**Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference:**

**Team Leader / International Consultant**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **POST TITLE:** | International Consultant / Team Leader to Implement a Terminal Evaluation |
| **AGENCY/PROJECT NAME:** | Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry / Dry Dipterocarp Forest Ecosystems of Southern Lao PDR Project (referred to as the SAFE Ecosystems Project / PIMS# 5448) |
| **COUNTRY OF ASSIGNMENT:** | Lao PDR |
| **PLACE OF ASSIGNMENT:**  **DURATION OF ASSIGNMENT:** | Vientiane, Lao PDR and travelling to project site in Savannakhet Province  35 days during (01 November 2021 – 31 January 2022 |
| **STARTING DATE:** | 01 November 2021 |

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 Sustainable Forestry and Land Management in the Dry Dipterocarp Forest Ecosystems of Southern Lao PDR Project (referred to as the SAFE Ecosystems Project / PIMS# 5448) implemented through the Department of Forestry, Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry. The project started on the 20th May 2016 and is in its sixth year of implementation. The TE process must follow the guidance outlined in the document ‘Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects’ ([link](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/GEF/TE_GuidanceforUNDP-supportedGEF-financedProjects.pdf)).

1. **PROJECT BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT`**

The Sustainable Forest and Land Management in the Dry Dipterocarp Forest Ecosystems of Southern Lao (SAFE Ecosystems project) Project is funded by Global Environment Facility (GEF), supported by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and implemented by the Department of Forestry under the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry. At the Provincial level, the project is implemented through the Savannakhet Provincial Agriculture and Forestry Office and District Agriculture and Forestry Offices of the five target districts of Xonaboully, Songkhone, Thaphanthong, Phine and Phalanxay.

Dry Dipterocarp Forest ecosystems are recognized as being globally important (as part of the Central Indochina Dry Forests ecoregion of the WWF Global 200 Ecoregions) and as habitat for a number of globally significant and threatened species. It also nationally important for their provision of numerous ecosystem services (water supply, sustainable timber and non-timber forests products, and carbon sequestration) that benefit the people of Lao PDR.

Over the last decades, Dry Dipterocarp Forest ecosystems and the species within them have come under increasing threats from large scale conversion of forest, degradation of forest ecosystem services, and species loss. Lao PDR retains a large proportion of the remaining Dry Dipterocarp Forests in the region. However, the demand for cash crops is propelling forest conversion, while unsustainable logging, over-hunting, over-harvesting of non-timber forest products and burning to provide fresh growth for livestock are all leading to habitat degradation.

Recognizing their global and national importance, the Government of Lao PDR prioritized the conservation and sustainable management of dry dipterocarp forest landscape. As part of government efforts to conserve the dry dipterocarp landscape, it selected the area to be the site of the newest national protected area in the country and a demonstration site for testing the implementation of national policies and processes related to Strategic Environmental Assessment, Integrated Spatial Planning and high conservation value forests. It also identified the landscape as suitable for the development and implementation of innovative financing mechanisms for sustainable forest management and protected area management as well as community participation in protected areas management, ecotourism programs, and livelihoods programs linked to conservation outcomes through formal conservation agreements with the community.

The 6-year project (expected operational closure May 20th, 2022) is executed under national implementation modality by the Department of Forestry. Execution of the project is subject to oversight by a Project Steering Committee while day-to-day coordination is carried out under the supervision of the Project Management Office led by the Project Manager. The Executing Agency (UNDP) is responsible for different outcomes/activities according to existing capacities and field realities, ensuring effective and efficient use of resources.

The project objective is to demonstrate sustainable land and forest management in the forested landscape of Savannakhet Province in order to secure the critical wildlife habitats, conserve biodiversity and maintain a continuous flow of multiple services including quality water provision and flood prevention.

The project components are the following

* Component 1: Enabling policy environment and increased compliance and enforcement capacities for sustainable land and forest management across landscapes including protected areas
* Component 2: Sustainable Forest Management and Protected Area Expansion in five priority Districts of Savannakhet Province
* Component 3: Developing and Promoting Incentives and Sustainable Financing for Biodiversity Conservation and Forest Protection

As of 30th August 2021, there were 14,846 confirmed cases of Covid-19 in Lao PDR, of which 14 cases were fatalities, 5,040 hospitalized and 5551 persons recovered spread across 16 provinces within the country. Lao PDR implemented its first nationwide lockdown from 30 March 2020 - 19 April 2020, which included the suspension of all international and inter-zonal travel, and imposition of restriction of movement within the country, with the exception of essential services. Restrictions on movement within the country after community spread was eventually managed in 2020. However, in April 2021 lockdown and restriction of movement were reimposed as a result of community spread as a result of an illegal border crossing case, as well as an influx of returning migrant worker when neighboring Thailand imposed its own lockdown measures. Various measures continue to be implemented in different parts of the country depending upon the number of COVID cases confirmed in the communities.

While International travel is currently restricted in Lao PDR, the Government continues to implement National restrictions on movements and gatherings of people as necessary such as limiting the number of attendees at events and ability to travel in areas with high number of cases confirmed in the community. These restrictions have resulted in numerous delays in project implementation and processes, including: (i) limitations of interactions and engagements between project partners and beneficiaries; (ii) completion of intended activities as required due to restriction of movement of people and supplies, and (iii) postponement of trainings and meetings to ensure compliance with the recommended health protocols. Additionally, the anticipated increase in COVID-19 cases particularly from the ongoing return of migrant workers from neighboring countries poses a considerable risk to the implementation of the project being evaluated, particularly with regards to travel to project sites, and consultations with project stakeholders.

1. **TE PURPOSE**

The TE report will assess the achievement of project results against what was expected to be achieved and draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming. The TE report promotes accountability and transparency and assesses the extent of project accomplishments.

The TE will mainly focus on assessing the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, results, impact, coordination and sustainability of the SAFE Ecosystems Project achievements over the past 6 years. It should include and analyze best practices, specific lessons learned, and recommendations (including forward looking ones) on the strategies used and how they were implemented. The results and recommendations of the TE will be used by key stakeholders (such as GEF, UNDP, government, local governments, etc.) to be replicated by other projects or by other countries, improving their implementation in future programs.

1. **TE APPROACH & METHODOLOGY**

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

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

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

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful TE. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to:

* Implementing Partner – Department of Forests in MAF
* Chair (or Co-Chair) of the National Project Board
* The National Project Director (NPD)
* Project Manager (PM)
* Assistant Project Manager (APM)
* Project Staff in Vientiane Capital
* Chair of the Provincial Project Board
* Staff of PAFO and DAFO
* Communities in the five target districts
* National Consultants
* International Consultants
* Co-financiers
* UNDP staff who have project responsibilities

Additionally, the TE team is expected to conduct field missions to Savannakhet province, including the following project sites in Xonaboully, Songkhone, Thaphangthong, Phine and Phalanxay Districts if permitted by UNDP as per the SOPs and government of Lao PDR regulations under COVID-19 pandemic (see ***Note*** below).

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, however, 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.

* ***Note:***

*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. Travel to the country has been restricted since March 2020 and travel in the country is also restricted. 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 UNDP Lao PDR Country Office.*

*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. Also note their working hours are generally between 8:30 am and 4:30 pm local time Monday to Friday. 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.*

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 TE will assess results according to the criteria outlined in the Guidance for TEs of UNDP-supported GEF-financed Projects ([link](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/GEF/TE_GuidanceforUNDP-supportedGEF-financedProjects.pdf)). The Findings section of the TE report will cover the topics listed below.

A full outline of the TE report’s content is provided in ToR Annex C.

The asterisk “(\*)” indicates criteria for which a rating is required.

Findings

1. Project Design/Formulation

* National priorities and country driven-ness
* Theory of Change
* Gender equality and women’s empowerment
* Social and Environmental Safeguards
* Analysis of Results Framework: project logic and strategy, indicators
* Assumptions and Risks
* Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g. same focal area) incorporated into project design
* Planned stakeholder participation
* Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
* Management arrangements

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

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 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 and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success that can provide knowledge gained from the particular circumstance (programmatic and evaluation methods used, partnerships, financial leveraging, etc.) that are applicable to other GEF and UNDP interventions. When possible, the TE team should include examples of good practices in project design and implementation.
* It is important for the conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned of the TE report to include results related to gender equality and empowerment of women.

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

**ToR Table 2: Evaluation Ratings Table for the SAFE Ecosystems Project**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) | Rating[[1]](#footnote-2) |
| 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 |  |

1. **TIMEFRAME**

The total duration of the TE will be approximately 35 working days over a time period of 12 weeks starting on 01 November 2021.The tentative TE timeframe is as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Timeframe | Activity |
| *10 October 2021* | Application closes for National Expert |
| *15 October 2021* | Final selection of TE team |
| *01 November 2021* | Preparation period for TE team (handover of documentation) |
| *5 November 2021* | Document review and preparation of TE Inception Report |
| *14 November* | Finalization and Validation of TE Inception Report; latest start of TE mission |
| *15 November –*  *3 December* | TE mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits, etc. |
| *10 December 2021* | Mission wrap-up meeting & debriefing of preliminary findings; earliest end of TE mission |
| *13-31 December 2021* | Preparation of draft TE report |
| *3 – 14 January 2022* | Circulation of draft TE report for comments |
| *17-21 January 2022* | Incorporation of comments on draft TE report into Audit Trail & finalization of TE report |
| *24-27 January 2022* | Preparation and Issuance of Management Response |
| *28 January 2022* | Concluding Stakeholder Workshop presenting final Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons Learned (optional) |
| *31 January 2022* | Expected date of full TE completion |

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

1. **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: (by 14 November 2021) | TE team submits Inception Report to the UNDP Lao PDR Country Office |
| 2 | Debriefing | Preliminary Findings | End of TE mission: (by 10 December 2021) | TE team presents to the UNDP Lao PDR Country Office and project management |
| 3 | Draft TE Report | Full draft report (using guidelines on report content in ToR Annex C) with annexes | Within 3 weeks of end of TE mission: (by 03 January 2022) | TE team submits to the UNDP Lao PDR Country Office; reviewed by BPPS-GEF 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: (by 31 January 2022) | TE team submits both documents to the UNDP Lao PDR Country Office |

\*All final TE reports will be quality assessed by the UNDP Independent Evaluation Office (IEO). Details of the IEO’s quality assessment of decentralized evaluations can be found in Section 6 of the UNDP Evaluation Guidelines.[[2]](#footnote-3)

1. **TE ARRANGEMENTS**

The principal responsibility for managing the TE resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project’s TE is the UNDP Lao PDR Country Office.

The UNDP Lao PDR Country Office will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the TE team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the TE team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits. An updated stakeholder list with contact details (phone and email) will need to be provided by the UNDP Lao PDR Country Office to the TE team.

1. **TE TEAM COMPOSITION**

A team of two independent evaluators will conduct the TE – one Team Leader / International Consultant (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions) and one National Expert from Lao PDR. The Team Leader will be responsible for the overall design and writing of the TE report, etc.) The National Expert will assess emerging trends with respect to regulatory frameworks, budget allocations, capacity building, and work with the Project Team in developing the TE itinerary, 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 “Team Leader” qualities in the following areas:

Education

* Master’s degree in Environmental Science, Forestry, Biodiversity Conservation, Landscape Management, Sustainable Development or other closely related fields. (5 points)

Experience

* Relevant experience with results-based management evaluation methodologies. (10 points)
* Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios. (5 points)
* Competence in adaptive management, as applied to Environmental Science, Forestry, Biodiversity Conservation, Landscape Management, or Sustainable Development. (10 points)
* Experience in evaluating GEF projects. (10 points)
* Experience working in Southeast Asia. (5 points)
* Experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years. (5 points)
* Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and Environmental Science, Forestry, Biodiversity Conservation, Landscape Management, or Sustainable Development; experience in gender responsive evaluation and analysis. (5 points)
* Excellent communication skills. (5 points)
* Demonstrable analytical skills. (5 points)
* Project evaluation/review experience within United Nations system will be considered an asset. (5 points)
* ***Note:***
* *Experience with implementing evaluations remotely during the COVID-19 pandemic will be considered an asset.*

Language

* Fluency in written and spoken English.

1. **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.

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%:

* 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 TE Audit Trail includes responses to and justification for each comment listed.
* ***Note:***

*In line with the UNDP’s financial regulations, when determined by the UNDP Lao PDR Country Office 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.*

1. **APPLICATION PROCESS[[3]](#footnote-4)**

Process and Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

1. Potential candidates will be selected from the vetted **UNDP Roster List**. They will then be required to submit the following:
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)[[4]](#footnote-5) 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)[[5]](#footnote-6));
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 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](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).

All potential candidate materials should be submitted indicating the following reference “Consultant for Terminal Evaluation of the Sustainable Forestry and Land Management in the Dry Dipterocarp Forest Ecosystems of Southern Lao PDR Project (PIMS# 5448)” or by email at the following address ONLY: [*lao.procurementjob@undp.org*](mailto:lao.procurementjob@undp.org)by 31 October 2021.

**Criteria for Evaluation of Proposal:** 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.

1. **TOR ANNEXES**

* ToR Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework
* ToR Annex B: Project Information Package to be reviewed by TE team
* ToR Annex C: Content of the TE report
* ToR Annex D: Evaluation Criteria Matrix template
* ToR Annex E: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators
* ToR Annex F: TE Rating Scales
* ToR Annex G: TE Report Clearance Form
* ToR Annex H: TE Audit Trail

**ToR Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework**

| **Objective & Components** | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Targets**  **End of Project** | **Source of verification** | **Assumptions** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Objective: To demonstrate sustainable land and forest management in the forested landscape of Savannakhet Province in order to secure the critical wildlife habitats, conserve biodiversity and maintain a continuous flow of multiple services including quality water provision and flood prevention**[[6]](#footnote-7) | Improved forest management measured by an increase in total area under Sustainable Land Management (as reported in LD PMAT, Part I) | 0 ha. | 698,746 ha. | Updated LD-PMAT | Ecosystem functioning in the DDF landscape is not significantly degraded by the effects of global and regional climate change  GoL agencies allocate adequate resources (staff and budgets) to fulfil their roles in strengthening management of forested landscapes in Savannakhet Province |
| Improved management effectiveness of protected areas covering at least 583,672 ha. (as measured in the GEF BD1 Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool – METT):   * Dong Phou Vieng Conservation Forest * Phou Xang He Conservation Forest * Se Ta Nouan – Phou Nak Protection Forest * Ong Mang Conservation Forest (proposed) | METT Scores:  39  39  33  47 | METT Scores by end of project:  65  65  60  74 | Updated METTs |
| Capacity to ensure compliance and enforcement of sustainable forest and land management, and mainstreaming of forest connectivity into the main production sectors in Savannakhet Province (as measured by scores in the UNDP-GEF Capacity Development Scorecard[[7]](#footnote-8)) | Capacity Score: 16.5 | Capacity Score   * By project mid-term: 25 * By end of project: 38 | Updated Capacity Dev. Scorecard |
| **Component 1: Enabling policy environment and increased compliance and enforcement capacities for sustainable land and forest management across landscapes including protected areas**[[8]](#footnote-9) | **Outputs**  1.1 – Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) completed for 5 selected districts in Savannakhet Province  1.2 – Integrated Land Use Management Plans (ILUMPs) developed and under implementation in 5 selected districts in Savannakhet Province  1.3 – GIS based decision support system developed and supporting Integrated Natural Resources Management in Savannakhet Province  1.4 – Multi-sectoral Coordination Mechanisms in place to support sustainable resource planning and management in Savannakhet Province  1.5 – Policies & Regulations revised to support Sustainable Forest Management and Sustainable Land Management at the District Level  1.6 – Stakeholder Capacities strengthened for Sustainable Management of Natural Resources in Savannakhet Province  1.7 – Guidelines in place for Sustainable Plantation Forestry and Agriculture | | | | | |
| Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) guiding resource management and conservation decision-making in Savannakhet Province | 0 SEAs have been carried out in Savannakhet Province | 1 SEA covering the 5 targeted districts completed by end of year 1 | Approved SEA | Government agencies, private enterprises / associations, and other stakeholders from natural resource production sectors (e.g. forestry, agriculture, mining) participate in coordinating bodies and other project activities  Policy and regulatory changes are approved by GoL in a timely manner |
| Improved land use planning and management reduces degradation over 1,060,525 hectares[[9]](#footnote-10) of forest landscapes in Savannakhet Province, leading to unabated provision of ecosystem services such as water supply (quality), flood prevention and biodiversity conservation | 0 district land use plans based on detailed ecological information or integrated into development and investment decision processes  No zoning or planning processes exist at the landscape level for Dry Dipterocarp Forests | 5 District-level Integrated Spatial Plans (ISPs) strengthened with data from Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and integrated with District Socio-Economic Development Plans (SEDPs)[[10]](#footnote-11) by end of year 2  Zoning Plan for the Dry Dipterocarp Forest Landscape approved and guiding management decisions by end of year 4 | Approved ISPs  Approved Zoning Plan |
| Information management systems to guide land and resource use planning in Savannakhet Province | Information on natural resources and conservation priorities is incomplete and highly dispersed | Decision Support System in place and operating by end of year 2 | Annual reports from DFRM GIS unit |
| Inter-institutional and multi-sectoral coordinating bodies overseeing resource management activities in Savannakhet Province to ensure compliance with SEAs, ILUMPs and SEDPs | No formal coordinating mechanisms exist for stakeholders involved in resource management and conservation | Multi-sectoral stakeholder committees established and meeting regularly at each of the 5 districts by end of year 1 | Committee meeting reports |
| Public-private partnerships for sustainable land and forest management in Savannakhet Province | Existing public-private partnerships are ad-hoc mechanisms between individual companies and institutions | Responsible Business Forum established and meeting regularly at the provincial level by end of year 1 | Forum meeting reports |
| Policy and regulatory frameworks support integrated approaches to resource management and conservation through following measures:   * Decree on Strategic Environmental Assessments (SEAs) & develop targeted regulations on ISPs * Jurisdictional issues and coordination for enforcement of wildlife and forest protection laws * Regulations on PA finance and functioning of protected areas within wider landscapes * Nationally-defined HCVF categories and integration of HCVFs into forest policies and regulations and PA management plans | Existing policy and regulatory frameworks have significant gaps that constrain effective PA management and the mainstreaming of BD, SFM and SLM approaches into provincial and district level planning and financing processes and resource management decisions | By end of year 2   * SEA Decree finalized and enacted by and ISP regulations approved   By end of year 3   * Resolve jurisdictional issues and coordination relating to enforcement of wildlife and forest protection laws * 2015 Decree on Pas revised to authorize PA financing mechanisms and landscape-level coordination * Adoption of HCVF definitions; HCVF restrictions incorporated into policies, regulations and management plans | Enacted decrees, regulations and provisions  Approved revised policy documents |
| Consolidated technical guidance on the design and management of plantation forestry and agriculture in the Dry Dipterocarp Forest landscape improve the sustainability of such operations and reduce their impacts on the surrounding landscape | General guidelines for plantation forestry and agriculture exist in Lao PDR, but are not specifically tailored to the ecological conditions of Dry Dipterocarp Forest landscapes | Guidelines on Sustainable Plantation Forestry and Agriculture developed by the end of year 3 | Published guidelines |
| **Component 2: Sustainable Forest Management and Protected Area Expansion in five priority Districts of Savannakhet Province** | **Outputs**  2.1 – New protected areas established that conserve priority habitats or ecosystem services and/or strengthen PA connectivity  2.2 – Management Capacity strengthened for Existing and New Protected Areas  2.3 – Existing intact forests designated as High Conservation Value Forests (HCVFs) to strengthen ecological connectivity between forest complexes  2.4 – Ecological integrity of degraded forest areas restored through reforestation / afforestation  2.5 – Village forestry Capacities and Mechanisms Strengthened (possible new activity)  2.6 – Provincial and District level stakeholders aware of benefits and strategies related to the conservation and sustainable development of Dry Dipterocarp Forests in Savannakhet Province  2.7 – Monitoring System in place to measure changes in key ecological determinants of ecosystem health in dry dipterocarp forests | | | | | |
| Area of Savannakhet Province under various forms of protection:   * New Protected Areas gazetted and fully operational * New or existing Protection Forests designated as High Conservation Value Forests (as measured in SFM Tracking Tool) | 0 ha.  0 ha. | By the end of the project:   * New protected area of 168,614 ha. (Ong Mang NPA) * Estimated 193,684 ha. Of designated HCVFs | PA establishment documents  HCVF designation documents | Any changes to the boundaries and/or regulations governing Conservation / Protection Forests have positive or minimally negative impacts  Government agencies and local communities constructively engage in management of protected areas  Land owners and users do not generate significant political pressure to weaken planning and resource use regulations for investment projects, logging, hunting and other forest uses |
| Restoration of degraded Dry Dipterocarp Forests to counteract on-going and past land degradation (as measured in SFM Tracking Tool) | Approx. 1,000 ha. In the 5 targeted districts have been reforested (mainly with non-native, commercial species) | Restoration of 1,111 ha. Of Dry Dipterocarp Forest with native species by the end of the project | Surveys and reports from PAFO |
| Capacities of communities located within or adjacent to protected forests to effectively participate in SFM activities | Forest-based communities have limited mechanisms or experience in SFM or community management of forest resources | Community land certificates issued for 16 villages by end of year 1  Village forestry management plans for 16 villages finalized by end of year 2 | Issues certificates and approved plans |
| Biodiversity management / ecosystem service provision mainstreamed in forest landscape management in five priority districts resulting in improvements in the status of biodiversity and ecosystem services, indicated by:   * Increase in Biodiversity Intactness Index for Dry Forests * Populations of species with IUCN Endangered Status   + Eld’s Deer (*Panolia eldii*)   + Silvered Leaf Monkey (*Trachypithecus cristatus*)   + Asian Elephant (*Elephas maximus*)   + Francois’ Langur (*Trachypithecus francoisi*)   + Siamese Crocodile (*Crocodylus siamensis*) * Maintenance of water quantity in downstream area of Xe Bangxiang River   + Baseflows (dry season)   + # of flooding events | 73.04  Current pop within Project Area:  60-80 individuals  70-100 individuals  32 individuals  12  12  Baseflow:0.40m  One flooding event  (142.256m) water level | TBD during project inception  Pop by project end:  60% increase  18% increase  12%increase  No net decrease  No net decrease  No decrease  No flooding event | BD monitoring reports from PONRE  Water flow / flooding reports from Dept. of Water and/or Dept. of Meteorology |
| **Component 3: Developing and Promoting Incentives and Sustainable Financing for Biodiversity Conservation and Forest Protection** | **Outputs**  3.1 – Public sector (agriculture, forestry, mining etc.) expenditures reviewed to optimise spending and realigned to increase financing for rehabilitation and conservation of forests.  3.2 – Wildlife-related ecotourism operations developed and operated at four sites  3.3 – New financing mechanisms (e.g. REDD+ initiatives, off-set schemes, PES, FRDF) developed and operational  3.4 – Alternative Livelihoods plans including Conservation Agreements Scheme developed and implemented | | | | | |
| Levels of investment in land use planning and forest management planning at the village and districts levels in the targeted landscape in Savannakhet Province | USD 741,000 per year[[11]](#footnote-12) | By end of project, levels of public and private investment increased to:  USD 900,000 per year | Budget reports from relevant agencies | GoL decision-makers approve increased budget allocations and consolidated financing systems for SFM and PA management |
| Wildlife-based ecotourism products designed and operating in the project target area | 0 projects operating | At least 4 wildlife-based ecotourism projects operating in project target area by the end of the project | Signed agreements between GoL and tourism operators |
| Funds available for management of protected areas / conservation forests in targeted landscape in Savannakhet Province (as reported in the GEF BD1 Tracking Tool – Financial Scorecard):   * Non-governmental financing mechanisms * Government budget allocations | USD 0 per year  USD 168,480 per year | By end of project, levels of public and private investment through diverse and new revenue sources increased to:  USD 100,000 per year  USD 250,000 per year | Budget reports from relevant Pas |
| Incentives and other benefits to communities within targeted landscape are directly linked to wildlife recovery and forest protection (as measured in SFM Tracking Tool) | 5< Conservation Agreements with communities in the Ong Mang Sanctuary | At least 16 community-based Conservation Agreements that incorporate improved ecological conditions and human development levels signed by end of year 2 | Signed Conservation Agreements |

**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 |
|  | *Add documents, as required* |

**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[[12]](#footnote-13))

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
  1. Project Results
* Progress towards objective and expected outcomes (\*)
* Relevance (\*)
* Effectiveness (\*)
* Efficiency (\*)
* Overall Outcome (\*)
* Country ownership
* Gender
* Other Cross-cutting Issues
* Social and Environmental Standards
* 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

**\*Note:** The TE Report should be approximately 30 pages plus annexes.

**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.)* |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? | | | |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in line with international and national norms and standards? | | | |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-political, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? | | | |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Gender equality and women’s empowerment: How did the project contribute to gender equality and women’s empowerment? | | | |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status? | | | |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| COVID-19: What impacts has the COVID-19 pandemic had upon the implementation of the project? How has the project tea been able to adapt under this new normal? | | | |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| *(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**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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 |

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

|  |
| --- |
| **Terminal Evaluation Report for Sustainable Forestry and Land Management in the Dry Dipterocarp Forest Ecosystems of Southern Lao PDR Project (PIMS# 5448) 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**

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** **01 November 2021 from the Terminal Evaluation of Sustainable Forestry and Land Management in the Dry Dipterocarp Forest Ecosystems of Southern Lao PDR Project PIMS# 5448)**

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. 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-2)
2. Access at: <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/section-6.shtml> [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Engagement of evaluators should be done in line with guidelines for hiring consultants in the POPP <https://popp.undp.org/SitePages/POPPRoot.aspx> [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. <https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx> [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. <http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc> [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. *Objective (Atlas output) monitored quarterly ERBM and annually in APR/PIR* [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. Project will work to ensure that gender equality is promoted in the selection of persons to participate in capacity development activities [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. *All outcomes monitored annually in the APR/PIR. It is highly recommended not to have more than 4 outcomes.* [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
9. Land use planning and management will benefit the entire landscapes of the 5 targeted districts (916,323 ha.) as well as areas of official protected areas that extend beyond the district boundaries (144,202 ha.) [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
10. The SEDP planning process would include enhanced consideration of underlying natural systems, better spatial analysis and evaluation, consideration of changes in Environmental Service Values under different options, and climate change mitigation and adaptation, thus enabling optimal allocation of land and critical BD and LD benefits in tandem. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
11. $325,000 per year from PONRE for environmental conservation; $333,000 per year from PONRE for district and provincial master plans on land allocation and land use, and the issuing of land use and land development certificates; $83,000/year from districts for development planning. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
12. See ToR Annex F for rating scales. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)