

## Virtual Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference (ToR) 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 *full-sized* project titled Implementing a “Ridge to Reef” Approach to Protecting Biodiversity and Ecosystem functions within and around Protected Areas in Grenada (*PIMS #5087*) implemented through the Ministry of Agriculture, Lands, Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment. The project started on February 10, 2015 and is in its *fifth* 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’ [TE\\_GuidanceforUNDP-supportedGEF-financedProjects.pdf](#).

### 2. PROJECT BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

#### Project Summary Table

Project Title:	Implementing a “Ridge to Reef” Approach to Protecting Biodiversity and Ecosystem functions within and around Protected Areas in Grenada			
GEF Project ID:	5069		at endorsement (Million US\$)	at completion (Million US\$)
UNDP Project ID:	00091627	GEF financing:	\$ 3,031,666	\$ 3,031,666
Country:	Grenada	Government:	\$ 15,176,822	\$ 15,176,822
Region:	Latin America & the Caribbean			
Focal Area:	Biodiversity and Ecosystems			
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	2.3. 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)			
Executing Agency:	United Nations Development Program (UNDP)	Total Project Cost:	\$ 250,000	\$ 250,000
Other Partners involved:	Ministry of Climate Resilience, the Environment, Forestry, Fisheries and Disaster Management	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		February 10, 2015
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: December 2019	Actual: February 2021

The Grenada “Ridge to Reef Project” is designed to support Grenada’s compliance with a number of agreed-upon International Environmental Management and Conservation Strategies, Policies and Plans (e.g MDGs and Aichi targets and goals) with the technical and financial assistance of the Global Environment Facility (GEF). The project intervention is essentially a complement to the Government of Grenada’s efforts, on the local level, to fulfill its obligations to various United Nations Conventions and Protocols (MEAs) with respect to Biodiversity and Eco-systems Functions/services by applying program based delivery systems; and with co-management initiatives that will accommodate the involvement of local area communities in a direct way. This project is therefore designed to address the GEF STAR 5 strategy for SLM, SFM/REDD+ together with focal areas such as BD, LD and climate change mitigation (ECM). The project will uniquely co-program with concurrent grant-aid initiatives having similar goals and purposes.

In particular, the project directly addresses and is consistent with the outcomes and outputs of GEF Strategic Objective #1– to improve sustainability of protected area systems. The project will support the implementation of key aspects of the Grenada System Plan for Parks and Protected areas and the Grenada Declaration (COP8) to effectively conserve at least 25% of its marine and territorial ecosystems by the year 2020. This project will enhance the capabilities of Grenada with respect to institutional, regulatory, and policy-based Strategic Planning. It will also provide Grenada with financial support for various materials that enable the process. The project will expand and enhance the existing PA system in the country by increasing the number of TPAs from 8 to 9 (increasing the number of hectares from 1,931 ha. to 2931 ha.) and increasing the number of MPAs from 3 to 7 (increasing the number of hectares from 1,780 ha. to 13, 180 ha.). Furthermore, the project will support the incorporation of a number of mini PAs into the national network as a minimum cost output. The consolidation and expansion of the PA system will be enhanced by 31 the project’s support in reducing threats to BD by addressing habitat degradation and over-exploitation of biological resources within PAs.

The project will also address GEF Land Degradation Strategic Object 3 – Reduce pressures on natural resources from competing land uses in the wider landscape. The proposed project will contribute to arresting and reversing current trends in land and forest degradation and deforestation, focused on an area (the Beausejour Watershed) that has direct and significant negative impacts on ecosystem services in adjacent Protected Areas, through implementation of Integrated Watershed Management and application of sustainable agricultural practices that will prevent erosion and sedimentation entering coastal and near shore waters, will create livelihood benefits for local communities, and will conserve important terrestrial, freshwater and marine ecosystems.

The project will also address GEF SFM-REDD+ Objective 1 – Reduce pressures on forest resources and generate sustainable flows of forest ecosystem services, by reducing the threat of deforestation from fire, slash and burn agriculture, and encroachment by housing and tourism, and by increasing forest cover and carbon stocks through agro-forestry and the removal of invasive species.

The project will implement a “Ridge-to-Reef” approach that integrates BD, LD and SFM approaches, jointly implemented by government and local communities, and combines protection of biodiversity and habitats within a functional, representative and sustainable national system of terrestrial and marine protected areas with sustainable management of land and water resources in adjoining / upstream watersheds. In so doing, the project supports the Decision 11 / COP.10 of the UNCCD at its 9th Plenary Meeting in October 2011 that “encourages eligible Parties, taking into account the cross-sectoral nature of land degradation, to use existing potential to harness synergies across the Global Environment Facility focal areas in order further to reinforce the importance of sustainable land management for integrating environment and developmental aspirations globally.”

Finally, the proposed project supports the following goals inter alia of the 2004 CBD Programme of Work on Protected Areas: 1.2 To integrate protected areas into broader land- and seascapes and sectors so as to maintain ecological structure and function; 1.4 To substantially improve site-based protected area planning and management; 1.5 To prevent and mitigate the negative impacts of key threats to protected areas; 2.2 To enhance and secure involvement of indigenous and local communities and relevant stakeholders; 3.2 To build capacity for the planning, establishment and management of protected areas; 3.1 To provide an enabling policy, institutional and socio-economic environment for protected areas; and 3.5 To strengthen communication, education and public awareness.”

The project’s goal is to provide multiple global and local benefits by strengthening land, forest, and reef management processes (eco-systems functions) and biodiversity conservation on all terrestrial landscapes and marine and seascapes in Grenada, especially within and around marine and terrestrial protected areas. This will be achieved through a multi-focal strategy having a “Ridge to Reef” approach that increases protected areas’ management effectiveness and applies targeted land management practices to include:

- (i) Development of a policy-based legal, planning and institutional /regulatory framework in support of a sustainably managed network of TPAs and MPAs;
- (ii) Development and management of landscapes and seascapes by adopting the approach of integrating SLM and SFM/REDD+ principles and practices as a matter of public policy (integrated approach for managing forest ecosystems, protection and sustainable use of the biodiversity, prevention of land/sea degradation, and integration of peoples livelihood objectives within the management of forest and marine eco-systems.);
- (iii) By piloting SFM/REDD+ and SLM practices in the Annandale/ Beausejour watershed to improve Carbon stocks, reducing deforestation, reducing susceptibility to drought (and forest fires) and consequent land degradation that would impact downstream landscapes and seascapes.

Over the period of implementation, government Ministries, departments and related priorities have been changed in keeping with national and international dynamics. For example, the Government Ministries and IP and associated Permanent Secretaries have changed over the years. More recently COVID19 has caused Government focus to safeguard public health to shift priorities from previously tabled legislative amendments to protected areas legislation.

During 2020, the project’s implementation was delayed as a direct result of COVID-19. Infrastructural projects namely the construction of an interpretation centre at Carriacou was significantly delayed by halts to construction activities and other government restrictions. Planned travel and in person training workshops were also cancelled to adhere to COVID19 public health restrictions. With subsequent reopening of activities within the limitations of physical distancing protocols, some virtual and limited (number restricted) activities have been able to resume.

In several instances, technical capacity and limited IT resources for beneficiaries (fisherfolk and farming stakeholders in particular) also posed a challenge to implementation via virtual modalities.

### **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 objective of this TE is to analyze the implementation of the project, to assess the effectiveness and efficiency of project achievements to deliver the stated objectives and outcomes, as well as to evaluate the project's contribution towards the implementation of a "Ridge to Reef" Approach to Protecting Biodiversity and Ecosystem functions within and around Protected Areas in Grenada. It establishes the relevance, performance and success of the project, including sustainability of results. The evaluation also brings together and analyses best practices, specific lessons learned, and recommendations regarding strategies employed and the implementation arrangements, that may be relevant to or replicable by other projects.

### **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. As a result of COVID-19, a field mission will not be undertaken. Stakeholder involvement will be undertaken through virtual meetings on Zoom, Skype etc. Stakeholder involvement would include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities. The following is an indicative list of the individuals/institutions whose views should be fully reflected in the final report.

<b>Name</b>	<b>Agency/Department</b>	<b>Contact Information</b>
Mr. Mohammad Nagdee	SSE Cluster Head, UNDP Barbados & the Eastern Caribbean	<a href="mailto:mohammad.nadgee@undp.org">mohammad.nadgee@undp.org</a>
Ms. Rudo Udika	Project Coordinator, Ridge to Reef (R2R)	<a href="mailto:rudo.udika@undp.org">rudo.udika@undp.org</a>
Ms. Claudia Ortiz	Regional Technical Adviser	claudia.ortiz@undp.org
Mr. Elvis Morain	Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Agriculture, Lands and Forestry	ps@moa.gov.gd
Ms. Desiree Stephen	Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Tourism, Civil Aviation, Climate Resilience & Environment	ps@tourism.gov.gd
Ms. Roxie Hutchinson	Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Foreign Affairs	krphutchinson@gmail.com
Dr. Kelvin George	Director, Department of Economic and Technical Cooperation	director@detc.gov.gd
Mr. Titus Antoine	Former Director, Department of Economic and Technical Cooperation	titus_antoine@yahoo.com
Ms. Claudette Peters	St. Patrick's Environmental and Community Tourism Organization (SPECTO)	specto.grenada@gmail.com
Mr. Evans Gooding	North East Farmers Organization (NEFO)	northeastfarmersgrenada@gmail.com
Ms. Magdalene Niles	North East Farmers Organization (NEFO)	northeastfarmersgrenada@gmail.com
Mr. Aden Forteau	Technical Officer, Climate Smart Agriculture & Rural Enterprise Programme (SAEP)	technical.officer@saep.gov.gd
Mr. Brian Whyte	Carriacou Fisher Folk	carriacoufisherfolkassociation@gmail.com

Dr. Angus Friday	Blue Innovation Institute	angusfriday@gmail.com
Ms. Lotten Haagman	Grenada Hotel & Tourism Authority	lotten.ha@gmail.com
Mr. Whyme Cox	Director, Planning & Projects National Water & Sewage Authority	wcox@nawasa.gd
Ms. Marion Geiss	GIZ, Deputy Head of Office	marion.geiss@giz.de
Ms. Christine Finney	Eco Dive Grenada	info@ecodivegrenada.com
Ms. Claire Morrall	St George's University	cmorrall@sgu.edu
Mr. Ian Noel	Port Authority Grenada	allauno@hotmail.com
Mrs. Khadijah Edwards	GEF SGP	kadijah.edwards@undp.org
Mr. Trevor Thompson	Ministry of Agriculture Lands and Forestry	trevort_lud@yahoo.com
Mr. Tobias Calliste	Fisheries Officer	tobex00@hotmail.com
Mr. Olando Harvey	MPA Coordinator	landokeri@yahoo.com
Mr. Moran Mitchell	Chief Fisheries Officer (Ag)	mitchellmoran767@gmail.com
Mr. Arley Gill	Legal Consultant	salimbi@hotmail.com

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.

*As of 11 March 2020, the World Health Organization (WHO) declared COVID-19 a global pandemic as the new coronavirus rapidly spread to all regions of the world. Grenada's has entry restrictions for some countries and all incoming passengers are expected to undertake mandatory quarantine. If it is not possible to travel to or within the country for the TE mission then the TE team should develop a methodology that takes this into account the conduct of the TE virtually and remotely, including the use of remote interview methods and extended desk reviews, data analysis, surveys and evaluation questionnaires. This should be detailed in the TE Inception Report and agreed with the Commissioning Unit.*

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

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

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

## 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 [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** Implementing a “Ridge to Reef” Approach to Protecting Biodiversity and Ecosystem functions within and around Protected Areas in Grenada

Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E)	Rating <sup>1</sup>
M&E design at entry	
M&E Plan Implementation	
Overall Quality of M&E	
Implementation & Execution	Rating
Quality of UNDP Implementation/Oversight	
Quality of Implementing Partner Execution	
Overall quality of Implementation/Execution	
Assessment of Outcomes	Rating
Relevance	
Effectiveness	
Efficiency	
Overall Project Outcome Rating	
Sustainability	Rating
Financial resources	
Socio-political/economic	
Institutional framework and governance	
Environmental	
Overall Likelihood of Sustainability	

<sup>1</sup> 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)

## 6. TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the TE will be approximately 35 *working days* over a time period of 5 *weeks* starting on February 8, 2021. *date*). The tentative TE timeframe is as follows:

Timeframe	Activity
01/02/21	Application closes
05/02/21	Selection of TE team
08/02/21	Preparation period for TE team (handover of documentation)
15/02/21 – 18/02/21 3days (recommended 2-4)	Document review and preparation of TE Inception Report
19/02/21 – 21/02/21 3 days	Finalization and Validation of TE Inception Report; latest start of TE mission
0 22/02/21 – 01/03/21 7 days (recommended 7-15)	TE mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits, etc.
05/03/21	Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings; earliest end of TE mission
06/02/21 – 13/03/21 5 days (recommended 5-10)	Preparation of draft TE report
15/03/21	Circulation of draft TE report for comments
08/03/21 – 10/03/21	Incorporation of comments on draft TE report into Audit Trail & finalization of TE report

11/03/21	Preparation and Issuance of Management Response
25/03/21	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 mission: 11/02/21	TE team submits Inception Report to Commissioning Unit and project management
2	Presentation	Initial Findings	End of TE mission: 12/03/21	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: 02/03/21	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: 10/03/21	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.<sup>2</sup>

## 8. TE ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing the TE resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's TE is UNDP Barbados and the Eastern Caribbean.

The Commissioning Unit and the Project Team will be responsible for supporting the TE Team. Assistance will be provided with arranging remote/virtual meetings, providing updated stakeholder list with contact details (phone and email) and other relevant documentation.

## 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 Latin America and the Caribbean and one team expert, from Grenada. The team leader be responsible for the overall design and writing of the TE report, etc. The team expert will assess emerging trends with respect to regulatory frameworks, budget allocations, capacity building, work with the Project Team in arranging meetings and requesting information etc.

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**

- Master's degree in Biodiversity and Conservation, Environmental Science, Natural Resources Management or other closely related field;

---

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

- Bachelor's degree and an additional five (5) years of experience would be accepted in lieu of a postgraduate degree

#### Experience

- At least five years demonstrated experience with results-based management evaluation methodologies;
- At least five years' experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to Biodiversity and Ecosystems;
- Experience in evaluating projects;
- Experience working in Latin America and the Caribbean;
- Experience in relevant technical areas for at least *10 years*;
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and Biodiversity and Ecosystems;
- 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.

#### **Team Expert**

#### Education

- Bachelor's Degree in Biodiversity and Conservation, Environmental Science, Natural Resources Management or other closely related field;

#### Experience:

- At least three years demonstrated experience with results-based management evaluation methodologies;
- At least three years' experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to Biodiversity and Ecosystems;
- Experience in evaluating projects;
- Excellent communication skills;
- Demonstrable analytical skills;

#### Language

- Fluency in written and spoken English.

Consultants will be evaluated based on the following weighting criteria:

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Weight</b>	<b>Max. Point</b>
<b>Technical</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>70</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Master's degree in Biodiversity and Conservation, Environmental Science, Natural Resources Management other closely related field</li> </ul>	20	20
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At least 2 -4 years of experience in project management,</li> <li>2 years' experience in Biodiversity Conservation, Adaptive Management or related activities</li> </ul>	10 10	10 10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Previous work experience in a UN organization or knowledge of the national Government system</li> </ul>	15	15
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sound cross-cultural, gender-awareness, interpersonal and networking skills</li> </ul>	15	15
<b>Financial</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>30</b>

## 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%:

- 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.

**The following provisions are for the impact of COVID-19 on the production of deliverables and any reduced payment should this occur:**

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 PROCESS<sup>3</sup>

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

- a) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](#)<sup>4</sup> provided by UNDP;
- b) **CV** and a **Personal History Form** ([P11 form](#)<sup>5</sup>);
- 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 Implementing a "Ridge to Reef" Approach to Protecting Biodiversity and Ecosystem functions within and around Protected Areas in Grenada or by email at the following address ONLY: *(insert email address)* by *(time and date)*. Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

<sup>3</sup> Engagement of evaluators should be done in line with guidelines for hiring consultants in the POPP <https://popp.undp.org/SitePages/POPPRoot.aspx>

<sup>4</sup><https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/psa/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx>

<sup>5</sup> [http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11\\_Personal\\_history\\_form.doc](http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc)

**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**

*(Add the following annexes to the final ToR)*

- ToR Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework
- ToR Annex B: Project Information Package to be reviewed by TE team
- ToR Annex C: 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

<b>The Project Will Contribute to Achieving Country Programme Outcomes in the CPAP or CPD:</b> protecting biodiversity and ecosystems functions in and around protected areas.					
<b>Country Programme Outcome Indicators:</b> strengthened national capacities for protected areas management so as to conserve and manage the biodiversity and ecosystems functions.					
<b>Primary Applicable Key Environmental and Sustainable Development Result Area:</b> Mainstreaming protected areas management, viability of protected areas system and application of management effectiveness tracking tools in the context of global benefits.					
<b>Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Programs:</b> SOI-Improve Sustainability of Protected Areas Systems.					
<b>Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes:</b> Outcome 1.1 – Improved Management effectiveness of existing and new protected areas (BD-1); Outcome 3.2- Integrated Landscape management practices adopted by 6 local area communities (LD-3); Outcome 1.3 – Good management practices adopted by relevant economic factors (vested interests) (SFM/REDD-1)					
<b>Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators:</b> indicator 1.1 5 new PAs and coverage of 12,400ha. of unprotected ecosystems (BD-1); 3.2 INRM tools and methodologies tested (LD-3); 3.4 Information on INRM technologies and food practice guidelines disseminated (LD-3), 1.3 types and quantity of services generated through SFM (SFM/REDD-1) all scored as recorded by management effectiveness tracking tool (METT).					
<b>Project Objective</b>	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Means of Verification</b>	<b>Risks and Assumptions</b>
To ensure that biodiversity (BD) and ecosystems functions within and around Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) and Terrestrial Protected Areas (TPAs) in Grenada are better protected from threats through the	PA management in Grenada is mainstreamed	-TPAs managed by Forestry Division and MPAs managed under the Fisheries Division with varying degrees of recognition and planning & management tools.	-TPA and MPA planning & management instruments and guidelines formally incorporated into the Government's Administration-	-PA planning and management instruments and guidelines. M/E records kept by the Project management unit	<b><u>Assumptions:</u></b> -Institutional stability and commitment of GoG throughout project implementation. Consensus among stakeholders for PA expansion and connectivity. National/International conditions remain stable.

<p>adoption of an integrated “Ridge to Reef” approach that increases Protected Area (PA) management effectiveness and applies targeted sustainable land management practices.</p>	<p>Financial sustainability to increase viability and resilience of the PA system in Grenada</p>	<p>-Insufficient financial resources for basic functions in the Forestry and Tourism Divisions as reflected by Financial Scorecard: 70 = 32%</p>	<p>Budgetary restructuring to foster strategic collaboration between fisheries, forestry and tourism to increase (double) budgetary allocations to 8 PAs as eco-sites, as reflected by increase in Financial Scorecard: 90 = 42%</p>	<p>-Forestry, fisheries tourism and program recurrent and capital budgets. METT Financial Scorecard applied at PPG, MTR, and TE M/E Records</p>	<p>Willingness of government to commit funding and resources to make the PAs system viable and resilient.</p> <p><b>Risks:</b> Extreme weather, fires, pests and invasive species are beyond predicted levels.</p>
	<p>Average METT scores of 6 existing TPAs and 3 MPAs</p>	<p>-53</p>	<p>-62</p>	<p>-METT Scorecard applied at PPG, MTR, and TE</p>	

	<p>Improved capacity for planning, implementation, and monitoring of site-specific co-managed strategies for threat reduction through SLM and SFM in PAs.</p>	<p>-Avg score on Capacity Development Scorecard:  Q 2: 2  Q10: 1  Q 11: 1  Q 13: 2  Q 14: 0</p> <p><u>Areas to be improved:</u></p> <p>-Co-management is identified as the governance model for SLM, SFM and TPA management, but no formal mechanisms are instituted.</p> <p>-Outdated laws, low public knowledge of the various legislation, and inadequate regulatory framework constrain enforcement.</p>	<p>-Avg score on Cap Dev SC increases by at least 1 point:  Q 2: 3  Q10: 2  Q 11: 2  Q 13: 3  Q 14: 1</p> <p><u>Specific improvements:</u></p> <p>-Develop and implement co-management mechanisms for SFM, SLM and TPA management (Outcome 1).</p> <p>-Review and update existing policies and legislation; implement site specific mgt plans for</p>	<p>-GEF Capacity Development Scorecard applied at PPG, MTR and TE</p>	
--	---	--	---	---	--

		<p>-Environmental information used to support decision-making processes is unavailable, under-utilized, incomplete or out-of-date.</p> <p>-Capacity and technological needs are, when available, obtained through external financing.</p> <p>-Monitoring is done irregularly, with or without an adequate monitoring framework.</p>	<p>PAs; endorse an interagency collaboration mechanism for SLM. (Outcomes 1 &amp; 2)</p> <p>-Develop and implement a protocol that facilitates information updating, access and sharing for decision-making (Outcomes 1 &amp; 2).</p> <p>-Develop a capacity development strategy to augment technical skills within the resident organizations per the priorities of the NAP.</p>		
--	--	---	--	--	--

			-National monitoring system with proper capacity building (Outcome 1).		
Outcome #1	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Means of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
1. Establishment and effective management of new and existing Protected Areas	Institutional framework for management effectiveness in and around PAs	-No formal National Parks Advisory Council; Forestry Division administers 8 TPAs under suboptimal conditions; Fisheries Division administers 3 MPAs.	-Formal establishment of a National Parks Advisory Council for TPAs and Management Committee for MPAs administering policy-based PAs, PoA.	-SROs Published in the Government Gazette so as to enable the TPA and MPA Strategic Management bodies to function.	<p><b>Assumptions:</b></p> <p>Government of Grenada adopts the Ridge to Reef Project as a key initiative for fulfilling its obligations for conservation and management of its BD so as to meet local and Global objectives.</p> <p><b>Risks:</b></p> <p>Contingency-based planning and management persists.</p>

	<p>Regulatory and legal framework for management effectiveness in and around PAs</p>	<p>-Forestry policy does not include INRM.          -Fisheries division does not use INRM in its administration of MPAs.          -No PA System</p>	<p>-A finalized and approved <i>Protected Area Forestry and Wildlife Bill</i> with draft SROs that promote INRM practices and principles.          -Fisheries division applying INRM principles and practices using enhanced law and/or regulations, within 2 years.          - PA System Business Plan developed and under implementation</p>	<p>New parent legislation published in the Government gazette and with associated SROs.</p>	
--	--	---	--	---	--

	<p>Expansion of protected areas system</p>	<p>-3,711 ha of bio-diverse landscapes/seascapes formally recognized and facing multiple threats:</p> <p>-8 TPAs managed under suboptimal conditions and 5 mini TPAs with no management mechanism. o TPAs cover 1,931 ha.</p> <p>-3 MPAs management suboptimal conditions o MPAs cover 1,780 ha.</p>	<p>-16, 111 ha of bio-diverse landscapes/seascape s formally recognized and managed effectively:</p> <p>-9 TPAs + 4 mini-TPAs effectively managed with legal demarcation, management plans, business plans, and adequate infrastructure in place. o TPAs cover 2,931 ha.</p> <p>-7 MPAs managed under optimal conditions within 5 years. o MPAs cover 13,180 ha.</p>	<p>Project records:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Technical reports</li> <li>- GIS maps</li> <li>- Project evaluation reports</li> <li>- Planning and policy documents</li> <li>- Tracking Tools</li> <li>- Field assessment</li> </ul>	<p>Assumptions:</p> <p>Increased support from GoG. Effective management measures adopted.</p> <p>Risks:</p> <p>Unpredicted natural hazards</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

	<p>Measurable Threat Reduction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Forest Cover</li> <li>-Direct Carbon benefits</li> <li>-Indirect Carbon benefits</li> <li>-Mangrove, sea grass bed and coral reef areas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Continuous deforestation threatens 10 ;012 hectares</li> <li>- 81,652.5 tC (Direct)</li> <li>- 322,158.3 tC (Indirect)</li> <li>- Continuous destruction of 231 Ha of mangrove, 1301 Ha of seagrass and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-10,012 hectares of forested area maintained or increased</li> <li>- 81,652.5 tC Direct maintained or increased</li> <li>- 322,158.3 tC Indirect maintained or increased</li> <li>- 231 Ha of mangrove, 1301 Ha of seagrass and 5095 Ha of reef areas maintained or</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Tracking Tools applied at PPG, MTR, and TE</li> <li>- Technical reports</li> <li>- GIS maps</li> <li>- Satellite imagery</li> <li>- Field assessments</li> </ul>	<p>Risks Unpredicted natural hazards</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>Consensus and interest among local stakeholders. Collaboration with Academia and Centres of excellence in data procurement and application of SLM/SFM practices</p>
	<p>Management of expanded PA network institutionalized</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-No coral Reef resilience program (protocol) in place.</li> <li>- No systematic SFM program in place</li> <li>- No staff trained in planning accounting, bio principal monitoring, enforcement, fire</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Coral reef resilience program (protocol) in place within 5 years.</li> <li>- SFM program adopted and administered in all PAs within 5 yrs.</li> <li>- 13 PA Staff trained</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- MMER protocol designed adopted and administered</li> <li>- CCM measures adopted and recorded</li> <li>- Records of staff training</li> <li>- Training Docs.</li> </ul>	

		management and co-management		- Capacity development Scorecard	
	PA network infrastructure and services	-Inconsistent infrastructure and facilities and services across TPAs and MPAs.	-Standardized and quality infrastructure facilities and services available at all TPA and MPA units in the PA network.	-Field inspections - Documentation and records	<b><u>Assumptions:</u></b>  Adequate investments: Entrepreneurs willing to assist and collaborate in the project.

	<p>Community involvement in PA management through conservation and sustainable use of natural resources</p>	<p>-0 communities adjacent to MPAs engaged in PA co-management - 0 communities adjacent to TPAs engaged on PA co-management</p>	<p>-3 communities adjacent to selected MPAs engaged in co-management - 3 communities adjacent to selected TPAs engaged in PA co-management</p>	<p>-Planning and policy documents and records. - Project records - METT scorecard</p>	<p><b><u>Assumptions:</u></b> Community interest in engaging in PA management activities</p>
--	---	---	--	---	--

	<p>Benefits/profitability from conservation/ sustainable-use resource-based livelihood opportunities</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-No systematic collaboration for INRM linked to livelihood opportunities</li> <li>- Minimal benefits from resources-based livelihoods</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Incentive schemes to engage entrepreneurs in INRM practices linked to livelihoods</li> <li>- Measured increase in benefits from resource-based livelihoods</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project records</li> <li>- METT scorecard</li> </ul>	
--	--	---	--	---	--

**Outputs:**

1.1 Institutional framework for PA System Management that would develop and administer a policy-based strategic plan of action for an expanded PA network, one advisory body for TPAs while the other is for MPAs; with the aid of policy instruments.

1.2 A legal and regulatory framework established through the finalization and approval of the bill for “Protected Area, Forestry and Wildlife” enhanced with SROs and operations management policy instruments that would the consolidate legal process to include private lands in the PA system. Accompanied by an adapted MPA Act as a response to community wide consultations with key stakeholders.

1.3 Expanded PA system through the creation of a new TPA (1000 ha.), enhanced management of 8 sub-optimally managed TPAs, as well as low-cost improvements for 4 small-hectare TPAs; and the creation of 4 new MPAs (11,400 ha).

1.4 Management of Protected Area Units Institutionalized as a TPA network and with a MPA network.

1.5 Conservation and sustainable use of natural resources as a means for community involvement in PA co-management.

## 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 rating<sup>6</sup>)
- 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)

---

<sup>6</sup> See ToR Annex F for rating scales.

- 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

- 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?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the project relate to the GEF Biodiversity focal area and has it been designed to deliver global environmental benefits in line with relevant international biodiversity conservation objectives?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project includes the relevant GEF outcomes, outputs and indicators</li> <li>• The project makes explicit links with global conservation action/national conservation goals (e.g. CBD, CITES, etc.)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Document</li> <li>• GEF 5 Focal Area Strategies</li> <li>• PIF</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review of Documents</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the project aligned to National development objectives, broadly, and to national conservation priorities specifically?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project design includes explicit links (indicators, outputs, outcomes) to the national development policy/national conservation strategies.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Document</li> <li>• National development strategies, conservation plans, etc.</li> <li>• PIF</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review of Documents</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the project relevant to stated regional development objectives as defined by CARICOM,</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explicit links are made within the project to regional development policies, action plans and associated initiatives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Document</li> <li>• CARICOM Strategic Plan, Caribbean Challenge Initiative</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review of Documents</li> </ul>

OECS and other regional frameworks?	such as the CARICOM Strategic Plan.	• PIF	
• Is the project's Theory of Change relevant to addressing the development challenge(s) identified?	• The Theory of Change clearly indicates how project interventions and projected results will contribute to the reduction of the three major barriers to low carbon development (Policy, institutional/technical capacity and financial)	• Project Document • PIF	• Desk Review of Documents
• Does the project directly and adequately address the needs of beneficiaries at local and regional levels?	• The Theory of Change clearly identifies beneficiary groups and defines how their capabilities will be enhanced by the project.	• Project Document • PIF	• Desk Review of Documents
• Is the project's results framework relevant to the development challenges and are results at the appropriate level?	• The project results framework adequately measures impact • The project indicators are SMART • Indicator baselines are clearly defined and populated and milestones and targets are • The results framework is comprehensive and demonstrates systematic links to the theory of change	• Project Document • PIF	• Desk Review of Documents
• Is the project appropriately aligned with relevant UN system priorities, including thematic objectives at the	• The project's results framework includes relevant thematic outcomes and indicators from the UNDP Strategic Plan, the UNDAF,	• Project Document • UNDP CPD, UNDAF, SP	• Desk Review of Documents

national/regional and international levels?	UNDP CPD and other relevant corporate objectives		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have the relevant stakeholders been adequately identified and have their views, needs and rights been considered during design and implementation?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The stakeholder mapping and associated engagement plan includes all relevant stakeholders and appropriate modalities for engagement.</li> <li>• Planning and implementation have been participatory and inclusive</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stakeholder mapping/engagement plan and reporting</li> <li>• Quarterly Reports</li> <li>• Annual Reports (PIR)</li> <li>• Stakeholder Consultation Reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review of Documents</li> <li>• Stakeholder Interviews</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have the interventions of the project been adequately considered in the context of other development activities being undertaken in the same or related thematic area?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A Partnership framework has been developed that incorporates parallel initiatives, key partners and identifies complementarities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Document</li> <li>• Quarterly Reports</li> <li>• Annual Reports (PIR)</li> <li>• Stakeholder mapping/engagement plan and reporting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review of Documents</li> <li>• Stakeholder Interviews</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have relevant lessons learned from previous projects informed the design, implementation, risk management and monitoring of the project?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lessons learned are explicitly identified and integrated into all aspects of the Project Document</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Document</li> <li>• PIF</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review of Documents</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did the project design adequately identify, assess and design appropriate mitigation actions for the potential social and environmental risks posed by its interventions?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SES checklist was completed appropriately and all reasonable risks were identified with appropriate impact and probability ratings and risk mitigation measures specified</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Document</li> <li>• SES Annex</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review of Documents</li> </ul>
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has the project achieved its output and outcome level objectives?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project has met or exceeded the output and outcome indicator end-of-project targets</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quarterly Reports</li> <li>• Annual Reports (PIR)</li> <li>• Monitoring Reports</li> <li>• Beneficiary testimony</li> <li>• Site visit/field reports</li> <li>• Pilot Data Analysis/Reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review of Documents</li> <li>• Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Were lessons learned captured and integrated into project planning and decision-making?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lessons learned have been captured periodically and/or at project end</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Steering Committee Meeting Minutes</li> <li>• Quarterly Reports</li> <li>• Annual Reports (PIR)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review of Documents</li> <li>• Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How well were risks (including those identified in the Social and Environmental Screening (SES) Checklist), assumptions and impact drivers being managed?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A clearly defined risk identification, categorization and mitigation strategy (updated risk log in ATLAS)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ATLAS Risk Log</li> <li>• M&amp;E Reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review of Documents</li> <li>• Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Were relevant counterparts from government and civil society involved in project implementation, including as part of the project steering committee?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The steering committee participation included representatives from key institutions in Government</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Steering Committee Meeting Minutes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has the project contributed directly to any</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft legislation has been developed or enacted to</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft legislation</li> <li>• Policy Documents</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review of Documents</li> </ul>

changes in legislation or policy in line with the project's objectives?	catalyse the reduction of barriers to the improved effectiveness of protected area management and biodiversity conservation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Action/Implementation Plans</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is there evidence that the project outcomes have contributed to better preparations to cope with natural disasters?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project has directly contributed to reductions in one or more vulnerabilities associated with natural disasters</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Quarterly Reports</li> <li>Annual Reports (PIR)</li> <li>Stakeholder/beneficiary testimony</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk Review of Documents</li> <li>Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has the project carefully considered the thematic issues related to human rights? In particular, has the project sought to and actively pursued equality of access to ecosystem services and opportunities for women and men (e.g. by ensuring that beneficiary selection that does not reinforce existing inequalities, ensuring the inclusion of women and men in decision-making roles within the project, including as part of management and stakeholder groups, etc.)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A gender mainstreaming plan was completed</li> <li>The project results framework has incorporated gender equality considerations, as relevant.</li> <li>Multi-dimensional poverty reduction is an explicit objective</li> <li>The project prioritized the most vulnerable as key beneficiaries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gender Mainstreaming Plan</li> <li>Project Document</li> <li>Stakeholder analysis and engagement plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk Review of Documents</li> </ul>
<b>Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in line with international and national norms and standards?</b>			
Did the project adjust dynamically to reflect changing national priorities/external	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project demonstrated adaptive management and changes were integrated into project planning and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Annual Work Plans</li> <li>Steering Committee Meeting Reports</li> <li>Quarterly Reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk Review of Documents</li> <li>Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries</li> </ul>

<p>evaluations during implementation to ensure it remained relevant?</p>	<p>implementation through adjustments to annual work plans, budgets and activities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Changes to AWP/Budget were made based on mid-term or other external evaluation</li> <li>• Any changes to the project's planned activities were approved by the Steering Committee</li> <li>• Any substantive changes (outcome-level changes) approved by the Steering Committee and donor, as required</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annual Reports (PIR)</li> <li>• Stakeholder/beneficiary testimony</li> <li>• Revised Project Results Framework</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent were the Project results delivered with the greatest value for money?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Value for money analyses, requests for information, market surveys and other market intelligence were undertaken for key procurements.</li> <li>• Procurement is done on a competitive basis, where relevant.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• VFM, RFI, Market Surveys</li> <li>• Procurement Evaluation Documents</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review of Documents</li> <li>• Interviews with project staff and government stakeholders</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Was co-financing adequately estimated during project design (sources, type, value, relevance), tracked during implementation and what were the reasons for any differences between expected and realised co-financing?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Co-financing was realized in keeping with original estimates</li> <li>• Co-financing was tracked continuously throughout the project lifecycle and deviations identified and alternative sources identified</li> <li>• Co-financiers were actively engaged throughout project implementation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annual Work Plans</li> <li>• Steering Committee Meeting Reports</li> <li>• Quarterly Reports</li> <li>• Annual Reports (PIR)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review of Documents</li> <li>• Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Was the level of implementation support provided by UNDP adequate and in keeping with the implementation modality and any related agreements (i.e. LOA)?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Technical support to the Executing Agency and project team were timely and of acceptable quality.</li> <li>• Management inputs and processes, including budgeting and procurement, were adequate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LOA (s)/Cooperation Agreement(s)</li> <li>• UNDP project support documents (emails, procurement/recruitment documents)</li> <li>• Quarterly Reports</li> <li>• Annual Reports (PIR)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review of Documents</li> <li>• Interviews with project staff, UNDP personnel</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have the capacities of the executing institution(s) and counterparts been properly considered when the project was designed?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An ex-ante analysis was undertaken of the internal control framework and internal capacities of the IP</li> <li>• An ex-ante capacity analysis was undertaken of key partners with explicit responsibilities for implementation of project funds</li> <li>• The cash transfer modality and implementation modality appropriately reflected the findings of any ex-ante analyses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HACT Assessment(s)</li> <li>• Capacity Assessments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review of Documents</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has the M&amp;E plan been well-formulated, and has it served as an effective tool to support project implementation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The M&amp;E plan has an adequate budget and was adequately funded</li> <li>• The logical framework was used during implementation as a management and M&amp;E tool</li> <li>• There was compliance with the financial and narrative reporting requirements (timeliness and quality)</li> <li>• Monitoring and reporting has been at both the activity and results levels</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Document</li> <li>• M&amp;E Plan</li> <li>• AWP</li> <li>• FACE forms</li> <li>• Quarterly Narrative Reports</li> <li>• Site visit reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review of Documents</li> <li>• Interviews with project staff and government stakeholders</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has the project adequately used relevant national systems (procurement, recruitment, payments) for project implementation where possible?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of national systems was in keeping with relevant national requirements and internal control frameworks</li> <li>• Management of financial resources has been in line with accounting best practice</li> <li>• Management of project assets has been in line with accounting best practice</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Procurement/ Recruitment reports</li> <li>• FACE forms</li> <li>• CDRs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review of Documents</li> <li>• Interviews with project staff and government stakeholders</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Were financial audit/spot check findings adequately addressed and relevant changes made to improve financial management?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appropriate management responses and associated actions were taken in response to audit/spot check findings.</li> <li>• Successive audits demonstrated improvements in financial management practices</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Audit Reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review of Document</li> </ul>
<p>Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-political, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?</p>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are there financial risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outcomes?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The exit strategy includes explicit interventions to ensure financial sustainability of relevant activities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Exit Strategy</li> <li>• Risk Log</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review of Documents</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do the legal frameworks, policies, and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project benefits?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The exit strategy identifies relevant sociopolitical risks and includes explicit interventions to mitigate same</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Exit Strategy</li> <li>• Risk Log</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review of Documents</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have key stakeholders identified their interest in project benefits beyond</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key stakeholders are assigned specific, agreed roles and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Exit Strategy</li> <li>• Risk Log</li> <li>• MOU(s)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review of Documents</li> </ul>

project-end and accepted responsibility for ensuring that project benefits continue to flow?	responsibilities outlined in the exit strategy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MOU(s) exist for on-going monitoring, maintenance and oversight of phased down or phased over activities</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are there ongoing activities that may pose an environmental threat to the sustainability of project outcomes?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The exit strategy identifies relevant environmental risks and includes explicit interventions to mitigate same</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Exit Strategy</li> <li>• Risk Log</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review of Documents</li> </ul>
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?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are there verifiable improvements in ecological status, or reductions in ecological stress, that can be linked directly to project interventions?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project has contributed directly to improved ecological conditions, including through reduced expanded and improved management of protected areas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quarterly Reports</li> <li>• Annual Reports (PIR)</li> <li>• Monitoring Reports</li> <li>• Pilot Data Analysis/Reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk Review of Documents</li> </ul>

## **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

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

## ToR Annex H: TE Audit Trail

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

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

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

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