**INDIVIDUAL PROCUREMENT NOTICE** 

Date: 1 April 2021

**Country:** Cairo, Egypt

**Description of the assignment:** UNDP-GEF Mid-Term Evaluation / International Consultant for Egypt for (PIMS #4590)

**Project name:** Mainstreaming the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity into the tourism development and operations in threatened ecosystems in Egypt

**Assignment:** Mid-Term Evaluation (MTR)

**Duty station:** Home based

**Period of assignment/services (if applicable):** 22 working days

Proposal should be submitted at the following email address to:[Procurementnotice.egypt@undp.org](mailto:Procurementnotice.egypt@undp.org) no later than **April 20, 2021**.

Any request for clarification must be sent in writing, or by standard electronic communication to the address or e-mail indicated above. The procurement unit will respond in writing or by standard electronic mail and will send written copies of the response, including an explanation of the query without identifying the source of inquiry, to all consultants.

**1. BACKGROUND**

This 4-year project is designed to mainstream biodiversity into the Egyptian tourism sector and government. It comes at a critical time in Egypt’s recent history with the political changes that are currently underway to make government institutions more accountable and to develop the economy, both of which are resulting in considerable changes in the way that both tourism and biodiversity resources may be managed in the future. Therefore, the project will work on two levels: The first level will engage directly with the industry and government to fill gaps in the existing planning and regulatory framework, namely a Strategic Environmental Assessment to identify key areas, habitats and ecological processes and assess their vulnerability and guidelines for the existing EIA regulations specific to biodiversity and linked to an offsetting mechanism and developing a monitoring programme to track the impacts of tourism on biodiversity for conservation management purposes. The second level will engage the tourism industry by developing Responsible Tourism Grading and promoting Egypt as a global destination for ecotourism and developing community-based systems to allow those closest to the resources to benefit and manage them sustainably.

The project will also create one new protected area and increase the size of two more while building management capacity and developing these and four more protected areas for sustainable tourism. All of these areas are currently under threat from tourism development. Because of the uncertainty and dynamic nature of the challenge and because the tourism industry faces an adaptive challenge and to a lesser extent a technical challenge, the project will be guided by a scenario planning exercise as a means to bring about the individual and institutional behavioral changes and to ensure that the project is highly adaptive.

**2. MAIN OBJECTIVES, RESPONSABILITIES AND DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ANALYTICAL WORK.**

|  |
| --- |
| The MTR will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects.  The MTR will assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document and assess early signs of project success or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made in order to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results. The MTR will also review the project’s strategy, its risks to sustainability.  The MTR must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The MTR Consultant will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Environmental & Social Safeguard Policy, the Project Document, project reports including Annual Project Review/PIRs, project budget revisions, lesson learned reports, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the Consultant considers useful for this evidence-based review). The MTR Consultant will review the baseline GEF focal area Tracking Tool submitted to the GEF at CEO endorsement, and the midterm GEF focal area Tracking Tool that must be completed before the MTR field mission begins.  The MTR consultant is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach ensuring close engagement with the Project Consultant, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), the UNDP Country Office(s), UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisers, and other key stakeholders.  Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to; -   * **The Egyptian Environmental Affairs Agency (Ministry of Environment)** * **United Nations Development Programme, Egypt Country Office** * **Local government (governorates),**   The final MTR report should describe the full MTR approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the review. |

**2. SCOPE OF WORK, RESPONSIBILITIES AND DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ANALYTICAL WORK**

*As Per attached TOR – Annex 1*

**3. REQUIREMENTS FOR EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS**

The evaluation team will be composed of one international evaluator. The consultant shall have prior experience in evaluating similar biodiversity projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The evaluator selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

**Education:**

* Advanced university degree in Biological Science, Economics, Sustainable Development, or related discipline

**Experience:**

* Minimum 7 years of relevant professional experience in the area of biodiversity and ecosystem
* Knowledge of UNDP and GEF
* Previous experience with results‐based monitoring and evaluation methodologies.
* Good communication and analytical skills
* Good command of English language, both written and spoken
* Previous work experience in the region is an asset
* Previous experience with gender-sensitive analysis

**Competencies:**

**Job Knowledge & Expertise:**

* Excellent organizational skills and ability to handle effectively multiple tasks without compromising quality, team spirit and positive working relationships with all colleagues.
* Dependability, reliability and initiative.
* Is motivated & demonstrates a capacity to pursue personal development & learning.

**Results-Orientation:**

* Plans and produces quality results to meet established goals.

**People Skills:**

* Sets clear performance goals and standards; executes responsibilities accordingly.
* Partnering & Networking:
* Seeks and applies knowledge, information, and best practices from within and outside UN.

**Innovation & Judgment:**

* Contributes creative, practical ideas and approaches to deal with challenging situations.
* Pursues own personal and professional development.
* Strives for quality client-centered services (internal/external).

**Language Requirements:**

Proficiency in English or Arabic Languages are essential.

**4. DOCUMENTS TO BE INCLUDED WHEN SUBMITTING THE PROPOSALS.**

* Applicants are requested to apply no later than **April 20, 2021**. Individual consultants are invited to submit their applications together with an updated P11 form for this position either online (on UNDP website) or by email to the Procurement Unit, [Procurementnotice.egypt@undp.org](mailto:Procurementnotice.egypt@undp.org).
* The application should contain a current and complete **Personal History Form** ([P11 form](http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc)) in English including the e‐mail and phone contact, together with a **financial offer** including a lumpsum for the fees excluding the travel costs that will be covered as per UNDP rules and regulations.
* **The Individual Consultants should provide a certificate of valid health insurance or show proof of valid health insurance. The insurance should cover the duration of the assignment.**
* In case the consultant does not have a valid health insurance, s\he shall include health insurance fees in their financial offers and provide the certificate before signing the contract.
* UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

**5. FINANCIAL PROPOSAL**

|  |
| --- |
| \* **Contracts based on daily fee**  The financial proposal will specify the daily fee only and payments are made to the Individual Consultant based on the number of days worked. Any field visits and its associated DSA and flights will not be included in this assignment. |

**6. EVALUATION**

Individual consultants will be evaluated based on the following methodology:

***Cumulative analysis***

When using this weighted scoring method, the award of the contract should be made to the individual

consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

a) responsive/compliant/acceptable, and

b) Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria

specific to the solicitation.

\* Technical Criteria weight; [70%]

\* Financial Criteria weight; [30%]

Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 49 points would be considered for the Financial Evaluation

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Criteria* | *Weight* |
| *Technical* | ***70%*** |
| Advanced university degree in Biological Science, Economics, Sustainable Development, or related discipline | 10% |
| Minimum 7 years of relevant professional experience in the area of biodiversity and ecosystem | 15% |
| Knowledge of UNDP and GEF | *10%* |
| Previous experience with results‐based monitoring and evaluation methodologies; | *20%* |
| Good communication and analytical skills | 5% |
| Previous work experience in the region is an asset | 5% |
| Previous experience with gender-sensitive analysis | 5% |
| Total Technical | *70%* |
| *Financial* | *30%* |
| *Total* | *100%* |

**ANNEX**

**ANNEX 1- TERMS OF REFERENCES (TOR)**

**MIDTERM Evaluation Terms of Reference**

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a Mid-Term evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Mid-Term Evaluation (MTR) of the **Mainstreaming the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity into the tourism development and operations in threatened ecosystems in Egypt (PIMS #4590)**

The essentials of the project to be evaluated are as follows:

Project Summary Table

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Title: |  | | | | | |
| GEF Project ID: | | 5073 |  | | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | *at completion (Million US$)* |
| UNDP Project Atlas Award ID:  Atlas Output ID: | | 4590  00087169  00094274 | GEF financing: | | USD 2,574,338 | USD 2,574,338 |
| Country: | | Egypt | Private sector: UNDP | | USD 100,000 | USD 100,000 |
| Region: | | Arab States | Government: | |  |  |
| Focal Area: | | E&E | Other: | |  |  |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): | |  | Total co-financing: | | USD 50,385,736 | USD 50,385,736 |
| Executing Agency: | | Ministry of State for Environmental Affairs Agency | Total Project Cost: | | USD 53,060,074 | USD 53,060,074 |
| Other Partners involved: | |  | ProDoc Signature (date project began): | | | 14 November 2018 |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | Proposed:  Aug 14, 2023 | | Actual: |

Objective and Scope

This 4-year project is designed to mainstream biodiversity into the Egyptian tourism sector and government. It comes at a critical time in Egypt’s recent history with the political changes that are currently underway to make government institutions more accountable and to develop the economy, both of which are resulting in considerable changes in the way that both tourism and biodiversity resources may be managed in the future. Therefore, the project will work on two levels:

* The first level will engage directly with the industry and government to fill gaps in the existing planning and regulatory framework, namely a Strategic Environmental Assessment to identify key areas, habitats and ecological processes and assess their vulnerability and guidelines for the existing EIA regulations specific to biodiversity and linked to an offsetting mechanism and developing a monitoring programme to track the impacts of tourism on biodiversity for conservation management purposes.
* The second level will engage the tourism industry by developing Responsible Tourism Grading and promoting Egypt as a global destination for ecotourism and developing community-based systems to allow those closest to the resources to benefit and manage them sustainably.

The project will also create one new protected area and increase the size of two more while building management capacity and developing these and four more protected areas for sustainable tourism. All of these areas are currently under threat from tourism development. Because of the uncertainty and dynamic nature of the challenge and because the tourism industry faces an adaptive challenge and to a lesser extent a technical challenge, the project will be guided by a scenario planning exercise as a means to bring about the individual and institutional behavioral changes and to ensure that the project is highly adaptive.

The MTR will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects.

The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

Evaluation approach and method

An overall approach and method[[1]](#footnote-1) for conducting project Mid-Term evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact,** as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Mid-Term Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR (*fill in* [*Annex C*](#_TOR_Annex_C:)) The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence‐based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The MTR consultant is expected to conduct field missions to Egypt, including the following project sites.

(1) the southern Red Sea coastal belt between Qosseir and the northern half of Elba National Park to Shalateen towards the Sudanese border (350 km);

(2) the north-western Mediterranean coastal belt between Omayed Biosphere Reserve near El Alamein and the Libyan border (400 km); and

(3) Siwa Oasis with its protected area as a key representative of the Western Desert ecosystems.

The final MTR report should describe the full MTR approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the review.

Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

Key stakeholders:

* The Egyptian Environmental Affairs Agency (Ministry of Environment)
* United Nations Development Programme, Egypt Country Office
* Local government (governorates),

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in [Annex B](#_TOR_Annex_B:) of this Terms of Reference.

Evaluation Criteria & Ratings

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see  [Annex A](#_TOR_Annex_A:)), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact.** Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in  [Annex D](#_TOR_Annex_D:).

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Ratings:** | | | |
| **1. Monitoring and Evaluation** | ***rating*** | **2. IA& EA Execution** | ***rating*** |
| M&E design at entry |  | Quality of UNDP Implementation |  |
| M&E Plan Implementation |  | Quality of Execution - Executing Agency |  |
| Overall quality of M&E |  | Overall quality of Implementation / Execution |  |
| **3. Assessment of Outcomes** | **rating** | **4. Sustainability** | **rating** |
| Relevance |  | Financial resources: |  |
| Effectiveness |  | Socio-political: |  |
| Efficiency |  | Institutional framework and governance: |  |
| Overall Project Outcome Rating |  | Environmental: |  |
|  |  | Overall likelihood of sustainability: |  |

Project finance / cofinance

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

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

Mainstreaming

UNDP supported GEF financed projects are key components in UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programmes. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender.

Impact

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.[[2]](#footnote-2)

Conclusions, recommendations & lessons

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions**, **recommendations** and **lessons**.

Implementation arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Egypt. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of Daily Subsistence Allowance and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

Evaluation timeframe

The total duration of the evaluation will be ***22*** days according to the following plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Timing | Completion Date |
| **Preparation** | 4 days | *14 May 2021* |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | *9* days | *1st week-June 2021* |
| **Final Report** | 2 days | *End of June 2021* |

Evaluation deliverables

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Deliverable | Content | Timing | Responsibilities |
| **Inception Report** | Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method | No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission.  *25 May 2021* | Evaluator submits to UNDP CO |
| **Presentation** | Initial Findings | End of evaluation mission  *End of May 2021* | To project management, UNDP CO |
| **Draft Final Report** | Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes | *1st week-June 2021* | Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs |
| **Final Report\*** | Revised report | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft  *End of June 2021* | Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC. |

\*When submitting the Midterm evaluation report, the evaluator is required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the Midterm evaluation report.

Team Composition

The evaluation team will be composed of one international evaluator. The consultant shall have prior experience in evaluating similar biodiversity projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The evaluator selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The Team members must present the following qualifications:

* Advanced university degree in a subject related to engineering, natural resources management, development or other relevant field.
* Minimum 8 years of relevant professional experience in the area of renewable energy, bio-energy technologies, rural energy, and energy policy
* Experience in environmental policy implementation and familiarity with climate change mitigation activities;
* Previous experience in evaluation for international development agencies, preferably for UN and/or GEF projects;
* Previous experience with results‐based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
* Familiarity with issues related to UNFCCC;
* Conceptual thinking and analytical skills;
* Excellent English communication skills; Strong writing and analytical skills coupled with experience in monitoring and evaluation techniques;
* Previous involvement in and understanding of UNDP and GEF procedures is an advantage and extensive international experience in the fields of project formulation, execution, and evaluation is an asset;
* Previous experience with gender-sensitive analysis.

Evaluator Ethics

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

Payment modalities and specifications

(*this payment schedule is indicative, to be filled in by the CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on their standard procurement procedures)*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| % | Milestone |
| *10%* | Acceptance of Inception Report prior to the field visit |
| *40%* | Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft Midterm evaluation report |
| *50%* | Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final Midterm evaluation report |

Application process

* Applicants are requested to apply no later than **April 20, 2021**. Individual consultants are invited to submit their applications together with an updated P11 form for this position either online (on UNDP website) or by email to the Procurement Unit, [Procurementnotice.egypt@undp.org](mailto:Procurementnotice.egypt@undp.org).
* The application should contain a current and complete **Personal History Form** ([P11 form](http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc)) in English including the e‐mail and phone contact, together with a **financial offer** including a lumpsum for the fees excluding the travel costs that will be covered as per UNDP rules and regulations.
* The Individual Consultants should provide a certificate of valid health insurance or show proof of valid health insurance. The insurance should cover the duration of the assignment.
* In case the consultant does not have a valid health insurance, s\he shall include health insurance fees in their financial offers and provide the certificate before signing the contract.
* UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

1. Annex A: Project Logical Framework

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome and Outcome Indicators as defined in CPAP or CPD:**  ***Outcome 5.3 The Government of Egypt and local communities have strengthened mechanisms for sustainable management of and sustainable access to natural resources such as land, water and ecosystems***  ***Outcome Indicator 5.3.1:*** *Increase in revenues generated from the 5 protected areas supported by UNDP* ***Baseline:*** *To be provided upon selection of the 5 protected areas* ***Target:****Increase revenue generated by protected areas by 25%.* | | | | | | |
| **Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area (same as that on the cover page, circle one): *1. Mainstreaming environment and energy*** | | | | | | |
| **Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program: *BD2 "Mainstream biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into production landscapes, seascapes, and sectors” and BD1 “Improve sustainability of protected area systems”*** | | | | | | |
| **Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes:** ***Outcome 2.2: “Measures to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity incorporated in policy and regulatory frameworks”; Outcome 1.1: “Improved management effectiveness of existing and new protected areas”; Outcome 1.1: “Improved management effectiveness of existing and new protected areas”.*** | | | | | | |
| **Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators: *Indicator 2.2: Polices and regulations governing sectoral activities that integrate biodiversity conservation as***  ***recorded by the GEF tracking tool as a score; Indicator 2.1: Landscapes and seascapes certified by internationally or nationally recognized environmental standards that incorporate biodiversity***  ***considerations (e.g. FSC, MSC) measured in hectares and recorded by GEF tracking tool*** | | | | | | |
|  | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Targets**  **End of Project** | **Source of verification** | **Risks and Assumptions** | |
| **Project Objective**[[3]](#footnote-3)**:**  **To mainstream biodiversity conservation into tourism sector development and operations in ecologically important and sensitive areas** | IRRF 2.5.1.A.1.1: Extent to which legal frameworks are in place for conservation, sustainable use, and/or access and benefit sharing of natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystems | 0 | Missing legal frameworks established | Legal decree, project reports |  | |
| IRRF 2.5.1.B.1.1: Extent to which policy frameworks are in place for conservation, sustainable use, and/or access and benefit sharing of natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystems | 0 | Missing policy frameworks established | Published policies, project reports |  | |
| IRRF 2.5.1.C.1.1: Extent to which institutional frameworks are in place for conservation, sustainable use, and/or access and benefit sharing of natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystems | 0 | Missing institutional frameworks established | Government institutional decrees, regulations, project reports |  | |
| Biodiversity explicitly included in plans and policies for tourism development by government, planning authorities and the private sector | The NSTSP addresses water, waste, energy and other broader environmental issues but not specifically biodiversity | National, regional and sector tourism strategies, policies and plans (such as the NSTSP) that give due and explicit recognition of the importance of biodiversity, protected areas and natural landscapes and integrate conservation goals | NSTSP and/or other relevant new strategies, policies and plans | Assumption: National interests will override individual and institutional interests. | |
| Tourism infrastructure development after land allocation by the TDA | Currently the sale of lands by the TDA and the design and placement of tourism infrastructures make no allowances for biodiversity (natural ecosystems and habitats, protected areas, species distribution, etc.) | Unsustainable infrastructure development in critical habitats inside and adjacent to protected areas, especially through coastal ribbon development for the mass tourism market, is prevented. Current and future TDA land allocation maps are reviewed against the SEA, integrating biodiversity and protected area concerns. Plots which are not already in private hands or have not had development take place in accordance with the Law but are deemed to be in sensitive areas are protected or have strict limitations imposed upon development. | TDA plans, maps and guidelines; actual tourism infrastructure development | Risk: The owners of plots are able to contest the changes due to the slow processing of applications by the state.  Risk: The possibility of revoking ownership or removing plots from the TDA plan sparks a “land grab”.  Assumption: The judicial process is transparent. | |
| Conservation status in the southern Red Sea coastal belt: for coral reefs, seagrass beds important also for the Dugong (*Dugong dugon* VU) and coastal habitats including mangroves and beaches used for nesting by the Green Turtle (*Chelonia mydas* EN) and Hawksbill Turtle (*Eretmochelys imbricate* CR) and forest groves including the Red Sea Fog Woodland | To be determined in the SEA | Project lifetime: Reduction of threats to specific sites, habitats and species as identified and measured by the GEF Threat Reduction Assessment tool.  Long term: Recovery of species populations and or area of coverage | NBSAP, surveys. TRA reports, site specific surveys. | Assumption: Threats to target resources are only affected by tourism and there are no other overriding factors affecting target species conservation status. | |
| Conservation status in the north-west Mediterranean coastal belt: for the unique coastal vegetation, oolotic calcareous ridges and dunes, saline depressions and saltmarshes, and the limestone ridge habitats bordering the coastal plain to the south west | To be determined in the SEA | Project lifetime: Reduction of threats to specific sites, habitats and species as identified and measured by the GEF Threat Reduction Assessment tool.  Long term: Recovery of species populations and or area of coverage | NBSAP, surveys. TRA reports, site specific surveys. | Assumption: Threats to target resources are only affected by tourism and there are no other overriding factors affecting target species conservation status. | |
| Conservation status in Siwa Oasis and PA: for vulnerable oasis and desert habitats representative of Egypt’s Western Desert ecosystems, Slender-horned Gazelle (*Gazella leptoceros* VU), Dorcas Gazelle (*Gazella dorcas* EN) | To be determined in the SEA | Project lifetime: Reduction of threats to specific sites, habitats and species as identified and measured by the GEF Threat Reduction Assessment tool.  Long term: Recovery of species populations and or area of coverage | NBSAP, surveys. TRA reports, site specific surveys. | Assumption: Threats to target resources are only affected by tourism and there are no other overriding factors affecting target species conservation status. | |
| **COMPONENT 1. Changing the trajectory of tourism development and operations to safeguard biodiversity** | | | | | | |
| **Outcome 1: Direct adverse impacts of tourism infrastructure development on biodiversity and land/sea-scapes (primarily loss and severe degradation of critical habitats in both terrestrial and marine ecosystems) are avoided, reduced or compensated in at least the c. 10,000 km² of ecologically sensitive areas (including c. 2324 km² inside protected areas) exposed to development pressures** | | | | | | |
| Output 1.1 Coherent and effective legal, policy, regulatory and institutional frameworks in place at the national and sub-national levels for multi-sectoral land-use planning at the landscape level, to avoid, reduce, mitigate and offset adverse impacts of tourism pressures on biodiversity | Capacity at the MSEA/EEAA/NCS, MoT/TDA for integrating biodiversity into SEAs, EIAs and related regulations in tourism planning and permitting, and for compliance monitoring and enforcement | There is no SEA and biodiversity is poorly addressed in the EIA | Capacity strengthened by ...To be determined during the inception phase |  | |  |
| Capacity of governorate and municipal authorities in the target areas for integrating biodiversity into tourism planning and permitting | No specific policies and capacities on the biodiversity/interface. Governorate and municipal planning is largely concerned with urban planning and solid waste management | Governorate and municipal planning reviews current plans against the needs of the SEA and imposes restrictions and mitigation measures where necessary | Governorate development plans, actual tourism developments, specific assessments | |  |
| Capacity of governorate and municipal authorities in the target areas for related compliance monitoring and enforcement | Very limited or no institutional capacities on effective regulation processes and oversight of tourism development and on promotion of NB/BFT | Institutional and technical capacity increased | Specific capacity assessments | |  |
| Environmental infractions during the construction and operational phases | To be defined during Inception | At least a 50% reduction in environmental infractions achieved through monitoring and enforcement | Reports of site visits by EIA authority and or project | |  |
| Available future scenarios | NSTSP provides a single vision for the future largely based upon increasing the number of tourists to Egypt each year | An agreed vision for the future of tourism in Egypt based upon the ecosystems ability to support the vision without loss of biodiversity | Egyptian Tourism Scenarios, NBSAP, NSTSP | | Risk: The default scenario or less desirable scenarios are ignored as being too negative and frightening |
| Strategic Environmental Assessments to inform tourism development plans about spatial areas where tourism development and/or operations are desirable/acceptable from the biodiversity standpoint, where they may be permitted subject to management-mitigation-offsetting, and where they should be altogether avoided; | There is no strategic environmental assessment (SEA) for any of the three project sites which indicate the impact of tourism development upon biodiversity, and site-specific EIAs do not consider connectivity, externalities and downstream effects | SEAs developed for all three project sites and linked to the approval of EIAs | SEAs | | Risk: An SEA is considered a significant threat to existing and proposed investments through the TDA; the document can be delayed or ignored.  Assumption and Risk: relating to all project outputs which require the SEA to be in place. This is a critical risk and should be closely monitored by the project. |
| Existing developments and EIAs | Many sites have been developed in sensitive areas without any thought to mitigation; some developments have been poorly monitored and/\*or are illegal | A review of existing developments against the original EIA and mitigation measures imposed on infractions | EEAA records, on-site visit reports | | Assumption: There is transparency in the review of these EIAs and there are sufficient technically qualified personnel to carry out the reviews. |
| Biodiversity concerns requirements integrated in EIA and tourism-related landscape planning | There are no SEA recommendations | At least 90% of new tourism-related infrastructural developments and hotels are consistent with SEA recommendations and apply rigorous EIAs whose conclusions are respected in the permitting process | NCS reports | | Assumption: Courts are prepared to impose punitive sanctions against transgressors. |
| Regulatory, institutional and financial arrangements for tourism-related biodiversity offset mechanism assessed and (if viable) established to define offset activities/outcomes and site selection and create a supply/demand database | There is no mechanism to offset tourism development within the existing EIA | Feasibility study completed and if appropriate a National Policy on Biodiversity Offsetting in the Tourism Sector and a legal means (i.e. an amendment to the EIA Law) to allow offsetting | Policy and Law | | Assumption: The feasibility study finds that there the enabling environment is sufficiently robust, transparent and accountable to support biodiversity offsetting in the tourism sector. |
| Environmental penalties | Currently fines imposed on developers are considered to be part of the development costs | Fines are punitive and equal to or greater than the cost of mitigation and or restoration | Court records and EEAA | | Assumption: There is transparency in the review of these EIAs.  Risk: The whole process becomes politicised. |
| Management systems for regulating dive industry use of reefs | The NSTSP has suggested different systems for limiting use but no decision has been made yet (still) | National guidelines on acceptable limits of change and carrying capacity for specific areas and habitats (recommended in the NSTSP) prepared, adopted.and reflected in the SEA. Conclusions and recommendations on dive industry use prepared and enforced through an appropriate management system | National Guidelines and designated areas within the SEA with agreed management systems/regimes | | Assumption: There is the political will and sufficient rule of law to ensure that some dive boats are decommissioned or removed from these waters. |
| A national-level policy mainstreaming committee overseeing policy and planning coherence between tourism development and environmental/biodiversity management established | There is no such committee | Committee established and meeting regularly to review all aspects of tourism related to biodiversity and participating in the scenario planning | Committee reports and Egytptian Tourism Scenarios | | Assumption: Committee will continue to be funded after the project. |
| A biodiversity monitoring and evaluation mechanism or process created to assess disturbance of habitats and key species from tourism and related pressures, determine acceptable limits of change, and provide management recommendations; | No such indicators exists specifically targeted at tourism development and activities | Specific indicators are incorporated into the NBSAP monitoring programme with a link to scenario planning.  Performance of key agencies and authorities related to tourism and biodiversity is reported annually against the indicators and reports are available to the public | MSEA, MT, EEAA, TDA, NCS | | Assumption: There is an independent and robust NGO community to challenge state agencies and the tourism sector *per se* by monitoring these reports to ensure accountability. |
| **Outcome 2. Reduction of biodiversity impacts caused by inappropriate practices from tourists and tourism establishments, most notably disturbance effects affecting sensitive animal and plant species, habitat degradation and over-exploitation of resources.** | | | | | | |
| Output 2.1 Frameworks and tools for fostering adoption by tourism operators of best-practice standards for sustainable tourism and nature-based/biodiversity-friendly tourism (NB/BFT) | New voluntary national certification schemes and verification mechanisms on responsible NB/BF tourism created for hotels and operators | Currently no such schemes or mechanisms exist in Egypt, there is no legal basis | One or several voluntary national certifications schemes in place, with appropriate penalties for misuse and miss-selling | Legal provisions, guidelines |  | |
| New responsible NB/BF tourism certification schemes adopted, and verification mechanisms operationalised (including through MoT/TDA/MSAE endorsements and campaigns) | Currently there are few tourist developments with any form of certification or accreditation, and none for NB/BFT | In the target areas, demonstrated adoption of and compliance with the selected responsible NB/BF tourism certification schemes by  - at least 10% of existing and 20% of new tourism-related infrastructural developments, hotels and tourism service providers;  - by at least 50% of NB/BFT operators. | Midterm – number of accredited businesses  Long-term – number of renewals |  | |
| Tourism marketing strategies by MoT/ETA and private sector | Egypt is currently marketed as a “sun and sea” and cultural heritage destination | MoT/ETA and private sector in their marketing campaigns also integrate Egypt’s natural heritage through NB/BFT and references to natural landscapes and protected areas and | Review of marketing campaigns and packages | Assumption: Government and private sector are willing to act in favour of long term sustainability of its tourism product. | |
| Tourism pricing | Currently there is no premium on NB/BFT tourism. Eco-certified developments have no competitive advantage | NB/BFT tourism consistently achieving a higher price per day than none NB/BFT. Eco-certified developments achieve a competitive advantage in pricing | Pricing surveys |  | |
| Economic/fiscal and other incentives (e.g. subsidies, tax deductions, promotion through national or regional government tourism materials/websites) and penalties (e.g. special taxes), to advance the adherence of private sector and local community businesses to the certification systems. |  |  |  |  | |
| Number of clearly labelled NB/BFT operators in the target regions | Almost non-existent | At least 10 new operators in each target region | Survey |  | |
| **COMPONENT 2. Strengthening the PA system and its management in three target regions of high biodiversity value exposed to tourism development and activities - the north-western Mediterranean coast, the southern Red Sea coast and Siwa Oasis/PA** | | | | | | |
| **Outcome 3: One new PA (min. 30,000 ha) designated, spatially configured and emplaced, and the boundaries of 2 of the existing 5 PAs (at least 15,000 ha added to the total of 50,000 km2) in the three target regions expanded, to include critical habitats in areas facing immediate or medium-term tourism development pressures expected to adversely affect biodiversity assets, but in which representative PA coverage is lacking.** | | | | | | |
| Output 3.1: Gazettement of the new PA(s), especially in the north-west Mediterranean coastal belt, and expansion of boundaries of existing PAs | Number and area of protected areas in the target areas | 5 protected areas in the target areas | 6 protected areas in the target areas and an additional 30,000 ha of new PA and 15,000 ha of expanded PA | Gazette, decrees |  | |
| **Outcome 4: Pressures from tourism controlled or reduced in c. 2,324 km² of ecologically sensitive areas inside the existing and new PAs exposed to tourism development pressures** | | | | | | |
| Output 4.1: Institutional and technical management framework in place in the new and existing PAs, depending on specific site needs: staffing, capacitation, physical demarcation of boundaries, basic infrastructure and equipment, participatory management planning, multi-stakeholder management boards, etc. | PA Management Effectiveness Tracking Tools (METTs) demonstrate satisfactory improvements, in particular in relation to  a) tourism planning and visitor management  b) a reduction of the direct and indirect impacts from tourism  c) revenue generation  d) relations with local communities | Current METT scores  Siwa: 59  Omayed: 47  Wadi Gemal: 59 | Current METT scores + 20% | METT | Assumption: Project performance and impact can be disaggregated from other project initiatives taking place and any changes (positive or negative) that might result from the institutional restructuring of the NCS | |
| Output 4.2: Effective management and servicing of tourism flows, minimising adverse impacts on biodiversity, and maximising positive opportunities for protected area and biodiversity management | Existence of visitor management plans | None of the PAs in the target areas have visitor management plans | 6 PAs in the target areas have visitor management plans | Visitor management plans |  | |
| Interpretation facilities for sensitising tourists, operators and local populations to regulations and good practices in tourist activities and souvenir shopping | None of the PAs in the target area have facilities for interpretation and there are no regulations and good practices | Regulations and good practices agreed and widely broadcast with high degree of compliance | PA reporting |  | |
| Output 4.3: Community-based integrated land and resource management plans developed, and implementation initiated; | Implementation of CBNRM agreements | A template for such agreements exists but has not been signed by the EEAA | Four local communities receive the appropriate authority to access and sustainably manage biodiversity and landscape resources | CBNRM agreements between EEAA and communities | Assumption: Local communities lack authority to control access and manage resources sustainably. The EEAA is prepared to transfer significant powers to the local community.  Risk: External private sector operators are able to capture the political process and block the transfer undermining the proposed systems. The military does not allow this to take place on security grounds. | |
| Output 4.4: Local communities engaged in NB/BFT ventures for livelihood including services and products (e.g. hotels, eco-lodges, environmental camp sites, eco-products and environmentally-friendly transportation and managed hunting tourism where appropriate) | Local community participation in NB/BFT | Local community participation in tourism is largely unplanned and opportunistic. While there are elements of NB/BFT there are no guiding policies | Community guidelines for the development and management of NB/BFT developed and accepted by the TDA and three local communities recognised as managers of local tourism resources in defined areas | National Guidelines developed by the local communities and the TDA | Risk: Larger external tour operators see this as a threat. | |
| Community-based NB/BFT enterprises | No baseline is established but there are very few tourism enterprises registered to the local communities | 5 community-based NB/BFT enterprises in each target region | Registration of community-based NB/BFT enterprises in the project areas.  Tourism-related sales of sustainable handicrafts increasing employment and income for local communities. |  | |
| Houbara Bustard: population size and # of captive bred birds released per year | Population size to be estimated at start of Houbara Centre project.  Birds released per year: 0 | Population size: +20%  Birds released per year: At least 50 | Reports, policies, agreements |  | |
| **Outcome 5: PA Financing Scorecard demonstrates progress towards meeting the finance needs to achieve effective management.** | | | | | | |
| Output 5.1: Site-specific effective PA financing systems based on integration into Egypt’s PA system and national PA financing strategy and on gate and tourism operator concession fees, ecotourism taxes, and on biodiversity offset and reinvestment schemes involving the tourism industry. | Score in PA Financial Sustainability Scorecard | 54% (122 of 225) | 70 % | PA Financial Sustainability Scorecard |  | |

Annex B: List of Documents to be reviewed by the evaluators

1. Project document
2. Annual Project Review (APR)/Project Implementation Report (PIR)
3. Combined delivery reports
4. Project Technical Reports
5. Project financial budgets
6. Project brochures and awareness materials (if any)

Annex C: Evaluation Questions

*This is a generic list, to be further detailed with more specific questions by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on the particulars of the project.*

| **Evaluative Criteria Questions** | | **Indicators** | **Sources** | **Methodology** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels? | | | | |
|  | * What are the challenges that the project was meant to address at its initiation. * How the project approach was able to set the links between global and national benefits * How would you assess the national ownership of the project * How relevant is the project to: development priorities of Egypt - UNDP thematic areas * How did the project approach contribute to GHG emission reduction |  | * Project document * Stakeholders | * Literature review * Interviews |
| Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? | | | | | |
|  | * What is the project status with respect to target outputs in terms of quantity, quality and timeliness? What factors impeded or facilitated the production of such outputs * How useful are the outputs to the needs of the direct beneficiaries. Is there a general acceptance of the outputs by these beneficiaries. |  | * PIRs * Stakeholders | * Literature review * Interviews | |
| Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards? | | | | | |
|  | * How well did the project use its resources to produce target outputs * To what extent are local expertise (by gender) and indigenous technologies and resources used * How did the project has selected the consultants and contractors who supported the project implementation * What are the areas that needed international consultants/contractors and why? |  | * PMU | * Interviews | |
| Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? | | | | | |
|  | * Have a mechanism been put in place to ensure the sustainability of the project results. * How has the project contributed to the development of the capacity of the direct beneficiaries to carry out their tasks in an environment of change in terms, a). individual learning, by gender, and b). improving organizational structures and interrelationships? * What are the likely impacts of the project beyond the direct beneficiaries? * Are there any signs of potential contribution to enabling environment or to a broader development context (ie. Institutional, socio-political, economic and environmental)? * Are the project results systematically disseminated? |  | * PIRs * Stakeholders | * Analysis | |
| **Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?** | | | | | |
|  | * Are there any plans to replicate and upscale the pilot projects |  | * stakeholders | * Interviews | |

Annex D: Rating Scales

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution*** | ***Sustainability ratings:*** | ***Relevance ratings*** |
| 6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings  5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings  4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS)  3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings  2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems  1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems | 4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability | 2. Relevant (R) |
| 3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks | 1.. Not relevant (NR) |
| 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks  1. Unlikely (U): severe risks | ***Impact Ratings:***  3. Significant (S)  2. Minimal (M)  1. Negligible (N) |
| *Additional ratings where relevant:*  Not Applicable (N/A)  Unable to Assess (U/A | | |

Annex E: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form

**Evaluators:**

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.

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form[[4]](#footnote-4)**

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

**Name of Consultant:** \_\_     \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**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: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Annex F: Evaluation Report Outline[[5]](#footnote-5)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **i.** | Opening page:   * Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project * UNDP and GEF project ID#s. * Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report * Region and countries included in the project * GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program * Implementing Partner and other project partners * Evaluation team members * Acknowledgements |
| **ii.** | Executive Summary   * Project Summary Table * Project Description (brief) * Evaluation Rating Table * Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons |
| **iii.** | Acronyms and Abbreviations  (See: UNDP Editorial Manual[[6]](#footnote-6)) |
| **1.** | Introduction   * Purpose of the evaluation * Scope & Methodology * Structure of the evaluation report |
| **2.** | Project description and development context   * Project start and duration * Problems that the project sought to address * Immediate and development objectives of the project * Baseline Indicators established * Main stakeholders * Expected Results |
| **3.** | Findings  (In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) must be rated[[7]](#footnote-7)) |
| **3.1** | Project Design / Formulation   * Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators) * Assumptions and Risks * Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design * Planned stakeholder participation * Replication approach * UNDP comparative advantage * Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector * Management arrangements |
| **3.2** | Project Implementation   * Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation) * Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region) * Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management * Project Finance: * Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (\*) * UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (\*) coordination, and operational issues |
| **3.3** | Project Results   * Overall results (attainment of objectives) (\*) * Relevance (\*) * Effectiveness & Efficiency (\*) * Country ownership * Mainstreaming * Sustainability (\*) * Impact |
| **4.** | Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons   * Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project * Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project * Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives * Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success |
| **5.** | Annexes   * ToR * Itinerary * List of persons interviewed * Summary of field visits * List of documents reviewed * Evaluation Question Matrix * Questionnaire used and summary of results * Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form |

Annex G: Evaluation Report Clearance Form

*(to be completed by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and included in the final document)*

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

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

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

UNDP GEF RTA

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

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

Annex H: TE Report audit trail

The following is a template for the evaluator to show how the received comments on the draft TE report have (or have not) been incorporated into the final MTR report. This audit trail should be included as an annex in the final MTR report.

**To the comments received on (*date*) from the** **Mid-Term Evaluation of (*project name*) (UNDP *PIMS #)***

*The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft Mid-Term Evaluation report; they are referenced by institution (“Author” column) and by comment number (“#” column):*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author** | **#** | **Para No./ comment location** | **Comment/Feedback on the draft TE report** | **Evaluator response and actions taken** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

1. For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](http://www.undp.org/evaluation/handbook), Chapter 7, pg. 163 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office:  [ROTI Handbook 2009](http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/M2_ROtI%20Handbook.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Objective (Atlas output) monitored quarterly ERBM and annually in APR/PIR [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. 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. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)