limited to the following:-

Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment
Department of Agriculture, Land Reform and Rural Development
Mpumalanga Department of Agriculture, Rural Development, Land and Environmental Affairs
Western Cape Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning
Ehlanzeni District Municipality
uMgungundlovu District Municipality
Mpumalanga Tourism and Parks Agency
Eastern Cape Parks and Tourism Agency
CapeNature
WWF-SA
NCT Forestry Co-operative
Kruger to Canyons Biosphere Region

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, SANBI 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.

4.1 COVID-19 implications in South Africa and impact on project components

The advent of the COVID-19 pandemic has been a serious challenge to South Africa and it has drastically affected its development trajectory. The government has put several measures such as restricted movements within the country, and from abroad to South Africa. On 23 March 2020, the President of South Africa announced a national lockdown at national alert level 5 that was lowered to national alert level 3 from 1 June 2020, to 2 from 17 August and 21 September 2020, restrictions were lowered to alert level 1. In December 2020, the country experienced a second wave of COVID-19 infections. The lockdown was tightened from an adjusted level 1 to an adjusted level 3 starting on 29 December 2020. The lockdown was lowered from an adjusted level 3 to an adjusted level 1 starting on 1 March 2021. On 17 February 2021, the national COVID-19 vaccination program was officially rolled out. As of May 2021, South Africa has the highest number of confirmed COVID-19 cases in Africa and 10th highest number of confirmed infections worldwide (26 May 2021). As at June 2021, the country is currently entering a 3rd COVID-19 wave. The Assignment will follow the UNDP corporate guidelines on the pandemic.

5. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE TE

The TE will assess project performance against expectations set out in the project's Strategic 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 assignment is estimated to run over 2 months. COVID-19 is a major concern, so with flexibility, the assignment is preferred to run over July-August, but can also run through August-September. It is however envisaged that the bulk of the TE effort will run through much of August 2021, with a field work component.

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 the Mainstreaming Biodiversity into Land Use Regulation and Management at the Municipal Scale, known locally as the 'Biodiversity and Land Use' (BLU) Project

Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E)	Rating¹
M&E design at entry	
M&E Plan Implementation	
Overall Quality of M&E	
Implementation & Execution	Rating
Quality of UNDP Implementation/Oversight	
Quality of Implementing Partner Execution	
Overall quality of Implementation/Execution	
Assessment of Outcomes	Rating
Relevance	
Effectiveness	
Efficiency	
Overall Project Outcome Rating	
Sustainability	Rating
Financial resources	
Socio-political/economic	
Institutional framework and governance	
Environmental	
Overall Likelihood of Sustainability	

6. TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the TE will be approximately *30 working days* over a time period of *eight weeks* starting on *5 July 2021*. The tentative TE timeframe is as follows:

Timeframe	Activity
30 June 2021	Application closes
7 July 2021	Selection of TE team
13 to 16 July 2021	Preparation period for TE team (handover of documentation)
16 July 2021 (4 days)	Document review and preparation of TE Inception Report
23 July 2021 (2 days)	Finalization and Validation of TE Inception Report; latest start of TE mission
26 July - 15 August 2021 (15 days)	TE mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits, etc.
12 August 2021	Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings; earliest end of TE mission
23 August 2021 (7 days)	Preparation of draft TE report
23 August 2021	Circulation of draft TE report for comments
1 September 2021	Incorporation of comments on draft TE report into Audit Trail & finalization of TE report
10 September 2021	Preparation and Issuance of Management Response
30 September 2021	Expected date of full TE completion

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)

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

7. TE DELIVERABLES

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	TE Inception Report	TE team clarifies objectives, methodology and timing of the TE	No later than 1 week before the TE mission: (23 July 2021)	TE team submits Inception Report to Commissioning Unit and project management
2	Presentation	Initial Findings	End of TE mission: (15 August 2021)	TE team presents to Commissioning Unit and project management
3	Draft TE Report	Full draft report (<i>using guidelines on report content in ToR Annex C</i>) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of end of TE mission: (23 August 2021)	TE team submits to Commissioning Unit; reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP
5	Final TE Report* + Audit Trail	Revised final report and TE Audit trail in which the TE details how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final TE report (<i>See template in ToR Annex H</i>)	Within 1 week of receiving comments on draft report: (30 August 2021)	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 Country Office South Africa*.

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 (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions) and one team expert, resident in South Africa. The team leader will be responsible for the overall design and writing of the TE report, engagements and interviews with principal stakeholders. The team expert will work with the Project Team in developing the TE itinerary and conduct field visits to project sites, review budget allocations and co-financing and tracking tools.

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

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:

Team Leader:

Education

- A minimum of a Master's degree in *Biodiversity Conservation, Development*, Public Administration, Environmental Governance or other closely related field;

Experience

- Relevant experience with results-based management evaluation methodologies;
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to GEF focal area of *Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use into Production Landscapes, Seascapes and Sectors*;
- Experience in evaluating projects;
- Experience working in *SADC region*;
- Experience in relevant technical areas for at least *10 years*;
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and *GEF focal area of Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use into Production Landscapes, Seascapes and Sectors*; experience in gender responsive evaluation and analysis;
- Excellent communication skills;
- Demonstrable analytical skills;
- Project evaluation/review experience within United Nations system will be considered an asset.

Language

- Fluency in written and spoken English.

Team Expert:

Education

- Master's degree in *Biodiversity Conservation, Development* or other closely related field;

Experience

- Relevant experience with results-based management evaluation methodologies;
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to GEF focal area of *Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use into Production Landscapes, Seascapes and Sectors*;
- Experience in evaluating projects;
- Experience working in *South Africa*;
- Experience in relevant technical areas for at least *10 years*;
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and *GEF focal area of Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use into Production Landscapes, Seascapes and Sectors*; experience in gender responsive evaluation and analysis;
- Excellent communication skills;

- Demonstrable analytical skills;
- Project evaluation/review experience within United Nations system will be considered an asset.

Language

- Fluency in written and spoken English.
- *Fluency in a South African language would be an asset.*

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.

12. APPLICATION PROCESS⁴

(Adjust this section if a vetted roster will be used)

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>

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

- a) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](#)⁵ provided by UNDP;
- b) **CV** and a **Personal History Form** ([P11 form](#))⁶;
- c) Brief description of **approach to work/technical proposal** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)
- d) **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc), supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the [Letter of Confirmation of Interest template](#). If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

All application materials should be submitted to the address (insert mailing address) in a sealed envelope indicating the following reference “Consultant for Terminal Evaluation of *Biodiversity and Land Use Project*” or by email at the following address ONLY: bid.pretoria@undp.org) by 19th July 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

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

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

ToR Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework

Strategic Results Framework, SRF (formerly GEF Logical Framework) Analysis

Indicator framework as part of the SRF

This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPAP or CPD:
Country Programme Outcome Indicators: <i>Component II: Climate Change and Greening South Africa's Economy;</i> <i>Outcome 2 on harnessing of South Africa's biodiversity resources to address sustainability whilst creating economic opportunities;</i> <i>Outcome Indicators:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Number of green jobs created in all sectors in the economy; and</i>• <i>Number of state institutions and non-state actors at 3 spheres of government implementing integrated White Paper policies.⁷</i>
Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area (same as that on the cover page, circle one): 1. <u>Mainstreaming environment and energy</u> OR 2. Catalyzing environmental finance OR 3. Promote climate change adaptation OR 4. Expanding access to environmental and energy services for the poor.
Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program: Mainstream biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into production landscapes/seascapes and sectors
Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes: Outcome 2.1: Increase in sustainably managed landscapes and seascapes that integrate biodiversity conservation. Outcome 2.2: Measures to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity incorporated in policy and regulatory frameworks
Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators: Indicator 2.1: Landscapes and seascapes certified by internationally or nationally recognized environmental standards that incorporate biodiversity considerations (e.g. FSC, MSC) measured in hectares and recorded by GEF tracking tool.

⁷ UNDP Country Programme Document for the Republic of South Africa (2013-2017). P6.

Indicator 2.2: Polices and regulations governing sectoral activities that integrate biodiversity conservation as recorded by the GEF tracking tool as a score.

Objective/ Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	End of Project target	Source of Information	Risks and assumptions
Objective – To mitigate multiple threats to biodiversity by increasing the capabilities of authorities and land owners to regulate land use and manage priority biodiversity at the municipal scale					
Component 1 – Land and Natural Resource Use Management, Regulation, Compliance Monitoring and Enforcement					
Measures to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity incorporated in policy and regulatory frameworks	Indicator 2.2: Polices and regulations governing sectoral activities that integrate biodiversity conservation as recorded by the GEF tracking tool as a score.				<u>Risks:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor coordination between institutions and cooperative governance mechanisms and structures with regard to biodiversity-inclusive planning, financing,

<p>Outcome 1.1</p> <p>Regulatory processes for land and natural resource use management incorporate criteria to prevent/minimise and offset impacts on biodiversity</p> <p><i>(Indicator 1.1: Regulatory processes incorporate biodiversity criteria in two District Municipalities)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Coordination mechanism in place ▪ Application forms incorporate biodiversity information ▪ Biodiversity guidelines developed ▪ Database & system for compliance monitoring and enforcement of authorisations reflect biodiversity priorities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No coordination mechanisms ▪ Biodiversity information included in one target district ▪ Guidelines exist on fynbos, grasslands, mining & biodiversity ▪ Existing compliance and enforcement database and system is not integrated or systematic and does not adequately reflect biodiversity priorities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Intergovernmental cooperation forum and/or framework in two target districts ▪ Biodiversity information included in authorisation application forms of two target districts ▪ Biodiversity guidelines for 1 new sector & 1 new biome ▪ Updated database and integrated compliance and enforcement system in at least 1 target district 	<p>National and Provincial competent authorities and conservation agencies</p>	<p>review and decision making are weak.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shrinking budgets for natural resource management at provincial and municipal levels. • Poor capacity for extension work, compliance monitoring and enforcement. • Regulatory challenges and blockages <p><u>Assumptions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project partners will work together effectively with one another and key stakeholders to meet objectives • Willing champions of projects will be acceptable to all stakeholders • Individual projects will be successful in 'making the case' for biodiversity mainstreaming (i.e. will not be perceived to be 'anti -development')
<p>Outcome 1.2</p> <p>The capacity of staff of regulatory authorities and other environmental planning professionals to apply criteria to prevent/ minimise and offset impacts on</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number of staff of regulatory authorities applying biodiversity criteria in review and decision making processes ▪ Improvement in capacity of staff in 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Zero at project start ▪ Zero at project start 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 20% increase on baseline ▪ 20% increase on baseline 	<p>Provincial competent authorities and conservation agencies</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is institutional readiness and adequate capacity as a foundation to implement projects and build additional capacity • Project partners are committed to embedding project impact into institutional systems to

<p>biodiversity is improved</p> <p><i>(Indicator 1.2: Capacity to apply biodiversity criteria evident among regulatory authorities and environmental and planning professionals, as indicated by survey to be conducted with key personnel at start and end of project)</i></p>	<p>regulatory authorities to apply criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Quality of biodiversity information provided by applicants 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Zero at project start 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 20% increase on baseline 		<p>deliver enduring outcomes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is mobilisation and participation in learning networks • There is an adequate 'good governance' foundation and management systems in place to minimise institutional risk • Investments will be layered to achieve synergies and traction, value gain - multiple mutually reinforcing gains
<p>Outcome 1.3</p> <p>Municipal land use planning, management and decision making integrate biodiversity priorities</p> <p><i>(Indicator 1.3: Municipal land use planning frameworks in two target District Municipalities incorporate biodiversity criteria)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number of IDPs where environmental layer of SDF is SPLUMA compliant ▪ SPLUMA complaint LUMS which contribute to improved land use regulation 	<p>Zero at project start - SPLUMA is promulgated but has not come into force yet - only tracking from project inception</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 6 IDPs with environmental layers in the SDFs that are SPLUMA compliant ▪ 1 741 937 ha under improved land use regulation through SPLUMA complaint LUMS in 6 local municipalities 	<p>District and local authorities</p>	
<p>Outcome 1.4</p> <p>Financial mechanisms and incentives are</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Percentage increase in resources allocated to 	<p>Baseline 2014 /2015:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ EDM = R 15 908 000 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 50% increase in resources allocated to biodiversity management 	<p>District and local authorities</p>	

<p>enhanced in order to encourage greater investment in biodiversity and ecosystem services and support job creation and sustainable economic development</p> <p><i>(Indicator 1.4: At least one new funding mechanism in place, increasing resource allocation)</i></p>	<p>biodiversity management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number of jobs (including temporary and permanent jobs) created in target municipalities to support ecosystem restoration and maintenance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ uMDM = R 1 200 000 ▪ EDM = 6 UDM = 0 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 600 jobs (including temporary and permanent jobs) created in target municipalities to support ecosystem restoration and maintenance 		
Component 2 – Conservation and Sustainable use of Biodiversity on Private and Communal Land					
<p>Increase in sustainably managed landscapes and seascapes that integrate biodiversity conservation.</p>	<p>Indicator: Landscapes and seascapes certified by internationally or nationally recognized environmental standards that incorporate biodiversity considerations (e.g. FSC, MSC) measured in hectares and recorded by GEF tracking tool.</p>				<p><u>Risks:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conflicts between different stakeholder groups • Low level of community willingness to take up the biodiversity economy • Poor coordination and cooperation between institutions • Poor capacity for extension work, compliance monitoring and enforcement. • Regulatory challenges and blockages

<p>Outcome 2.1</p> <p>Improved security for biodiversity priority areas</p> <p><i>(Indicator 2.1: New biodiversity stewardship agreements cover 62,464 ha of biodiversity priority areas)</i></p>	<p>Ha of biodiversity priority areas secured: – X Ha under negotiation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - X Ha submitted for declaration - X Ha declared 	<p>Amathole - 0 ha</p> <p>Cape Winelands - 4,118 ha</p> <p>Ehlanzeni - 7,900 ha</p> <p>uMgungundlovu - 10,500 ha</p>	<p>62 464 ha (new) of biodiversity priority areas secured</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 20 000 Ha under negotiation - 14 495 Ha submitted for declaration - 27 969 Ha declared 	<p>Provincial conservation agencies, SANBI</p>	<p><u>Assumptions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project partners will work together effectively with one another and key stakeholders to meet objectives • Willing champions of projects will be acceptable to all stakeholders • Individual projects will be successful in 'making the case' for biodiversity mainstreaming (i.e. will not be perceived to be 'anti -development')
<p>Outcome 2.2</p> <p>Biodiversity management of threatened medicinal species and priority ecosystems enhanced</p> <p><i>(Indicator 2.2: Biodiversity management plans that reflect gazetted norms and standards for 3 medicinal plant species and 1 priority ecosystem in place)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number of Biodiversity Management Plans for threatened and highly traded medicinal species (BMP:S) ▪ Number of Biodiversity Management Plans for priority ecosystem (BMP:E) 	<p>1 BMP:S for a medicinal plant species (<i>Pelargonium Sidoides</i>)</p> <p>Zero BMP:E exist</p>	<p>3 new BMP:S</p> <p>1 BMP:E</p>	<p>Provincial conservation agencies, SANBI</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is institutional readiness and adequate capacity as a foundation to implement projects and build additional capacity • Project partners are committed to embedding project impact into institutional systems to deliver enduring outcomes • There is mobilisation and participation in learning networks • There is an adequate 'good governance' foundation and management systems in place to minimise institutional risk
<p>Outcome 2.3</p> <p>Pressure on biodiversity is reduced through better land</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number of ha of priority biodiversity areas under better land & natural 	<p>Monitoring baseline:</p> <p>Amathole – 0 ha</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 161 000 ha (new) under better land & natural resource management practices 	<p>Provincial conservation agencies, SANBI</p>	<p></p>

<p>and natural resource management practices implemented by private and communal land owners</p> <p><i>(Indicator 2.3:</i> - Biodiversity considerations integrated into sector standards in 3 production sectors</p> <p>- 161 000ha under better land and natural resource use management through adherence by producers to new sector standards)</p>	<p>resource management practices implemented by private and communal land owners</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Biodiversity considerations integrated into production sectors 	<p>Cape Winelands – 22,924 ha</p> <p>Ehlanzeni - 0 ha</p> <p>uMgungundlovu – 4,704 ha</p> <p>Codes of practice/certification standards exist for forestry, wine and red meat commercial sectors</p> <p>Baseline for fruit - 0</p> <p>Baseline for sugar - 0</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Biodiversity considerations integrated into 3 (new) production sectors for communal/ small growers (fruit, sugar, small scale forestry) ▪ 30% of fruit producers from the target district comply with codes of practice/certification standards (SIZA) ▪ 100% of commercial and small scale sugar producers supplying sugar to the mill in the target district comply with codes of practice/certification standards (SUSFarms) 		
---	---	---	---	--	--

		Baseline for forestry – 0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 20% of small grower/communal foresters from the target district comply with codes of practice/ certification standards 		
<p>Outcome 2.4</p> <p>Financing mechanisms and incentives for biodiversity stewardship improved and capacity to implement incentives is strengthened</p> <p><i>(Indicator 2.4: At least one funding mechanism or tax incentive in place for biodiversity stewardship)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amendments made to existing tax incentives for biodiversity Number of land owners using tax incentives 	<p>Income tax deductions for biodiversity conservation are provided for under section 18A of the Income Tax Act</p> <p>Zero land owners have signed conservation stewardship contracts and made use of current tax incentives</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Biodiversity tax incentives amended 5 land owners make use of tax incentives Guidelines for tax consultants developed 		

List of Outputs per Outcome as part of the SRF

Project's Development Goal: To enhance the sustainable and effective conservation of globally significant biodiversity in South Africa through exploring, piloting and implementing innovative mechanisms and approaches to mainstreaming biodiversity and ecosystem services into the regulation and management of land and resource use in the landscape	
Project Objective: To mitigate multiple threats to biodiversity by increasing the capabilities of authorities and land owners to regulate land use and manage biodiversity in threatened ecosystems at the municipal scale	
Outcomes	Outputs
1.1 Land and Natural Resource Component 1: Land Use Management, Regulation, Compliance Monitoring and Enforcement	
1.1 Regulatory processes for land and resource use management incorporate criteria to prevent/minimise and offset impacts on biodiversity	<p>Output 1.1</p> <p>1.1.1. Coordination mechanism for land and natural resource use regulation and compliance monitoring in place, functional and comprises of the relevant national, provincial and municipal regulatory authorities in Ehlanzeni and Cape Winelands District Municipalities;</p> <p>1.1.2. Land and natural resource use application information requirements of the relevant regulatory authorities are amended to consider biodiversity priorities and incorporate the mitigation hierarchy to avoid / mitigate / off set impacts on biodiversity;</p> <p>1.1.3. Policy support provided and government endorsed guidelines developed to ensure biodiversity priorities are integrated into assessment and decision making for land and natural resource use that affects biodiversity and ecosystem services;</p> <p>1.1.4. Compliance monitoring and enforcement of land and natural resource use authorisations reflect biodiversity priorities.</p>
1.2 The capacity of staff of regulatory authorities and other environmental professionals to apply criteria to prevent/ minimise and offset impacts on biodiversity is improved	<p>Output 1.2</p> <p>1.2.1 Capacity development that includes training for regulatory authorities is undertaken and institutionalised;</p> <p>1.2.2 Capacity development on biodiversity priorities for environmental and planning professionals and communities is undertaken; and</p> <p>1.2.3 Capacity to monitor and enforce compliance with biodiversity permit/ authorisation conditions, and/ or identify and successfully prosecute, land use and natural resource crimes, is in place.</p>

<p>1.3 Municipal land use planning, management and decision making integrate biodiversity priorities</p>	<p>Output 1.3</p> <p>1.3.1 Relevant Protocols that guide the implementation of the Spatial Planning and Land Use Management Act SPLUMA in Ehlanzeni & uMgungundlovu District Municipalities include biodiversity priorities;</p> <p>1.3.2 Environmental layers are incorporated into Integrated Development Plans to produce Spatial Development Frameworks that comply with protocols developed under SPLUMA;</p> <p>1.3.3 SPLUMA compliant Land Use Management Systems which contributed to improved land use regulation are developed; and</p> <p>1.3.4 Municipal decisions on infrastructure placement incorporate the mitigation hierarchy to avoid-minimise-offset impacts on biodiversity.</p>
<p>1.4 Financial mechanisms and incentives are enhanced in order to encourage greater investment in biodiversity and ecosystem services and support job creation and sustainable economic development</p>	<p>Output 1.4</p> <p>1.4.1 Public sector funding mechanisms that increase resource allocation to biodiversity management are investigated and piloted and the case for them is made to National Treasury.</p>
<p>Component 2: Conservation and Sustainable use of Biodiversity on Private and Communal Land</p>	
<p>2.1 Improved security for biodiversity priority areas</p>	<p>Output 2.1</p> <p>2.1.1 Biodiversity stewardship agreements are negotiated and/or concluded on private and communal land in Amathole, Ehlanzeni and uMgungundlovu District Municipalities as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20 000 Ha under negotiation • 14 495 Ha submitted for declaration • 27 969 Ha declared
<p>2.2 Biodiversity management of threatened species for medicinal purposes and priority ecosystems enhanced</p>	<p>Output 2.2</p> <p>2.2.1 Biodiversity management plans that include sustainable use and harvesting thresholds developed for 3 threatened and heavily traded medicinal plant species; and</p> <p>2.2.2 The development of a biodiversity management plan is piloted and tested for one priority ecosystem.</p>
<p>2.3 Pressure on biodiversity is reduced through better land and natural resource</p>	<p>Output 2.3</p>

<p>management practices implemented by private and communal land owners</p>	<p>2.3.1 Better land and natural resource management practices are implemented by private and communal land owners in and outside stewardship areas in Amathole, Cape Winelands, Ehlanzeni and uMgungundlovu District Municipalities; and</p> <p>2.3.2 Biodiversity considerations are integrated into national or international codes of conduct/production standards/certification systems for the fruit, sugar and forestry sectors in Cape Winelands and uMgungundlovu District Municipalities.</p>
<p>2.4 Financing mechanisms and incentives for biodiversity stewardship improved and capacity to implement incentives is strengthened</p>	<p>Output 2.4</p> <p>2.4.1 Innovative funding model to expand financial resources for stewardship programmes piloted;</p> <p>2.4.2 Enhanced income tax deduction incentives for conservation stewardship in place; and</p> <p>2.4.3 Build capacity among financial/tax advisors and stewardship staff with regard to what the incentives offer and how they can be accessed and applied.</p>

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

#	Item (electronic versions preferred if available)
1	Project Identification Form (PIF)
2	UNDP Initiation Plan
3	Final UNDP-GEF Project Document with all annexes
4	CEO Endorsement Request
5	UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) and associated management plans (if any)
6	Inception Workshop Report
7	Mid-Term Review report and management response to MTR recommendations
8	All Project Implementation Reports (PIRs)
9	Progress reports (quarterly, semi-annual or annual, with associated workplans and financial reports)
10	Oversight mission reports
11	Minutes of Project Board Meetings and of other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
12	GEF Tracking Tools (from CEO Endorsement, midterm and terminal stages)
13	GEF/LDCF/SCCF Core Indicators (from PIF, CEO Endorsement, midterm and terminal stages); for GEF-6 and GEF-7 projects only
14	Financial data, including actual expenditures by project outcome, including management costs, and including documentation of any significant budget revisions
15	Co-financing data with expected and actual contributions broken down by type of co-financing, source, and whether the contribution is considered as investment mobilized or recurring expenditures
16	Audit reports
17	Electronic copies of project outputs (booklets, manuals, technical reports, articles, etc.)
18	Sample of project communications materials
19	Summary list of formal meetings, workshops, etc. held, with date, location, topic, and number of participants
20	Any relevant socio-economic monitoring data, such as average incomes / employment levels of stakeholders in the target area, change in revenue related to project activities
21	List of contracts and procurement items over ~US\$5,000 (i.e. organizations or companies contracted for project outputs, etc., except in cases of confidential information)
22	List of related projects/initiatives contributing to project objectives approved/started after GEF project approval (i.e. any leveraged or “catalytic” results)
23	Data on relevant project website activity – e.g. number of unique visitors per month, number of page views, etc. over relevant time period, if available
24	UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD)
25	List/map of project sites, highlighting suggested visits
26	List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Board members, RTA, Project Team members, and other partners to be consulted
27	Project deliverables that provide documentary evidence of achievement towards project outcomes
	<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 rating⁸)
 - 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

⁸ See ToR Annex F for rating scales.

- 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
- 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 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>

Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in line with international and national norms and standards?			
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-political, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
Gender equality and women's empowerment: How did the project contribute to gender equality and women's empowerment?			
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
<i>(Expand the table to include questions for all criteria being assessed: Monitoring & Evaluation, UNDP oversight/implementation, Implementing Partner Execution, cross-cutting issues, etc.)</i>			

ToR Annex E: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators

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

Evaluators/Consultants:

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.
8. Must ensure that independence of judgement is maintained, and that evaluation findings and recommendations are independently presented.
9. Must confirm that they have not been involved in designing, executing or advising on the project being evaluated and did not carry out the project's Mid-Term Review.

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

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

Name of Evaluator: _____

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.

Signed at _____ (Place) on _____ (Date)

Signature: _____

ToR Annex F: TE Rating Scales

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

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

ToR Annex H: TE Audit Trail

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

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

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

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

