

# Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference (ToR) for an International Consultant for UNDP-supported GEF-financed projects

Project Title:	Mainstreaming biodiversity into the management of the coastal zone in the Republic of Mauritius			
GEF Project ID:	5514		<i>at endorsement (Million US\$)</i>	<i>at completion (Million US\$)</i>
UNDP Project ID:	PIMS 4483	GEF financing:	4,664,521	
Country:	Republic of Mauritius	IA/EA own:	70,000	
Region:	Africa	Government:	9,392,208	
Focal Area:	Biodiversity	Other:	7,676,969	
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	BD2; LD1; LD3	Total co-financing:	17,139,177	
Executing Agency	Ministry of Blue Economy, Marine Resources, Fisheries and Shipping	Total Project Cost:	21,803,698	
Implementing Partners involved:	Ministry of Environment, Solid Waste and Climate Change. Ministry of Agro-Industry and Food Security. Department of Continental Shelf, Marine Zone. Administration and Exploration Ministry of Housing and Land Use. Ministry of Tourism. Rodrigues Regional Authority Reef Conservation.	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		June 2016
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: June 2021	Actual: December 2022

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full- and medium-sized UNDP-supported GEF-financed projects are required to undergo a Terminal Evaluation (TE) at the end of the project. This Terms of Reference (ToR) sets out the expectations for the TE of the full -sized project titled 'Mainstreaming biodiversity into the management of the coastal zone in the Republic of Mauritius' (PIMS 4483; GEF 5514) implemented through the Ministry of Blue Economy, Marine Resources, Fisheries and Shipping. The project has a duration of 60 months. It started on the 2<sup>nd</sup> of June 2016 and is in its final year of implementation having been granted an extension until December 2022. The TE process must follow the guidance outlined in the document 'Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects'.

([http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/GEF/TE\\_GuidanceforUNDP-supportedGEF-financedProjects.pdf](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/GEF/TE_GuidanceforUNDP-supportedGEF-financedProjects.pdf) ).

## 2. PROJECT BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

### Location and Context

Mauritius forms part of the Western Indian Ocean Islands, one of the 25 internationally recognized biodiversity 'hotspots'. The tropical climate, topography and history of isolation, has resulted in the evolution of a diverse biota with a high degree of endemism. Terrestrial biodiversity is forest dependent. However, much of the extant forest has been lost: land clearance and forest degradation has already impacted more than 90% of Mauritius Island's land surface. Marine biodiversity is in a better condition but is also threatened. Extensive reef systems surround all of the islands of the archipelago. Rodrigues, in particular, harbours a large reef expanse, three times the size of the island.

Most of the useable land on the island of Mauritius has been put to production use. In spite of the extensive degradation and transformation that has occurred in many areas, coastal ecosystems and adjacent landscapes still maintain their basic ecological functions. The coastal strip provides prime land for habitation, recreation and tourism, while seascapes provide the basis of food provision through fisheries and also the country's main touristic attraction—beaches, nautical sports and related activities. Lagoon habitats are especially important in this regard. They contribute to the overall productivity of coastal waters by supporting a variety of habitats, including salt marshes, seagrasses, and mangroves.

### Project Objective

To mainstream the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and ecosystem services into coastal zone management and into the operations and policies of the tourism and physical development sectors in the Republic of Mauritius through a 'land- and seascape wide' integrated management approach based on the Environmental Sensitive Areas' (ESAs) inventory and assessment.

### Project Goal

The project will address the threats to biodiversity in Coastal Wetlands, Shore and Offshore ESAs within the target landscapes through a three-pronged approach. First, it will support the incorporation of ESA recommendations into policies and enforceable regulations pertaining to coastal zone management (CZM). With a special focus on tourism and physical development in the coastal zone, threats to biodiversity and ecosystem functions and resilience will be mitigated. Second, the project will support the effective management of marine protected areas (MPAs) across the Republic, given that they are an important part of the coastal and marine land/seascapes targeted by the project. Third, the project will take measures to arrest land degradation in sensitive locations, designed to reduce coastal erosion and sedimentation and help restore ecosystem functions in key wetlands areas. As a result of the project, biodiversity within coral reefs, seagrass beds, mangroves, inter-tidal mudflats, sand beaches and dunes, and coastal freshwater marshlands will be better protected and managed sustainably, both in Mauritius mainland and in Rodrigues.

### Expected Project Outcomes

1. Threats to biodiversity and ecosystem function are addressed by ensuring that marine and coastal Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESAs) are an integral part of planning and implementation mechanisms relating to coastal development and the tourism sector.
2. Threats to marine and coastal biodiversity are mitigated and fishery resources protected in at least 20,000 ha of seascapes, through the improved management of MPAs and no-take zones.
3. Erosion control and ecosystem services restoration: erosion and soil loss are reduced in 200 ha of erosion-prone water sheds; and ecosystem services are restored in 100 ha of coastal wetlands.

### Institutional Arrangements

A Project Steering Committee (PSC) is convened by the Implementing Partner to provide expert and technical guidance to the implementation of the project. The PSC, which is chaired by the Implementing Partner, serves as the project's coordination and decision-making body. Working closely with the Implementing Partner, the UNDP Country Office (UNDP-CO) is responsible for: (i) providing financial and audit services to the project; (ii) when required, recruitment of project staff and contracting of consultants and service providers (iii) overseeing financial expenditures against project budgets approved by PSC; (iv) appointment of independent financial auditors and evaluators; and (iv) ensuring that all activities including procurement and financial services are carried out in strict compliance with UNDP-GEF procedures. The day-to-day administration of the project is carried out by a Project Management Unit (PMU) comprising a Project Manager (PM) and one Project Assistant, who will be located within the Implementing Partner offices. The Project is technically supported by an international Chief Technical Adviser (CTA). The CTA supports the provision of the required technical inputs, reviewing and preparing Terms of Reference and reviewing the outputs of consultants and other sub-contractors.

### Key Partners and Stakeholders

The Project Document notes that the project would focus its stakeholder engagement at two levels of intervention: (i) working with national and local public institutions and agencies to strengthen their capacity to effectively protect and manage coastal and marine ecosystems and their associated biodiversity, and to align project activities with government's strategic priorities; and (ii) working directly with civil society organizations, formal and informal use rights holders, and private individuals to mitigate impacts and optimize benefits of project activities. The Project Document lists the key partners and stakeholders in the Project under '**Table 7: Key project stakeholders and relevant roles**'. During the Project lifetime, the Chief Technical Advisor (CTA) drafted a Stakeholder Engagement Plan as this was not initially included in the endorsed Project Document.

### Cross-Cutting Aspects

The Project Document notes that the project aimed to adopt the Human Rights-Based Approach (HRBA) to programming, as used by UN agencies since 2003. This requires that the problems and challenges faced by different stakeholders involved in or affected by project interventions and inequalities and discrimination patterns that occur in the area where the project is located are addressed from the beginning. The HRBA approach particularly emphasises the need for a good understanding of the underlying structural causes of such problems so that effective and sustainable strategies for change can be identified. Since early phases of the project, women have been encouraged to participate in all stages of project implementation, including in training and capacity-building initiatives, especially through the livelihood activities in Rodrigues which included 40% women. The Mid-Term Review has captured details and statistics for this gender engagement in project activities.

### Relevance to partner Government Strategies and to the UNDP Strategic

Section 1.4.1 of the Project Document discusses sectoral Mainstreaming within the Government and relates various existing or planned government strategies to the various aims and outcomes/components of the Project.

UNDP approaches the issues of biodiversity management and ecosystem resilience from a development and governance point of view. The agency's goal is to build the capacity of beneficiary countries to maintain and enhance their ecosystem services in order to secure livelihoods, fight poverty and promote development. UNDP's Ecosystems and Biodiversity Framework 2012-2020 establishes a benchmark of achievements and the strategic thinking behind its programming in relation to these issues. The project is in line with the UNDP Strategic Plan 2014-2017 which puts emphasis on maintenance and protection of natural capital, as well as developing incentives to both manage and benefit biodiversity.

The Mid-Term Review has noted that UNDP could use the lessons from the project in discussions and briefings towards development of UNDP and Government Strategies (e.g. the new National Env. Strategy, CPD, UNDAF, COVID Recovery, new Projects, etc.). This should especially focus on the broader discourse in Mauritius on Economic Development Vs. Environmental Sustainability and how a more sustainable focus can help to achieve the SDGs.

## **3. TE PURPOSE**

The TE has the following complementary purposes:

- To promote accountability and transparency.
- To synthesize lessons that can help to improve the selection, design, and implementation of future UNDP-supported GEF-financed initiatives; and to improve the sustainability of benefits and aid in overall enhancement of UNDP programming.
- To assess and document project results, and the contribution of these results towards achieving GEF strategic objectives aimed at global environmental benefits.
- To gauge the extent of project convergence with other development priorities, including poverty alleviation, strengthening resilience to the impacts of climate change, reducing disaster risk and vulnerability, as well as cross-cutting issues such as gender equality, women's empowerment, and supporting human rights.

The TE report will assess the achievement of project results against what was expected to be achieved at project endorsement and the inception phase, taking note of any changes or amendments to expected project deliverables and indicator targets which have been highlighted both by the annual Project Implementation Reviews and by the Mid-Term Review.

The Mid-Term Review has noted that UNDP could use the lessons from the project in discussions and briefings towards development of UNDP and Government Strategies (e.g. the new National Env. Strategy, CPD, UNDAF, COVID Recovery, new Projects, etc.). This should especially focus on the broader discourse in Mauritius on Economic Development Vs. Environmental Sustainability and how a more sustainable focus can help to achieve the SDGs. These lessons, in turn, can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming. The TE report promotes accountability and transparency and assesses the extent of project accomplishments.

#### 4. TE APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

The TE report must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful, collected from the feedback of those who have been involved with the Project at various stages, including the design, implementation, and supervision of the project.

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

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

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful TE. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to the executing agencies, senior officials and task team/component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project beneficiaries, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. The TE should specifically interact with and interview those agencies and bodies listed in the Project Document under '**Table 7: Key project stakeholders and relevant roles**' as well as any listed within the project's Stakeholder Engagement Plan or through attendance at pertinent project workshops and meetings,

Additionally, the TE National Expert (see below) will be expected to conduct field missions to sites around Mauritius and Rodrigues that have been involved in the Project as recommended by UNDP and the Project Manager.

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

Where appropriate to this Project, the TE should consider and comment on the following cross-cutting issues:

- Gender and GEEW

- Poverty-Environment Nexus and Poverty Alleviation
- Crisis Prevention and Recovery natural disasters
- Climate Change
- Catalytic Role, Replication and Upscaling
- Human Rights (includes Disabilities)
- Vulnerable Groups
- Minority Groups
- Sustainable Development Goals
- Environmental and Social Safeguards
- Sustainable Livelihoods

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 evaluation team may have justifications for revising the standard TE approach and these should be discussed in consultation with the evaluation manager and key stakeholders. These changes in approach should be agreed and reflected clearly in the TE Inception Report. The final report must describe the full TE approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the evaluation.

## 5. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE TE

The TE will assess project performance against expectations set out in the project's Logical Framework/Results Framework (see ToR Annex A). In reviewing the Results Framework, the TE should specifically evaluate the indicators and Targets to (A) ensure that the indicators captured in the Results Framework are SMART (Specific, Measurable, Attributable, Relevant, Time-bound and Timely) and (B) to assess the achievements for each target against the Indicator. The TE will assess results according to the criteria outlined in the Guidance for TEs of UNDP-supported GEF-financed Projects ([http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/GEF/TE\\_GuidanceforUNDP-supportedGEF-financedProjects.pdf](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/GEF/TE_GuidanceforUNDP-supportedGEF-financedProjects.pdf) )

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

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

### Findings

#### i. Project Design/Formulation

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

#### ii. Project Implementation

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

### iii. Project Results

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

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

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

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

**ToR Table 2: Evaluation Ratings Table for 'Mainstreaming biodiversity into the management of the coastal zone in the Republic of Mauritius'**

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

## 6. TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the TE will be approximately 30 working days over a time period of 8 weeks starting on 1 September 2022. The tentative TE timeframe is as follows:

Timeframe	Activity
<i>1 August 2022</i>	Application closes
<i>15 August 2022</i>	Selection of TE team
<i>1 September 2022</i>	Preparation period for TE team (handover of documentation)
<i>5 September 2022 4 days</i>	Document review and preparation of TE Inception Report
<i>10 September 2022 5 days</i>	Finalization and Validation of TE Inception Report; latest start of TE mission
<i>12 September 2022 15 days</i>	TE mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits, etc.
<i>27 September 2022</i>	Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings; earliest end of TE mission
<i>28 September 2022 10 days</i>	Preparation of draft TE report

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

8 October 2022	Circulation of draft TE report for comments
15 October 2022	Incorporation of comments on draft TE report into Audit Trail & finalization of TE report
22 October 2022	Preparation and Issuance of Management Response
25 October 2022	Concluding Stakeholder Workshop (optional)
30 October 2022	Expected date of full TE completion

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

## 7. TE DELIVERABLES

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	TE Inception Report	TE team clarifies objectives, methodology and timing of the TE	No later than 2 weeks before the TE mission: (9 September 2022)	TE team submits Inception Report to Commissioning Unit and project management
2	Presentation	Initial Findings	End of TE mission: (27 September 2022)	TE team presents to Commissioning Unit and project management
3	Draft TE Report	Full draft report (using guidelines on report content in ToR Annex C) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of end of TE mission: (7 October 2022)	TE team submits to Commissioning Unit; reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP
4	Final TE Report* + Audit Trail	Revised final report and TE Audit trail in which the TE details how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final TE report (See template in ToR Annex H)	Within 1 week of receiving comments on draft report: (25 October 2022)	TE team submits both documents to the Commissioning Unit

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

The final TE Report should include the Management Response to the Conclusions and Recommendations provided by the Evaluator.

## 8. TE ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing the TE resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's TE is the UNDP Country Office in the Republic of Mauritius.

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



The Commissioning Unit will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the TE team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the TE team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

## 9. TE TEAM COMPOSITION

A team of two Independent Evaluators will conduct the TE – one International Team Leader (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions) and one National Expert from Mauritius. The Team Leader will be responsible for the overall design and writing of the TE report, etc. The team expert will assist the Team Leader in identifying and collecting/collating the appropriate information in-country and in organising interviews, etc. as well as assessing any emerging trends with respect to regulatory frameworks, budget allocations, capacity building, etc. The National Expert will work with the Project Team in developing the TE itinerary, etc.

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

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

### **International Consultant (Team Leader)**

#### Education

- Master's degree in an Environmental subject or other closely related field;

#### Experience

- Relevant experience with results-based management evaluation methodologies;
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to Biodiversity and Marine Ecosystems
- Experience in evaluating projects;
- Experience working in Africa/Indian Ocean;
- Experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years;
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and mainstreaming biodiversity/reducing pressure on natural resources;
- Experience in gender responsive evaluation and analysis;
- Excellent communication skills;
- Demonstrable analytical skills;
- Project evaluation/review experience within United Nations system is an important asset.

#### Language

- Fluency in written and spoken English.

### **National Consultant/Expert:**

- Experience in validating/assessing baseline and end of project target scenarios;
  - Work experience in the field of ecosystem-based management, preferably in coastal and marine ecology, fisheries or other related fields, for at least 4 years;
  - Ability to work effectively in a team, with good relationship management skills;
-

- Project evaluation/review experiences with results-based monitoring and evaluation and methodologies within United Nations system will be considered an asset
  - Ability to maintain high standards despite pressing deadlines
  - Excellent communication (both oral and written) and analytical skills, and skills for conflict resolution and negotiation;
  - Good knowledge of environmental and socio-economic context of the Republic of Mauritius
  - Previous Experience working with the GEF-evaluations;
  - A Master's degree in environmental science, marine science, fisheries management, or other closely related field
- 

## 10. EVALUATOR ETHICS

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

## 11. PAYMENT SCHEDULE

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

Criteria for issuing the final payment of 40%<sup>3</sup>:

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

## 12. APPLICATION PROCESS<sup>4</sup>

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

- a) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](#)<sup>5</sup> provided by UNDP;

<sup>3</sup> 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. See the UNDP Individual Contract Policy for further details: [https://popp.undp.org/layouts/15/WopiFrame.aspx?sourcedoc=/UNDP\\_POPP\\_DOCUMENT\\_LIBRARY/Public/PSU\\_Individual%20Contract\\_Individual%20Contract%20Policy.docx&action=default](https://popp.undp.org/layouts/15/WopiFrame.aspx?sourcedoc=/UNDP_POPP_DOCUMENT_LIBRARY/Public/PSU_Individual%20Contract_Individual%20Contract%20Policy.docx&action=default)

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

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

- b) **CV** and a **Personal History Form** ([P11 form<sup>6</sup>](#));
- c) Brief description of **approach to work/technical proposal** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)
- d) **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc.), supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the [Letter of Confirmation of Interest template](#). If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

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

### 13. TOR ANNEXES

- ToR Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework
- 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

---

<sup>6</sup> [http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11\\_Personal\\_history\\_form.doc](http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc)

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

#	Indicator	Baseline	Mid Term Target	Targets by End of Project	• Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
<b>Project Objective: To mainstream the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and ecosystem services into coastal zone management and into the operations and policies of the tourism and physical development sectors in the Republic of Mauritius through a 'land- and seascape wide' integrated management approach based on the Environmental Sensitive Areas' (ESAs) inventory and assessment.</b>						
1	Area of coastal and marine ESAs under improved management or conservation status	4,696 ha (= currently managed MPAs i.e. Blue Bay Marine Park and SEMPA)	No Target	27,000 ha (i.e. approx. area of marine and coastal ESAs in ICZM plans for Black River District (4602 ha), and Rodrigues (16,290 ha); and area of ESAs in proposed and existing MPAs outside these locations (c. 8,022 ha) where management will be improved)	Spatial data and GIS (e.g. NSDI) Information on MPAs from AFRC Project Progress Reports Project Annual reports/PIR	<u>Assumptions:</u> Capacity building project interventions effectively contribute to institutional development Government commits to an incremental growth in the funding allocation, and policy support for protection and sustainable management of marine and coastal biodiversity  <u>Risk:</u> Policy reform is slow and does not support the required changes needed
2	Average METT Scores for the 5 METT sites impacted by the project	48%	No Target	At least 60%	METT assessment compiled (a) during PPG (reviewed and revised by the UNDP-GEF RTA), (b) by mid-term and (c) by project end, independently vetted by evaluators for b and c.	
3	Policy effectiveness of ESA categorisation in key planning and decision making processes pertaining to coastal and marine areas	ESAs are not fully integrated in the development planning process (as stated in the PRODOC barrier analysis, paragraph <b>Error! Reference source not found.</b> , and in related content.)	No Target	A number of barriers relating to the mainstreaming or application of coastal and marine ESAs in decision making processes have been overcome, as independently vetted by project evaluations	Mid-term Review Terminal Evaluation	
<b>Outcome 1: Threats to biodiversity and ecosystem function are addressed by ensuring that marine and coastal Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESAs) are an integral part of planning and implementation mechanisms relating to coastal development and the tourism sector.</b>						
<b>Outputs:</b> Information necessary for marine and coastal biodiversity mainstreaming is made available and capacity for knowledge management is developed by making the ESA study and other relevant information available ESAs are mainstreamed into physical development and ICZM planning processes, through the provision of guidance and support to the ongoing ICZM planning and physical development planning processes and by demonstrating appropriate approaches through implementation of an ICZM plan for Rodrigues and one District level plan for Mauritius Standards and a certification system developed for the tourism sector that facilitates the mainstreaming of the management of marine and coastal biodiversity into their operations						
4	Spatial and policy information for all marine and coastal ESAs openly and freely available to all planning agencies, decision makers, stakeholders and to the general public, with due consideration to the different target audiences in the terms of data use and data applications	The ESA maps have not been distributed to all local authorities, and it is not always easy for a planning authority or developer to identify whether a proposed development site will impact on an ESA.	Online Platform Installed	(a) All relevant Ministries to have access to information and to be using it in planning applications and permits that affect marine and coastal ESAs  (b) All relevant planning decisions in coastal and marine areas to take account of ESAs  (c) Open, free and interactive access to geo-referenced ESA maps, assuming that the adequacy of terms of data use and data applications with respect to the different data users	Availability of maps, documents etc. on line Results of survey of stakeholders at beginning and end of project to assess use of the information Mid-term Review, Terminal Evaluation (end of project achievements to be independently assessed through evaluation)	<u>Assumptions:</u> Government willing to make information and maps on ESAs publically available (other than critical confidential information such as private ownership details)  Relevant government entities show willingness to implement policy measures and legislation  Local government and stakeholders willing to develop and implement ICZM plans

#	Indicator	Baseline	Mid Term Target	Targets by End of Project	• Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
5	Number and profile of persons(M/F) and organisations accessing coastal and marine biodiversity information using the tools and products developed by and/or influenced by the project	Zero	25 Individual Consultations	50 individual consultations by Terminal Evaluation	Sex, age, location disaggregated feedback forms attached to communications materials  MOUs between institution housing the knowledge management system and institutions providing data  Web hits  Number, sex, age, location of subscribers to newsletters/electronic mail outs  Visitors to visitor centres,  Training courses participant records, disaggregated by sex, age location	Rodrigues establishes a long-term budget for the GIS Unit and has the capacity to manage the Unit & retains the capacity  Ministry of Housing & Lands collaborate on the ESA & OPS Integration  Eco-labelling is of interest to operators in the coastal zone and they are willing to pay for it.  <u>Risk:</u>
6	For Rodrigues, existence of marine and coastal information and GIS unit	None	GIS Unit Installed	Unit in place with qualified staff recruited and working effectively	Presence of unit	Conflicts and misunderstandings between agencies involved undermine efforts Tourism operators unwilling to participate in voluntary eco-labelling schemes
7	New indicator for new Activity and Study on carrying Capacity (Ministry of Tourism): ““Threshold level and management strategies for nautical activities in defined areas established”.	“No threshold level for nautical activities”	Ground Truthing completed by Mid Term	“Threshold Levels established”	Carrying Capacity Study; Progress and PIR Reports, ICZM and coastal policies and regulations	Information and data available; Technically adequate consultants; Policy makers, stakeholders and public ready to accept results and recommendations. RISKS: Government ready to use recommendations in existing and new policies / regulations and enforcement; Tourism will rebound from COVID-19 Pandemic
<b>Outcome 2: Threats to marine and coastal biodiversity are mitigated and fishery resources protected in at least 20,000 ha of seascapes, through the improved management of MPAs and no-take zones.</b>						
<b>Outputs: 2.1 Management effectiveness of the MPA network is improved through management planning where required, and also through the introduction of operations and business planning, and improved surveillance and enforcement. 2.2 An investment framework for MPAs is developed and contributes to improved financial sustainability of the marine protected area sub-system</b>						
8	Protected area management effectiveness scores for each MPA as recorded by Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT) – see PRODOC <a href="#">Annex 3, Table 14</a>	Baseline METT Scores:  SEMPA = 62%  Rodrigues Northern Marine Reserves = 43%  BBMP = 58%  BMP = 48%  Fishing Reserves = 28%	Improvement in Score	METT Scores by project end:  SEMPA = at least 75%  Rodrigues Northern Marine Reserves = at least 55%  BBMP = at least 70%  BMP = at least 55%  Fishing Reserves = at least 40%	METT assessment compiled (a) during PPG (reviewed and revised by the UNDP-GEF RTA), (b) by mid-term and (c) by project end, independently vetted by evaluators for b and c.	<u>Assumptions:</u>  Government adopts fundamental policy reforms required, such as the consultative approach to MPA planning and management involving increased stakeholder participation  Institutional and policy barriers for an effective site-level revenue generation, collection and retention into the PA system can be lifted, and government allows funding generated by MPAs to be invested in site management

#	Indicator	Baseline	Mid Term Target	Targets by End of Project	• Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
9	Area (ha) of MPAs, either legally designated or established through MOUs with communities	15,913 ha	No Target	20,000 ha (expectation to include VMCA and marine areas around northern islets)	Project Progress Reports Project Annual reports/PIR	Communities and stakeholders accept responsibility for sustainable stewardship of coastal and marine resources
	Key MPA finance indicators, as recorded by the SO1 TT, Financial Scorecard for the MPA Sub-system (see <a href="#">PRODOC Annex 3, Table 15</a> )	(a) Funding gap for management of MPAs: As per the rough SO1 TT baseline assessments, the funding gap (2015) is approx. 100% of current expenditure under the basic management scenario, and 430% under the optimal management scenario  (b) Financial Sustainability Score for the MPA Sub-system = 24%	No Target	(a) The annual financing gap is reduced to be at least 50% of expenditure under the basic management scenario  (b) Financial Sustainability Score for the MPA Sub-system = increases to at least 40%	Financial Sustainability scorecards assessment compiled (a) during PPG (reviewed and revised by the UNDP-GEF RTA), (b) by mid-term and (c) by project end, independently vetted by evaluators for b and c.	The Social and Community Welfare Centres have the resources to act as information, communication and facilitation hubs  The financial reporting system of the MOEMRFSOI is adapted to provide information directly on MPA planning and management operations More detailed MPA finance assessments, especially with respect to needs and gaps, are carried out regularly and broken down for relevant PA/MPA managing agencies in Mauritius and Rodrigues, in close collaboration with the PAN and other related projects
10	Total operational budget (including HR and capital budget) allocation for MPA management	c. USD300,000	No Target	USD 450,000 (based on expectation of 50% increase)	Audited financial reports of MOEMRFSOI	Risk: Adverse policy and regulatory environment prevails (e.g. Government does not support proposals for MPA revenue retention; does not change policy direction towards more decentralised socio economic and environmental planning)  Downturn in visitor numbers reducing income to MPAs from fees and permits  Coastal communities unwilling to adopt new practices and livelihoods
11	Number of additional males and females benefitting from livelihoods strengthened through solutions for management of MPAs	Gender sensitive community baseline survey to be undertaken during inception phase of workshop	No Target	30	Tracker studies, panel data  On Rodrigues, information from SGP monitoring unit in the EPU	

**3: Erosion control and ecosystem services restoration: erosion and soil loss are reduced in 200 ha of erosion-prone water sheds; and ecosystem services are restored in 100 ha of coastal wetlands.**

**Outputs:** 3.1 Sustainable land management (SLM) techniques are applied to control erosion and water course sedimentation in the SEMPA watershed, with a focus on Rivière-Coco 3.2 Essential ecosystem services are restored in coastal wetlands (e.g. water filtration, storage and flood control services, habitat and recreation)

12	Area of coastal wetlands managed effectively	26 ha (based on area of Rivulet du Terre Rouge Ramsar site and assumption that this is managed effectively)	50 ha of wetlands restored.  Management Plan for Terre Rouge and Pointe D'Esny approved and gazetted	100 ha (= area of two coastal wetlands Ramsar sites – 48 ha – plus an additional area that might be managed with private owners)	Project Progress Reports Project Annual reports/PIR	<u>Assumptions:</u> Government is willing to support appropriate legislative and policy reforms  Other enabling legislation passed and/or regulations made: Environment Act updated, Development and Planning Act wholly proclaimed, and regulatory framework for ESA adopted Private landowners willing to participate in conservation interventions for coastal wetlands, and issues surrounding private ownership resolved
----	--	---	--	--	--	--

#	Indicator	Baseline	Mid Term Target	Targets by End of Project	• Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
13	Revised Wetland Bill and Regulations and submitted to the State Law Office for enactment”	Wetland Bill is in place. There is need to review the National RAMSAR Committee in the wetlands bill and the requirements of the application should be well defined and listed (for example site plan by sworn land surveyor, showing delimitation of the wetlands and buffer). There should be clear definition of all types of wetlands. ESA bill was prepared by the M/Environment.	Wetland Bill revised	Wetland Bill revised and presented to Government for review and adoption along with associated regulations  Training needs assessment (TNA) to be worked out. The TNA will be used as basis to procure training services.  Training assessment to be finalised by the end of the second year of the project.  Accredited training programme to be implemented during the third year.  Capacity built within the Government to secure resources to replicate the training programme.	Government gazette notice	Women and men farmers on Rodrigues are willing to adopt new practices that prevent soil erosion  <u>Risk:</u> Soil erosion prevention techniques take longer than project lifetime for proven success
14	Area over which soil erosion techniques are successfully applied in Riviere Coco	Baseline is “0” (No soil erosion control present at Riviere Coco)  SEMPA - GEF SGP project concerning rehabilitation of 15 ha for watershed management for prevention of soil erosion at Var Brulee.	100 ha of the Riviere Coco region rehabilitated.  A detailed project document prepared for all the watersheds from Grand Var to Anse Raffin.	At least 200 hectares is fenced and rehabilitated in the Riviere Coco region (particularly Grand Var area). Schemes identified, developed and put into place for fishermen and other persons so as to sustain their livelihoods. Training needs identified, developed and training provided to fishermen and farmers A detailed project document prepared for all the watersheds from Grand Var to Anse Raffin.	Project information (PIR reports etc.)	

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

#	Item (electronic versions preferred if available)
1	Project Identification Form (PIF)
2	UNDP Initiation Plan
3	Final UNDP-GEF Project Document with all annexes
4	CEO Endorsement Request
5	UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) and associated management plans (if any)
6	Inception Workshop Report
7	Mid-Term Review report and management response to MTR recommendations
8	All Project Implementation Reports (PIRs)
9	Progress reports (quarterly, semi-annual or annual, with associated workplans and financial reports)
10	Oversight mission reports
11	Minutes of Project Board Meetings and of other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
12	GEF Tracking Tools (from CEO Endorsement, midterm and terminal stages)
13	GEF/LDCF/SCCF Core Indicators (from PIF, CEO Endorsement, midterm and terminal stages); for GEF-6 and GEF-7 projects only
14	Financial data, including actual expenditures by project outcome, including management costs, and including documentation of any significant budget revisions
15	Co-financing data with expected and actual contributions broken down by type of co-financing, source, and whether the contribution is considered as investment mobilized or recurring expenditures
16	Audit reports
17	Electronic copies of project outputs (booklets, manuals, technical reports, articles, etc.)
18	Sample of project communications materials
19	Summary list of formal meetings, workshops, etc. held, with date, location, topic, and number of participants
20	Any relevant socio-economic monitoring data, such as average incomes / employment levels of stakeholders in the target area, change in revenue related to project activities
21	List of contracts and procurement items over ~US\$5,000 (i.e. organizations or companies contracted for project outputs, etc., except in cases of confidential information)
22	List of related projects/initiatives contributing to project objectives approved/started after GEF project approval (i.e. any leveraged or "catalytic" results)
23	Data on relevant project website activity – e.g. number of unique visitors per month, number of page views, etc. over relevant time period, if available
24	UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD)
25	List/map of project sites, highlighting suggested visits
26	List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Board members, RTA, Project Team members, and other partners to be consulted
27	Project deliverables that provide documentary evidence of achievement towards project outcomes
28	Report from the Social and Environmental Review undertaken in 2020-21



## ToR Annex C: Content of the TE report

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

---

<sup>7</sup> See ToR Annex F for rating scales.

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

#### 4.1 Project Implementation

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

#### 4.2 Project Results and Impacts

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

#### 5. Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons

- Main Findings
- Conclusions
- Recommendations
- Lessons Learned

#### 6. Annexes

- TE ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
- TE Mission itinerary, including summary of field visits
- List of persons interviewed
- List of documents reviewed
- Evaluation Question Matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology)
- Questionnaire used and summary of results
- Co-financing tables (if not include in body of report)
- TE Rating scales
- Signed Evaluation Consultant Agreement form
- Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form
- Signed TE Report Clearance form

- *Annexed in a separate file:* TE Audit Trail
- *Annexed in a separate file:* relevant terminal GEF/LDCF/SCCF Core Indicators or Tracking Tools, as applicable

## ToR Annex D: Evaluation Criteria Matrix template

Consultant to determine/clarify the questions for the TE Inception Report

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

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

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

### Evaluators/Consultants:

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

### Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

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

Name of Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): \_\_\_\_\_

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

Signed at \_\_\_\_\_ (Place) on \_\_\_\_\_ (Date)

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

### ToR Annex F: TE Rating Scales

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

### ToR Annex G: TE Report Clearance Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## ToR Annex H: TE Audit Trail

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):

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