



## Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference

**Location:** Home-based with possible 1 mission

**Application Deadline:** January 20, 2022

**Type of Contract:** Individual Consultant

**Assignment Type:** Terminal evaluator for UNDP-supported GEF-finance project

**Languages Required:** English

**Starting Date:** 1 February

**Expected Duration of Assignment:** 3 months

### **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 project titled ***“Enhancing financial sustainability of protected areas system in Albania”*** (PIMS #5602) implemented through the *UNDP Albania CO/Ministry of Tourism and Environment*. The project started on the 1 December 2017 and is in its 4<sup>th</sup> 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’ [Guidance For Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects](#)’

#### **2. Project Description**

The Government of Albania has established a representative system of Protected Areas (PAs), which covers more than 18% of the Albanian territory. The Law on Protected Areas provides significant improvement in the overall management effectiveness of the country’s system of PAs; it is substantially contributing to planning, administration and use of PAs in Albania consolidating the legal context for the declaration, conservation, administration, management and use of the PAs and their natural and biological resources, as well as facilitating conditions for the development of ecotourism, public information and education and the generation of direct and indirect economic benefits by the local population as well as the public and private sectors.

The current funding baselines for the PA system, and the capacities to administer and improve PA revenue streams, are still well below the levels required to ensure that the protected area system can properly serve its function as an important tool to protect biodiversity.

This project seeks to assist the GoA in reducing existing funding gaps for the system of protected areas, improving the management of individual protected areas, improving cost-efficiencies in individual protected areas and building the financial management capacities of protected area nationwide by increasing the capacity of the central and local staff. Therefore, it focuses activities at two levels of support: (i) building the financial management capacities of the agency responsible for administering the system of protected areas; and (ii) demonstrating the efficacy of different financing strategies in a sub-set of individual protected areas.

One of the project components is focused on implementation of mechanisms to improve revenue streams on three National Parks: (i) Dajti National Park (DNP); (ii) Divjaka-Karavasta National Park (DKNP); and (iii) the Llogara-Karaburuni protected area complex (LKC).

### **3. TE Purpose**

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

The TE process must follow a collaborative and participatory approach ensuring close engagement with key participants including the Country Office M&E Focal Points and Programme Officers, Government counterparts including the GEF Operational Focal Point (OFP), the Directorate of Development Programmes on Environment and other key stakeholders. The TE occurs during the last few months of project activities, allowing the TE team to proceed while the Project Team is still in place, yet ensuring the project is close enough to completion for the evaluation team reach conclusions on key aspects such as project sustainability.

The COVID pandemic has affected the project implementation due to several measures and restrictions imposed in the country.

Since March 9, 2020, where measures on Covid-19 have started in Albania, a set of mitigation measures including lockdowns, curfews, travel bans were applied, and some continue to be in place amid the rise of the number of cases of Covid-19 in Albania.

They have affected the project implementation resulting in some delays due to delays in government counterparts providing feedback and inputs for the development of studies and activities, difficulty/inability in reaching out to stakeholders to acquire information and data for the preparation of studies and their participation in awareness raising activities, workshops, meetings, etc.

### **Description of responsibilities**

### **4. TE Approach & Methodology**

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

The TE consultant will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure/SESP) the Project Document, project reports including annual PIRs, project budget revisions, lesson learned reports, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based evaluation.

The TE consultant 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 Advisors, direct beneficiaries and other stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful TE. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to executing agencies, senior officials and task team/component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project beneficiaries, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. Additionally, the TE consultant is expected to conduct field missions. In case that the TE mission might not be possible due to the Covid-19 situation in Albania, the virtual tools will be used to conduct the interviews.

<b>Partner</b>	<b>Contact Name</b>
<i>Project Manager</i>	<i>Violeta Zuna</i>
<i>UNDP Country Office Programme Officer</i>	<i>Elvita Kabashi</i>
<i>Project Implementing Partner</i>	<i>Klodiana Marika, Project Director</i>
<i>GEF Focal Point</i>	<i>Sofjan Jaupaj</i>
<i>National Agency of Protected Areas</i>	<i>Zamir Dedej, General Director</i>
<i>Regional Agency of Protected Areas of Tirana</i>	<i>Ilir Vishkurti – Director of Tirana RAPA, responsible for Dajti NP</i>
<i>Regional Agency of Protected Areas of Fier</i>	<i>Ardian Koci – Director of Fier RAPA, responsible for Divjake-Karavasta NP.</i>
<i>Regional Agency of Protected Areas of Vlora</i>	<i>Lorela Lazaj – Director of Vlora RAPA, responsible for Llogara NP and Karaburun-Sazan MPA</i>
<i>Prefect of Vlora</i>	<i>Flamur Mamaj, Head of Management Committee</i>
<i>Fishery Association in Vlora</i>	<i>Sherif Dyrmishi, Responsible Fishermen Association</i>
<i>Private business in Divjaka</i>	<i>Resort Divjaka</i>
<i>Private business in Tirana</i>	<i>Dajti Express</i>

The specific design and methodology for the TE should emerge from consultations between the TE consultant 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 consultant 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 should be clearly outlined in the inception report and be fully discussed and agreed between UNDP, stakeholders and the TE consultant.

The final TE report should 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.

UNDP cannot be liable for anything that may result to the international consultant that is COVID related, be it health wise, time in quarantine, change in flights, etc. The TE consultant should develop a methodology that takes this into account and the conduct of the TE virtually and remotely, including the use of remote interview methods and extended desk reviews, data analysis, surveys and evaluation questionnaires.

If a data collection/ field mission is not possible then remote interviews may be undertaken through telephone or online (skype, zoom etc.).

## **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 [Guidance For Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects](#).

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 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

### 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

### iv. Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons Learned

- The TE consultant 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 consultant 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 D.

## **6. Expected Outputs and Deliverables**

The TE consultant shall prepare and submit:

- TE Inception Report: TE consultant clarifies objectives and methods of the TE no later than 2 weeks before the TE assessment. TE consultant submits the Inception Report to the UNDP CO and project management. Approximate due date: February 15, 2022.
- Presentation: TE consultant presents initial findings to project management and the UNDP CO at the end of the TE assessment. Approximate due date: March 10, 2022.
- Draft TE Report: TE consultant submits full draft report with annexes within 3 weeks of the end of the TE assessment. Approximate due date: March 31, 2022
- Final TE Report\* and Audit Trail: TE consultant submits revised report, with Audit Trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final TE report, to the UNDP CO within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft. Approximate due date: April 25, 2022.

\*The final TE report must be in English. If applicable, UNDP CO 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.<sup>1</sup>

## **7. TE Arrangements**

The principal responsibility for managing the TE resides with the UNDP CO Albania.

The UNDP CO Albania will contract the consultant and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the TE consultant. 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.

---

<sup>1</sup> Access at: <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/section-6.shtml>

Due to the COVID-19, the UNDP CO Albania and Project Team will support the implementation of remote/ virtual meetings. An updated stakeholder list with contact details (phone and email) will be provided by the UNDP CO Albania to the TE consultant.

## 8. Duration of the Work

The total duration of the TE will be approximately *20 working days* over a time period of *(3 months)* starting *February 1, 2022* and shall not exceed 3 months from when the TE consultant is hired. The tentative TE timeframe is as follows:

- *February 4, 2022*: Prep the TE (handover of project documents)
- *February 8, 2022*: 2 days (recommended 2-4): Document review and preparing TE Inception Report
- *February 15, 2022*: 2 days: Finalization and Validation of TE Inception Report- latest start of TE assessment
- *February 10- 25, 2022*: 7 days (r: 7-15): TE assessment: Mission in Albania or virtual stakeholder meetings, interviews.
- *March 10, 2022*: Assessment wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of TE assessment
- *March 31, 2022*: 5 days (r: 5-10): Preparation of draft TE report
- *April 3, 2022*: Circulation of draft TE report for comments
- *April 15, 2022*: 1 day (r: 1-2): Incorporation of comments on draft TE report into Audit Trail & finalization of TE report
- *April 22, 2022*: Preparation & Issue of Management Response
- *April 25, 2022*: Expected date of full TE completion

The expected start date of the contract is *01.02.2022*

## 9. Duty Station

### Travel:

- International travel might not be possible for the consultant given the current situation with the COVID-19 pandemic and travel restriction imposed by number of countries in the region and globally;
- In case of travel, the BSAFE course must be successfully completed prior to commencement of travel;
- The Consultant is responsible for ensuring they have vaccinations/inoculations when travelling to certain countries, as designated by the UN Medical Director.
- The Consultant is required to comply with the UN security directives set forth under: <https://dss.un.org/dssweb/>
- All related travel expenses will be covered and will be reimbursed as per UNDP rules and regulations upon submission of an F-10 claim form and supporting documents.

## REQUIRED SKILLS AND EXPERIENCE

## **International evaluator:**

### Education

- Master's degree in *M&E, sustainable development, social sciences, environmental conservation* 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 *Biodiversity/Environment*.
- Experience in evaluating projects;
- Experience working in *the Balkans and/or Albania*.
- Experience in relevant technical areas for at least *10 years*;
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and *Biodiversity*, 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 UNDP CO
- 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the draft TE report to the UNDP CO



- 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final TE report and approval by the UNDP CO 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**

*Applicants are requested to send in their offer by January 24, 2020. Individual consultants are invited to submit applications for this position.*

### **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.

## **12. Recommended Presentation of Proposal**

- Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](#) provided by UNDP;
- CV** and a **Personal History Form** ([P11 form](#));
- 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)
- Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc.), supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the [Letter of Confirmation of Interest template](#). If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

All application materials should be submitted indicating the following reference “Consultant for Terminal Evaluation of *(Establishing Albania’s Environmental Information Management and Monitoring System Aligned with the Global Reporting)*” by email at the following address ONLY: [procurement.al@undp.org](mailto:procurement.al@undp.org) by 16.00 CET on 21.12.2020. Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

### **13. 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.

### **14. Annexes to the Terminal Evaluation ToR**

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

## ToR Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework

PROJECT OBJECTIVE AND OUTCOMES	INDICATOR(PROCESS)	BASELINE	TARGET	SOURCES OF VERIFICATION	RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS
<p><b>Project Objective:</b></p> <p><i>A reduction in the funding gap for protected areas leads to improvements in their management effectiveness, particularly in respect of reducing the threats to, and improving the conservation status of, their biodiversity values'</i></p>	<p>Financial sustainability score card for the PA system</p>	<p>16%</p>	<p>&gt;30%:</p>	<p>Project review of Financial sustainability Scorecard.</p>	<p><b>Assumptions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Government continues to view protected areas as a key investment strategy for meeting biodiversity conservation (and selected socio-economic development) targets.</li> <li>– The MoE and NAPA ensure that a balance is maintained between the core biodiversity and heritage conservation mandate for protected areas and the sustainable use of these protected areas for tourism, recreation and natural resource harvesting purposes.</li> <li>– The NAPA maintains independently audited annual financial statements</li> </ul> <p><b>Risks:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– There are delays in the full establishment and operationalization of the National Agency of Protected Areas</li> <li>– The GoA does not commit adequate funding to support the staffing, development and operational management of the protected area system</li> <li>– The cumulative effect of climate change and unsustainable levels of natural resource use exacerbates habitat</li> </ul>
	<p>Funding gap (of the 'functional management scenario') for the PA system</p>	<p>US\$5.15 million/ annum</p>	<p>&lt;US\$4 million/ annum</p>	<p>Audited financial statements</p>	

PROJECT OBJECTIVE AND OUTCOMES	INDICATOR(PROCESS)	BASELINE	TARGET	SOURCES OF VERIFICATION	RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS
					fragmentation and degradation in the terrestrial and marine ecosystems of the protected area system, further undermining their potential to generate increased revenue streams.
<b>Outcome 1:</b>  <i>Improved financial planning and management capacity of the protected area system.</i>	<b>Outputs:</b> 1.1. National planning framework for the PA system is prepared. 1.2. Financial planning and management capabilities of the NAPA are strengthened. 1.3. Capacity of NAPA to mobilize funding for the PA system is developed				
	Capacity development score for the institution responsible for protected areas.	Systemic: 37% Institutional: 27% Individual: 31%	Systemic: 42% Institutional: 45% Individual: 42%	Project review of Capacity Development Scorecards	<b>Assumptions:</b> – Responsibilities for financial planning and management is delegated to protected area institutions. – Income from protected areas is retained (in part or in full) for re-investment back into the management of the protected area system. – The protected area institution maintains independently audited annual financial statements
	Strategic plan and financial plan for the	Strategic Plan: No	Strategic Plan: Yes Financial Plan: Yes	Formal record of approval and adoption	

PROJECT OBJECTIVE AND OUTCOMES	INDICATOR(PROCESS)	BASELINE	TARGET	SOURCES OF VERIFICATION	RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS
	PA system drafted and adopted	Financial Plan: No			<b>Risks:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– There are delays in the full establishment and operationalization of the National Agency of Protected Areas</li> <li>– The GoA does not commit adequate funding to support the staffing, development and operational management of the protected area system</li> </ul>
	Number of protected area staff trained in the financial policies and guidelines of the NAPA	0	>100	Annual report of NAPA	
	Number of protected area staff completing specialised, targeted short-course financial training and financial skills development programmes	0	15	Project training records Training reports of NAPA and the MoE	
	Total annual funding available for the planning and management of the PA system.	US\$ 2 million	>US\$ 5 million	Audited financial statements	
	Establishment of a protected area Trust Fund	No	Yes	Founding document/s of Trust Fund	
<b>Outcome 2:</b>  <i>Increased revenue from individual</i>	<b>Outputs:</b> 2.1. Commercial enterprises operating in DNP are contributing financially to the operational management costs of the park. 2.2. Park income is derived from fishing, farming and forestry in the natural resource zone of the DKNP.				

PROJECT OBJECTIVE AND OUTCOMES	INDICATOR(PROCESS)	BASELINE	TARGET	SOURCES OF VERIFICATION	RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS
<i>protected areas.</i>	2.3. Park revenue is collected from the summer influx of recreational users in the LKC.				

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

#	Item (electronic versions preferred if available)
1	Project Identification Form (PIF)
2	Final UNDP-GEF Project Document with all annexes
3	CEO Endorsement Request
4	UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) and associated management plans (if any)
5	Inception Workshop Report
6	MidTerm Evaluation Report
7	All Project Annual Reports (APRs) with associated workplans and financial reports)
8	Oversight mission reports
9	Minutes of Project Steering Committee Meetings and of other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
10	GEF Tracking Tools (from CEO Endorsement, midterm and terminal stages)
11	GEF/LDCF/SCCF Core Indicators (from PIF, CEO Endorsement, midterm and terminal stages); for GEF-6 and GEF-7 projects only
12	Financial data, including actual expenditures by project outcome, including management costs, and including documentation of any significant budget revisions
13	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
14	Audit reports
15	Electronic copies of project outputs (booklets, manuals, technical reports, articles, etc.)
16	Sample of project communications materials
17	Summary list of formal meetings, workshops, etc. held, with date, location, topic, and number of participants
18	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
19	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)
20	List of related projects/initiatives contributing to project objectives approved/started after GEF project approval (i.e. any leveraged or “catalytic” results)
21	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
22	UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD)
23	List/map of project sites, highlighting suggested visits
24	List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Board members, RTA, Project Team members, and other partners to be consulted
25	Project deliverables that provide documentary evidence of achievement towards project outcomes
	<i>Add documents, as required</i>

## ToR Annex C: Content of the TE report

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

---

<sup>2</sup> See ToR Annex F for rating scales.



- 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 incl. Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)
- 4.2 Project Results
- Progress towards objective and expected outcomes (\*)
  - Relevance (\*)
  - Effectiveness (\*)
  - Efficiency (\*)
  - Overall Outcome (\*)
  - Country ownership
  - Gender
  - Other Cross-cutting Issues
  - Sustainability: financial (\*), socio-economic (\*), institutional framework and governance (\*), environmental (\*), and overall likelihood (\*)
  - Country Ownership
  - Gender equality and women's empowerment
  - Cross-cutting Issues
  - GEF Additionality
  - Catalytic Role / Replication Effect
  - Progress to Impact
5. Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons
- Main Findings
  - Conclusions
  - Recommendations
  - Lessons Learned
6. Annexes
- TE ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
  - TE Mission itinerary
  - List of persons interviewed
  - List of documents reviewed
  - Summary of field visits

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

## ToR Annex D: Evaluation Criteria Matrix template

<b>Evaluative Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Sources</b>	<b>Methodology</b>
Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF Focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national level?			
<i>(include evaluative questions)</i>	<i>(i.e. relationships established, level of coherence between project design and implementation approach, specific activities conducted, quality of risk mitigation strategies, etc.)</i>	<i>(i.e. project documentation, national policies or strategies, websites, project staff, project partners, data collected throughout the TE mission, etc.)</i>	<i>(i.e. document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc.)</i>
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in line with international and national norms and standards?			
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-political, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
Gender equality and women's empowerment: How did the project contribute to gender equality and women's empowerment?			
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
<i>(Expand the table to include questions for all criteria being assessed: Monitoring &amp; Evaluation, UNDP oversight/implementation, Implementing Partner Execution, cross-cutting issues, etc.)</i>			

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

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

### 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: \_\_\_\_\_

professionalism).

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

<b>TE Rating Scales</b>	
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>

<b>Evaluation Ratings Table</b>	
Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E)	Rating <sup>3</sup>
M&E design at entry	
M&E Plan Implementation	
Overall Quality of M&E	
Implementation & Execution	Rating
Quality of UNDP Implementation/Oversight	
Quality of Implementing Partner Execution	
Overall quality of Implementation/Execution	
Assessment of Outcomes	Rating
Relevance	
Effectiveness	
Efficiency	
Overall Project Outcome Rating	

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

Sustainability	Rating
Financial resources	
Socio-political/economic	
Institutional framework and governance	
Environmental	
Overall Likelihood of Sustainability	

## ToR Annex G: TE Report Clearance Form

**Terminal Evaluation Report for** *(Project Title & UNDP PIMS ID)* **Reviewed and Cleared By:**

**Commissioning Unit (M&E Focal Point)**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

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

**Regional Technical Advisor (Nature, Climate and Energy)**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

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

## ToR Annex H: TE Audit Trail Template

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

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

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

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

[1] UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

[2] Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations.

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



