

NOTE: This file contains two TE ToR templates – Template 1 (page 1) is formatted for the UNDP Procurement website and Template 2 (page 19) is formatted for the UNDP Jobs website

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

Template 1 - formatted for attachment to the [UNDP Procurement website](#)

1. INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full- and medium-sized UNDP-supported GEF-financed projects are required to undergo a Terminal Evaluation (TE) at the end of the project. This Terms of Reference (ToR) sets out the expectations for the TE of the medium-sized NIM project titled Monitoring and assessment of MEA implementation and environmental trends in Antigua and Barbuda (PIMS 5425) implemented through the United Nations Development Programme Barbados and the Eastern Caribbean (Executing Agency) and the Ministry of Health and Environment: Department of Environment (DoE) (Implementing Partner). The project started on the August 15th, 2018 and is in its 4th 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).

2. PROJECT BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

The goal of this project is to help Antigua and Barbuda better meet and sustain global environmental priorities within the framework of national development priorities. This requires the country to have the capacity to coordinate efforts, as well as best practices for integrating global environmental priorities into planning, decision-making, and reporting processes. To that end, the objective of this project is to strengthen capacities for the effective management of data and information in order to catalyze attaining and sustaining obligations under the three Rio Conventions as well as to monitor progress towards meeting these obligations. The project is in line with the GEF-6 CCD Strategy objective 1, which calls for countries to “integrate global environmental needs into management information systems.” The uniqueness of this project is centered on its cross-cutting nature. Other projects currently under implementation focus on strengthening targeted capacities under one of the three Rio Conventions, and thus have a relatively narrower system boundary than the CCD programme approach. This project will be carried out via two linked components. Component one calls for environmental indicators and a national environmental information management system for Antigua and Barbuda. Component two focuses on generating, accessing, and using information and knowledge. The project will take an adaptive collaborative management (ACM) approach to implementation, which calls for stakeholders to take an

early and proactive role in the mainstreaming exercises, as well as to help identify and solve unexpected implementation barriers and challenges. By taking an ACM approach, project activities and outputs can be more legitimately modified and adapted to maintain timely and cost-effective project performance and delivery.

Component 1: Environmental indicators and monitoring system for Antigua and Barbuda

This component focuses on the establishment of a sustainable system for the collection, processing, storage, and dissemination of accurate, trustworthy and timely environmental information for use in planning and decision-making. This will require improved indicators, technologies and analytical methodologies, data and information protocols, and learning-by-doing training on the new system. Activities under this component will also focus on strengthening the institutional construct and associated management regime for collecting, creating, and transforming data and information into knowledge. This component will target capacity building activities to develop a national environmental information system as an integral part of the Environmental Information Management and Advisory System.

Component 2: Generate, access and use information and knowledge

Component two continues the early implementation of the national environmental information system developed under component one. This will include piloting the new and improved institutional arrangements, and mobilizing financial resources to ensure the sustainability of the system. This component will also demonstrate the value of the system by producing a State of the Environment report and a national report for each of the three Rio Conventions. Another key feature of this component is awareness-raising of the value of the NEIS, the environment, and the Rio Conventions. Together with the activities and outputs of component 1, these activities will help Antigua and Barbuda to take a more holistic approach to formulating and implementing globally environmentally-friendly and resilient development planning frameworks, as well as to monitor and adapt them appropriately to ensure their institutional sustainability.

The world is currently facing the COVID-19 pandemic which affected people everywhere and brought a halt to global and local economic activity and transport systems, as well as unprecedented disruptions to daily life that undercut the societal fabric of opportunities for human interaction¹. In order to ensure the well-being and safety of UNDP's staff and contractors, as well as to ensure no harm is done to partners, communities and interlocutors, the implementation of this TE may have to be undertaken virtually, according to item "Evaluation Approach and Method" of this TOR.

¹ Guidance Note: Good practices during COVID-19. OECD/DAC and IEO/UNDP, April 2020

Project title:	Monitoring and assessment of MEA implementation and environmental trends in Antigua and Barbuda		
PIMS ID	5425		<i>at endorsement</i>
GEF Project ID:	9467		<i>(Million US\$)</i>
UNDP Project ID:	00099053	GEF financing:	US\$ 880,000
Country:	Antigua and Barbuda	IA/EA own UNDP in kind:	\$ 100,000
Region:	Latin America & the Caribbean	Government: In kind grant	\$ 600,000 \$200,000
GEF Strategic Objective	CCCD1: Integrate global environmental needs into management information systems	Other:	
UNDAF and Country Programme Outcome	UN Multi-Country Sustainable Development Framework Priority Area 4: A Sustainable and Resilient Caribbean a) Policies and programmes for climate change adaptation, disaster risk reduction, and universal access to clean and sustainable energy in place b) Inclusive and sustainable solutions adopted for the conservation, restoration, and use of ecosystems and natural resources		
UNDP Strategic Plan Output:	Growth and development are inclusive and sustainable, incorporating productive capacities that create employment and livelihoods for the poor and excluded	Total co-financing:	US\$ 900,000
Executing Agency:	Ministry of Health and Environment: Department of Environment (DoE)	Total Project Cost:	US\$ 1,780,000
Other Partners involved:	n/a	ProDoc Signature (date project began):	
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: May 25 th 2022

3. TE PURPOSE

The TE report will assess the achievement of project results against what was expected to be achieved and draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, future projects with similar objectives, 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 also be important in determining completeness of the project, and if the activities and indicators identified during project development justly reflected the project objectives. It could also provide some guidance on how request for project extensions could be fairly correlated to time granted.

4. TE APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

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

The TE Team will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure/SESP) the Project Document, project reports including annual APRs, 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 organizations and persons listed in Annex I; executing agencies, senior officials and task team/component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project beneficiaries, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. Additionally, the TE team is expected to conduct field missions to Antigua and Barbuda to consult with local project teams and the key stakeholders.

The specific design and methodology for the TE should emerge from consultations between the TE Team and the above-mentioned parties regarding what is appropriate and feasible for meeting the TE purpose and objectives and answering the evaluation questions, given limitations of budget, time and data. The TE team must use gender-responsive methodologies and tools and ensure that gender equality and women's empowerment, as well as other cross-cutting issues and SDGs are incorporated into the TE report.

The final methodological approach including interview schedule, field visits and data to be used in the evaluation must be clearly outlined in the TE Inception Report and be fully discussed and agreed between UNDP, stakeholders and the TE Team. **The Inception Report must be a product of a Virtual Mission.**

(The final report must describe the full TE approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the evaluation.

5. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE TE

The TE will assess project performance against expectations set out in the project's Logical Framework/Results Framework (see ToR Annex A). The TE will assess results according to the criteria outlined in the Guidance for TEs of UNDP-supported GEF-financed Projects (http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/GEF/TE_GuidanceforUNDP-supportedGEF-financedProjects.pdf). (The Findings section of the TE report will cover the topics listed below. A full outline of the TE report's content is provided in ToR Annex C.

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

Findings

i. Project Design/Formulation

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

ii. Project Implementation

- Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
- Actual stakeholder participation and partnership arrangements
- Project Finance and Co-finance
- Monitoring & Evaluation: design at entry (*), implementation (*), and overall assessment of M&E (*)
- Implementing Agency (UNDP) (*) and Executing Agency (*), overall project oversight/implementation and execution (*)
- Risk Management, including Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)

iii. Project Results

- Assess the achievement of outcomes against indicators by reporting on the level of progress for each objective and outcome indicator at the time of the TE and noting final achievements
- Relevance (*), Effectiveness (*), Efficiency (*) and overall project outcome (*)
- Sustainability: financial (*), socio-political (*), institutional framework and governance (*), environmental (*), overall likelihood of sustainability (*)
- Country ownership
- Gender equality and women's empowerment
- Cross-cutting issues (poverty alleviation, improved governance, climate change mitigation and adaptation, disaster prevention and recovery, human rights, capacity development, South-South cooperation, knowledge management, volunteerism, etc., as relevant)
- GEF Additionality
- Catalytic Role / Replication Effect
- Progress to impact

Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons Learned

- The TE Team will include a summary of the main findings of the TE report. Findings should be presented as statements of fact that are based on analysis of the data.
- The section on conclusions will be written in light of the findings. Conclusions should be comprehensive and balanced statements that are well substantiated by evidence and logically connected to the TE findings. They should highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project, respond to key evaluation questions and provide insights into the identification of and/or solutions to important problems or issues pertinent to project beneficiaries, UNDP and the GEF, including issues in relation to gender equality and women's empowerment.
- Recommendations should provide concrete, practical, feasible and targeted recommendations directed to the intended users of the evaluation about what actions to take and decisions to make. The recommendations should be specifically supported by the evidence and linked to the findings and conclusions around key questions addressed by the evaluation.
- The TE report should also include lessons that can be taken from the evaluation, including best practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success that can provide knowledge gained from the particular circumstance (programmatic and evaluation methods used, partnerships, financial leveraging, etc.) that are applicable to other GEF and UNDP interventions. When possible, the TE Team should include examples of good practices in project design and implementation.
- It is important for the conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned of the TE report to incorporate gender equality and empowerment of women.

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

ToR Table 2: Evaluation Ratings Table for *Monitoring and assessment of MEA implementation and environmental trends in Antigua and Barbuda (MEA – CCCD)*

Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E)	Rating 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	

6. TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the TE will be approximately **30 working days** over a time period of **11 weeks** starting on *September 30 or on the date of contract signature*. The tentative TE timeframe is as follows:

Timeframe	Activity
13 September 2021	Application closes
27 September 2021	Selection of TE team
30 September July 2021	Preparation period for TE team (handover of documentation)
8 October 2021	Document review and preparation of TE Inception Report

² Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, Implementation/Oversight & Execution, Relevance are rated on a 6-point scale: 6=Highly Satisfactory (HS), 5=Satisfactory (S), 4=Moderately Satisfactory (MS), 3=Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), 2=Unsatisfactory (U), 1=Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). Sustainability is rated on a 4-point scale: 4=Likely (L), 3=Moderately Likely (ML), 2=Moderately Unlikely (MU), 1=Unlikely (U)

Timeframe	Activity
19 October, 2021	Finalization and Validation of TE Inception Report; latest start of TE mission
20 October to November 5, 2021 (13 days)	TE mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, etc.
9 November 2021	Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings; earliest end of TE mission
19 November 2021 (7 days)	Preparation and submission of draft TE report
19 November to 3 December 2021	Circulation of draft TE report for comments
8 December 2021 (2 days)	Incorporation of comments on draft TE report into Audit Trail & finalization of TE report
10 December 2021	Expected date of full TE completion. Submission of final report and supporting documentation
20 January 2022	Preparation and Issuance of Management Response

7. TE DELIVERABLES

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	TE Inception Report	TE Consultant clarifies objectives, methodology and timing of the TE	No later than 2 weeks before the TE mission (October 8, 2021)	TE Consultant submits Inception Report to Commissioning Unit and project management. The Inception Report must be a product of a Virtual Mission.
2	Presentation	Initial Findings	End of TE mission (November 9, 2021)	TE Consultant presents to Commissioning Unit and project management
3	Draft TE Report	Full draft report (<i>using guidelines on report content in ToR Annex C</i>) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of end of TE mission (November 19, 2021)	TE Consultant submits to Commissioning Unit; reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP
5	Final TE Report* + Audit Trail	Revised final report and TE Audit trail in which the TE details how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final TE report (<i>See template in ToR Annex H</i>)	Within 1 week ³ of receiving comments on draft report (December 8, 2021)	TE Consultant submits both documents to the Commissioning Unit

³ Within 1 week of receiving comments from the UNDP. Comments from the GEF Focal Point and the IP should be received within the 2 weeks prior to comments from the UNDP.

*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.⁴

8. TE ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing the TE resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's TE is UNDP Barbados & the Eastern Caribbean. The Commissioning Unit and Project Team will support the implementation of remote/visual meetings over the period of the TE.

The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the TE Team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

9. TE CONSULTANT/TEAM

A team of two independent evaluators will conduct the TE – one team leader (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions) and one team expert, usually from the country of the project. The team leader will conduct interviews with local counterparts alongside the local consultant, be responsible for the overall design and writing of key reports and supporting documents (Inception and TE report), analyze and interpret data collected, present findings (alongside the local consultant), deduce key lessons, insights and recommendations and ensure these are reflected in the relevant reports. The team expert will organize and conduct interviews/meetings with local counterparts, work with the Project Team in developing the TE itinerary, conduct site visits (if necessary) to verify the achievement of deliverables/completion of key activities, review all draft documents and provide detailed inputs and comments.

The evaluator (s) cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation and/or implementation including the writing of the project document), must not have conducted this project's Mid-Term Review and should not have a conflict of interest with the project's related activities.

The selection of evaluators will be aimed at maximizing the overall qualities in the following areas:

CRITERIA

Education

- Master's degree in *Environmental Management/ Science or Engineering* or other closely related field;

Experience

⁴ Access at: <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/section-6.shtml>

- Relevant experience with results-based management evaluation methodologies;
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to *Climate Change*
- Experience in evaluating projects;
- Experience working in *the Caribbean Region*;
- Experience in relevant technical areas for at least *10 years*;
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and *Climate Change*; experience in gender responsive evaluation and analysis;
- Excellent communication skills;
- Demonstrable analytical skills;
- Project evaluation/review experience within United Nations system will be considered an asset.

Language

- Fluency in written and spoken English.

10. EVALUATOR ETHICS

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

11. PAYMENT SCHEDULE

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

Criteria for issuing the final payment of 40%⁵:

⁵ 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

- The final TE report includes all requirements outlined in the TE TOR and is in accordance with the TE guidance.
- The final TE report is clearly written, logically organized, and is specific for this project (i.e. text has not been cut & pasted from other TE reports).
- The Audit Trail includes responses to and justification for each comment listed.

12. APPLICATION PROCESS⁶

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

- a) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](#)⁷ provided by UNDP;
- b) **CV** and a **Personal History Form** ([P11 form](#)⁸);
- c) Brief description **of approach to work/technical proposal** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)
- d) **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other costs related to a virtual consultation, supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the [Letter of Confirmation of Interest template](#). If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

All application materials should be submitted to the address (insert mailing address) in a sealed envelope indicating the following reference “Consultant for Terminal Evaluation of *Monitoring and assessment of MEA implementation and environmental trends (MEA) project*” or by email at the following address ONLY: procurement.bb@undp.org by 5:00PM UTC-4 on September 13, 2021. Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

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

13. TOR ANNEXES

- ToR Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework

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

⁶ Engagement of evaluators should be done in line with guidelines for hiring consultants in the POPP

<https://popp.undp.org/SitePages/POPPRoot.aspx>

⁷<https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/psu/Support%20documents%20on%20C%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx>

⁸ http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc

- ToR Annex B: Project Information Package to be reviewed by TE Consultant
- 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 I: List of Persons/Organizations to be Interviewed

ToR Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework

This project will contribute to the following Sustainable Development Goal (s): s): SDG 13, SDG 14, and SDG 15
This project will contribute to the following country outcome included in the UNDAF/Country Programme Document: UN Multi-Country Sustainable Development Framework Priority Area 4: A Sustainable and Resilient Caribbean a) Policies and programmes for climate change adaptation, disaster risk reduction, and universal access to clean and sustainable energy in place b) Inclusive and sustainable solutions adopted for the conservation, restoration, and use of ecosystems and natural resources
This project will be linked to the following output of the UNDP Strategic Plan: Output 1.3: Solutions developed at national and sub-national levels for sustainable management of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste.

	Objective and Outcome Indicators	Baseline	End of Project Target	Means of Verification	Assumptions
Project Objective To strengthen capacities for the effective management of data and information in order to catalyze attaining and sustaining obligations under the three Rio Conventions as well as to monitor progress	Indicator 1: Number of new partnership mechanisms with funding for sustainable management solutions of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste at national and/or subnational level.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Despite the presence of a number of capacity development interventions, and the EPMA, coordination and formal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Institutional arrangements and inter-agency agreements on information management are negotiated One new partnership mechanism to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meeting Minutes⁹ Working group and workshop reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government ministries and authorities maintain political commitment to the formulation and early implementation of the NEIS The project will be executed in a

⁹ Meeting minutes includes records of key meetings such as local, regional and national consultations regarding inputs on the design and implementation of the relevant output and associated activities. Meetings may be individual or group meetings, with government officials or non-state stakeholders.

	Objective and Outcome Indicators	Baseline	End of Project Target	Means of Verification	Assumptions
toward meeting these obligations		mechanism are inadequate. Further, many solutions for the sustainable management of natural resources are only available within the construct of externally-funded projects. Thus, the baseline of this indicator is effectively zero.	link collaboration among agencies and actors around the EIMAS and NEIS is established	<p>ts and products¹⁰</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNDP quarterly progress reports • Annual Project Implementation Reports • Independent final evaluation report • GEF Cross- 	<p>transparent, holistic, adaptive, and collaborative manner</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-state stakeholder representatives, in particular project champions, remain active participants in the project • Policy and institutional reforms and modifications recommended by the project are politically, technically, and financially feasible
	Indicator 2: Number of direct project beneficiaries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The baseline for this project is set at zero, to be 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 500 different stakeholders have benefitted 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a commitment of the relevant government agencies and their

¹⁰ These will include a list of all workshop and working group participants

	Objective and Outcome Indicators	Baseline	End of Project Target	Means of Verification	Assumptions
		<p>compared with the number of unique stakeholders benefitting from the project's activities</p>	<p>directly from an integrated NEIS</p>	<p>Cutting Capacity Development Score card</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RMS • NEIS • Training programme • State of the Environment report • Three national reports to the Rio Conve 	<p>staffs to actively engage in project activities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-state stakeholder representatives, in particular project champions, remain active participants in the project
	<p>Indicator 3: Gender responsive State of the Environment Report and national reports to the three Rio Conventions</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The last comprehensive national environmental profile for Antigua and Barbuda was completed in 1991. • While support projects have allowed Antigua and Barbuda to create capacities to advance towards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The national environmental information system is used to develop a State of the Environment Report and three national reports for the three Rio Conventions. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reports are rated as high quality • Gender responsive and comprehensive data collection system to inform State of the Environment (SoE) Report which includes the collection of data in alignment with the four basic questions put forward for SoE reporting (Rump 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expert peer reviewers follow through with quality reviews • The government remains politically committed to the NEIS and facilitates its development and approval for implementation for use in decision making 	

	Objective and Outcome Indicators	Baseline	End of Project Target	Means of Verification	Assumptions
		<p>satisfactory reporting under national and international obligations associated with MEAs, the country's capacity remains insufficient, especially given the new reporting requirements under the Paris Agreement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Currently, local environmental management and decision-making is suffering from poor 	<p>1996):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) What is happening? [the environmental conditions and trends] b) Why is it happening? i.e. the human and natural causes of changes c) Are the changes significant? i.e. the health, economic, social and ecological implications d) What is, or could be, the response? i.e. the environmental implications of societal response 	<p>ntion Secre tariat s</p>	

	Objective and Outcome Indicators	Baseline	End of Project Target	Means of Verification	Assumptions
		data collection, management, and analysis. Unreliable data is often used to make important decisions.			
Component/Outcome ¹¹ 1 Environmental indicators and monitoring system for Antigua and Barbuda	Indicator 4: A user-friendly online platform is established, presenting available information on core environmental indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The DoE is in the process of implementing the EPMA 2015. Local environmental management and decision-making is suffering from poor 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental indicators are selected and a cost-effective monitoring plan is agreed by month 8 Monitoring plan finalized by month 11 National and regional information sources are 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meeting minutes Feasibility study Peer reviewer comments Baseline 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Best practices from other countries are appropriately used Assessment is deemed legitimate, relevant, and valid among all key stakeholder representatives and project champions Expert peer reviewers follow through with quality reviews NEIS is politically, technically, and financially feasible The government remains politically committed to the

¹¹Outcomes are short- to medium-term results that the project makes a contribution towards, and that are designed to help achieve the longer term objective. Achievement of outcomes will be influenced both by project outputs and additional factors that may be outside the direct control of the project.

	Objective and Outcome Indicators	Baseline	End of Project Target	Means of Verification	Assumptions
		<p>data collection, management, and analysis.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Over the last decade, government ministries and agencies in Antigua and Barbuda, along with NGOs and civil society organizations, have invested significant resources in data collection and management. Despite these efforts, major gaps 	<p>identified by month 7</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Institutional arrangements and inter-agency agreements on information management are negotiated by month 19 An online platform is designed and peer reviewed by month 19 Early implementation of the system is completed by month 41 	<p>assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Official letter of approval Lessons learned report NEIS design 	<p>NEIS and facilitates its development and approval</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The NEIS functions as an integral asset of the EIMAS

	Objective and Outcome Indicators	Baseline	End of Project Target	Means of Verification	Assumptions
		and barriers remain.			
	Indicator 5: Stakeholders are trained to effectively maintain and manage the NEIS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a limited number of individuals who have sufficient training of database development and management, particularly in the area of GIS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Training exercises begin by month 13 and continues through to month 38 At least 125 stakeholders (at least 40% women) are trained on data management skills relevant to the NEIS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Long-term training programme on data and information management developed by month 40 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Needs assessment report Training programme and module Tracking and progress reports Participant registration lists Workshop reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The experience of civil servants and other stakeholders in the learn-by-doing training will be sufficiently rewarding that further interest is generated for sustained and active participation in the long-term Lead agencies will allow their staff to attend all trainings
Component/ Outcome 2 Generate, access and use information and knowledge	Indicator 6: A sustainable financing strategy is developed for the national environmental information system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The EPMA 2015 established a national Sustainable Island Resource Framework Fund that 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Economic analysis is completed by month 10 Feasibility study of the NEIS is completed by month 14 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Feasibility study on financial and economic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analysis is deemed legitimate, relevant, and valid among all key stakeholder representatives and project champions

	Objective and Outcome Indicators	Baseline	End of Project Target	Means of Verification	Assumptions
		<p>will be used to implement environmental management at the national level. The SIRF Fund is currently being operationalized and is focused on adaptation activities. Funding is now mainly sourced from international donor funds and is inadequate.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A sustainable financing and management strategy is developed by month 24 	<p>instruments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Validated resource mobilization strategy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expert peer reviewers follow through with quality reviews Strategy and plan developed by the project are politically, technically, and financially feasible
	<p>Indicator 7: National environment information system is integrated into decision-making frameworks and used for reporting on progress to</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> While support projects have increased Antigua & 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High value programme and/or plan for piloting mainstreaming exercises is 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Published State of the Environment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reports are deemed legitimate, relevant, and valid among all key stakeholder representatives and project champions Expert peer reviewers

	Objective and Outcome Indicators	Baseline	End of Project Target	Means of Verification	Assumptions
	meet and sustain Rio Convention obligations	<p>Barbuda’s reporting capacities under national and international obligations, the country’s capacity remains insufficient and it faces significant barriers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The last state of the environment report was completed in 2010 • Unreliable data is often used to make important decisions as valid data is often not available or integrated 	<p>selected by month 15</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NEIS is integrated into national processes by month 36 • Lessons learned and best practices from pilot activities collected for NEIS roadmap • Reports are rated as high quality • State of the Environment report published by month 40 • Three national reports to the Rio Conventions by month 40 	<p>nt report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rio Convention reports submitted to Convention Secretariats • Working Group and workshop reports and products • Workshop attendance lists • Roadmap • Feasibility study 	follow through with quality reviews

	Objective and Outcome Indicators	Baseline	End of Project Target	Means of Verification	Assumptions
		into decision-making processes.			
	Indicator 8: Raised awareness of the contribution of global environmental values to socio-economic development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The general public remains generally unaware or unconcerned about the contribution of the Rio Conventions to meeting and satisfying local and national socio-economic priorities Awareness of Rio Convention mainstreaming is limited, and stakeholders do not fully appreciate the value of conserving the global environment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public awareness and communication campaign plan developed by month 10 One Public Service Announcement (PSA) is developed and aired Learning-by-doing training to sensitize the public on the national environment information system Environmental awareness module prepared by month 18 Project Launch and Results Conference 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public awareness campaign plan Meeting minutes Awareness and sensitization workshop reports Training programme, school curricula containing new module, materials and training modules Attendance list Surveys of public sector stakeholders Airing of PSA Published articles 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public dialogues attract people that are new to the concept of Rio Convention mainstreaming, as well as detractors, with the assumption that dialogues will help change attitudes in a positive way The right representation from the various government ministries, departments, and agencies participate in project activities There is sufficient commitment from policy-makers to maintain long-term support to public awareness raising activities Development partners implementing parallel public awareness campaigns are willing to modify, as appropriate, their activities to supporting the awareness activities of the present project to create synergies and achieve cost-

	Objective and Outcome Indicators	Baseline	End of Project Target	Means of Verification	Assumptions
			<p>held by month 6 and 43 respectively</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Survey developed (N>500) and employed by month 6 and 43 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two (2) national and three (3) sub-national awareness workshops held, spread out in years 2,3,and 4 • Two (2) private sector and two (2) media sensitization panel discussions held, one held each year • At least 12 articles and at least 2 per year on linkages between the global environment and socio-economic 		<p>effectiveness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Survey respondents contribute their honest attitudes and values • Survey results will show an increased awareness and understanding of the Rio Conventions' implementation through national environmental legislation over time • Changes in awareness and understanding of Rio Convention mainstreaming can be attributed to project activities (survey questionnaire can address this issue) • PSAs will be listened to and not skipped over • The content of PSAs will be absorbed • Articles published will be read and not skipped over

	Objective and Outcome Indicators	Baseline	End of Project Target	Means of Verification	Assumptions
			issues published		

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 (APRs)
9	Progress reports (quarterly, semi-annual or annual, with associated workplans and financial reports)
10	Oversight mission reports
11	Minutes of Project Board Meetings and of other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
12	GEF Tracking Tools (from CEO Endorsement, midterm and terminal stages)
13	GEF/LDCF/SCCF Core Indicators (from PIF, CEO Endorsement, midterm and terminal stages); for GEF-6 and GEF-7 projects only
14	Financial data, including actual expenditures by project outcome, including management costs, and including documentation of any significant budget revisions
15	Co-financing data with expected and actual contributions broken down by type of co-financing, source, and whether the contribution is considered as investment mobilized or recurring expenditures
16	Audit reports and Spot Checks
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

- i. Title page
 - Title of UNDP-supported GEF-financed project
 - UNDP PIMS ID and GEF ID
 - TE timeframe and date of final TE report
 - Region and countries included in the project
 - GEF Focal Area/Strategic Program
 - Executing Agency, Implementing partner and other project partners
 - TE Team
- ii. Acknowledgements
- iii. Table of Contents
- iv. Acronyms and Abbreviations
1. Executive Summary (3-4 pages)
 - Project Information Table
 - Project Description (brief)
 - Evaluation Ratings Table
 - Concise summary of findings, conclusions and lessons learned
 - Recommendations summary table
2. Introduction (2-3 pages)
 - Purpose and objective of the TE
 - Scope
 - Methodology
 - Data Collection & Analysis
 - Ethics
 - Limitations to the evaluation
 - Structure of the TE report
3. Project Description (3-5 pages)
 - Project start and duration, including milestones
 - Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope
 - Problems that the project sought to address, threats and barriers targeted
 - Immediate and development objectives of the project
 - Expected results
 - Main stakeholders: summary list
 - Theory of Change
4. Findings
(in addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (*) must be given a rating¹²)

¹² See ToR Annex F for rating scales.

- 4.1 Project Design/Formulation
 - Analysis of Results Framework: project logic and strategy, indicators
 - Assumptions and Risks
 - Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g. same focal area) incorporated into project design
 - Planned stakeholder participation
 - Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
- 4.1 Project Implementation
 - Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
 - Actual stakeholder participation and partnership arrangements
 - Project Finance and Co-finance
 - Monitoring & Evaluation: design at entry (*), implementation (*), and overall assessment of M&E (*)
 - UNDP implementation/oversight (*) and Implementing Partner execution (*), overall project implementation/execution (*), coordination, and operational issues
 - Risk Management, including Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)
- 4.2 Project Results and Impacts
 - Progress towards objective and expected outcomes (*)
 - Relevance (*)
 - Effectiveness (*)
 - Efficiency (*)
 - Overall Outcome (*)
 - Sustainability: financial (*), socio-economic (*), institutional framework and governance (*), environmental (*), and overall likelihood (*)
 - Country ownership
 - Gender equality and women's empowerment
 - Cross-cutting Issues
 - GEF Additionality
 - Catalytic/Replication Effect
 - Progress to Impact
- 5. Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons
 - Main Findings
 - Conclusions
 - Recommendations
 - Lessons Learned
- 6. Annexes
 - TE ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
 - List of persons interviewed
 - List of documents reviewed
 - Evaluation Question Matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology)
 - Questionnaire used and summary of results

- Co-financing tables (if not include in body of report)
- TE Rating scales
- Signed Evaluation Consultant Agreement form
- Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form
- Signed TE Report Clearance form
- *Annexed in a separate file:* TE Audit Trail
- *Annexed in a separate file:* relevant terminal GEF/LDCF/SCCF Core Indicators or Tracking Tools, as applicable

ToR Annex D: Evaluation Criteria Matrix template

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the project relate to the GEF Climate Change focal area and has it been designed to deliver global environmental benefits in line with relevant international climate change objectives? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project includes the relevant GEF outcomes, outputs and indicators The project makes explicit links with global climate action goals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Document GEF 5 Focal Area Strategies PIF 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the project aligned to National development objectives, broadly, and to national energy transition priorities specifically? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project design includes explicit links (indicators, outputs, outcomes) to the national development policy/national energy policies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Document National development strategies, energy policies, Nationally Determined Contributions, etc. PIF 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the project relevant to stated regional development objectives as defined by CARICOM, OECS and other regional frameworks? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explicit links are made within the project to regional development policies, action plans and associated initiatives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Document PIF 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the project's Theory of Change relevant to addressing the development challenge(s) identified? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Theory of Change clearly indicates how project interventions and projected results will contribute to the reduction of the three major barriers to low carbon development (Policy, institutional/technical capacity and financial) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Document PIF 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the project directly and adequately address the needs of beneficiaries at local and regional levels? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Theory of Change clearly identifies beneficiary groups and defines how their capabilities will be enhanced by the project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Document PIF 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the project's results framework relevant to the development challenges and are results at the appropriate level? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project results framework adequately measures impact The project indicators are SMART Indicator baselines are clearly defined and populated and milestones and targets are The results framework is comprehensive and demonstrates systematic links to the theory of change 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Document PIF 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the project appropriately aligned with relevant UN system priorities, including thematic objectives at the national/regional and international levels? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project's results framework includes relevant thematic outcomes and indicators from the UNDP Strategic Plan, the UNDAF, UNDP CPD and other relevant corporate objectives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Document UNDP CPD, UNDAF, SP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have the relevant stakeholders been adequately identified and have their views, needs and rights been considered during design and implementation? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The stakeholder mapping and associated engagement plan includes all relevant stakeholders and appropriate modalities for engagement. Planning and implementation have been participatory and inclusive 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholder mapping/engagement plan and reporting Quarterly Reports Annual Reports (APR) Stakeholder Consultation Reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents Stakeholder Interviews
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have the interventions of the project been adequately considered in the context of other development activities being undertaken in the same or related thematic area? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A Partnership framework has been developed that incorporates parallel initiatives, key partners and identifies complementarities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Document Quarterly Reports Annual Reports (APR) Stakeholder mapping/engagement plan and reporting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents Stakeholder Interviews

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have relevant lessons learned from previous projects informed the design, implementation, risk management and monitoring of the project? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lessons learned are explicitly identified and integrated into all aspects of the Project Document 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Document PIF 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Did the project design adequately identify, assess and design appropriate mitigation actions for the potential social and environmental risks posed by its interventions? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SES checklist was completed appropriately and all reasonable risks were identified with appropriate impact and probability ratings and risk mitigation measures specified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Document SES Annex 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has the project achieved its output and outcome level objectives? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project has met or exceeded the output and outcome indicator end-of-project targets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quarterly Reports Annual Reports (APR) Monitoring Reports Beneficiary testimony Site visit/field reports Pilot Data Analysis/Reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries Site visits
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Were lessons learned captured and integrated into project planning and decision-making? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lessons learned have been captured periodically and/or at project end 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Steering Committee Meeting Minutes Quarterly Reports Annual Reports (APR) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How well were risks (including those identified in the Social and Environmental Screening (SES) Checklist), assumptions and impact drivers being managed? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A clearly defined risk identification, categorization and mitigation strategy (updated risk log in ATLAS) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ATLAS Risk Log M&E Reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How were risks related to COVID19 managed? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> COVID-related risks were defined against project activities with mitigating actions proposed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PME COVID-updated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Were relevant counterparts from government and civil society involved in project implementation, including as part of the project steering committee? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The steering committee participation included representatives from key institutions in Government 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Steering Committee Meeting Minutes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the project contributed directly to any changes in legislation or policy in line with the project's objectives? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft legislation has been developed or enacted to catalyse the reduction of barriers to the increased penetration of renewable energy/energy efficient technologies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft legislation • Policy Documents • Action/Implementation Plans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there evidence that the project outcomes have contributed to better preparations to cope with natural disasters? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project has directly contributed to reductions in one or more vulnerabilities associated with natural disasters 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarterly Reports • Annual Reports (APR) • Stakeholder/beneficiary testimony 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents • Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the project carefully considered the thematic issues related to human rights? In particular, has the project sought to and actively pursued equality of access to clean energy services and opportunities for women and men (i.e. project team composition, gender-related aspects of pollution impacts, stakeholder outreach to women's groups, etc.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A gender mainstreaming plan was completed • The project results framework has incorporated gender equality considerations, as relevant. • Multi-dimensional poverty reduction is an explicit objective • The project prioritized the most vulnerable as key beneficiaries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gender Mainstreaming Plan • Project Document • Stakeholder analysis and engagement plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards? 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did the project adjust dynamically to reflect changing national priorities/external evaluations during implementation to ensure it remained relevant? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project demonstrated adaptive management and changes were integrated into project planning and implementation through adjustments to annual work plans, budgets and activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual Work Plans • Steering Committee Meeting Reports • Quarterly Reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents • Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes to AWP/Budget were made based on mid-term or other external evaluation • Any changes to the project's planned activities were approved by the Steering Committee • Any substantive changes (outcome-level changes) approved by the Steering Committee and donor, as required 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual Reports (APR) • Stakeholder/beneficiary testimony • Revised Project Results Framework 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent were the Project results delivered with the greatest value for money? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Value for money analyses, requests for information, market surveys and other market intelligence were undertaken for key procurements. • Procurement is done on a competitive basis, where relevant. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VFM, RFI, Market Surveys • Procurement Evaluation Documents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents • Interviews with project staff and government stakeholders
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was co-financing adequately estimated during project design (sources, type, value, relevance), tracked during implementation and what were the reasons for any differences between expected and realised co-financing? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Co-financing was realized in keeping with original estimates • Co-financing was tracked continuously throughout the project lifecycle and deviations identified and alternative sources identified • Co-financiers were actively engaged throughout project implementation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual Work Plans • Steering Committee Meeting Reports • Quarterly Reports • Annual Reports (APR) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents • Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was the level of implementation support provided by UNDP adequate and in keeping with the implementation modality and any related agreements (i.e. LOA)? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical support to the Executing Agency and project team were timely and of acceptable quality. • Management inputs and processes, including budgeting and procurement, were adequate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LOA (s)/Cooperation Agreement(s) • UNDP project support documents (emails, procurement/recruitment documents) • Quarterly Reports • Annual Reports (APR) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents • Interviews with project staff, UNDP personnel

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have the capacities of the executing institution(s) and counterparts been properly considered when the project was designed? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An ex-ante analysis was undertaken of the internal control framework and internal capacities of the IP • An ex-ante capacity analysis was undertaken of key partners with explicit responsibilities for implementation of project funds • The cash transfer modality and implementation modality appropriately reflected the findings of any ex-ante analyses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HACT Assessment(s) • Capacity Assessments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the M&E plan been well-formulated, and has it served as an effective tool to support project implementation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The M&E plan has an adequate budget and was adequately funded • The logical framework was used during implementation as a management and M&E tool • There was compliance with the financial and narrative reporting requirements (timeliness and quality) • Monitoring and reporting has been at both the activity and results levels 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Document • M&E Plan • AWP • FACE forms • Quarterly Narrative Reports • Site visit reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents • Interviews with project staff and government stakeholders
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the project adequately used relevant national systems (procurement, recruitment, payments) for project implementation where possible? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of national systems was in keeping with relevant national requirements and internal control frameworks • Management of financial resources has been in line with accounting best practice • Management of project assets has been in line with accounting best practice 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procurement/Recruitment reports • FACE forms • CDRs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents • Interviews with project staff and government stakeholders
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Were financial audit/spot check findings adequately addressed and relevant changes made to improve financial management? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate management responses and associated actions were taken in response to audit/spot check findings. • Successive audits demonstrated improvements in financial management practices 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Audit Reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there financial risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outcomes? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The exit strategy includes explicit interventions to ensure financial sustainability of relevant activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Exit Strategy • Risk Log 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do the legal frameworks, policies, and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project benefits? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The exit strategy identifies relevant socio-political risks and includes explicit interventions to mitigate same 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Exit Strategy • Risk Log 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have key stakeholders identified their interest in project benefits beyond project-end and accepted responsibility for ensuring that project benefits continue to flow? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key stakeholders are assigned specific, agreed roles and responsibilities outlined in the exit strategy • MOU(s) exist for on-going monitoring, maintenance and oversight of phased down or phased over activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Exit Strategy • Risk Log • MOU(s) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there ongoing activities that may pose an environmental threat to the sustainability of project outcomes? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The exit strategy identifies relevant environmental risks and includes explicit interventions to mitigate same 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Exit Strategy • Risk Log 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there verifiable improvements in ecological status, or reductions in ecological stress, that can be linked directly to project interventions? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project has contributed directly to improved ecological conditions, including through reduced GHG emissions for energy generation and transportation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarterly Reports • Annual Reports (APR) • Monitoring Reports • Pilot Data Analysis/Reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents • Site visits

ToR Annex E: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators

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

Evaluators/Consultants:

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

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

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

Name of Evaluator: _____

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____

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

Signed at _____ (Place) on _____ (Date)

Signature: _____

ToR Annex F: TE Rating Scales

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

ToR Annex G: TE Report Clearance Form

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

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

ToR Annex I: List of Individuals/Organizations to be Interviewed

Table A: List of Individuals/ Institutions

Name	Agency/Department
Mr. Mohammad Nadgee	Programme Manager, Sustainable Solutions and Energy
Diann Black-Layne	Project Manager, Department of Environment
Jason Williams	Project Coordinator, Department of Environment
Ezra Christopher	M&E Consultant, Department of Environment
Crystal Wilson	Project Assistant, Department of Environment
Chalisa Philip	Accounting Officer, Department of Environment
Amira McDonald	Communications Officer, Department of Environment
Oraine Nurse	Technical Data Consultant, Department of Environment
Janeil Johnston	GIS Officer, Department of Environment
Dr Helena Jeffery Brown	Technical Consultant, Department of Environment
Jamila Gregory	Project Development Associate, Department of Environment
Ato Lewis	Snr Environment Officer, Department of Environment
Daryl George	Snr Environment Officer, Department of Environment
Aaliyah Tuitt	Technical Data Consultant, Department of Environment
Stachel Edwards	Chief Statistician, Statistics Division
Tracelyn Joseph	Senior Statistician, Statistics Division
Ruleta Camacho-Thomas	Advisor, National Parks Authority
Arica Hill	Executive Director, Environmental Awareness Group
Dr Linroy Christian	Director, Department of Analytical Services
Philmore Mullin	Director, National Office of Disaster Services
Dale O'Brien	Director, Community Development Division
Andrew Nurse	Assistant Surveyor, Survey & Mapping Division
Dale Destin	Director, Antigua and Barbuda Meteorological Services
Orvin Paige	Meteorologist, Antigua and Barbuda Meteorological Services
Ruth Spencer	Coordinator, Marine Ecosystem Protected Areas Trust
Luxmore Edwards	Director, IT Centre, Ministry of Information, Broadcasting, Telecommunications & Information Technology
Priscilla Nicholas	Statistician, Ministry of Education
Stacey Payne-Mascall	Assistant Director of Education Planning Unit, Ministry of Education
Shelly Galloway	Ministry of Education
Natalya Lawrence	GEF Small Grants Programme
Ian Horsford	Chief Fisheries Officer, Fisheries Division
Tricia Lovell	Deputy Chief Fisheries Officer, Fisheries Division
Frederick Southwell	Town and Country Planner, Development Control Authority
Soraya Looby	Jnr Building Inspector, Development Control Authority
Adriel Thibou	Forestry Officer, Forestry Unit
Arif Jonas	Network Manager, Antigua and Barbuda Transport Board
Dianne Rodrigues	Director, Antigua and Barbuda Bureau of Standards

Name	Agency/Department
June Jackson	Executive Director, Gilbert Agricultural Rural Development Centre
McClure Simon	Consumer Service & Hydrology Officer, Antigua Public Utilities Authority
Brenda Thomas-Odlum	Representative, Civil Society Organization

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

Template 2 - formatted for the [UNDP Jobs website](#)

BASIC CONTRACT INFORMATION

Location: Home Based/ Virtual

Application Deadline: October 22, 2021

Type of Contract: Consultancy

Assignment Type: International/ Local

Languages Required: English

Starting Date: November 10, 2021

Duration of Initial Contract: 8 weeks

Expected Duration of Assignment: 30 Working Days

BACKGROUND

1. Introduction

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full- and medium-sized UNDP-supported GEF-financed projects are required to undergo a Terminal Evaluation (TE) at the end of the project. This Terms of Reference (ToR) sets out the expectations for the TE of the medium-sized project titled Monitoring and assessment of MEA implementation and environmental trends in Antigua and Barbuda (PIMS 5425) implemented through the United Nations Development Programme Barbados and the OECS (Executing Agency) and the Ministry of Environment, Rural Modernization and Kalinago Upliftment (Implementing Partner). The project started on the December 1st, 2016 and is in its 4th 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).

2. Project Description

The goal of this project is to help Antigua and Barbuda better meet and sustain global environmental priorities within the framework of national development priorities. This requires the country to have the capacity to coordinate efforts, as well as best practices for integrating global environmental priorities into planning, decision-making, and reporting processes. To that end, the objective of this project is to strengthen capacities for the effective management of data and information in order to catalyze attaining and sustaining obligations under the three Rio Conventions as well as to monitor progress towards meeting these obligations. The project is in line with the GEF-6 CCCD Strategy objective 1, which calls for countries to “integrate global environmental needs into management information systems.” The uniqueness of this project is centered on its cross-cutting nature. Other projects currently under implementation focus on strengthening targeted capacities under one of the three Rio Conventions, and thus have a relatively narrower system boundary than the CCCD programme approach. This project will be carried out via two linked components. Component one calls for environmental indicators and a national environmental information management system for Antigua and Barbuda. Component two focuses on generating, accessing, and using information and knowledge. The project will take an adaptive collaborative management (ACM) approach to implementation, which calls for stakeholders to take an early and proactive role in the mainstreaming exercises, as well as to help identify and solve unexpected implementation barriers and challenges. By taking an ACM approach, project activities and outputs can be more legitimately modified and adapted to maintain timely and cost-effective project performance and delivery.

Component 1: Environmental indicators and monitoring system for Antigua and Barbuda

This component focuses on the establishment of a sustainable system for the collection, processing, storage, and dissemination of accurate, trustworthy and timely environmental information for use in planning and decision-making. This will require improved indicators, technologies and analytical methodologies, data and information protocols, and learning-by-doing training on the new system. Activities under this component will also focus on strengthening the institutional construct and associated management regime for collecting, creating, and transforming data and information into knowledge. This component will target capacity building activities to develop a national environmental information system as an integral part of the Environmental Information Management and Advisory System.

Component 2: Generate, access and use information and knowledge

Component two continues the early implementation of the national environmental information system developed under component one. This will include piloting the new and improved institutional arrangements, and mobilizing financial resources to ensure the sustainability of the system. This component will also demonstrate the value of the system by producing a State of the Environment report and a national report for each of the three Rio Conventions. Another key feature of this component is awareness-raising of the value of the NEIS, the environment, and the Rio Conventions. Together with the activities and outputs of component 1, these activities will help Antigua and Barbuda to take a more holistic approach to formulating and implementing globally environmentally-friendly and resilient

development planning frameworks, as well as to monitor and adapt them appropriately to ensure their institutional sustainability.

Project title:	Monitoring and assessment of MEA implementation and environmental trends in Antigua and Barbuda		
PIMS ID GEF Project ID:	5425 9467		<i>at endorsement (Million US\$)</i>
UNDP Project ID:	00099053	GEF financing:	US\$ 880,000
Country:	Antigua and Barbuda	IA/EA own UNDP in kind:	\$ 100,000
Region:	Latin America & the Caribbean	Government: In kind grant	\$ 600,000 \$200,000
GEF Strategic Objective	CCCD1: Integrate global environmental needs into management information systems	Other:	
UNDAF and Country Programme Outcome	UN Multi-Country Sustainable Development Framework Priority Area 4: A Sustainable and Resilient Caribbean a) Policies and programmes for climate change adaptation, disaster risk reduction, and universal access to clean and sustainable energy in place b) Inclusive and sustainable solutions adopted for the conservation, restoration, and use of ecosystems and natural resources		
UNDP Strategic Plan Output:	Growth and development are inclusive and sustainable, incorporating productive capacities that create employment and livelihoods for the poor and excluded	Total co-financing:	US\$ 900,000
Executing Agency:	Ministry of Health and Environment: Department of Environment (DoE)	Total Project Cost:	US\$ 1,780,000
Other Partners involved:	n/a	ProDoc Signature (date project began):	
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: May 25 th 2022

The world is currently facing the COVID-19 pandemic which affected people everywhere and brought a halt to global and local economic activity and transport systems, as well as unprecedented disruptions to daily life that undercut the societal fabric of opportunities for human interaction¹³. In order to ensure the well-being and safety of UNDP’s staff and contractors, as well as to ensure no harm is done to partners, communities and interlocutors, the implementation of this TE may have to be undertaken virtually, according to item “Evaluation Approach and Method” of this TOR.

3. TE Purpose

The TE report will assess the achievement of project results against what was expected to be achieved and draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, future projects with similar objectives, 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 also be important in determining completeness of the project, and if the activities and indicators identified during project development justly reflected the project objectives. It could also provide some guidance on how request for project extensions could be fairly correlated to time granted.

DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

4. TE Approach & Methodology

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

The TE Team will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure/SESP) the Project Document, project reports including annual APRs, 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.

¹³ Guidance Note: Good practices during COVID-19. OECD/DAC and IEO/UNDP, April 2020

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 organizations and persons listed in Annex I; executing agencies, senior officials and task team/component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project beneficiaries, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. Additionally, the TE team is expected to conduct field missions to Antigua and Barbuda to consult with local project teams and the key stakeholders.

The specific design and methodology for the TE should emerge from consultations between the Team and the above-mentioned parties regarding what is appropriate and feasible for meeting the TE purpose and objectives and answering the evaluation questions, given limitations of budget, time and data. The TE Team must use gender-responsive methodologies and tools and ensure that gender equality and women's empowerment, as well as other cross-cutting issues and SDGs are incorporated into the TE report.

The final methodological approach including interview schedule, field visits and data to be used in the evaluation must be clearly outlined in the TE Inception Report and be fully discussed and agreed between UNDP, stakeholders and the TE Team. **The Inception Report must be a product of a Virtual Mission.**

5. Detailed Scope of the TE

The TE will assess project performance against expectations set out in the project's Logical Framework/Results Framework (see TOR Annex A). The TE will assess results according to the criteria outlined in the Guidance for TEs of UNDP-supported GEF-financed Projects (http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/GEF/TE_GuidanceforUNDP-supportedGEF-financedProjects.pdf).

The Findings section of the TE report will cover the topics listed below. A full outline of the TE report's content is provided in ToR Annex C.

The asterisk "(*)" indicates criteria for which a rating is required.

Findings

iv. Project Design/Formulation

- National priorities and country driven-ness
- Theory of Change
- Gender equality and women's empowerment
- Social and Environmental Safeguards
- Analysis of Results Framework: project logic and strategy, indicators
- Assumptions and Risks
- Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g. same focal area) incorporated into project design

- Planned stakeholder participation
- Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
- Management arrangements

v. Project Implementation

- Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
- Actual stakeholder participation and partnership arrangements
- Project Finance and Co-finance
- Monitoring & Evaluation: design at entry (*), implementation (*), and overall assessment of M&E (*)
- Implementing Agency (UNDP) (*) and Executing Agency (*), overall project oversight/implementation and execution (*)
- Risk Management, including Social and Environmental Standards

vi. Project Results

- Assess the achievement of outcomes against indicators by reporting on the level of progress for each objective and outcome indicator at the time of the TE and noting final achievements
- Relevance (*), Effectiveness (*), Efficiency (*) and overall project outcome (*)
- Sustainability: financial (*), socio-political (*), institutional framework and governance (*), environmental (*), overall likelihood of sustainability (*)
- Country ownership
- Gender equality and women's empowerment
- Cross-cutting issues (poverty alleviation, improved governance, climate change mitigation and adaptation, disaster prevention and recovery, human rights, capacity development, South-South cooperation, knowledge management, volunteerism, etc., as relevant)
- GEF Additionality
- Catalytic Role / Replication Effect
- Progress to impact

vii. Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons Learned

- The TE Team will include a summary of the main findings of the TE report. Findings should be presented as statements of fact that are based on analysis of the data.
- The section on conclusions will be written in light of the findings. Conclusions should be comprehensive and balanced statements that are well substantiated by evidence and logically connected to the TE findings. They should highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project, respond to key evaluation questions and provide insights into the identification of and/or solutions to important problems or issues pertinent to project beneficiaries, UNDP and the GEF, including issues in relation to gender equality and women's empowerment.

- Recommendations should provide concrete, practical, feasible and targeted recommendations directed to the intended users of the evaluation about what actions to take and decisions to make. The recommendations should be specifically supported by the evidence and linked to the findings and conclusions around key questions addressed by the evaluation.
- The TE report should also include lessons that can be taken from the evaluation, including best practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success that can provide knowledge gained from the particular circumstance (programmatic and evaluation methods used, partnerships, financial leveraging, etc.) that are applicable to other GEF and UNDP interventions. When possible, the TE Team should include examples of good practices in project design and implementation.
- It is important for the conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned of the TE report to include results related to gender equality and empowerment of women.

The TE report will include an Evaluation Ratings Table, as shown in the ToR Annex.

6. Expected Outputs and Deliverables

The TE Team shall prepare and submit:

- TE Inception Report: TE team clarifies objectives and methods of the TE no later than *2 weeks* before the TE mission. TE team submits the Inception Report to the Commissioning Unit and project management. Approximate due date: *(November 26, 2021)*
- Presentation: TE team presents initial findings to project management and the Commissioning Unit at the end of the TE mission. Approximate due date: *(December 10, 2021)*
- Draft TE Report: TE team submits full draft report with annexes *within 3 weeks* of the end of the TE mission. Approximate due date: *(December 21, 2021)*
- Final TE Report* and Audit Trail: TE team submits revised report, with Audit Trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final TE report, to the Commissioning Unit *within 1 week* of receiving UNDP comments on draft. Approximate due date: *(January 12, 2022)*

*The final TE report must be in English. If applicable, the Commissioning Unit may choose to arrange for a translation of the report into a language more widely shared by national stakeholders.

All final TE reports will be quality assessed by the UNDP Independent Evaluation Office (IEO). Details of the IEO's quality assessment of decentralized evaluations can be found in Section 6 of the UNDP Evaluation Guidelines.¹⁴

7. TE Arrangements

¹⁴ Access at: <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/section-6.shtml>

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

The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the TE Consultant to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

8. Duration of the Work

The total duration of the TE will be approximately **30 working days** over a time period of **11 weeks** starting on September 30, 2021 and shall not exceed five months from when the TE Consultant is hired. The tentative TE timeframe is as follows:

- *13 September 2021 Applications received*
- *27 September 2021 Selection of TE Consultant*
- *30 September 2021 Preparation period for TE Consultant (handover of documentation)*
- *8 October 2021 Document review and preparation of TE Inception Report. The Inception Report must be a product of a Virtual Mission.*
- *19 October 2021- Finalization and Validation of TE Inception Report; latest start of TE mission*
- *5 November 2021- 13 days TE Virtual mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, etc.*
- *9 November 2021 – 2 days Wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings; earliest end of TE virtual mission*
- *19 November 2021 – 7 days Preparation of draft TE report*
- *19 November to 3 December 2021 Circulation of draft TE report for comments*
- *8 December 2021 Incorporation of comments on draft TE report into Audit Trail & finalization of TE report*
- *20 January 2022 Preparation and Issuance of Management Response*
- *21 January 2022 Expected date of full TE completion*

The expected date start date of contract is **September 30, 2021**.

9. Duty Station

This consultancy will be conducted virtually.

REQUIRED SKILLS AND EXPERIENCE

10. TE Consultant Required Qualifications

A team of *two independent evaluators* will conduct the TE – *one team leader (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions) and one team expert, usually from the country of the project*. The team leader will conduct interviews with local counterparts alongside the local consultant, *be responsible for the overall design and writing of key reports and supporting documents (Inception and TE report), analyze and interpret data collected, present findings (alongside the local consultant), deduce*

key lessons, insights and recommendations and ensure these are reflected in the relevant reports. The team expert will organize and conduct interviews/meetings with local counterparts, work with the Project Team in developing the TE itinerary, conduct site visits (if necessary) to verify the achievement of deliverables/completion of key activities, review all draft documents and provide detailed inputs and comments.

The evaluator(s) cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation and/or implementation (including the writing of the project document), must not have conducted this project's Mid-Term Review and should not have a conflict of interest with the project's related activities.

The selection of evaluators will be aimed at maximizing the overall qualities in the following areas:
(Adjust the qualifications as needed and provide a weight to each qualification)

Education

- Master's degree in *Environmental Management/ Science or Engineering* or other closely related field;

Experience

- Relevant experience with results-based management evaluation methodologies;
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to *Climate Change*
- Experience in evaluating projects;
- Experience working in *the Caribbean Region*;
- Experience in relevant technical areas for at least *10 years*;
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and *Climate Change*; experience in gender responsive evaluation and analysis;
- Excellent communication skills;
- Demonstrable analytical skills;
- Project evaluation/review experience within United Nations system will be considered an asset.

Language

- Fluency in written and spoken English.

11. Evaluator Ethics

The TE Team will be held to the highest ethical standards and is required to sign a code of conduct upon acceptance of the assignment. This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'. The evaluator must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data. The evaluator must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be

solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses without the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

12. Payment Schedule

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

Criteria for issuing the final payment of 40%

- The final TE report includes all requirements outlined in the TE TOR and is in accordance with the TE guidance.
- The final TE report is clearly written, logically organized, and is specific for this project (i.e. text has not been cut & pasted from other MTR reports).
- The Audit Trail includes responses to and justification for each comment listed.

APPLICATION PROCESS

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

13. Scope of Price Proposal and Schedule of Payments

Financial Proposal:

- Financial proposals must be “all inclusive” and expressed in a lump-sum for the total duration of the contract. The term “all inclusive” implies all cost (professional fees, travel costs, living allowances etc.);
- The lump sum is fixed regardless of changes in the cost components.

14. Recommended Presentation of Proposal

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

All application materials should be submitted to the address (insert mailing address) in a sealed envelope indicating the following reference “Consultant for Terminal Evaluation of *Monitoring and assessment of MEA implementation and environmental trends (MEA) project*” or by email at the following address ONLY: procurement.bb@undp.org by 5:00PM UTC-4 on September 13, 2021. Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

15. Criteria for Selection of the Best Offer

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

16. Annexes to the TE ToR

Suggested ToR annexes include:

- ToR Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework
- ToR Annex B: Project Information Package to be reviewed by TE Consultant
- ToR Annex C: Content of the TE report
- ToR Annex D: Evaluation Criteria Matrix template
- ToR Annex E: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators
- ToR Annex F: TE Rating Scales and TE Ratings Table
- ToR Annex G: TE Report Clearance Form
- ToR Annex H: TE Audit Trail template
- ToR Annex I: List of individuals/organizations to be interviewed

Annexes to Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference

[Share ToR Annexes directly with short-listed applicants. Include link to ‘Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported GEF-Financed Projects’ and other existing literature or documents that will help candidates gain a better understanding of the project situation and the work required.]

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

- **ToR Annex H: TE Audit Trail template**
- **ToR Annex I: GEF CO- Financing template**

ToR Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework

This project will contribute to the following Sustainable Development Goal (s): s): SDG 13, SDG 14, and SDG 15					
This project will contribute to the following country outcome included in the UNDAF/Country Programme Document: UN Multi-Country Sustainable Development Framework Priority Area 4: A Sustainable and Resilient Caribbean a) Policies and programmes for climate change adaptation, disaster risk reduction, and universal access to clean and sustainable energy in place b) Inclusive and sustainable solutions adopted for the conservation, restoration, and use of ecosystems and natural resources					
This project will be linked to the following output of the UNDP Strategic Plan: Output 1.3: Solutions developed at national and sub-national levels for sustainable management of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste.					
	Objective and Outcome Indicators	Baseline	End of Project Target	Means of Verification	Assumptions
Project Objective To strengthen capacities for the effective management of data and information in order to catalyze attaining and sustaining obligations under the three Rio Conventions as well as to monitor progress toward meeting these obligations	Indicator 1: Number of new partnership mechanisms with funding for sustainable management solutions of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste at national and/or subnational level.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Despite the presence of a number of capacity development interventions, and the EPMA, coordination and formal mechanism are inadequate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Institutional arrangements and inter-agency agreements on information management are negotiated One new partnership mechanism to link collaboration among 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meeting Minutes¹⁵ Working group and works hop reports and products¹⁶ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government ministries and authorities maintain political commitment to the formulation and early implementation of the NEIS The project will be executed in a transparent, holistic, adaptive,

¹⁵ Meeting minutes includes records of key meetings such as local, regional and national consultations regarding inputs on the design and implementation of the relevant output and associated activities. Meetings may be individual or group meetings, with government officials or non-state stakeholders.

¹⁶ These will include a list of all workshop and working group participants

		<p>Further, many solutions for the sustainable management of natural resources are only available within the construct of externally-funded projects. Thus, the baseline of this indicator is effectively zero.</p>	<p>agencies and actors around the EIMAS and NEIS is established</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNDP quarterly progress reports • Annual Project Implementation Reports • Independent final evaluation report • GEF Cross-Cutting Capacity Development 	<p>and collaborative manner</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-state stakeholder representatives, in particular project champions, remain active participants in the project • Policy and institutional reforms and modifications recommended by the project are politically, technically, and financially feasible
	<p>Indicator 2: Number of direct project beneficiaries</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The baseline for this project is set at zero, to be compared with the number of unique stakeholders benefitting from the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 500 different stakeholders have benefitted directly from an integrated NEIS 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a commitment of the relevant government agencies and their staffs to actively engage in project activities • Non-state stakeholder representatives, in particular project champions, remain

		project's activities		Score card	active participants in the project
	Indicator 3: Gender responsive State of the Environment Report and national reports to the three Rio Conventions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The last comprehensive national environmental profile for Antigua and Barbuda was completed in 1991. While support projects have allowed Antigua and Barbuda to create capacities to advance towards satisfactory reporting under national and international obligations associated with MEAs, the country's capacity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The national environmental information system is used to develop a State of the Environment Report and three national reports for the three Rio Conventions. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reports are rated as high quality Gender responsive and comprehensive data collection system to inform State of the Environment (SoE) Report which includes the collection of data in alignment with the four basic questions put forward for SoE reporting (Rump 1996): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) What is happening? [the environmental conditions and trends] b) Why is it happening? i.e. the human and natural causes of changes c) Are the changes significant? i.e. the health, economic, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> RMS NEIS Training programme State of the Environment report Three national reports to the Rio Convention Secretariats 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expert peer reviewers follow through with quality reviews The government remains politically committed to the NEIS and facilitates its development and approval for implementation for use in decision making

		<p>remains insufficient, especially given the new reporting requirements under the Paris Agreement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Currently, local environmental management and decision-making is suffering from poor data collection, management, and analysis. Unreliable data is often used to make important decisions. 	<p>social and ecological implications</p> <p>d) What is, or could be, the response? i.e. the environmental implications of societal response</p>		
	Indicator 4: A user-friendly online platform is	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The DoE is in the process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental indicators are 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Best practices from other countries are appropriately

<p>Component/Outcome ¹⁷ 1</p> <p>Environmental indicators and monitoring system for Antigua and Barbuda</p>	<p>established, presenting available information on core environmental indicators</p>	<p>of implementing the EPMA 2015.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local environmental management and decision-making is suffering from poor data collection, management, and analysis. Over the last decade, government ministries and agencies in Antigua and Barbuda, along with NGOs and civil society organizations, have 	<p>selected and a cost-effective monitoring plan is agreed by month 8</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitoring plan finalized by month 11 National and regional information sources are identified by month 7 Institutional arrangements and inter-agency agreements on information management are negotiated by month 19 An online platform is designed and peer reviewed by month 19 Early implementation of the system 	<p>minutes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Feasibility study Peer reviewer comments Baseline assessment Official letter of approval Lessons learned report NEIS design 	<p>used</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assessment is deemed legitimate, relevant, and valid among all key stakeholder representatives and project champions Expert peer reviewers follow through with quality reviews NEIS is politically, technically, and financially feasible The government remains politically committed to the NEIS and facilitates its development and approval The NEIS functions as an integral asset of the EIMAS
---	---	--	---	---	--

¹⁷Outcomes are short- to medium-term results that the project makes a contribution towards, and that are designed to help achieve the longer term objective. Achievement of outcomes will be influenced both by project outputs and additional factors that may be outside the direct control of the project.

		<p>invested significant resources in data collection and management.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Despite these efforts, major gaps and barriers remain. 	is completed by month 41		
	<p>Indicator 5: Stakeholders are trained to effectively maintain and manage the NEIS</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a limited number of individuals who have sufficient training of database development and management, particularly in the area of GIS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Training exercises begin by month 13 and continues through to month 38 At least 125 stakeholders (at least 40% women) are trained on data management skills relevant to the NEIS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Long-term training programme on data and information management developed by month 40 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Needs assessment report Training programme and module Tracking and progress reports Participant registration lists Workshop reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The experience of civil servants and other stakeholders in the learn-by-doing training will be sufficiently rewarding that further interest is generated for sustained and active participation in the long-term Lead agencies will allow their staff to attend all trainings

<p>Component/ Outcome 2</p> <p>Generate, access and use information and knowledge</p>	<p>Indicator 6: A sustainable financing strategy is developed for the national environmental information system</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The EPMA 2015 established a national Sustainable Island Resource Framework Fund that will be used to implement environmental management at the national level. The SIRF Fund is currently being operationalized and is focused on adaptation activities. Funding is now mainly sourced from international donor funds and is inadequate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Economic analysis is completed by month 10 Feasibility study of the NEIS is completed by month 14 A sustainable financing and management strategy is developed by month 24 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Feasibility study on financial and economic instruments Validated resource mobilization strategy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analysis is deemed legitimate, relevant, and valid among all key stakeholder representatives and project champions Expert peer reviewers follow through with quality reviews Strategy and plan developed by the project are politically, technically, and financially feasible
---	---	--	--	---	--

	<p>Indicator 7: National environment information system is integrated into decision-making frameworks and used for reporting on progress to meet and sustain Rio Convention obligations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While support projects have increased Antigua & Barbuda’s reporting capacities under national and international obligations, the country’s capacity remains insufficient and it faces significant barriers. • The last state of the environment report was completed in 2010 • Unreliable data is often used to make important decisions as valid data is 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High value programme and/or plan for piloting mainstreaming exercises is selected by month 15 • NEIS is integrated into national processes by month 36 • Lessons learned and best practices from pilot activities collected for NEIS roadmap • Reports are rated as high quality • State of the Environment report published by month 40 • Three national reports to the Rio Conventions by month 40 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Published State of the Environment report • Rio Convention reports submitted to Convention Secretariats • Working Group and workshop reports and products • Workshop attendance lists • Roadmap • Feasibility study 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reports are deemed legitimate, relevant, and valid among all key stakeholder representatives and project champions • Expert peer reviewers follow through with quality reviews
--	---	---	---	--	---

		often not available or integrated into decision-making processes.			
	Indicator 8: Raised awareness of the contribution of global environmental values to socio-economic development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The general public remains generally unaware or unconcerned about the contribution of the Rio Conventions to meeting and satisfying local and national socio-economic priorities Awareness of Rio Convention mainstreaming is limited, and stakeholders do not fully appreciate the value of conserving the global environment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public awareness and communication campaign plan developed by month 10 One Public Service Announcement (PSA) is developed and aired Learning-by-doing training to sensitize the public on the national environment information system Environmental awareness module prepared by month 18 Project Launch and Results Conference 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public awareness campaign plan Meeting minutes Awareness and sensitization workshop reports Training programme, school curricula containing new module, materials and training modules Attendance list Surveys of public sector stakeholders Airing of PSA Published articles 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public dialogues attract people that are new to the concept of Rio Convention mainstreaming, as well as detractors, with the assumption that dialogues will help change attitudes in a positive way The right representation from the various government ministries, departments, and agencies participate in project activities There is sufficient commitment from policy-makers to maintain long-term support to public awareness raising activities Development partners implementing parallel public awareness campaigns are willing to modify, as appropriate, their activities to supporting the awareness activities of the present project to create synergies and achieve cost-

			<p>held by month 6 and 43 respectively</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Survey developed (N>500) and employed by month 6 and 43 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two (2) national and three (3) sub-national awareness workshops held, spread out in years 2,3,and 4 • Two (2) private sector and two (2) media sensitization panel discussions held, one held each year • At least 12 articles and at least 2 per year on linkages between the global environment and socio-economic issues published 	<p>effectiveness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Survey respondents contribute their honest attitudes and values • Survey results will show an increased awareness and understanding of the Rio Conventions' implementation through national environmental legislation over time • Changes in awareness and understanding of Rio Convention mainstreaming can be attributed to project activities (survey questionnaire can address this issue) • PSAs will be listened to and not skipped over • The content of PSAs will be absorbed • Articles published will be read and not skipped over
--	--	--	--	--

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 (APRs)
9	Progress reports (quarterly, semi-annual or annual, with associated workplans and financial reports)
10	Oversight mission reports
11	Minutes of Project Board Meetings and of other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
12	GEF Tracking Tools (from CEO Endorsement, midterm and terminal stages)
13	GEF/LDCF/SCCF Core Indicators (from PIF, CEO Endorsement, midterm and terminal stages); for GEF-6 and GEF-7 projects only
14	Financial data, including actual expenditures by project outcome, including management costs, and including documentation of any significant budget revisions
15	Co-financing data with expected and actual contributions broken down by type of co-financing, source, and whether the contribution is considered as investment mobilized or recurring expenditures
16	Audit reports and Spot Checks
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

- v. Title page
 - Title of UNDP-supported GEF-financed project
 - UNDP PIMS ID and GEF ID
 - TE timeframe and date of final TE report
 - Region and countries included in the project
 - GEF Focal Area/Strategic Program
 - Executing Agency, Implementing partner and other project partners
 - TE Consultant
- vi. Acknowledgements
- vii. Table of Contents
- viii. Acronyms and Abbreviations
- 7. Executive Summary (3-4 pages)
 - Project Information Table
 - Project Description (brief)
 - Evaluation Ratings Table
 - Concise summary of findings, conclusions and lessons learned
 - Recommendations summary table
- 8. Introduction (2-3 pages)
 - Purpose and objective of the TE
 - Scope
 - Methodology
 - Data Collection & Analysis
 - Ethics
 - Limitations to the evaluation
 - Structure of the TE report
- 9. Project Description (3-5 pages)
 - Project start and duration, including milestones
 - Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope
 - Problems that the project sought to address, threats and barriers targeted
 - Immediate and development objectives of the project
 - Expected results
 - Main stakeholders: summary list
 - Theory of Change
- 10. Findings
(in addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (*) must be given a rating¹⁸)

¹⁸ See ToR Annex F for rating scales.

4.1 Project Design/Formulation

- Analysis of Results Framework: project logic and strategy, indicators
- Assumptions and Risks
- Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g. same focal area) incorporated into project design
- Planned stakeholder participation
- Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector

4.3 Project Implementation

- Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
- Actual stakeholder participation and partnership arrangements
- Project Finance and Co-finance
- Monitoring & Evaluation: design at entry (*), implementation (*), and overall assessment of M&E (*)
- UNDP implementation/oversight (*) and Implementing Partner execution (*), overall project implementation/execution (*), coordination, and operational issues
- Risk Management, including Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)

4.4 Project Results and Impacts

- Progress towards objective and expected outcomes (*)
- Relevance (*)
- Effectiveness (*)
- Efficiency (*)
- Overall Outcome (*)
- Sustainability: financial (*), socio-economic (*), institutional framework and governance (*), environmental (*), and overall likelihood (*)
- Country ownership
- Gender equality and women's empowerment
- Cross-cutting Issues
- GEF Additionality
- Catalytic/Replication Effect
- Progress to Impact

11. Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons

- Main Findings
- Conclusions
- Recommendations
- Lessons Learned

12. Annexes

- TE ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
- List of persons interviewed
- List of documents reviewed
- Evaluation Question Matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology)
- Questionnaire used and summary of results

- Co-financing tables (if not include in body of report)
- TE Rating scales
- Signed Evaluation Consultant Agreement form
- Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form
- Signed TE Report Clearance form
- *Annexed in a separate file:* TE Audit Trail
- *Annexed in a separate file:* relevant terminal GEF/LDCF/SCCF Core Indicators or Tracking Tools, as applicable

ToR Annex D: Evaluation Criteria Matrix template

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the project relate to the GEF Climate Change focal area and has it been designed to deliver global environmental benefits in line with relevant international climate change objectives? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project includes the relevant GEF outcomes, outputs and indicators The project makes explicit links with global climate action goals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Document GEF 5 Focal Area Strategies PIF 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the project aligned to National development objectives, broadly, and to national energy transition priorities specifically? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project design includes explicit links (indicators, outputs, outcomes) to the national development policy/national energy policies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Document National development strategies, energy policies, Nationally Determined Contributions, etc. PIF 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the project relevant to stated regional development objectives as defined by CARICOM, OECS and other regional frameworks? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explicit links are made within the project to regional development policies, action plans and associated initiatives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Document PIF 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the project's Theory of Change relevant to addressing the development challenge(s) identified? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Theory of Change clearly indicates how project interventions and projected results will contribute to the reduction of the three major barriers to low carbon development (Policy, institutional/technical capacity and financial) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Document PIF 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the project directly and adequately address the needs of beneficiaries at local and regional levels? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Theory of Change clearly identifies beneficiary groups and defines how their capabilities will be enhanced by the project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Document PIF 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the project's results framework relevant to the development challenges and are results at the appropriate level? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project results framework adequately measures impact The project indicators are SMART Indicator baselines are clearly defined and populated and milestones and targets are The results framework is comprehensive and demonstrates systematic links to the theory of change 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Document PIF 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the project appropriately aligned with relevant UN system priorities, including thematic objectives at the national/regional and international levels? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project's results framework includes relevant thematic outcomes and indicators from the UNDP Strategic Plan, the UNDAF, UNDP CPD and other relevant corporate objectives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Document UNDP CPD, UNDAF, SP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have the relevant stakeholders been adequately identified and have their views, needs and rights been considered during design and implementation? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The stakeholder mapping and associated engagement plan includes all relevant stakeholders and appropriate modalities for engagement. Planning and implementation have been participatory and inclusive 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholder mapping/engagement plan and reporting Quarterly Reports Annual Reports (APR) Stakeholder Consultation Reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents Stakeholder Interviews
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have the interventions of the project been adequately considered in the context of other development activities being undertaken in the same or related thematic area? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A Partnership framework has been developed that incorporates parallel initiatives, key partners and identifies complementarities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Document Quarterly Reports Annual Reports (APR) Stakeholder mapping/engagement plan and reporting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents Stakeholder Interviews

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have relevant lessons learned from previous projects informed the design, implementation, risk management and monitoring of the project? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lessons learned are explicitly identified and integrated into all aspects of the Project Document 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Document • PIF 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did the project design adequately identify, assess and design appropriate mitigation actions for the potential social and environmental risks posed by its interventions? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SES checklist was completed appropriately and all reasonable risks were identified with appropriate impact and probability ratings and risk mitigation measures specified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Document • SES Annex 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the project achieved its output and outcome level objectives? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project has met or exceeded the output and outcome indicator end-of-project targets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarterly Reports • Annual Reports (APR) • Monitoring Reports • Beneficiary testimony • Site visit/field reports • Pilot Data Analysis/Reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents • Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries • Site visits
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Were lessons learned captured and integrated into project planning and decision-making? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lessons learned have been captured periodically and/or at project end 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Steering Committee Meeting Minutes • Quarterly Reports • Annual Reports (APR) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents • Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How well were risks (including those identified in the Social and Environmental Screening (SES) Checklist), assumptions and impact drivers being managed? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A clearly defined risk identification, categorization and mitigation strategy (updated risk log in ATLAS) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ATLAS Risk Log • M&E Reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents • Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How were risks related to COVID19 managed? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • COVID-related risks were defined against project activities with mitigating actions proposed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PME COVID-updated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Were relevant counterparts from government and civil society involved in project implementation, including as part of the project steering committee? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The steering committee participation included representatives from key institutions in Government 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Steering Committee Meeting Minutes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the project contributed directly to any changes in legislation or policy in line with the project's objectives? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft legislation has been developed or enacted to catalyse the reduction of barriers to the increased penetration of renewable energy/energy efficient technologies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft legislation • Policy Documents • Action/Implementation Plans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there evidence that the project outcomes have contributed to better preparations to cope with natural disasters? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project has directly contributed to reductions in one or more vulnerabilities associated with natural disasters 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarterly Reports • Annual Reports (APR) • Stakeholder/beneficiary testimony 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents • Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the project carefully considered the thematic issues related to human rights? In particular, has the project sought to and actively pursued equality of access to clean energy services and opportunities for women and men (i.e. project team composition, gender-related aspects of pollution impacts, stakeholder outreach to women's groups, etc.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A gender mainstreaming plan was completed • The project results framework has incorporated gender equality considerations, as relevant. • Multi-dimensional poverty reduction is an explicit objective • The project prioritized the most vulnerable as key beneficiaries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gender Mainstreaming Plan • Project Document • Stakeholder analysis and engagement plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards? 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did the project adjust dynamically to reflect changing national priorities/external evaluations during implementation to ensure it remained relevant? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project demonstrated adaptive management and changes were integrated into project planning and implementation through adjustments to annual work plans, budgets and activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual Work Plans • Steering Committee Meeting Reports • Quarterly Reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents • Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes to AWP/Budget were made based on mid-term or other external evaluation • Any changes to the project's planned activities were approved by the Steering Committee • Any substantive changes (outcome-level changes) approved by the Steering Committee and donor, as required 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual Reports (APR) • Stakeholder/beneficiary testimony • Revised Project Results Framework 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent were the Project results delivered with the greatest value for money? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Value for money analyses, requests for information, market surveys and other market intelligence were undertaken for key procurements. • Procurement is done on a competitive basis, where relevant. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VFM, RFI, Market Surveys • Procurement Evaluation Documents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents • Interviews with project staff and government stakeholders
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was co-financing adequately estimated during project design (sources, type, value, relevance), tracked during implementation and what were the reasons for any differences between expected and realised co-financing? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Co-financing was realized in keeping with original estimates • Co-financing was tracked continuously throughout the project lifecycle and deviations identified and alternative sources identified • Co-financiers were actively engaged throughout project implementation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual Work Plans • Steering Committee Meeting Reports • Quarterly Reports • Annual Reports (APR) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents • Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was the level of implementation support provided by UNDP adequate and in keeping with the implementation modality and any related agreements (i.e. LOA)? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical support to the Executing Agency and project team were timely and of acceptable quality. • Management inputs and processes, including budgeting and procurement, were adequate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LOA (s)/Cooperation Agreement(s) • UNDP project support documents (emails, procurement/recruitment documents) • Quarterly Reports • Annual Reports (APR) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents • Interviews with project staff, UNDP personnel

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have the capacities of the executing institution(s) and counterparts been properly considered when the project was designed? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An ex-ante analysis was undertaken of the internal control framework and internal capacities of the IP • An ex-ante capacity analysis was undertaken of key partners with explicit responsibilities for implementation of project funds • The cash transfer modality and implementation modality appropriately reflected the findings of any ex-ante analyses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HACT Assessment(s) • Capacity Assessments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the M&E plan been well-formulated, and has it served as an effective tool to support project implementation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The M&E plan has an adequate budget and was adequately funded • The logical framework was used during implementation as a management and M&E tool • There was compliance with the financial and narrative reporting requirements (timeliness and quality) • Monitoring and reporting has been at both the activity and results levels 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Document • M&E Plan • AWP • FACE forms • Quarterly Narrative Reports • Site visit reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents • Interviews with project staff and government stakeholders
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the project adequately used relevant national systems (procurement, recruitment, payments) for project implementation where possible? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of national systems was in keeping with relevant national requirements and internal control frameworks • Management of financial resources has been in line with accounting best practice • Management of project assets has been in line with accounting best practice 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procurement/Recruitment reports • FACE forms • CDRs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents • Interviews with project staff and government stakeholders
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Were financial audit/spot check findings adequately addressed and relevant changes made to improve financial management? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate management responses and associated actions were taken in response to audit/spot check findings. • Successive audits demonstrated improvements in financial management practices 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Audit Reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there financial risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outcomes? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The exit strategy includes explicit interventions to ensure financial sustainability of relevant activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Exit Strategy • Risk Log 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do the legal frameworks, policies, and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project benefits? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The exit strategy identifies relevant socio-political risks and includes explicit interventions to mitigate same 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Exit Strategy • Risk Log 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have key stakeholders identified their interest in project benefits beyond project-end and accepted responsibility for ensuring that project benefits continue to flow? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key stakeholders are assigned specific, agreed roles and responsibilities outlined in the exit strategy • MOU(s) exist for on-going monitoring, maintenance and oversight of phased down or phased over activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Exit Strategy • Risk Log • MOU(s) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there ongoing activities that may pose an environmental threat to the sustainability of project outcomes? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The exit strategy identifies relevant environmental risks and includes explicit interventions to mitigate same 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Exit Strategy • Risk Log 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there verifiable improvements in ecological status, or reductions in ecological stress, that can be linked directly to project interventions? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project has contributed directly to improved ecological conditions, including through reduced GHG emissions for energy generation and transportation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarterly Reports • Annual Reports (APR) • Monitoring Reports • Pilot Data Analysis/Reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents • Site visits

ToR Annex E: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators

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

Evaluators/Consultants:

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

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

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

Name of Evaluator: _____

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____

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

Signed at _____ (Place) on _____ (Date)

Signature: _____

ToR Annex F: TE Rating Scales

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

ToR Annex G: TE Report Clearance Form

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

ToR Annex H: TE Audit Trail

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

To the comments received on (date) from the Terminal Evaluation of Monitoring and assessment of MEA implementation and environmental trends (MEA) project) (UNDP Project PIMS #5425)

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

ToR Annex I: List of Individuals/Organizations to be Interviewed

Table B: List of Individuals/ Institutions

Name	Agency/Department
Mr. Mohammad Nadgee	Programme Manager, Sustainable Solutions and Energy
Diann Black-Layne	Project Manager, Department of Environment
Jason Williams	Project Coordinator, Department of Environment
Ezra Christopher	M&E Consultant, Department of Environment
Crystal Wilson	Project Assistant, Department of Environment
Chalisa Philip	Accounting Officer, Department of Environment
Amira McDonald	Communications Officer, Department of Environment
Oraine Nurse	Technical Data Consultant, Department of Environment
Janeil Johnston	GIS Officer, Department of Environment
Dr Helena Jeffery Brown	Technical Consultant, Department of Environment
Jamila Gregory	Project Development Associate, Department of Environment
Ato Lewis	Snr Environment Officer, Department of Environment
Daryl George	Snr Environment Officer, Department of Environment
Aaliyah Tuitt	Technical Data Consultant, Department of Environment
Stachel Edwards	Chief Statistician, Statistics Division
Tracelyn Joseph	Senior Statistician, Statistics Division
Ruleta Camacho-Thomas	Advisor, National Parks Authority
Arica Hill	Executive Director, Environmental Awareness Group
Dr Linroy Christian	Director, Department of Analytical Services
Philmore Mullin	Director, National Office of Disaster Services
Dale O'Brien	Director, Community Development Division
Andrew Nurse	Assistant Surveyor, Survey & Mapping Division
Dale Destin	Director, Antigua and Barbuda Meteorological Services
Orvin Paige	Meteorologist, Antigua and Barbuda Meteorological Services
Ruth Spencer	Coordinator, Marine Ecosystem Protected Areas Trust
Luxmore Edwards	Director, IT Centre, Ministry of Information, Broadcasting, Telecommunications & Information Technology
Priscilla Nicholas	Statistician, Ministry of Education
Stacey Payne-Mascal	Assistant Director of Education Planning Unit, Ministry of Education
Shelly Galloway	Ministry of Education
Natalya Lawrence	GEF Small Grants Programme
Ian Horsford	Chief Fisheries Officer, Fisheries Division
Tricia Lovell	Deputy Chief Fisheries Officer, Fisheries Division
Frederick Southwell	Town and Country Planner, Development Control Authority
Soraya Looby	Jnr Building Inspector, Development Control Authority
Adriel Thibou	Forestry Officer, Forestry Unit
Arif Jonas	Network Manager, Antigua and Barbuda Transport Board

Name	Agency/Department
Dianne Rodrigues	Director, Antigua and Barbuda Bureau of Standards
June Jackson	Executive Director, Gilbert Agricultural Rural Development Centre
McClure Simon	Consumer Service & Hydrology Officer, Antigua Public Utilities Authority
Brenda Thomas-Odlum	Representative, Civil Society Organization