

Terminal Evaluation (TE) Terms of Reference

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 TEs of two *full-sized projects* under the Good Growth Partnership (GGP), one of the GEF-funded integrated approach pilots (IAPs). Both projects are implemented through the *United Nations Development Programme Regional Hub for Latin America and the Caribbean (UNDP RH LAC)*.

The first project is titled **Reducing Deforestation from Commodity Production** (PIMS #5664- Atlas award 00098209) – a global project working in Indonesia, Liberia and Paraguay. The project started on the 15th of June 2017 (with the Paraguay portion starting on the 3rd of July 2017).

The second project is titled **Adaptive Management and Learning for the Commodities IAP** (PIMS #5665- Atlas award 00097946) – which is also a global project. It started on the 3rd of March 2017.

Both projects are now in their 4th year of implementation and will end respectively on 14 June 2022 and 31 March 2022.

Separate TEs will be conducted for each project, though with an understanding of the broader GGP context. In both cases, the TE process must follow the guidance outlined in the document '[Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects](#)'.

2. PROJECT BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

The [Good Growth Partnership \(GGP\)](#) is a GEF-financed integrated approach pilot (IAP) programme, "*Taking Deforestation out of Commodity Supply Chains*" (also referred to as "*the Commodities IAP*") aiming to reduce the global impacts of agricultural commodities on greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and biodiversity by meeting the growing demand of palm oil, soy and beef through supply that does not lead to deforestation and related GHG emissions.

It consists of 5 *child projects* working across production, financing, and demand in Brazil, Indonesia, Liberia, and Paraguay (integrated supply chain approach). Working with a full range of stakeholders, from small-scale producers to national governments and global corporations, the GGP promotes a holistic approach to sustainability that encompasses entire commodity supply chains and looks at where the layers of the supply chain integrate and overlap to enhance financial incentives and demand for sustainably produced agricultural commodities. By combining forces, the Good Growth Partnership aims to provide a model of wide-scale systemic reform that capitalizes on the strengths of each partner.

The two child projects "Reducing Deforestation from Commodity Production" (Production) and "Adaptive Management and Learning for the Commodities IAP" (A&L) – both led by the UNDP Green Commodities Programme (UNDP GCP) within RH LAC – are key parts of the GGP.

The **Production** child project seeks to turn the sustainable production of key commodities from niche and specialized operations to the norm in each commodity sector. It works to improve the enabling environment for sustainable production practices for oil palm in Indonesia and Liberia, and beef in Paraguay – while conserving forests and safeguarding the rights of smallholder farmers and forest-dependent communities.

Component 1 of the project is on dialogue platforms, action plans, and regulatory reform (focusing on enabling conditions for sustainable production and land-use related policies).

Component 2 covers farmer extension services and trainings on good agricultural practices (GAPs). **Component 3** is on improved land-use planning, zoning, and set-asides, resulting in increased legal protections and reduced carbon emissions.

Component 4 is on knowledge management, including increased knowledge of effective strategies and tools for improving production of commodities in ways that do not involve conversion of forested land, and uptake and replication of lessons learned.

The full range of outcomes and targets under each component can be consulted in the project logical framework in Annex A. They are aligned with outcomes 1 and 3 of the UNDP Country Programme for Indonesia 2016-2020, outcome 2 of the UNDAF and UNDP Country Programme for Liberia 2013-2017, and results 2.1 and 3.2 of the Paraguay UNDAF 2015-2019 (MANUD). The overall programme and project objectives are also aligned with output 1.3 of the UNDP Strategic Plan 2014-2017.

As a GEN2 project, gender equality is a significant objective of the project, and gender is mainstreamed across all activities in implementation.

The Production project is organized into two UNDP project documents:

- i. Indonesia, Liberia and Global support;
- ii. Paraguay.

In both cases, the project is implemented following UNDP's direct implementation modality (DIM), with the following governance and management arrangements:

- i. For Indonesia, Liberia and Global support – the Implementing Partner is the Regional Hub for Latin America and the Caribbean (RH LAC – which is thus responsible and accountable for managing the project (including M&E), achieving project outcomes, and for the effective use of UNDP resources. The Country Offices of Indonesia and Liberia are executing the Indonesia and Liberia components of the project.
- ii. For Paraguay, the Implementing Partner is the UNDP Paraguay Country Office.

The Indonesia portion of the project has been executed by UNDP Indonesia, in partnership with the Ministry of Agriculture, the Ministry of Environment and Forestry and the Coordinating Ministry for Economic Affairs, and with Conservation International (CI) and WWF Indonesia acting as responsible parties for the landscape-level work in the South Tapanuli (North Sumatra) and Sintang (West Kalimantan – then taken over by UNDP Indonesia) districts respectively.

The Liberia portion of the project has been executed by UNDP Liberia, in partnership with the Ministry of Agriculture, the Forest Development Authority, and the Environmental Protection Agency, and with CI acting as responsible party for landscape-level work in the North-West Liberian/MANCO landscape (across the counties of Grand Cape Mount, Bomi, Gbarpolu, and Bong).

The Paraguay portion of the project has been implemented by UNDP Paraguay in partnership with the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development.

Key stakeholders include government entities, CSOs (including local and international NGOs, cooperatives, farmer and community associations, and other representatives of local communities and indigenous people), private sector entities, and academic institutions in all 3 countries and at the global level.

The Production project is now in its 4th year of implementation, and project activities are expected to end in the second half of 2021. COVID-19 has posed significant challenges to project implementation; this applies to all countries and project components, with reduced access to the field and limited opportunities for face-to-face interaction. This has impacted the work of all Platforms and dialogue forums, as well as the delivery of trainings and workshops. In many cases, activities were successfully delivered through digital means – though in some occurrences, limited access to telecommunication technologies and reduced internet coverage have resulted in delays in project implementation. Furthermore, the COVID-19 pandemic has impacted significantly the policymaking agenda (and consequence budget allocation decisions) of all three

(COVID) TE ToR for GEF-Financed Projects – Standard Template for UNDP Procurement Site – June 2020

project countries, where the response to the pandemic has been prioritized over other items. This has posed significant challenges to the policy work being conducted under the Production project.

The total Production project budget is of USD 14,584,403 (GEF funding), with planned co-financing for additional USD 164,916,118. The project is expected to close on 14 June 2022.

The **A&L** project allows for coordination and integration of the partnership – which is led by the UNDP GCP within the UNDP RH LAC. This child project is instrumental in ensuring that the programme is viewed as a cohesive whole and that it has a clear identity.

Component 1 of the A&L project, implemented by UNDP Regional Hub for LAC, is coordinating the management of the GGP programme, leading to logical technical sequencing, programme-level monitoring and evaluation, and overall resilience. This includes leading Secretariat meetings, supporting the creation of integrated intervention plans, and capturing and disseminating effective adaptive management practices across the programme.

Through **Component 2**, implemented by WWF US and executed by ISEAL Alliance, the project contributes to developing a robust and policy-relevant evidence base on the effectiveness and impacts of voluntary sustainability standards (VSS) and VSS-like mechanisms being used to implement deforestation-free and sustainable production and sourcing initiatives. The establishment of a Global Impact Platform (re-branded as “Evidensia”) will fill in key gaps to the evidence base and synthesize and communicate evidence in decision-relevant terms.

Component 3, also implemented by UNDP Regional Hub for LAC, is on knowledge management, partnership development and communications aimed at maximizing learning, fostering synergies and promoting replication and upscaling of actions to address deforestation in commodity supply chains. This includes supporting an active community of practice – the Green Commodities Community – through which practitioners from the GGP child projects, countries, and partners as well as the broader sustainable commodities community share knowledge and learn from each other.

COVID-19 has had a limited impact on the A&L project activities, except for the organization of the 2nd Good Growth Conference, which will be delivered virtually in the first half of 2021, and the level of collaboration between the Partners which slightly decreased due to competing priorities and adaptations needed in project implementation. Most of the activities initially planned in-person were adapted to virtual formats.

The total A&L project budget is of USD 2,749,124, with planned co-financing for additional USD 6,496,204. The project will be closing on 31 March 2022.

The other three child projects of the GGP are “Demand”, “Transactions”, and “Brazil”. The **Demand** project, led globally by WWF US, helps raise awareness and strengthen demand for sustainably produced beef, palm oil and soy among consumers, policymakers, companies and investors. Under the **Transactions** project, the UN Environment’s Finance Initiative (UNEP FI) and the International Finance Corporation (IFC) work closely with banks and related institutions to help make sustainable financing more accessible for businesses, farmers and producers who require additional capital to invest in more environmentally sound practices. The **Brazil** project, led by Conservation International, combines the production, demand, and transactions streams into a single project in that country, including national work with a landscape focus of the MATOPIBA region.

3. THE PURPOSE

Separate TEs will be conducted for the Production and A&L projects, though with an understanding of the broader GGP context. For each project, 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, through informing future project design and implementation. The TE report promotes accountability and transparency, and assesses the extent of project accomplishments, including through adaptation to the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic.

For each of the two TEs, a management response will be prepared by the commissioning unit, detailing whether the Project Team and stakeholders fully accept, partially accept or reject the recommendations (including justification for the acceptance/rejection). For all recommendations which are fully or partially accepted, key follow-up actions will be developed and monitored.

4. TE APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

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

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

For each of the two projects, the TE team is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (including the GEF Operational Focal Point in the Production countries), Implementing Partners and Responsible Parties, the UNDP Country Offices, the UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisors, direct beneficiaries, the GEF Secretariat's Focal Point for GGP and other key stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to successful TEs. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to the following.

For the Production project: representatives of the global project team at the Regional Hub for LAC, the UNDP Country Offices in Liberia, Indonesia and Paraguay and the GGP project teams in each of these countries, CI HQ, CI Liberia, CI Indonesia, WWF Indonesia, senior officials and task team/component leaders, key experts and consultants in the relevant subject areas, Project Board, project beneficiaries, academia, local government and CSOs.

For the A&L project: representatives of the global project team at the Regional Hub for LAC, WWF US, CI HQ, CI Brazil, UNEP FI, IFC, the ISEAL Alliance, members of the Green Commodities Community (GCC), senior officials and task team/component leaders, key experts and consultants in the relevant subject areas, Project Board, and, if relevant, project beneficiaries, academia, local government and CSOs.

Additionally, for the Production project, the TE team is expected to conduct field missions to the following project sites: in Indonesia, the districts of South Tapanuli (North Sumatra), Pelalawan (Riau) and Sintang (West Kalimantan); in Liberia, the MANCO/North-West Liberian landscape; and in Paraguay, relevant project sites in the Chaco region.

No field mission is required for the A&L project. However, it would be extremely beneficial for the Team Leader (or another relevant member of the team) to attend virtually the Good Growth Conference scheduled

for May 24th - 28th 2021, if possible. That will allow the team member to get well acquainted up-front with the concepts, approaches and concrete work involved in these projects, and already allow for contacts with many of the relevant stakeholders.

The TE team should spend enough time to get acquainted with the evolution of the political economy in the four countries, and remain mindful of it in the recommendations they produce.

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

The final methodological approach including interview schedule, field visits and data to be used in the evaluation must be clearly outlined in the TE Inception Report and be fully discussed and agreed between UNDP, stakeholders and the TE team.

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

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

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

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

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

5. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE TE

For each of the two projects, the TE will assess project performance against expectations set out in the project's Logical Framework/Results Framework (see ToR Annex A). The TEs will assess results according to the criteria outlined in the [Guidance for TEs of UNDP-supported GEF-financed Projects](#). The Findings section of the TE reports will cover the topics listed below.

A full outline of the TE reports' 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 drivenness
- 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

Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons Learned

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

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

ToR Table 2: Evaluation Ratings Table for *Reducing Deforestation from Commodity Production and Adaptive Management and Learning for the Commodities IAP*

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

¹ 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)

6. TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the TEs will be approximately **80 man days** (60 days for the Production project, and 20 days for the A&L project) over a time period of **41 weeks** starting on **June 1st 2021**. The tentative TE timeframes are as follows.

Timeframe applicable to both projects.

Timeframe	Activity
<i>Feb 28th 2021</i>	Application closes
<i>May 20th 2021</i>	Selection of TE team
<i>June 1st – October 31st 2021</i>	Preparation period for TE team (handover of documentation)

For the Production project.

Timeframe	Activity
<i>July 1st to 31st 2021 (11 days)</i>	Document review and preparation of TE Inception Report
<i>By August 31st 2021 (2 days)</i>	Finalization and Validation of TE Inception Report
<i>September 1st to November 15th (34 days)</i>	TE mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits, etc.
<i>By December 10th (1 day)</i>	Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings; earliest end of TE mission
<i>Dec 11th - January 7th 2022 (10 days)</i>	Preparation of draft TE report
<i>Between January 7th and January 28th 2022</i>	Circulation of draft TE report for comments
<i>February 15th 2022 (2 days)</i>	Incorporation of comments on draft TE report into Audit Trail & finalization of TE report
<i>January 7th – March 14th 2022</i>	Preparation and Issuance of Management Response
<i>June 30th 2022</i>	Expected date of full TE completion

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

For the A&L project.

Timeframe	Activity
<i>By June 15th 2021 (5 days)</i>	Document review and preparation of TE Inception Report
<i>By June 30th 2021 (1 day)</i>	Finalization and Validation of TE Inception Report
<i>July 1st – August 31st 2021 (6 days)</i>	TE work: stakeholder interviews, etc.
<i>September 15, 2021 (1 day)</i>	Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings; earliest end of TE mission
<i>By October 15, 2021 (5 days)</i>	Preparation of draft TE report

<i>Between October 16 and November 15^h 2021</i>	Circulation of draft TE report for comments
<i>By November 30 2021 (2 days)</i>	Incorporation of comments on draft TE report into Audit Trail & finalization of TE report
<i>October 15th – December 15th 2021</i>	Preparation and Issuance of Management Response
<i>June 30th 2022</i>	Expected date of full TE completion

7. TE DELIVERABLES

Applicable to both TEs.

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	A & L TE Inception Report	TE team clarifies objectives, methodology and timing of the TE	No later than 2 weeks before the TE mission: <i>June 30th 2021 for the A&L TE; August 31st 2021 for the Production TE.</i>	TE team submits Inception Report to Commissioning Unit and project management
2	Presentation	Initial Findings	End of TE mission: <i>September 15th 2021 for the A&L TE; December 10th 2021 for the Production TE.</i>	TE team presents to Commissioning Unit and project management
3	Draft TE Report	Full draft report (<i>using guidelines on report content in ToR Annex C</i>) with annexes	Within 4 weeks of end of TE mission: <i>October 15th 2021 for the A&L TE; January 7th 2022 for the Production TE.</i>	TE team submits to Commissioning Unit; reviewed by BPPS-GEF RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP
4	Final Paraguay - Focused Report, with comments addressed	Revised Paraguay Focused report and TE Audit Trail in which TE details how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final TR Report (See template TOR Annex H)	By Dec 17 th	TE team submits Paraguay focused report to Commissioning Unit and Project Management
5	Production TE Final Report	Full Draft Report (using guidelines on report content in TOR Annex C) with annexes (NB includes all countries for the Production TE)	Within 6 weeks of receiving comments on draft report: <i>March 30th 2022 for the A&L TE; June 15th 2022 for the Production TE.</i>	TE team submits to Commissioning Unit; reviewed by BPPS-GEF RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP

6	Final TE Report* + Audit Trail	Revised final report and TE Audit trail in which the TE details how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final TE report (See template in ToR Annex H)	Within 6 weeks of receiving comments on draft report: <i>March 30th 2022 for the A&L TE; June 15th 2022 for the Production TE.</i>	TE team submits to Commissioning Unit; reviewed by BPPS-GEF RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP
7	Additional Requests from Project as per Amendment 4	Prepare and deliver a presentation of findings, conclusions and recommendations (A&L + Production TEs) to the GEF, catering for their format preference	30 April 2022	TE team submits to Commissioning Unit; reviewed by BPPS-GEF RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP
		Review 5 impact briefs to ensure no major areas of success are being overlooked (based on the evaluation of both Production and A&L)	30 April 2022	TE team submits to Commissioning Unit; reviewed by BPPS-GEF RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP
		Support GCP comms team to turn the Production TE's executive summary into a comms products, through sharing quotes and other interview materials gathered during the TE mission (in respect of ethical standards)	31 May 2022	TE team submits to Commissioning Unit; reviewed by BPPS-GEF RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP

*All final TE reports will be quality assessed by the UNDP Independent Evaluation Office (IEO). Details of the IEO's quality assessment of decentralized evaluations can be found in Section 6 of the UNDP Evaluation Guidelines.²

8. TE ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing the TEs resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for these projects' TEs is the *United Nations Development Programme Regional Hub for Latin America and the Caribbean (UNDP RH LAC)*.

The Commissioning Unit will contract the company which will conduct the two TEs. The company will be responsible for the travel arrangements of the evaluation team to and within Indonesia, Liberia, and Paraguay. The cost of travel will have to be included into the financial proposal, for which the company will

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

(COVID) TE ToR for GEF-Financed Projects – Standard Template for UNDP Procurement Site – June 2020

receive a lumpsum covering all costs (daily fees, travel, per diem, insurances, etc.). The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the TE team to provide all relevant documents and stakeholder contact details, and support setting-up stakeholder interviews (in person, or remotely) and arranging field visits.

9. TE TEAM COMPOSITION

The TE team will be composed of 3 to 6 members, including one international team leader (ideally with experience evaluating GEF-financed projects in the same or similar focus areas and regions), one international agricultural commodities expert, one to three country specialists (typically national consultants capable of providing insights into the local context and knowledge) to support the Production project related in-country missions in Liberia, Indonesia and Paraguay, depending if the Team leader and the International Agricultural Commodities Expert are country specialists as well. If needed, a 4th evaluation expert could support with the evaluation of the A&L project. The TE team members 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 team leader shall be responsible for coordinating activities with the rest of the TE team (the agricultural commodities expert, the national evaluation expert/s, and eventually the 4th evaluation expert for A&L), the overall evaluation design and writing of the TE reports and to ensure quality of the final report submitted to UNDP.

The evaluation experts, in close collaboration with the agricultural commodities expert – and under the overall leadership of the team leader, will assess emerging trends with respect to regulatory frameworks, budget allocations, capacity building and work with the Project Team in developing the TE itinerary.

To the extent possible, considering the evolution of the COVID-19 pandemic in and beyond the project countries, we anticipate the following composition and length of field missions for the Production TE:

- Indonesia – team leader, agricultural commodities expert, local evaluation expert; 15 days including at least 9 days in the landscapes (3 in each landscape).
- Liberia: team leader, agricultural commodities expert, local evaluation expert; 5 days including at least 2 days in the landscape.
- Paraguay: team leader, agricultural commodities expert, local evaluation expert; 7 days including at least 3 days in the landscape.

Organization Experience:

- At least 3 years of experience in conducting international development projects reviews and/or evaluations;
- Experience conducting evaluations of GEF-financed projects (at least 3 years/evaluations will be considered as an asset);

- At least 5 years of experience working in agriculture, agricultural commodities, deforestation, sustainable forest management, ecosystems and biodiversity, climate change mitigation, and/or multi-focal area projects;
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- Experience working in Latin America, West or Central Africa, and Asia;
- Firm that can mobilize a team of highly qualified experts with the profile described below;
- Experience working with the United Nations system will be considered an asset.

Key Personnel Experience:

1. Team leader

- A Master's degree in international affairs, agriculture, forestry, environmental studies, natural sciences, social sciences, or other closely related field;
- At least 10 years of experience in project design, monitoring and/or evaluation in sustainable development;
- Experience leading remote evaluations will be considered an asset;
- Experience in adaptive management, as applied to agriculture, sustainable forest management, ecosystems and biodiversity, climate change mitigation, gender and agriculture or multi-focal area projects and demonstrated understanding of these issues;
- Experience working with the GEF and/or the evaluation of GEF-financed projects;
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and agriculture, commodities, value chains, deforestation, or climate change mitigation; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis;
- Excellent report writing and analytical skills;
- Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset;
- Experience working in Latin America, West or Central Africa, and/or Asia will be considered an asset;
- Mastery of Bahasa Indonesia and/or Spanish will be considered an asset.
- **Mandatory requirement: Mastery of the English language.**

2. International Agricultural Commodities Expert

- A Master's degree in business administration, international affairs, agriculture, forestry, environmental studies, natural sciences, social sciences, or other closely related field;
- At least 5 years of experience working on sustainable agricultural commodities;

- Experience working on palm oil and/or beef will be considered an asset;
- At least 2 years of experience supporting project evaluations;
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and agriculture, commodities, value chains, deforestation, or climate change mitigation; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis;
- Experience working in Latin America, West or Central Africa, and/or Asia;
- Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset.
- Experience working with GEF-financed projects will be considered an asset;
- Mastery of Bahasa Indonesia and/or Spanish will be considered an asset.
- **Mandatory requirement: Mastery of the English language.**

3. **Evaluation Experts (Indonesia, Liberia, Paraguay)**

- A Bachelor's degree in international affairs, agriculture, forestry, environmental studies, natural sciences, social sciences, or other closely related field;
- At least 2 years of experience in project design, monitoring and/or evaluation; At least 2 years of experience working in the agricultural commodities sector of relevance to the country (palm oil for Indonesia and Liberia, beef for Paraguay) and excellent understanding of the local context especially related to commodities production and deforestation;
- Experience working with GEF-financed projects will be considered an asset;
- Experience of engaging with the private sector, government and civil society;
- **Mandatory requirement: Mastery of the English and relevant national languages (Bahasa Indonesia for Indonesia national evaluation expert, Spanish for Paraguay national evaluation expert).**

4. **(Optional) Evaluation Expert (A&L)**

- A Master's degree in international affairs, agriculture, forestry, environmental studies, natural sciences, social sciences, or other closely related field;
- At least 5 years of experience in project design, monitoring and/or evaluation in sustainable development, with at least 2 years of experience leading or supporting terminal evaluations;
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to coordination, partnerships, knowledge management and learning;
- Experience working with GEF-financed projects will be considered an asset;
- **Mandatory requirement: Mastery of the English language.**

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. These evaluations will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation' (Annex E). The evaluators 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 evaluators must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluations 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 evaluations and not for other uses without the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

11. PAYMENT SCHEDULE – revised under Amendment 2 and 4

#	Deliverables	Original Contract Price (Lump Sum, All Inclusive)	Amendment 2 Price (Lump Sum, All Inclusive)	Amendment 4 (Lump Sum, All Inclusive)	Total Price (Lump Sum, All Inclusive)
1	A&L TE Inception Report	8,305.84			8,305.84
2	Production TE Inception Report	8,305.84			8,305.84
3	A&L TE Draft Final Report	12,458.76			12,458.76
4	Production TE Draft Final Report (includes presentations of findings and anticipated delivery of Paraguay-focused report by Dec 17 th 2021)	20,764.60	3,888.00		24,652.60
5	A&L TE Final Report	12,458.76			12,458.76
6	Production TE Final Report	20,764.60			20,764.60

7	<p>Additional Project Requests:</p> <p>Prepare and deliver a presentation of findings, conclusions and recommendations (A&L + Production TEs) to the GEF, catering for their format preference – 30 April 2022</p> <p>Review 5 impact briefs to ensure no major areas of success are being overlooked (based on the evaluation of both Production and A&L) – 30 April 2022</p> <p>Support GCP comms team to turn the Production TE's executive summary into a comms products, through sharing quotes and other interview materials gathered during the TE mission (in respect of ethical standards) - 31 May 2022</p>			3,888.00	
	Total	83,058.40	3,888.00	3,888.00	90,834.40

Criteria for issuing the final payments of 15% for the A&L TE and 30% for the Production TE³:

- 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 final TE report must be in English. If applicable, the Commissioning Unit may then choose to arrange for a translation of the report into a language more widely shared by national stakeholders.
- The Audit Trail includes responses to and justification for each comment listed.

³ The Commissioning Unit is obligated to issue payments to the TE team as soon as the terms under the ToR are fulfilled. If there is an ongoing discussion regarding the quality and completeness of the final deliverables that cannot be resolved between the Commissioning Unit and the TE team, the Regional M&E Advisor and Vertical Fund Directorate will be consulted. If needed, the Commissioning Unit's senior management, Procurement Services Unit and Legal Support Office will be notified as well so that a decision can be made about whether or not to withhold payment of any amounts that may be due to the evaluator(s), suspend or terminate the contract and/or remove the individual contractor from any applicable rosters.

(COVID) TE ToR for GEF-Financed Projects – Standard Template for UNDP Procurement Site – June 2020

In line with the UNDP's financial regulations, when determined by the Commissioning Unit and/or the consultant that a deliverable or service cannot be satisfactorily completed due to the impact of COVID-19 and limitations to the TE, that deliverable or service will not be paid.

Due to the current COVID-19 situation and its implications, a partial payment may be considered if the consultant invested time towards the deliverable but was unable to complete to circumstances beyond his/her control.

12. APPLICATION PROCESS⁴

The technical proposal should include the following:

- a) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the template⁵ provided by UNDP;
- b) **Composition of the team and summary of key personnel competences with CV**
- 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) Implementation timelines
- e) Subcontracting and Partnership (if any)
- f) One or two samples demonstrating the Team Leader's report writing skills

Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

13.TOR ANNEXES

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

This ToR is approved by:



Pascale Bonzom , GGP Global Project Manager

⁴ Engagement of evaluators should be done in line with guidelines for hiring consultants in the POPP
<https://popp.undp.org/SitePages/POPPRoot.aspx>

⁵<https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/psa/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx>

(COVID) TE ToR for GEF-Financed Projects – Standard Template for UNDP Procurement Site – June 2020

ToR Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework

Production

	Objective and Outcome Indicators	Baseline ⁶	Mid-term Target ⁷	End of Project Target
Project Objective: Encourage sustainable practices for oil palm and beef production while conserving forests and safeguarding the rights of smallholder farmers and forest-dependent communities	Objective 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.	One national green commodity platform (in Indonesia). [Baseline was corrected to remove erroneous reference to Paraguay national green commodity platform that will be established under a different project].	At least 40 private sector, civil society, and donor organizations newly connected and engaged in broad-based dialogue under national and sub-national platforms	At least 60 private sector, civil society, and donor organizations newly connected and engaged in broad-based dialogue under national and sub-national platforms
	Objective Indicator 2: Number of direct project beneficiaries among groups including smallholder farmers and forest-dependent communities	NA	At least 2,500 households benefitting	At least 6,000 households benefitting
	Objective Indicator 3: Area of high conservation value forest (HCVF), or equivalent, identified and set aside within commodity production landscapes for conservation of globally significant biodiversity and associated ecosystem goods and services	<10% of total HCVF within the landscapes is set aside	At least 25% of total HCVF is set aside	At least 50% of HCVF is set aside

⁶ Baseline, mid-term and end of project target levels must be expressed in the same neutral unit of analysis as the corresponding indicator. Baseline is the current/original status or condition and need to be quantified. The baseline must be established before the project document is submitted to the GEF for final approval. The baseline values will be used to measure the success of the project through implementation monitoring and evaluation.

⁷ Target is the change in the baseline value that will be achieved by the mid-term review and then again by the terminal evaluation.

	Objective and Outcome Indicators	Baseline ⁶	Mid-term Target ⁷	End of Project Target
Component 1 Dialogue and public private partnerships; production policies and enforcement	Outcome 1.1 Responsible Governmental authorities, along with private sector & civil society organizations, build consensus and reduce conflict related to target commodity production and growth at national and sub-national levels			
	Outcome Indicator 1.1.1 Number of national and sub-national commodity platforms, and number of district district/target landscape forums established and fully operational	Baseline 1.1.1 1 national commodity platform (Indonesia = INPOP), 1 sub-national commodity platform (Indonesia = JSSPO)	Mid-term Target 1.1.1 2 national commodity platforms; 4 sub-national platforms; and up to 4 district/target landscape forums. [Baseline was corrected to remove erroneous reference to Paraguay national green commodity platform that will be established under a different project. The mid-term target has been corrected to remove reference to same].	End of Project Target 1.1.1 2 national commodity platforms; 4 sub-national platforms; and up to 4 district/target landscape forums. [Baseline was corrected to remove erroneous reference to Paraguay national green commodity platform that will be established under a different project. The mid-term target has been corrected to remove reference to same].
	Outcome 1.2 Practical alignment and implementation of public and private investments and other actions related to target commodities			
	Outcome Indicator 1.2.1 Number of national and sub-national Commodity Action Plans finalized	Baseline 1.2.1 0 national and sub-national Commodity	Mid-term Target 1.2.1	End of Project Target 1.2.1 2 national-level and 4 sub-national level action plans

	Objective and Outcome Indicators	Baseline ⁶	Mid-term Target ⁷	End of Project Target
	and adopted by national and sub-national governments	Action Plans finalized and adopted	1 national level action plan finalized, adopted and under implementation	finalized, adopted and under implementation
	<p>Outcome 1.3 Improved national and sub-national policies, regulations and programmes related to commodity production practices in three target countries</p> <p>Outcome Indicator 1.3.1</p> <p>Number of priority policies and regulations drafted and proposed that address systemic barriers to government oversight of and support for sustainable, reduced-deforestation commodity production practices, with priorities identified in Table 7 of the CEO Endorsement request as well as through national and sub-national commodity platforms and project global support services.</p>	<p>Baseline 1.3.1</p> <p>0 policy and regulatory priorities realized</p>	<p>Mid-term Target 1.3.1</p> <p>3 policy and regulatory priorities drafted and proposed</p>	<p>End of Project Target 1.3.1</p> <p>5 policy and regulatory priorities drafted and proposed</p>
	Outcome 1.4 Improved national and sub-national policies, regulations and programmes related to land use			

	Objective and Outcome Indicators	Baseline ⁶	Mid-term Target ⁷	End of Project Target
	allocations for commodity production and set asides in three target countries			
	Outcome Indicator 1.4.1 Number of new or revised national and sub-national policies, regulations, and programmes drafted, proposed, and adopted that are related to land use allocation for commodity production	Baseline 1.4.1 0 policies, regulations and programmes	Mid-term Target 1.4.1 3 national or sub-national policies, regulations or programmes drafted, proposed, and adopted	End of Project Target 1.4.1 4 national or sub-national policies, regulations or programmes drafted, proposed, and adopted
	Outcome Indicator 1.4.2 Number of new or revised national and sub-national policies, regulations, and programmes established or endorsed that increase protection for and conservation of HCV and HCS areas	Baseline 1.4.2 0 national and sub-national policies, regulations and programmes	Mid-term Target 1.4.2 3 national and sub-national policies, regulations or programmes drafted, proposed, and adopted	End of Project Target 1.4.2 5 national and sub-national policies, regulations or programmes drafted, proposed, and adopted
	Outcome 1.5 Improved monitoring of land use change in three target countries and particularly within target landscapes			
	Outcome Indicator 1.5.1	Baseline 1.5.1	Mid-term Target 1.5.1	End of Project Target 1.5.1

	Objective and Outcome Indicators	Baseline ⁶	Mid-term Target ⁷	End of Project Target
	Improved land-use change monitoring systems in target landscapes, as measured by the number of land-use change reports on target landscapes published and disseminated in the countries.	0 reports (No monitoring system is in place)	0 reports (Improved land-use change monitoring system is in place)	10 reports (6 in Indonesia, 2 in Liberia, 2 in Paraguay)
Component 2 Farmer support systems and agri-inputs	Outcome 2.1 Improved national and sub-national systems for supporting sustainable, reduced deforestation commodity production and intensification			
	Outcome Indicator 2.1.1 Existence of national and sub-national farmer support strategies emphasizing: (i) reduced deforestation, (ii) sustainable intensification, (iii) biodiversity conservation and (iv) elimination of gender gap in agricultural productivity	Baseline 2.1.1 No farmer support strategies exist	Mid-term Target 2.1.1 2 national and 1 sub-national strategies under preparation	End of Project Target 2.1.1 2 national and 1 sub-national strategies adopted
	Outcome 2.2: Effective approaches to smallholder support (via public private partnerships) have been demonstrated			
	Outcome Indicator 2.2.1			

	Objective and Outcome Indicators	Baseline ⁶	Mid-term Target ⁷	End of Project Target
	Number of smallholder farmers trained in, and employing sustainable agricultural practices	Baseline 2.2.1 0 farmers trained	Mid-term Target 2.2.1 2,500 farmers trained, with at least 25% employing sustainable agricultural practices	End of Project Target 2.2.1 6,000 farmers trained, with at least 25% employing sustainable agricultural practices
Component 3: Land use plans and maps in targeted landscapes	Outcome 3.1 Improved land use planning / zoning helps to shift targeting and conversion to commodity production from high biodiversity value, high carbon stock, ecosystem service-rich forested areas to degraded or otherwise appropriate lands Outcome Indicator 3.1.1 Number of hectares of HCV and HCS forest areas in commodity-producing landscapes protected through zoning, or similar legal protections	Baseline 3.1.1 0 ha of HCVF and HCS covered	Mid-term Target 3.1.1 230,000 ha of HCVF and HCS covered	End of Project Target 3.1.1 925,000 ha of HCVF and HCS covered
	Outcome 3.2 Enhanced land use set aside and protection strategies, including gazettement, of HCV and HCS forest areas within commodity-producing landscapes, reduces deforestation, avoids 59.3 million tons of CO2e emissions Outcome Indicator 3.2.1 Tons CO2e emissions avoided due to			

	Objective and Outcome Indicators	Baseline ⁶	Mid-term Target ⁷	End of Project Target
	gazettement and other related land use and protection strategies	Baseline 3.2.1 0 additional tons Co2e emissions avoided	Mid-term Target 3.2.1 6 million tons Co2e emissions projected to be avoided based on actions to date	End of Project Target 3.2.1 59.3 ⁸ million tons CO2e emissions avoided (lifetime direct and indirect)
Component 4: Knowledge management.	<p>Outcome 4.1 Increased knowledge of effective strategies and tools for improving production of commodities in ways that do not involve conversion of forested land</p> <p>Outcome Indicator 4.1.1 Level of technical understanding of landscape-level dynamics of change towards reduced-deforestation commodity production in each target landscape, as measured by the number of reports generated from the application of a landscape assessment tool that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Assesses the political, economic, social, and environmental drivers of deforestation related to commodity production and expansion; ii. Scores and compares the enabling environment readiness 	Baseline 4.1.1 0 (No tool exists)	Mid-term Target 4.1.1 5 (Tool has been developed, and baseline assessments completed in each target landscape)	End of Project Target 4.1.1 10 (End-of-project assessment for each target landscape completed, in addition to the baseline assessments)

⁸ End of project target revised from 65.6 million tons CO2e based on the intensive recalculation process undertaken by the target countries in October 2017, and approved by the GEF Secretariat in November 2017.

	Objective and Outcome Indicators	Baseline ⁶	Mid-term Target ⁷	End of Project Target
	towards deforestation-free commodity production of multiple landscapes within the Production child project; and iii. Evaluates the effectiveness of interventions targeting the drivers of deforestation with a landscape.			
	<p>Outcome 4.2 Uptake, adaptation and replication of demonstrated lessons and knowledge</p> <p>Outcome Indicator 4.2.1 Documented examples of specific lessons shared via Community of Practice being applied in other sub-national and national situations</p>	<p>Baseline 4.2.1 0 examples</p>	<p>Mid-term Target 4.2.1 3 examples applied</p>	<p>End of Project Target 4.2.1 7 examples applied</p>

A&L

	Objective and Outcome Indicators	Baseline ⁹	Mid-term Target ¹⁰	End of Project Target
Project Objective: Effectively leverage demand, transactions and support to production to ensure successful implementation of the Commodities GGP program.	Objective Indicator 1: Connectivity between finance, demand, and production sector stakeholders for soy, beef and oil palm in the 4 GGP target countries, as measured by the number of partnerships between producers, buyers and finance providers, fostering sustainable commodity supply chains.	There is currently inadequate coordination and integration of supply chain stakeholders in the public and private sectors in the 4 GGP target countries to influence demand, financial transactions and production to reduce impacts on tropical forests from soy, beef and palm.	1 partnership	At least 1 partnership per country (total of at least 4 partnerships)

⁹ Baseline, mid-term and end of project target levels must be expressed in the same neutral unit of analysis as the corresponding indicator. Baseline is the current/original status or condition and need to be quantified. The baseline must be established before the project document is submitted to the GEF for final approval. The baseline values will be used to measure the success of the project through implementation monitoring and evaluation.

¹⁰ Target is the change in the baseline value that will be achieved by the mid-term review and then again by the terminal evaluation.

	<p>Objective Indicator 2: Level of engagement of GGP with global commodity initiatives, key partners, as well as with practitioners and producers from the GGP target countries (Indonesia, Liberia, Paraguay, Brazil), as measured by:</p> <p>a) quarterly engagement between the GGP and other global and national initiatives, key partners and country practitioners, through the global community of practice.</p> <p>b) global community of practice event.</p> <p>c) recognition from representatives of major global initiatives of the value of GGP and its learnings, as measured by satisfaction reported after the global community of practice events.</p>	No broad mechanism in place to coordinate engagement of GGP with other global initiatives, key partners and country practitioners in GGP target countries.	<p>a) 4 quarters with at least one engagement</p> <p>b) 1 global community of practice event</p> <p>c) 50% satisfaction</p>	<p>a) 12 quarters with at least one engagement</p> <p>b) 2 global community of practice events</p> <p>c) 60% satisfaction</p>
	<p>Objective Indicator 3: Learning on gender mainstreaming through the GGP Program as it relates to commodity supply chain actions (as measured by # of project documents, publications, training materials and presentations that include a discussion of gender issues).</p>	0	4 pieces of learning on gender	6 pieces of learning on gender

Component/Outcome 1: Coordinated management of the Commodities Integrated Approach Pilot leading to logical technical sequencing of activities, Program-level monitoring and evaluation and overall resilience.	Outcome Indicator 1.1: Level of logical technical sequencing of key interventions and milestones across individual child projects, as measured by the number of monthly GGP Secretariat calls and annual national level intervention plans to achieve expected Program goals and their effective implementation.	Without the Adaptive Management & Learning project, the workplans would not have connectivity between each other.	20 monthly GGP Secretariat calls, 6 national and 2 global level inter-agency intervention plans, approved by the child project agency leads, showing support provided by global projects and evidence of cross fertilization among child projects.	40 monthly GGP Secretariat calls, 12 national and 4 global level inter-agency intervention plans, approved by the child project agency leads, showing support provided by global projects and evidence of cross fertilization among child projects.
	Outcome Indicator 1.2: Effectiveness of adaptive management within the GGP as measured by the number of successful adaptive management practices that address bottlenecks in implementation or in attainment of Program goals.	N/A because GGP not yet under implementation.	At least 2 adaptive management practices implemented per year.	At least 2 adaptive management practices implemented per year.

Component/Outcome 2: Increased understanding of the impacts of voluntary sustainability standards (VSS) and VSS-like mechanisms on deforestation, biodiversity habitat, and other social and environmental outcomes across different geographies and contexts, to promote adaptive management and to increase the effectiveness of these mechanisms. (WWF Managed Component)	Outcome Indicator 2.1: Establishment and effective functioning of the Global Impact Platform.	A Global Impacts platform does not exist.	Platform prototype technology infrastructure is in place and ready for testing, with 100 documents or abstracts uploaded.	Platform is a leading repository of research documents, with 150 documents or abstracts uploaded and 5000 annual visitors.
	Outcome Indicator 2.2: Number of new syntheses and summaries of evidence uploaded to the Platform and associated audience-specific communications created and disseminated.	0	4	12

Component/Outcome 3: Knowledge management, partnership development and communications implemented to maximize learning, foster synergies and promote replication and upscaling of actions to address deforestation in commodity supply chains.	Outcome Indicator 3.1: Number of knowledge products on GGP to share GGP insights and learnings.	0	At least one information brief on a topic such as gender and resilience. Articles on media partner websites, including 12 pieces of independent editorial and 4 pieces of co-created content.	At least 1 detailed publication to assess the impacts of demand and transactions on sustainable production (and vice versa), as well as 2 information briefs on issues including gender and resilience.
	Outcome Indicator 3.2: Percentage of participants of Community of Practice events that have changed their programs, practices and/or policies based on GGP learning (as measured by a survey of participants of each of the two face-to-face CoP global events).	0	At least 25%	At least 60%

	Outcome Indicator 3.3: Number of active partners with which the GGP is engaged at a programmatic level (through two-way sharing of information, expertise or tools; collaboration to increase impacts; implementation of delivery services, or provision of co-financing).	0	Maintenance of active engagement with at least 3 key partners, such as bilateral donors, NGOs, platforms, fora, and other organizations.	Maintenance of active engagement with at least 6 key partners, such as bilateral donors, NGOs, platforms, fora and other organizations
--	---	---	--	--

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
6	Project Inception Report
7	Mid-Term Review report and management response to MTR recommendations
8	All Project Implementation Reports (PIRs)
9	Progress reports (quarterly, semi-annual or annual, with associated workplans and financial reports)
10	Oversight mission reports
11	Minutes of Project Board Meetings and of other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
12	GEF Tracking Tools (from CEO Endorsement)
13	GEF Core Indicators (from midterm and terminal stages)
14	Financial data, including actual expenditures by project outcome, including management costs, and including documentation of any significant budget revisions
15	Co-financing data with expected and actual contributions broken down by type of co-financing, source, and whether the contribution is considered as investment mobilized or recurring expenditures
16	Audit reports
17	Electronic copies of project outputs (booklets, manuals, technical reports, articles, etc.)
18	Sample of project communications materials
19	Summary list of formal meetings, workshops, etc. held, with date, location, topic, and number of participants
20	Relevant socio-economic monitoring data
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) for each country
25	List/map of project sites, highlighting suggested visits
26	List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Board members, RTA, Project Team members, and other partners to be consulted
27	Project deliverables that provide documentary evidence of achievement towards project outcomes
	<i>Any other additional documents, as relevant</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 (12-14 pages)

(in addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (*) must be given a rating¹¹)

 - 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

¹¹ See ToR Annex F for rating scales.

- 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

4.2 Project Results

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

5. Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons (4-6 pages)

- 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 Core Indicators

ToR Annex D: Evaluation Criteria Matrix

The questions and approaches in the evaluation matrix below are for reference, and will need to be adapted and expanded by the evaluators, and in agreement with the commissioning unit, once the TE team is on board.

The TE team shall also extend the scope of the below matrix to cover all criteria being assessed as per the ['Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects'](#): Monitoring & Evaluation, UNDP oversight/implementation, Implementing Partner Execution, cross-cutting issues, etc.

Production

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Evaluative Criteria Sub-questions	Project Indicators	Sources of Info.	Methodology
Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF Focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national level?				
Was the project intervention aligned with the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national level in the three target countries?	Did the project adapt throughout implementation to the evolving priorities and agenda at the local, regional and national level in the three target countries? To what extent?		Project documentation; GEF-6 programming directions; national policies and/or strategies; UNDP CPD; UNDAF/UNSDCF; relevant stakeholders.	Desk review; key informant interviews (KIIs).
	How were such priorities impacted by the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic? Was the project successful in adapting to the emerging priorities and operational context?			
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?				
Did responsible government authorities, along		# of private sector, civil society, and donor organizations newly connected and engaged in	Project documentation; relevant stakeholders.	Desk review; KIIs and Focus Group Discussions

with private sector & civil society organizations, build consensus and reduce conflict related to target commodity production and growth at national and sub-national levels, due to UNDP's intervention?		<p>broad-based dialogue under national and sub-national platforms</p> <p># of national and sub-national commodity platforms, and number of district/target landscape forums established and fully operational</p>		(FGDs) with relevant stakeholders.
Was practical alignment achieved among the above stakeholders, with following implementation of public and private investments and other actions related to target commodities?	Are the different stakeholders satisfied with the practical alignment achieved and formalized through national and/or subnational action plans?	# of national and sub-national Commodity Action Plans finalized and adopted by national and sub-national governments	National policies and/or strategies; project documentation; relevant stakeholders.	Desk review; KIIs and FGDs.
	To what extent all different stakeholders feel that their interests were taken into consideration in the development of national or subnational action plans?			
	To what extent did national and/or subnational action plans lead to concrete actions related to the improved sustainability of target commodity/ies production?			
Did national and subnational policies, regulations, and programmes related to commodity		# of priority policies and regulations drafted and proposed that address systemic barriers to government oversight of and support for	National policies and/or strategies; project documentation; relevant stakeholders.	Desk review; KIIs (and FGDs if relevant).

production practices improve due to UNDP's intervention in the three target countries? To what extent?		sustainable, reduced-deforestation commodity production practices, with priorities identified in Table 7 of the CEO Endorsement request as well as through national and sub-national commodity platforms and project global support services.		
Did national and subnational policies, regulations and programmes related to land use allocations for commodity production and set asides improve due to UNDP's intervention in the three target countries? To what extent?	Have these new policies, regulations and programmes already led to concrete and demonstrable changes related to land use allocation in the three target countries?	<p># of new or revised national and sub-national policies, regulations and programmes drafted, proposed, and adopted that are related to land use allocation for commodity production</p> <p># of national and sub-national policies, regulations and programmes established or endorsed that increase protection for and conservation of HCV and HCS areas.</p> <p>Area of high conservation value forest (HCVF), or equivalent, identified and set aside within commodity production landscapes for conservation of globally significant biodiversity and associated ecosystem goods and services (%)</p>	National policies and/or strategies; project documentation; relevant stakeholders.	Desk review; KIIs (and FGDs if relevant).
Has monitoring of land use change improved in the three target countries, and		Improved land-use change monitoring systems in target landscapes, as measured by the # of land-use change reports on	Land-use change reports; project documentation; relevant stakeholders.	Desk review; KIIs (and FGDs if relevant).

particularly within the target landscapes, due to UNDP's intervention? To what extent?		target landscapes published and disseminated in the countries		
Have national and subnational systems for supporting sustainable, reduced deforestation commodity production and intensification improved due to UNDP's intervention? To what extent?	Have the improved system already yielded any results in terms of capacities to support sustainable commodity production and intensification?	Existence of national and sub-national farmer support strategies emphasizing: (i) reduced deforestation, (ii) sustainable intensification, (iii) biodiversity conservation and (iv) elimination of gender gap in agricultural productivity	National policies and/or strategies; project documentation; relevant stakeholders.	Desk review; KIIs (and FGDs if relevant).
Have effective approaches to smallholder support been demonstrated (via public-private partnership) through UNDP's intervention?	Were the selected approaches indeed effective? What should be changed/amended?	# of smallholder farmers trained in, and employing sustainable agricultural practices	Project documentation (including training content and monitoring reports); relevant stakeholders.	Desk review; Observation; KIIs (and FGDs if relevant).
	Are smallholders satisfied by the level of support received through UNDP's intervention?			
Did UNDP's intervention contribute to generate knowledge of effective strategies and tools for improving production of commodities in ways that do not involve conversion of forested land?	To what extent is the new knowledge generated providing valuable insights for future project interventions?	Level of technical understanding of landscape-level dynamics of change towards reduced-deforestation commodity production in each target landscape, as measured by the # of reports generated from the application of a landscape assessment tool that: i. Assesses the political, economic, social, and environmental drivers of deforestation related to	Project documentation; relevant stakeholders.	Desk review, KIIs.
	Are these insights generalizable beyond the project's intervention areas? To what extent?			

		commodity production and expansion; ii. Scores and compares the enabling environment readiness towards deforestation-free commodity production of multiple landscapes within the Production child project; and iii. Evaluates the effectiveness of interventions targeting the drivers of deforestation with a landscape.		
Was the project successful in promoting uptake, adaptation, and replication of demonstrated lessons and knowledge within and beyond the targeted landscapes? To what extent?		# of documented examples of specific lessons shared via Community of Practice being applied in other sub-national and national situations	Project documentation; relevant stakeholders.	Desk review; KIIs.
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in line with international and national norms and standards?				
Was the project implemented efficiently, in line with international and national norms and standards?	Do the outcomes of the program represent value for money? To what extent is the relationship between inputs and outputs timely, cost-effective and to expected standards?		Project documentation; relevant stakeholders; any external sources as relevant.	Desk review; KIIs (and FGDs if relevant).
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-political, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?				

To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-political, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			Project documentation; relevant stakeholders; any external sources as relevant.	Desk review; KIIs (and FGDs if relevant).
Gender equality and women's empowerment: How did the project contribute to gender equality and women's empowerment?				
Was a gender approach mainstreamed through all relevant project activities in a qualitative way? To what extent?			Project documentation; relevant stakeholders.	Desk review; KIIs (and FGDs if relevant).
Did the project contribute to advancing gender equality and women's empowerment within its sphere of possibilities?			Project documentation; relevant stakeholders.	Desk review; KIIs (and FGDs if relevant).
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?				
Has improved land use planning/zoning helped to shift targeting and conversion of high biodiversity value/ high carbon stock/ ecosystem service-rich forested areas to degraded lands due to commodity		# of hectares of HCV and HCS forest areas in commodity-producing landscapes protected through zoning, or similar legal protections	Project documentation; relevant stakeholders.	Desk review; Observation; KIIs (and FGDs if relevant).

production? To what extent?				
Did reduced deforestation due to enhanced land use set aside and protection strategies (including gazettelement) lead to the avoidance of 59.3 million tons of CO2e emissions? In which timeframe?		# of tons CO2e emissions avoided due to gazettelement and other related land use and protection strategies	Project documentation; relevant stakeholders.	Desk review; KIIs.
<p><i>The TE team shall also extend the scope of the below matrix to cover all criteria being assessed as per the 'Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects': Monitoring & Evaluation, UNDP oversight/implementation, Implementing Partner Execution, cross-cutting issues, etc.</i></p>				

A&L

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Evaluative Criteria Sub-questions	Project Indicators	Sources of Info.	Methodology
Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF Focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national level?				
To what extent did the project provide added value to the implementation of the other GGP child projects? How does this compare with what expected at project design phase?	Was the project successful in adapting its integrator role to the evolving and emerging needs of the GGP programme throughout implementation? To what extent?	Project documentation; relevant stakeholders.	Project documentation; relevant stakeholders.	Desk review; KIIs (and FGDs if relevant).
	Was the project successful in adapting to the emerging priorities and operational context resulting from the			

	outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic?			
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?				
Has the project been successful in delivering coordinated management of the Commodities Integrated Approach Pilot – leading to logical technical sequencing of activities, Program-level monitoring and evaluation and overall resilience? To what extent?		<p>Level of logical technical sequencing of key interventions and milestones across individual child projects, as measured by the # of monthly GGP Secretariat calls and annual national level intervention plans to achieve expected Program goals and their effective implementation.</p> <p>Effectiveness of adaptive management within the GGP as measured by the # of successful adaptive management practices that address bottlenecks in implementation or in attainment of Program goals.</p>	Project documentation; relevant stakeholders.	Desk review; KIIs (and FGDs if relevant).
Has the project intervention led to increased understanding of the impacts of voluntary sustainability standards (VSS) and VSS-like mechanisms on deforestation, biodiversity habitat, and other social and environmental outcomes across different geographies and contexts, to		<p>Establishment and effective functioning of the Global Impact Platform (as measured by the # of documents or abstracts uploaded and # of annual visitors)</p> <p>Number of new syntheses and summaries of evidence uploaded to the Platform and associated audience-specific communications created and disseminated.</p>	Project documentation; relevant stakeholders.	Desk review; KIIs (and FGDs if relevant).

<p>promote adaptive management and to increase the effectiveness of these mechanisms? To what extent?</p> <p>(WWF Managed Component)</p>				
<p>Has the project implementation of the knowledge management, partnership development and communications functions maximized learning, fostered synergies and promoted replication and upscaling of actions to address deforestation in commodity supply chains?</p>		<p>Number of knowledge products on GGP to share GGP insights and learnings</p> <p>Percentage of participants of Community of Practice events that have changed their programs, practices and/or policies based on GGP learning (as measured by a survey of participants of each of the two face-to-face CoP global events).</p> <p>Number of active partners with which the GGP is engaged at a programmatic level (through two-way sharing of information, expertise or tools; collaboration to increase impacts; implementation of delivery services, or provision of co-financing).</p>	<p>Project documentation; relevant stakeholders.</p>	<p>Desk review; KIIs (and FGDs if relevant).</p>
<p>Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in line with international and national norms and standards?</p>				

Was the project implemented efficiently, in line with international and national norms and standards?	Do the outcomes of the program represent value for money? To what extent is the relationship between inputs and outputs timely, cost-effective and to expected standards?		Project documentation; relevant stakeholders; any external sources as relevant.	Desk review; KIIs (and FGDs if relevant).
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-political, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?				
To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-political, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			Project documentation; relevant stakeholders; any external sources as relevant.	Desk review; KIIs (and FGDs if relevant).
Gender equality and women's empowerment: How did the project contribute to gender equality and women's empowerment?				
Did the project contribute to advancing gender equality and women's empowerment? To what extent?		Learning on gender mainstreaming through the GGP Program as it relates to commodity supply chain actions (as measured by # of project documents, publications, training materials and presentations that include a discussion of gender issues).	Project documentation; relevant stakeholders.	Desk review; KIIs (and FGDs if relevant).
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?				
Was the project successful in effectively leveraging demand, transactions		Connectivity between finance, demand, and production sector stakeholders for soy, beef and oil palm in the 4 GGP target	Project documentation; relevant stakeholders; any external sources as relevant.	Desk review; KIIs (and FGDs if relevant).

and support to production to ensure successful implementation of the Commodities GGP program?		<p>countries, as measured by the # of partnerships between producers, buyers and finance providers, fostering sustainable commodity supply chains.</p> <p>Level of engagement of GGP with global commodity initiatives, key partners, as well as with practitioners and producers from the GGP target countries (Indonesia, Liberia, Paraguay, Brazil), as measured by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) quarterly engagement between the GGP and other global and national initiatives, key partners and country practitioners, through the global community of practice. b) global community of practice event. c) recognition from representatives of major global initiatives of the value of GGP and its learnings, as measured by satisfaction reported after the global community of practice events. 		
<p>The TE team shall also extend the scope of the below matrix to cover all criteria being assessed as per the ‘Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects’: Monitoring & Evaluation, UNDP oversight/implementation, Implementing Partner Execution, cross-cutting issues, etc.</p>				

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 limitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.
8. Must ensure that independence of judgement is maintained, and that evaluation findings and recommendations are independently presented.
9. Must confirm that they have not been involved in designing, executing or advising on the project being evaluated and did not carry out the project's Mid-Term Review.

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

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

Name of Evaluator: _____

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____

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

Signed at _____ (Place) on _____ (Date)

Signature: _____

ToR Annex F: TE Rating Scales

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

ToR Annex G: TE Report Clearance Form

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

ToR Annex H: TE Audit Trail

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

To the comments received on (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