**Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference (ToR)**

**BASIC CONTRACT INFORMATION**

**Location: Home Based (no travel envisaged)**

**Application Deadline: 30th November 2020**

**Type of Contract: IC**

**Assignment Type: Terminal Evaluation for UNDP GEF Global ABS Project**

**Languages Required: English – Knowledge of any other UN Language will be an asset**

**Starting Date: 1st January 2021**

**Duration of Initial Contract: 5 months**

**Expected Duration of Assignment: 30 working days**

**BACKGROUND**

##### **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 UNDP GEF Global ABS Project: “Strengthening human resources, legal frameworks, and institutional capacities to implement the Nagoya Protocol *(PIMS 5381)* implemented through the *United Nations Development Programme*. The project started on the *24th of August 2016* and is in its *5th* year of implementation. The TE process must follow the guidance outlined in the document ‘[Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects’](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/GEF/TE_GuidanceforUNDP-supportedGEF-financedProjects.pdf)).

##### **Project Description**

The Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization (ABS), an agreement under the Convention on Biological Diversity, was adopted on 29 October 2010 in Nagoya (Japan) and entered into force on 12 October 2014, it provides a transparent legal framework for the effective implementation of the 3rd objective of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). The Protocol applies to genetic resources that are covered by the CBD and to the benefits arising from their utilization, it also covers associated Traditional Knowledge (TK) associated with Genetic Resources (GR) held by indigenous and local communities. Contracting parties to the Nagoya Protocol need to fulfil core obligations to take measures in relation to access to genetic resources, benefit-sharing and compliance.

1.1. Introduction:

The UNDP-GEF Project “Strengthening human resources, legal frameworks, and institutional capacities to implement the Nagoya Protocol” (Global ABS Project) was initially a 3-year project (extended to 5) that specifically aims at assisting 24 countries in the development and strengthening of their national ABS frameworks, human resources, and administrative capabilities to implement the Nagoya Protocol. The project seeks to achieve this through its 4 components namely:

• Component 1: Strengthening the legal, policy and institutional capacity to develop national ABS frameworks;

• Component 2: Building trust between users and providers of genetic resources to facilitate the identification of bio-discovery efforts; and

• Component 3: Strengthening the capacity of indigenous and local communities to contribute to the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol.

• Component 4: Implementing a Community of Practice and South-South Cooperation Framework on ABS.

The project is a part of UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub (IRH) portfolio. The Project overall management is located in UNDP Panama Regional Hub while the Financial part is handled in Istanbul.

* 1. Context:

The implementation of the basic measures of the Nagoya Protocol in the participating countries will unleash a wide range of monetary and non-monetary benefits for providers of genetic resources. Some of these benefits should be reinvested in the conservation and sustainable use the biological resources from where the genetic resources were obtain. This will fulfill the three objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity.

##### **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.

As stated in the Project Document (PRODOC), an independent Terminal Evaluation (TE) should take place three months prior to the final Project Steering Committee (PSC) meeting and should be undertaken in accordance with UNDP and GEF guidance. This final evaluation should focus on the delivery of the project’s results as initially planned (and as corrected after the mid-term evaluation, if any such correction took place). The TE will look at impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental benefits/goals. The Terminal Evaluation will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects.

The TE will also provide recommendations for follow-up activities and requires a management response, which is to be uploaded to PIMS and to the UNDP Evaluation Office Evaluation Resource Center (ERC). The GEF ABS Tracking Tool will also be completed during the TE.

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including board meeting minutes, project budget revisions, progress reports, regional and country project related products, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. All these documents will be provided.

The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact as defined and explained in the [UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported GEF-financed Projects](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/UNDP-GEF-TE-Guide.pdf). An overall approach and method for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP-supported projects can be found in the [UNDP Evaluation Guidelines](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/index.shtml).

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the [UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'](http://www.unevaluation.org/ethicalguidelines).

**DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

##### **TE Approach & Methodology**

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

The evaluator 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 evaluator 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 by the time the evaluator is recruited.

The evaluator 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.

The specific design and methodology for the TE should emerge from consultations between the evaluator 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 evaluator 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 evaluator.

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.

1. **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 scope of the evaluation will cover all activities undertaken in the framework of the project and will be done through a desk review and Skype/ phone interviews with no anticipated travel to the project countries. While the evaluation will cover all activities undertaken under the project, it will involve an in-depth assessment of country activities of a selected sample of countries (8-10). The exact list of countries will be specified by UNDP at the beginning of the contract. The evaluator will compare expected outcomes of the project to actual achieved outcomes, assess the development results to determine their contribution to the attainment of the project objectives. They will also attempt to evaluate the efficiency of project management, including the delivery of outcomes and activities in terms of quality, quantity, timeliness and cost efficiency as well as features related to the process involved in achieving those outputs and the impacts of the project. The evaluation will also address the underlying causes and issues that contributed to targets not adequately achieved. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact, as defined and explained 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 evaluation in the assessment of the Project’s outcomes will at a minimum cover the following criteria: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact.**

* **Relevance:** Relevance looks at the relationship between the needs and problems identified and the objectives of the intervention. The extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with beneficiaries’ requirements, country needs, global priorities and partners’ and donors’ policies.
* **Effectiveness**: The extent to which the development intervention’s objectives were achieved. The evaluation should form an opinion on the progress made to date and the role of UNDP’s CIRDA Project delivering the observed changes. If the objectives have not been achieved, an assessment should be made of the extent to which progress has fallen short of the target and what factors have influenced why something hasn't been successful or why it has not yet been achieved.
* **Efficiency**: A measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted into results.
* **Sustainability:** The continuation of benefits after the project ends. The probability of continued long-term benefits, assessing i) sustainability of financial resources, ii) socio-political sustainability, iii) sustainability of institutional framework and governance, iv) environmental sustainability, and v) a final rating of overall sustainability
* **Impact:** The evaluator will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include mainstreaming. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender.

The evaluation should also assess the key financial aspects of the project. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, if applicable and available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub and Project Team to obtain financial data.

An important aspect of this evaluation will be the activities, achievements, challenges and lessons learned performed under Component 4, *Implementing a Community of Practice and South-South Cooperation Framework on ABS* , for which the evaluation should liaise with both UNV and the Project team.

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

1. 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

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 (\*)
* Implementing Agency (UNDP) (\*) and Executing Agency (\*), overall project oversight/implementation and execution (\*)
* Risk Management, including Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)

1. 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 evaluator 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 evaluator 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 in the ToR Annex.

Project finance / cofinance

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator will receive assistance from the UNDP IRH and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Co-financing  (type/source) | UNDP own financing (mill. US$) | | Government  (mill. US$) | | Partner Agency  (mill. US$) | | Total  (mill. US$) | |
| Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Actual | Actual |
| Grants |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Loans/Concessions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * In-kind support |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Sources of co-financing** | **Name of co-financier** | **Type** | **Type of Investment Mobilized** | **Amount (in USD)** |
| *Select one:*  *GEF Agency/ Donor Agency / Recipient Country Gov’t / Private Sector / Civil Society Organization/ Beneficiaries / Other* |  | *Select one: Grant/ Loan/ Equity Investment/ Public Investment/ Guarantee/ In-Kind/ Other* | *Select one: Investment mobilized/ Recurrent expenditure* |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **TOTAL** |  |  |  |  |

1. **Expected Outputs and Deliverables**

The TE *consultant* shall prepare and submit:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| # | Deliverable | Description | Timing | Responsibilities |
| 1 | TE Inception Report | Evaluator clarifies objectives, methodology and timing of the TE | No later than 2 weeks before the TE mission: *(by January 31, 2021)* | Evaluator submits Inception Report to Commissioning Unit and project management |
| 2 | Presentation | Initial Findings | *(by March 15, 2021)* | Evaluator presents to Commissioning Unit and project management |
| 3 | Draft TE Report | Full draft report *(using guidelines on report content in ToR Annex C)* with annexes | : *(April 10, 2021)* | Evaluator 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 *(See template in ToR Annex H)* | Within 1 week of receiving comments on draft report: *(April 30, 2021)* | Evaluator 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.[[1]](#footnote-1)

1. **TE Arrangements**

The principal responsibility for managing the TE resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project’s TE is UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the evaluator to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits, if applicable. All deliverables will be reviewed by the Project Manager, GEF Regional Technical Advisor and ultimately approved by the Chief of the Country Office Solutions & Reg. Programme Coordination Team.

1. **Duration of the Work**

The total duration of the TE will be approximately *30 working days)* over a time period of *(20 weeks)* starting on *(January 1, 2021)*. The tentative TE timeframe is as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Timeframe | Activity |
| *December 10, 2020* | Application closes |
| *December 15, 2020* | Selection of evaluator |
| *January 1, 2021* | Preparation period for evaluator (handover of documentation) |
| *January 15, 2021 2 days)* | Document review and preparation of TE Inception Report |
| *January 31, 2021 4 days* | Finalization and Validation of TE Inception Report; latest start of TE mission (virtual) |
| *February 28, 2021- 8 days* | Virtual stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits, etc. |
| *March 15, 2021 – 8 days* | Virtual wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings |
| *April 10, 2021 5 days* | Preparation of draft TE report and circulation for comments |
| *April 30, 2021* | Incorporation of comments on draft TE report into Audit Trail & finalization of TE report |
| *May 10, 2021* | Preparation and Issuance of Management Response |
|  |  |
| *May 15, 2021* | Expected date of full TE completion |

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

1. **Duty Station**

*Home Based – All work including meetings should be performed virtually.* No Travel is expected for this consultancy.

**REQUIRED SKILLS AND EXPERIENCE**

1. **Required Qualifications**

*Important: The evaluator 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.*

Education:

* Master’s degree in Biodiversity, Environmental Sciences, environmental law or policy, multi-lateral environmental agreements, or other closely related field, PHD will be considered an asset – ABS and Nagoya Protocol proven knowledge will be highly considered - (Max. 10 points).

Experience:

* Technical knowledge that can be proven by a minimum 10 years’ work experience in a field related to Environmental law or policy, multi-lateral environmental agreements, etc. (Max. 15 points);
* Knowledge of UNDP and GEF programming and procedures, an asset (Max. 15 points);
* Previous experience with results‐based monitoring and evaluation methodologies (Max. 10 points);
* Demonstrated evaluation experience through two writing samples of past evaluations of similarly funded projects (Max 10 points);
* Working knowledge of the Nagoya Protocol and ABS is a plus (5 points)

• Experience with evaluations of global or regional projects is a strong asset (max 5 points)

* Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and Climate*;* experience in gender responsive evaluation and analysis (X points)

Languages:

* Fluency in English, both oral and written is required (Max. 4 points);
* Working knowledge of French, Spanish or Arabic is a plus (1 point).

1. **Evaluator Ethics**

The evaluator will be held to the highest ethical standards and is required to sign a code of conduct upon acceptance of the assignment. This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’. The evaluator must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data. The evaluator must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses without the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

1. **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%[[2]](#footnote-2):

* 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.

1. **Recommended Presentation of Proposal**
2. **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx) provided by UNDP;
3. **CV** and a **Personal History Form** ([P11 form](http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc));
4. **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)
5. **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the [Letter of Confirmation of Interest template](https://popp.undp.org/_layouts/15/WopiFrame.aspx?sourcedoc=/UNDP_POPP_DOCUMENT_LIBRARY/Public/PSU_%20Individual%20Contract_Offerors%20Letter%20to%20UNDP%20Confirming%20Interest%20and%20Availability.docx&action=default). 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.

**APPLICATION PROCESS**

Qualified candidates are requested to submit an application containing:

* **Financial Proposal\*** - specifying a total lump sum amount for the tasks specified in this announcement. The financial proposal shall include a breakdown of this lump sum amount (number of anticipated working days, travel, per diems and any other possible costs).

*\*Please note that the* ***financial proposal is all-inclusive*** *and shall take into account various expenses incurred by the consultant/contractor during the contract period (e.g. fee, health insurance, vaccination, personal security needs and any other relevant expenses related to the performance of services...). No* ***travel is envisaged under this consultancy.***

***Payments*** *will be made only upon confirmation of UNDP on delivering on the contract obligations in a satisfactory manner.*

*Individual Consultants are responsible for ensuring they have* ***vaccinations****/inoculations when travelling to certain countries, as designated by the UN Medical Director. Consultants are also required to comply with the UN* ***security directives*** *set forth under dss.un.org*

*General Terms and conditions as well as other related documents can be found under: http://on.undp.org/t7fJs.*

*Qualified women and members of minorities are encouraged to apply.*

*Due to large number of applications we receive, we are able to inform only the successful candidates about the outcome or status of the selection process.*

*Individual Consultants are responsible for ensuring they have* ***vaccinations****/inoculations when travelling to certain countries, as designated by the UN Medical Director. Consultants are also required to comply with the UN* ***security directives*** *set forth under dss.un.org*

*General Terms and conditions as well as other related documents can be found under: http://on.undp.org/t7fJs.*

*Qualified women and members of minorities are encouraged to apply.*

*Due to large number of applications we receive, we are able to inform only the successful candidates about the outcome or status of the selection process.*

1. **Criteria for Selection of the Best Offer**

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

*ToR ANNEX A: List of Documents to be reviewed by the evaluator*

* ToR Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework
* ToR Annex B: Project Information Package to be reviewed by the evaluator
* 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

*The following documents will also be available:*

* *Project operational guidelines, manuals, and systems*
* *UNDP country/countries programme document(s)*
* *Minutes of the Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)*
* *Any additional documents, as relevant.*

**Annex A: Results and Resource Framework**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Targets**  **End of Project** | **Source of verification** | **Risks and Assumptions** | |
| **Project Objective:** To assist countries in the development and strengthening of their national ABS frameworks, human resources and administrative capabilities to implement the Nagoya Protocol. | Number of national ABS law/regulation/policy proposals developed and/or strengthened with the participation of key stakeholders including indigenous peoples and ILCs. | * Albania: some legal ABS measures in place * Belarus: some legal acts to regulate the access to genetic resources in place, but they do not include all the issues relevant to the Nagoya Protocol * Egypt: draft ABS legislation pre-dating the Nagoya Protocol * India: legal framework in place * Jordan: amendment of the Environment Protection Law in process * Sudan: legal amendment to introduce ABS in progress; some draft sectoral rules in process | * Albania: ABS policy and legislation adopted * Belarus: improved ABS rules adopted to fully implement the Nagoya Protocol * Egypt: ABS legislation and ABS bylaw adopted * India: strengthened participation of research community in the ABS regulatory system * Jordan: amendment of Environmental Protection Act and ABS bylaws approved * Sudan: ABS policy/ legislation adopted and sectoral laws reviewed to properly reflect ABS provisions | * Official Gazette and bulletins per country * National ABS law/regulation/policy draft proposals * Project reports * Reports submitted to ABS CHM; * National reports on implementation of the Nagoya | * There is political will to develop/update ABS-related legislation at the national level * One or more institution is officially designated and capacitated to fulfill the functions and responsibility of a national competent authority * Speedy processes for adoption and promulgation of texts | |
| * Dominican Republic: some ABS provisions are included in the existing regulation for biodiversity research * Ecuador: ABS comprehensive legal framework in place * Honduras: No ABS-related law/ regulation in place * Panama: specific ABS legal framework in place * Uruguay: No ABS-related law/ regulation in place | * Dominican Republic: draft of a national ABS law and corresponding regulations * Ecuador: guidelines for the implementation of the existing ABS legal framework integrating the different relevant legal provisions in force in the country * Honduras: draft of a national ABS law and corresponding regulations * Panama: draft of revised ABS legal framework * Uruguay: draft of a national ABS law and corresponding regulations |
| * Botswana: No ABS-related law/ regulation in place * Comoros: No ABS-related law/ regulation in place * Ethiopia: Pre- Nagoya protocol measures on ABS in place * Kenya: Pre- Nagoya protocol measures on ABS in place * Seychelles: No ABS-related law/ regulation in place * South Africa: Pre- Nagoya protocol measures on ABS in place | * Botswana: draft of a national ABS law and corresponding regulations * Comoros: draft of a national ABS law and corresponding regulations * Ethiopia: updated/ harmonized ABS legislation submitted for approval * Kenya: effective ABS laws updated through consultative process and submitted for approval * Seychelles: draft of a national ABS law and corresponding regulations * South Africa: draft amendment to the ABS Provisions in the National Environmental Management: Biodiversity Act (No. 10 of 2004) |
| * Kazakhstan: No ABS-related law/ regulation in place * Mongolia: No ABS-related law/ regulation in place * Myanmar: No ABS-related law/ regulation in place * Samoa: No ABS-related law/ regulation in place * Tajikistan: No ABS-related law/ regulation in place | * Kazakhstan: ABS national policy and legal framework developed and submitted for adoption * Mongolia: ABS national policy and legal framework developed and submitted for adoption * Myanmar: ABS national policy and legal framework developed and submitted for adoption * Samoa: ABS national policy and legal framework developed and submitted for adoption * Tajikistan: ABS national policy and legal framework developed and submitted for adoption |
| Increase by X% in the capacities of national and state competent authorities and related agencies to develop, implement, and enforce national ABS domestic legislation, administrative or policy measures for ABS - including a CHM, as measured by the UNDP ABS Capacity Development Scorecard | * Albania: 42.42% * Belarus: 30.30% * Egypt: 16.67 % * India: 53.05 % * Jordan: 22.73 % * Sudan: 24.24 % | * Albania: 52.42% * Belarus: 50.30% * Egypt: 36.67 % * India: 58.05 % * Jordan: 42.73% * Sudan: 44.24 % | * Updated UNDP ABS Capacity Development Scorecard * Government records / official bulletins * ABS and CHM related reports * National reports on implementation of the Nagoya Protocol | * Staff apply their new knowledge and abilities in a satisfactory manner * There is stability in the human resources within the institution that benefits from the capacity development activities * Willingness from staff to participate in the training activities | |
| * Colombia: 74.24% * Dominican Republic: 28.79% * Ecuador: 45.45% * Honduras: 28.79% * Panama: 40. 91% * Uruguay: 12.12% | * Colombia: 94.24% * Dominican Republic: 58.79% * Ecuador: 65.45% * Honduras: 58.79% * Panama: 70.91% * Uruguay: 12.12% |
| * Botswana: 18.67% * Comoros: 13.64% * Ethiopia: 65.15% * Kenya: 49.97% * Rwanda: 68.18% * Seychelles: 45.45% * South Africa: 75.76% | * Botswana: 50% * Comoros: 50% * Ethiopia: 90% * Kenya: 70% * Rwanda: 50% * Seychelles: 80% * South Africa: 85% |
| * Kazakhstan: 35.0% * Mongolia: 30.0% * Myanmar: 20.0% * Samoa: 35.0% * Tajikistan: 15.0 % | * Kazakhstan: 50 to 75% * Mongolia: 45 to 65% * Myanmar: 35 to 55% * Samoa: 50 to 75% * Tajikistan: 30 to 50% |
| Number of ABS partnerships established with project support for the development of products for commercial purposes | * Albania: zero (0) * Belarus: zero (0) * Egypt: zero (0) * India: zero (0) * Jordan: zero (0) * Sudan: zero (0) | * Albania: at least one partnership established * Belarus: at least one partnership established * Egypt: at least one partnership established * India: at least one partnership established * Jordan: at least one partnership established * Sudan: at least one partnership established | * Scientific publications * Research reports * Patents | * Effective cooperation between users and providers of genetic resources * Commercial feasibility of the products selected | |
| * Colombia: zero (0) * Dominican Republic: zero (0) * Honduras: zero (0) * Panama: zero (0) * Uruguay: zero (0) | * Colombia: at least one partnership established * Dominican Republic: at least one partnerships established * Honduras: at least one partnership established * Panama: at least one partnership established * Uruguay: at least two partnerships established |
| * Botswana: zero (0) * Comoros: zero (0) * Ethiopia: zero (0) * Kenya: zero (0) * Rwanda: zero (0) * Seychelles: zero (0) * South Africa: zero (0) | * Botswana: negotiations for one partnership in progress * Comoros: negotiations for one partnership in progress * Ethiopia: one partnerships established * Kenya: one partnership established * Rwanda: negotiations for one partnership in progress * Seychelles: negotiation in progress * South Africa: one partnership established |
| * Kazakhstan: zero (0) * Mongolia: zero (0) * Myanmar: zero (0) * Samoa: zero (0) * Tajikistan: zero (0) | * Kazakhstan: at least one biodiscovery partnership established * Mongolia: at least two partnership established * Myanmar: at least one partnership established * Samoa: at least one partnership established * Tajikistan: at least one partnership established |
| **Component 1:** Strengthening the legal, policy and institutional capacity to develop national ABS frameworks | Number of national policy measures adopted for protecting TK, innovations and practices, and customary uses of biological and genetic resources | * Albania: zero (0) * Belarus: zero (0) * Egypt: zero (0) * Jordan: zero (0) * Sudan: zero (0) | * Albania: draft assessment of TK associated with genetic resources with options on how to protect TK\* * Belarus: draft assessment of TK associated with genetic resources with options on how to protect TK\* * Egypt: draft of an institutional framework for protecting TK * Jordan: draft of an institutional framework for protecting TK * Sudan: draft assessment of genetic resources including needs and options for protecting TK\*   (\*Targets to be confirmed during project inception phase) | * Official Gazette per country * National draft proposals for protecting TK/ABS * National CHM web portals | * There is political will for the protection of TK within the national ABS framework and from the ILCs to participate | |
| * Dominican Republic: zero (0) * Ecuador: zero (0) | * Dominican Republic: proposal for the legal protection of TK within the ABS framework * Ecuador: Draft of regulations for the Code of Social Knowledge Economy and Innovation (COES) TK component |
| * Botswana: zero (0) * Comoros: zero (0) * Ethiopia: TK well captured in the existing legal framework * Kenya: zero (0) * Rwanda: zero (0) * Seychelles: zero (0) | * Botswana: national TK policy instrument submitted for approval or adoption * Comoros: national TK policy instrument submitted for approval or adoption * Ethiopia: national TK policy instrument submitted for approval or adoption * Kenya: revised national TK policy instruments submitted for approval or adoption * Rwanda: revised national TK policy instruments submitted for approval or adoption * Seychelles: national TK policy instrument submitted for approval or adoption |
| * Kazakhstan: zero (0) * Mongolia: zero (0) * Myanmar: zero (0) * Samoa: zero (0) * Tajikistan: zero (0) | * Kazakhstan: National TK guidelines developed * Mongolia: National TK guidelines developed * Myanmar: National TK guidelines developed * Samoa: National TK guidelines developed * Tajikistan: National TK guidelines developed |
| Number of countries with a national ABS CHM, an improved web page with relevant ABS information, or a national biodiversity CHM with ABS-related information. | * Albania: national biodiversity CHM in place * Belarus: national biodiversity CHM in place * Egypt: national biodiversity CHM in place * Jordan: national biodiversity CHM in place * Sudan: national biodiversity CHM in place | * Albania: ABS procedures and information uploaded into the existing CHM * Belarus: ABS procedures and information uploaded into the existing CHM * Egypt: ABS procedures and information uploaded into the existing CHM * Jordan: ABS procedures and information and procedures uploaded into the existing CHM * Sudan: ABS procedures and information uploaded into the existing CHM |
| * Dominican Republic: 0 * Ecuador: national biodiversity CHM in place * Honduras: national biodiversity CHM in place * Panama: 0 * Uruguay: 0 | * Dominican Republic: fully functional ABS-related web page * Ecuador: ABS procedures and information uploaded into the existing CHM * Honduras: ABS procedures and information uploaded into the existing CHM * Panama: fully functional ABS-related web page * Uruguay: fully functional ABS-related web page |
| * Botswana: 0 * Comoros: 0 * Ethiopia: ABS CHM in place but needs strengthening * Kenya: ABS CHM in place but needs strengthening * Rwanda: national biodiversity CHM in place * Seychelles: national biodiversity CHM in place * South Africa: DEA website with no ABS-related information | * Botswana: ABS CHM established * Comoros: ABS CHM established * Ethiopia: existing ABS CHM strengthened * Kenya: existing ABS CHM strengthened * Rwanda: ABS CHM established and linked to the biodiversity CHM * Seychelles: ABS procedures and information uploaded into the existing CHM * South Africa: fully functional ABS-related web page (DEA) |
| * Kazakhstan: zero (0) * Mongolia: zero (0) * Myanmar: zero (0) * Samoa: zero (0) * Tajikistan: national biodiversity CHM in place | * Kazakhstan: National ABS CHM established * Mongolia: National ABS CHM established * Myanmar: ABS CHM established * Samoa: ABS CHM established * Tajikistan: ABS CHM established and linked to the biodiversity CHM |
| Number of key stakeholders per country trained through the project regarding ABS rules and procedures (granting of permits, assessment of access applications, core principles of PIC and MAT and their application, and rights and roles of ILCs, among others); and negotiate ABS agreements | * Albania: zero (0) * Belarus: zero (0) * Egypt: zero (0) * India: zero (0) * Jordan: zero (0) * Sudan: zero (0) | * Albania: twenty (20) * Belarus: twenty (20) * Egypt: twenty (20) * India: fifty (50) * Jordan: twenty (20) * Sudan: twenty (20) | * Data bases & documents with records of the training events * Project evaluation reports: PIR/APR, mid-term and final evaluations | * Staff apply their new knowledge and abilities in a satisfactory manner * There is stability in the human resources within the institution that benefits from the capacity development activities | |
| * Colombia: zero (0) * Dominican Republic: zero (0) * Ecuador: zero (0) * Honduras: zero (0) * Panama: zero (0) * Uruguay: zero (0) | * Colombia: twenty-five (25) * Dominican Republic: sixty (60) * Ecuador: sixty (60) * Honduras: eighty-five (85) * Panama: seventy-five (75) * Uruguay: eighty-five (85) |
| * Botswana: zero (0) * Comoros: zero (0) * Ethiopia: zero (0) * Kenya: zero (0) * Rwanda: zero (0) * Seychelles: zero (0) * South Africa: zero (0) | * Botswana: forty (40) * Comoros: forty (40) * Ethiopia: sixty (60) * Kenya: sixty (60) * Rwanda: forty (40) * Seychelles: forty (40) * South Africa: sixty (60) |
| * Kazakhstan: zero (0) * Mongolia: zero (0) * Myanmar: zero (0) * Samoa: zero (0) * Tajikistan: zero (0) | * Kazakhstan: one hundred (100) * Mongolia: one hundred (100) * Myanmar: one hundred (100) * Samoa: one hundred (100) * Tajikistan: one hundred (100) |
| **Outputs:**   * National ABS law/regulation/policy proposals drafted and submitted for approval to competent authorities * Improved capacities of National Competent Authorities and related agencies on processing access applications, developing model contractual clauses under mutually agreed terms, including the negotiation and tracking of ABS agreements and biodiscovery projects to ensure compliance. * Supportive institutional framework for sui generis systems for protecting TK, innovations and practices and customary uses of biological and genetic resources * Mechanisms institutionalized to facilitate: a) a CHM for countries that have a national ABS framework and are willing to advertise such framework and other ABS information in the CHM; b) Understanding at the ministerial level of the importance of genetic resources as a source of innovation in the national economy and the need to support research and development for the valuation of biodiversity; c) Dialogue and collaboration between policy makers and stakeholders (including research institutions, private sector, and ILCs) to ensure certainty and clarity for users and providers of genetic resources; and d) access to information and support compliance under the national law and the Nagoya Protocol | | | | | | |
| **Component 2:** Building trust between users and providers of genetic resources to facilitate the identification of bio-discovery efforts | Number of commercial agreements between users and providers of genetic resources | * Albania: zero (0) * Belarus: zero (0) * Egypt: zero (0) * India: TBD\* * Jordan: zero (0) * Sudan: zero (0) (\*Baseline to be confirmed during project inception phase) | * Albania: at least one (1) agreement in progress\* * Belarus: at least one (1) agreement in progress * Egypt: at least one (1) agreement concluded * India: at least one (1) agreement in progress\* * Jordan: at least one (1) agreement concluded * Sudan: at least one (1) agreement concluded   (\*Target to be confirmed during project inception phase) | * Signed agreements   Official reports and web pages of the National Competent Authorities | * Will among between users and providers of genetic resources to pursue bio-discovery projects | |
| * Colombia: three (3) * Dominican Republic: two (2) * Honduras: zero (0) * Panama: one (1) * Uruguay: zero (0) | * Colombia: one (1) more agreement concluded * Dominican Republic: one (1) more agreement concluded * Honduras: one (1) agreement concluded * Panama: one (1) more agreement in progress * Uruguay: at least two (2) agreements concluded |
| * Botswana: zero (0) * Comoros: zero (0) * Ethiopia: one (1) * Kenya: two (2) * Rwanda: zero (0) * Seychelles: one (1) * South Africa: three (3) | * Botswana: at least one (1) agreement in progress\* * Comoros: at least one (1) agreement in progress\* * Ethiopia: at least one (1) additional agreement concluded * Kenya: at least one (1) additional agreement concluded * Rwanda: at least one (1) agreement in progress\* * Seychelles: at least one (1) agreement in progress * South Africa: at least one (1) additional agreement concluded   (\*Target to be confirmed during project inception phase) |
| * Kazakhstan: zero (0) * Mongolia: zero (0) * Myanmar: zero (0) * Samoa: zero (0) * Tajikistan: zero (0) | * Kazakhstan: one (1) agreement in progress * Mongolia: one (1) agreement in progress * Myanmar: one (1) agreement in progress * Samoa: one (1) agreement in progress * Tajikistan: at least two (2) agreements negotiated |
| Ethical codes of conduct or guidelines per country for research on TK and genetic resources | * Egypt: zero (0) * India: zero (0) * Jordan: zero (0) * Sudan: zero (0) | * Egypt: guidelines for research on TK and genetic resources * India: guidelines to access genetic resources and TK for researchers * Jordan: guidelines for research on TK and genetic resources * Sudan: guidelines for research on TK and genetic resources | * Signed code of conduct declarations * Published guidelines | * There is political will for the protection of TK within the national ABS framework | |
| * Honduras: zero (0) | * Honduras: code of conduct/good practices guidelines for the academic research sector |
| * Botswana: zero (0) * Comoros: zero (0) * Ethiopia: some codes or guidelines in place * Kenya: some codes or guidelines in place * Rwanda: zero (0) * Seychelles: zero (0) * South Africa: some codes or guidelines in place | * Botswana: at least one (1) code or guideline developed * Comoros: at least one (1) code or guideline developed * Ethiopia: at least one (1) code or guideline developed * Kenya: standards for code of best practices on TK developed * Rwanda: at least one (1) code or guideline developed * Seychelles: best practices/code of conduct for research on TK and genetic resources developed * South Africa: guidelines and codes of conduct to promote sustainable harvesting developed |
| * Kazakhstan: zero (0) * Mongolia: zero (0) * Myanmar: zero (0) * Samoa: zero (0) * Tajikistan: zero (0) | * Kazakhstan: three (3) codes of conduct developed: agriculture, pharmaceutical, and biotechnology sectors * Mongolia: three (3) codes of conduct developed: agriculture, pharmaceutical, and biotechnology sectors * Myanmar: three (3) codes of conduct developed: agriculture, pharmaceutical, and biotechnology sectors * Samoa: three (3) codes or guidelines developed * Tajikistan: three (3) codes or guidelines developed for different sectors |
| Proportion (%) of users and providers (government officials, population of researchers, local communities, and relevant industry) aware of the National law and CBD and NP provisions related to ABS and TK. | * Albania: 0% * Belarus: 0% * Egypt: 0% * India: 0% * Jordan: 0% * Sudan: 0% | * Albania: 25% * Belarus: 25% * Egypt: 25% * India: 25% * Jordan: 25% * Sudan: 25% | * Awareness survey results * Project evaluation reports: PIR/APR, mid-term and final evaluations | * Sampling effort are optimal * Willingness of stakeholders to engage in project activity | |
| * Colombia: very low * Dominican Republic: very low * Ecuador: very low * Honduras: very low * Panama: very low * Uruguay: very low | * Colombia: 40 to 50% * Dominican Republic: 40 to 50% * Ecuador: 40 to 50% * Honduras: 40 to 50% * Panama: 40 to 50% * Uruguay: 40 to 50% |
| * Botswana: very low * Comoros: very low * Ethiopia: high * Kenya: moderate * Rwanda: very low * Seychelles: low * South Africa: high | * Botswana: 40 to 50% * Comoros: 20 o 40% * Ethiopia: 40 to 60% * Kenya: 40 to 60% * Rwanda: 40 to 50% * Seychelles: 40 to 50 % * South Africa: 40 to 60% |
| * Kazakhstan: 10-15% * Mongolia: 10-15% * Myanmar: 10-15% * Samoa: 10-15% * Tajikistan: 10-15% | * Kazakhstan: ≥ 35% * Mongolia: ≥ 35% * Myanmar: ≥ 35% * Samoa: ≥ 35% * Tajikistan: ≥ 35% |
| Change in knowledge, attitudes, and practices (KAP) of specific groups (e.g., researchers, local communities, and relevant industry) that may use or benefit from ABS with respect to national ABS frameworks, the CBD, and Nagoya Protocol. | * Sixteen countries\*: X   (Baseline and targets will be determined during project inception phase)  \*Botswana, Comoros, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ethiopia Kazakhstan, Kenya, Mongolia, Myanmar, Panama, Rwanda, Samoa, Seychelles, South Africa, Tajikistan, Uruguay | Sixteen countries\*: Increase in KAP of specific groups related to ABS  \*Botswana, Comoros, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ethiopia Kazakhstan, Kenya, Mongolia, Myanmar, Panama, Rwanda, Samoa, Seychelles, South Africa, Tajikistan, Uruguay | * Knowledge, attitudes, and practices survey results * Project evaluation reports: PIR/APR, mid-term and final evaluations |
| **Outputs:**   * Existing and emerging partnerships for bio-discovery between users and providers of genetic resources to generate ‘success stories’ and practical lessons, as well as reinforce trust. * Information and experience exchange on the interaction between ABS rules and biodiversity-based research and development activities in various sectors, including best practices, training programmes and modules on biodiscovery, research procedures, intellectual property and business models of key industries (pharmaceutical, botanical, biotechnological, agricultural, the food/beverage biotechnology, and cosmetics sector) developed and made available to relevant stakeholders including ILCs. * Ethical codes of conduct or guidelines for research on TK and genetic resources. * Campaign to raise awareness on the ABS national frameworks, CBD and Nagoya Protocol targeting policymakers, researchers, ILCs, and relevant industry. * KAP assessment surveys targeting specific groups (e.g., researchers, local communities, and relevant industry) that may use or benefit from ABS transactions are carried out to assess enhanced awareness about national ABS frameworks, the CBD and Nagoya Protocol. | | | | | | |
| **Component 3:** Strengthening the capacity of ILCs to contribute to the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol | Number of ABS BCPs and/or TK registries per country adopted by local communities | * Egypt: zero (0) * Jordan: zero (0) | * Egypt: one (1) BCP developed * Jordan: one (1) BCP developed | * Published of agreed-upon BCPs * Online TK databases * ILC-based registries | * Effective cooperation between interest groups (national government, relevant industry, ILC organizations, researchers, etc.) for the participation of ILCs in the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol | |
| * Dominican Republic: zero (0) * Ecuador: zero (0) (but some activities underway) * Honduras: one (1) (not officially recognized) * Panama: zero (0) (but some activities underway) * Uruguay: zero (0) | * Dominican Republic: one (1) BCP developed * Ecuador: at least two (2) BCPs developed * Honduras: one (1) BCP developed * Panama: one (1) BCP developed * Uruguay: at least one (1) BCP developed |
| * Botswana: 0 * Comoros: 0 * Ethiopia: 0 * Kenya: BCPs in place * Rwanda: 0 * Seychelles: 0 * South Africa: BCPs in place | * Botswana: process for the conclusion of at least one (1) BCP underway * Comoros: at least one (1) BCP developed * Ethiopia: at least one (1) BCP developed * Kenya: at least one (1) more BCP developed * Rwanda: process for the conclusion of at least one (1) BCP underway * Seychelles: process for the conclusion of at least one (1) BCP underway * South Africa: at least one (1) more BCP developed |
| * Kazakhstan: zero (0) * Mongolia: zero (0) * Myanmar: zero (0) * Samoa: zero (0) * Tajikistan: zero (0) | * Kazakhstan: at least two (2) BCPs developed * Mongolia: at least two (2) BCPs developed * Myanmar: at least two (2) BCPs developed * Samoa: at least two (2) BCPs developed * Tajikistan: at least two (2) BCPs developed |
| Capacities of local ILCs per country to negotiate ABS agreements as measured by the UNDP ILC/ABS Capacity Development Scorecard | * Twenty-two countries\*: X% (Baseline and targets will be determined during project inception phase)   \*Albania, Belarus, Botswana, Comoros, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Honduras, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Mongolia, Myanmar, Panama, Rwanda, Samoa, Seychelles, South Africa, Sudan, Tajikistan, Uruguay | * Twenty-two countries\*: Baseline + X%   \*Albania, Belarus, Botswana, Comoros, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Honduras, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Mongolia, Myanmar, Panama, Rwanda, Samoa, Seychelles, South Africa, Sudan, Tajikistan, Uruguay | * Updated ILC/ABS Capacity Development Scorecard |
| **Outputs:**   * BCPs, model contractual clauses constitute the basis for clarifying PIC and MAT requirements between users and providers of TK and biological resources. * Campaign increases ILCs’ awareness on the importance of genetic resources and TK associated with genetic resources, and related access and benefit‑sharing issues, including the need to participate in the national ABS policymaking process. | | | | | | |
| **Component 4**. Implementing a Community of Practice and South-South Cooperation Framework on ABS[[3]](#footnote-3) | CoP on ABS implemented and operating at regional and global level by project mid-point | * No | * Yes | * ABS CoP website * Project and country ABS‑related reports | | * Willingness of countries and other project stakeholders to be part of the CoP and share ABS information |
| Number of experts on ABS mapped and incorporated into a regional and global database by project mid-point | * Zero (0) | * Fifty (50) | * Database/expert roster * Project reports | |
| Number of technical assistance requirements on ABS fulfilled at regional and global level by project end | * Zero (0) | * Fifteen (15) | * Official country requirements for technical support * Mission and project reports | |
| Number of knowledge products on specific ABS topics developed at the regional and global levels by project end | * Zero (0) | * Twenty (20) | * ABS CoP website * Project reports | |
| **Outputs:**   * CoP on ABS at the regional and global levels serves as a collaboration and information tool to support the implementation of ABS mechanisms under the Nagoya Protocol. * ABS roster of experts provides technical assistance and advisory services to governments and other stakeholders on environmental law, biotechnology, economics, benefits-sharing, among other ABS-related topics. * Systematized experiences, best practices, lessons learned, and knowledge products on ABS support countries’ ABS-related activities. * Website serves as a virtual knowledge platform for the ABS CoP and for the dissemination of information about the project. | | | | | | |

**ToR Annex B: Project Information Package to be reviewed by evaluator**

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

**ToR Annex C: Content of the TE report**

1. Title page

* Tile 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

1. Acknowledgements
2. Table of Contents
3. Acronyms and Abbreviations
4. 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

1. 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

1. 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

1. Findings

(in addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) must be given a rating[[4]](#footnote-4))

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
  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 incl. Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)
  1. Project Results
* Progress towards objective and expected outcomes (\*)
* Relevance (\*)
* Effectiveness (\*)
* Efficiency (\*)
* Overall Outcome (\*)
* Country ownership
* Gender
* Other Cross-cutting Issues
* Sustainability: financial (\*), socio-economic (\*), institutional framework and governance (\*), environmental (\*), and overall likelihood (\*)
* Country Ownership
* Gender equality and women’s empowerment
* Cross-cutting Issues
* GEF Additionality
* Catalytic Role / Replication Effect
* Progress to Impact

1. Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons

* Main Findings
* Conclusions
* Recommendations
* Lessons Learned

1. Annexes

* TE ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
* TE Mission itinerary
* List of persons interviewed
* List of documents reviewed
* Summary of field visits
* Evaluation Question Matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology)
* Questionnaire used and summary of results
* Co-financing tables (if not include in body of report)
* TE Rating scales
* Signed Evaluation Consultant Agreement form
* Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form
* Signed TE Report Clearance form
* *Annexed in a separate file*: TE Audit Trail
* *Annexed in a separate file:* relevant terminal GEF/LDCF/SCCF Core Indicators or Tracking Tools, as applicable

**ToR Annex D: Evaluation Criteria Matrix template**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluative Criteria Questions** | **Indicators** | **Sources** | **Methodology** |
| Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF Focal area, and to the environment and development priorities a the local, regional and national level? | | | |
| *(include evaluative questions)* | *(i.e. relationships established, level of coherence between project design and implementation approach, specific activities conducted, quality of risk mitigation strategies, etc.)* | *(i.e. project documentation, national policies or strategies, websites, project staff, project partners, data collected throughout the TE mission, etc.)* | *(i.e. document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc.)* |
| Does the project support other local or regional ABS related project/activities? | Main areas of common interest between the project and other local or regional ABS related project/activities | * Results obtained from these interactions | * Reports or other data or knowledge products |
| Is the project internally coherent in its design? | * Level of coherence between project expected results and project design internal logic * Level of coherence between project design and project implementation approach   Existence of a gender analysis and evidence that it informed project design | • Program and project documents  • Key project stakeholders | • Document analysis  • Key interviews |
| Is the project relevant to the GEF Biodiversity focal area and how does the project support the GEF biodiversity focal area? | * Existence of a clear relationship between the project objectives and GEF Biodiversity focal area? * Alignment with GEF Biodiversity focal area;   Identify contribution to GEF Biodiversity focal area | * Project documents,   GEF focal areas strategies and document | * Documents analyses * GEF website   Interviews with UNDP and project team |
| * Does the project provide relevant lessons and experiences towards a second phase or other related projects to be developed in the future? | * Main Lessons and Experiences | Data collected during evaluation | * Data analysis   Interviews with project staff |
| Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? | | | |
| Has the project achieved its output and outcome level objectives? | See indicators in project document results framework and log frame | * Project documents * Annual reports (PIRs)   Data collected during analysis | * Documents analysis * Interviews with project team   Interviews with relevant stakeholders |
| * How is risk and risk mitigation being managed?   -How well are risks, assumptions and impact drivers being managed?  -What was the quality of risk mitigation strategies developed?  -Were these sufficient?  -Are there clear strategies for risk mitigation related with longterm sustainability of the project? | * Completeness of risk identification and assumptions during project planning and design * Quality of existing information systems in place to identify emerging risks and other issues   Quality of risk mitigations strategies developed and followed | * Project documents   UNDP, project team, and relevant stakeholders | * Documents analysis   Interviews |
| * What lessons can be drawn regarding effectiveness for other similar projects in the future? * Were the lessons learned captured during the project implementation used to inform project implementation/management?   - What changes could have been made (if any) to the design of the project in order to improve the achievement of the project’s expected results? |  | Data collected throughout evaluation | Data analysis |
|  |  |  |  |
| Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in line with international and national norms and standards? | | | |
| * Was the project implemented in an efficient way?   -Was adaptive management used or needed to ensure efficient resource use?  - Did the project logical framework and work plans and any changes made to them use as management tools during implementation?  - Did the leveraging of funds (co financing) happen as planned?  - Were financial resources utilized efficiently? Could financial resources have been used more efficiently?  - Was procurement carried out in a manner making efficient use of project resources? | * Availability and quality of financial and progress reports * Timeliness and adequacy of reporting provided * Level of discrepancy between planned and utilized financial expenditures * Planned vs. actual funds leveraged   Quality of results-based management reporting (progress reporting, monitoring and evaluation) | * Project documents   UNDP project team | * Documents analysis   Key Interviews |
| * How efficient are partnership arrangements for the project? * To what extent partnerships/ linkages between institutions/ organizations were encouraged and supported? * Which partnerships/linkages were facilitated? Which ones can be considered sustainable? * -What was the level of efficiency of cooperation and collaboration arrangements?   -Which methods were successful or not and why? | * Specific activities conducted to support the development of cooperative arrangements between partners * Examples of supported partnerships * Evidence that particular partnerships/linkages will be sustained   Types/quality of partnership cooperation methods utilized | * Project documents and evaluations   Project partners and relevant stakeholders | * Documents analysis   Key Interviews |
| Has the project been efficient in achieving its expected outcomes? | See indicators in project document results framework and log frame | * Project documents   Data collected during analysis | * Documents analysis * Interviews with project team   Interviews with relevant stakeholders |
| What are the lessons learned/ recommendations to improve the efficiency of similar global projects/ interventions? |  | * Progress Reports   Interviews with stakeholders | * Documents analysis * Interviews with project team   Interviews with relevant stakeholders |
| Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-political, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? | | | |
| * To what extent will the stakeholders sustain the project? * -What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained?   To what degree is there sufficient public/stakeholder awareness in ABS and the support of the project’s long-term objectives? | * Degree of political and social support * Changes in national legislation, reporting   Level of engagement of national stakeholders | UNDP, project team, and relevant stakeholders | * Document analysis * Interviews * Monitoring data/Progress reports * Progress reports   Exit surveys |
| The what extend did the project improve national capacities in the area of ABS national reporting and led to improved quality of reporting? |  | UNDP, Partners, CBD and relevant stakeholders | Interviews with relevant stakeholders |
| Gender equality and women’s empowerment: How did the project contribute to gender equality and women’s empowerment? | | | |
| Has the Project contributed to gender equality? | Identify areas in which the project is contributing to gender equality | **Specify results achieved that focus on increasing gender equality and the empowerment of women** | Analysis of Reports  Interviews |
|  |  |  |  |
| Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status? | | | |
| Assess the likely permanence (long lasting nature) of the impacts | The positive and negative, foreseen and unforeseen changes to and effects produced by a development intervention | * Project documents   UNDP, project team, and relevant stakeholders | * Document analysis   Interviews |
| *(Expand the table to include questions for all criteria being assessed: Monitoring & Evaluation, UNDP oversight/implementation, Implementing Partner Execution, cross-cutting issues, etc.)* | | | |

**ToR Annex E: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators**

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

**Evaluators/Consultants:**

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

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form**

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

Name of Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

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

Signed at \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (Place) on \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (Date)

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

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

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Ratings Table** | |
| Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) | Rating[[5]](#footnote-5) |
| 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 |  |

**ToR Annex G: TE Report Clearance Form**

|  |
| --- |
| **Terminal Evaluation Report for** *(Project Title & UNDP PIMS ID*) **Reviewed and Cleared By:**  **Commissioning Unit (M&E Focal Point)**  Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  **Regional Technical Advisor (Nature, Climate and Energy)**  Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |

**ToR Annex H: TE Audit Trail**

**To the comments received on** *(date)* **from the Terminal Evaluation of** *(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** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

1. Access at: <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/section-6.shtml> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. 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> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. To be accomplished by UNDP with UNV’s support as a Responsibilie Party. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. See ToR Annex F for rating scales. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution, Relevance are rated on a 6-point rating scale: 6 = Highly Satisfactory (HS), 5 = Satisfactory (S), 4 = Moderately Satisfactory (MS), 3 = Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), 2 = Unsatisfactory (U), 1 = Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). Sustainability is rated on a 4-point scale: 4 = Likely (L), 3 = Moderately Likely (ML), 2 = Moderately Unlikely (MU), 1 = Unlikely (U) [↑](#footnote-ref-5)