

Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference

BRA/17/G31 – (PIMS 5896) Taking Deforestation Out of the Soy Supply Chain

BACKGROUND

1. Introduction

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full- and medium-sized UNDP-supported GEF-financed projects are required to undergo a Terminal Evaluation (TE) at the end of the project. This Terms of Reference (ToR) sets out the expectations for the TE of the *full-sized* project titled *BRA/17/G31 - Taking Deforestation Out of the Soy Supply Chain (PIMS 5896)* implemented through the *Conservation International*. The project started on June 30TH, 2017 and is in its fourth year of implementation. The TE process must follow the guidance outlined in the document ‘Guidance For Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects’ http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/GEF/TE_GuidanceforUNDP-supportedGEF-financedProjects.pdf

2. Project Description

The project was designed to reduce the threat to biodiversity, pressures on high conservation value forests, and GHG emissions that the advancing agricultural frontier is posing in the Matopiba region, by promoting a dialogue to build a shared vision on sustainable landscapes among key stakeholders - government, companies, civil society and the productive sector- and fostering the development of solutions to implement this vision, such as restoration practices, strengthening of local government capacities and a system to support soy producers in adopting best agricultural practices. The project will focus on the west of Bahia and central Tocantins. This is in line with the overall Integrated Approach Pilot (IAP), whose program goal is to implement a supply chain approach to solve underlying root causes of deforestation from agriculture commodities. The total project funding is of USD 6.6 million planned to be implemented in activities to be carried out until December 2021. This is a GEF funded project, with the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) as the implementing agency and Conservation International (CI) as the Executing Agency in partnership with multiple stakeholders.

The world is currently facing the COVID-19 pandemic, which is affecting people everywhere and impacting global and local economic activity and transport systems, as well as causing unprecedented disruptions to daily life that undercut the societal fabric of opportunities for human interaction¹. In order to ensure the well-being and safety of UNDP’s staff and contractors, as well as to ensure no harm is done to partners, communities and interlocutors, the implementation of this TE shall be undertaken virtually, as outlined in “Evaluation Approach and Method” of this TOR.

In Brazil, according to the World Health Organization (WHO)², since January 3rd, 2020 there have been 16.274.695 confirmed cases of COVID-19 with 454.429 deaths. The COVID-19 pandemic has significantly

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

² <https://covid19.who.int/region/amro/country/br>, 28/05/2021.

impacted project activities. Despite ongoing efforts to minimize the risks, reinforcing the adoption of adaptative management measures during the pandemic, field work has been fully restricted since mid-March/2020. Many GGP activities were originally planned to take place in person to ensure the effectiveness of consultations with local stakeholders, however these had to be postponed to 2021.

3. TE Purpose

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

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the “Guidance for conducting terminal evaluations of UNDP-supported, 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.

The TE will evaluate all interventions made by the Executing Agency (CI) to ensure project execution and project team/beneficiaries’ safety amid COVID-19 pandemic in Brazil. Should be considered in this evaluation work plans’ adjustments, financial and budgetary aspects, field activities adaptation, engagement strategy and communication efforts.

DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

4. TE Approach & Methodology

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

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

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful TE³. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to; executing agencies, senior officials and task team/component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project beneficiaries, academia, local government and CSOs, etc.

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

The final methodological approach including interview schedule and data to be used in the evaluation should be clearly outlined in the inception report and be fully discussed and agreed between UNDP, stakeholders and the TE consultant.

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

As of March 11th, 2020, the World Health Organization (WHO) declared COVID-19 a global pandemic as the new coronavirus rapidly spread to all regions of the world. Travel to, and within the country has been restricted. The TE consultant should develop a methodology that takes this into account to conduct the TE virtually and remotely, including the use of remote interview methods and extended desk reviews, data analysis, surveys and evaluation questionnaires. This should be detailed in the TE Inception Report and agreed with the Commissioning Unit.

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

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

5. Detailed Scope of the TE

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

³ (link to stakeholder engagement in UNDP Eval Guidelines?)

The Results Framework 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 Findings section of the TE report will cover the topics listed below. A full outline of the TE report's content is provided in ToR Annex C. The asterisk "(*)" indicates criteria for which a rating is required.

Findings:

i. Project Design/Formulation

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

ii. Project Implementation

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

iii. Project Results

- Assess the achievement of outcomes against indicators by reporting on the level of progress for each objective and outcome indicator at the time of the TE and noting final achievements
- Relevance (*), Effectiveness (*), Efficiency (*) and overall project outcome (*)
- Sustainability: financial (*), socio-political (*), institutional framework and governance (*), environmental (*), overall likelihood of sustainability (*)
- Country ownership
- Gender equality and women's empowerment

- Cross-cutting issues (poverty alleviation, improved governance, climate change mitigation and adaptation, disaster prevention and recovery, human rights, capacity development, South-South cooperation, knowledge management, volunteerism, etc., as relevant)
- GEF Additionality
- Catalytic Role / Replication Effect
- Progress to impact

iv. Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons Learned

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

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

6. Expected Outputs and Deliverables

The TE consultant shall prepare and submit:

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	TE Inception Report	TE Consultant clarifies objectives, methodology and timing of the TE	No later than 2 weeks before the TE task.	TE Consultant submits Inception Report 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 task.	TE Consultant submits to Commissioning Unit; reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
5	Final TE Report* + Audit Trail	Revised final report and TE Audit trail in which the TE details how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final TE report (See template in ToR Annex H)	Within 1 week of receiving comments on draft report.	TE Consultant submits both documents to the Commissioning Unit

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

All final TE reports will be quality assessed by the UNDP Independent Evaluation Office (IEO). Details of the IEO's quality assessment of decentralized evaluations can be found in Section 6 of the UNDP Evaluation Guidelines.⁴

7. 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 Brazil Country Office. The Commissioning Unit will contract the evaluators.

The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the TE consultant to provide all relevant documents, to include an itinerary of the confirmed stakeholder interviews.

8. Duration of the Work

The total duration of the TE will be approximately **35 working days (wd)** over a time period of 9 weeks starting on August 10th, 2021. The tentative TE timeframe is as follows:

Timeframe	Activity
August 10, 2021	Preparation period for TE Consultant (handover of documentation)
August 11, 2021 (4 working days)	Document review and preparation of TE Inception Report
August 17, 2021 (2 working days)	Finalization and Validation of TE Inception Report; latest start of TE task.
August 19, 2021 (10 working days)	TE task: Virtual stakeholder meetings, interviews, etc.
September 2, 2021	Task wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings; earliest end of TE task.
September 6, 2021 (10 working days)	Preparation of draft TE report
September 20, 2021 (5 working days)	Circulation of draft TE report for comments
September 27, 2021 (3 working days)	Incorporation of comments on draft TE report into Audit Trail & finalization of TE report
September 29, 2021	Preparation and Issuance of Management Response
October 1, 2021	Expected date of full TE completion

The expected date start date of contract is 10/08/2021.

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

REQUIRED SKILLS AND EXPERIENCE

9. TE Team Composition and Required Qualifications

One international independent evaluator will conduct the TE. The consultant shall have prior experience evaluating UNDP-GEF financed projects.

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

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

Education

- Master's degree in environmental issues or natural resources management 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;
- Experience in evaluating projects;
- Experience working *in Latin America*. Experience in Brazil is an asset;
- Experience in relevant technical areas for at least *10 years*;
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and biodiversity; experience in gender responsive evaluation and analysis;
- Excellent communication skills;
- Demonstrable analytical skills;
- Project evaluation/review experience within United Nations system will be considered an asset;
- Experience of working on GEF or GEF evaluations, especially with Biodiversity;
- Experience with implementing evaluations remotely will be considered an asset.

Language

- Fluency in written and spoken English.
- Proficiency in Spanish or Portuguese, with preference for Portuguese

10. Evaluator Ethics

The TE consultant 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

#	Deliverable	Payment Percentage
1	MTR Inception Report	20% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final TE Inception Report and approval by the Commissioning Unit.
2	Draft Final Report	30% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the draft TE report to the Commissioning Unit.
3	Final Report*	50% 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 50%:

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

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

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

APPLICATION PROCESS

- Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](#)⁵ provided by UNDP;
- CV** and a **Personal History Form** ([P11 form](#))⁶;
- 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)

⁵

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

⁶ http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc

- d) **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the [Letter of Confirmation of Interest template](#). As the TE will be conducted **remotely/virtually, no travel expenses may be included in the financial proposal**. If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

All application materials should be sent to the following email ONLY: ic.procurement.br@undp.org by July 4th, , **2021**, indicating the following reference “Consultant for BRA/17/G31 Terminal Evaluation”. Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

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

Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for this process. The application should contain a current and complete CV in English with indication of the e-mail and phone contact, as well as a price offer (in US Dollars) indicating the total cost of the assignment.

The CV and the proposed price must be submitted in separate files. Noncompliance with this provision will cause the application to be disregarded.

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.

The consultant shall have prior experience in evaluating similar 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 consultant must present the following qualifications:

Mandatory Experience

- Master’s degree in environmental issues or natural resources management or other closely related field.
- 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;
- Experience in evaluating projects;
- Experience working in Latin America.
- Experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years;
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and biodiversity; experience in gender responsive evaluation and analysis;
- Excellent communication skills;

- Demonstrable analytical skills;
- Fluency in written and spoken English.
- Proficiency in Spanish or Portuguese, with preference for Portuguese.

Qualifying Criteria

- Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system;
- Experience of working on GEF or GEF evaluations, especially with Biodiversity;
- Experience with implementing evaluations remotely;
- Experience working in Brazil.

Evaluation Procedure:

The final criteria for this selection process will be **technical capacity** and **price**.

Individual consultants will be evaluated based on a cumulative analysis taking into consideration the combination of the applicants’ qualifications and financial proposal. The award of the contract shall be made to the individual **consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:**

a. Classification of technical qualification (cv)

The maximum score in TECHNICAL QUALIFICATION is 100 points.

Analysis of the CV regarding compliance with the mandatory requirements specified in these Terms of Reference. Candidates who do not meet the minimum mandatory criteria described herein will be disqualified at this stage.

CRITERIA	SCORE	WEIGHT	SUBTOTAL
CV Evaluation			
Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system. 01 point per evaluation/review experience.	0 to 5	6	30
Experience of working on GEF evaluations, especially with Biodiversity. 01 point per evaluation report.	0 to 5	6	30
Experience with implementing evaluations remotely. 01 point per evaluation report.	0 to 5	5	25
Experience working in Brazil. 01 point per evaluation report.	0 to 5	3	15
Total			100

b. Classification of Financial Proposals (Price) – Final

Only the financial proposals (price) of candidates who attain a **final Score of 70 points or higher in the TECHNICAL CLASSIFICATION** will be taken into consideration.

The Final Score—FS—of the process will be reached by the sum of the **final Technical Score—TS multiplied by a factor of 0.70**, and the **Price Proposal score—PS—multiplied by a factor 0.30**, i.e.:

$$FS = TS \times 0.70 + PS \times 0.30$$

The **PS** score will be calculated according to the following formula:

$$PS = 100 \times LPP / Ppe$$

Where:

PS = score of the price proposal

LPP = lowest price proposal

Ppe = price proposal under evaluation

The lowest price proposal will score one hundred (100).

The proposal achieving the highest final score will be selected.

12. Annexes to the TE ToR

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

ToR Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework

This project will contribute to the following Sustainable Development Goal (s): End hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition and promote sustainable agriculture.					
This project will contribute to the following country outcome included in the UNDAF/Country Programme Document: <i>copy relevant outcome here</i>					
This project will be linked to the following output of the UNDP Strategic Plan: Output 2.5: Legal and regulatory frameworks, policies and institutions enabled to ensure the conservation, sustainable use, and access and benefit sharing of natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystems, in line with international conventions and national legislation.					
	Objective and Outcome Indicators (no more than a total of 15 -16 indicators)	Baseline⁷	Mid-term Target⁸	End of Project Target	Assumptions⁹
Project Objective: To reduce the threat to biodiversity that the advancing agricultural frontier is posing in the Matopiba region, through a supply chain approach that solves the underlying root causes of deforestation from soy.	1: Extent to which legal or policy or institutional frameworks are in place for conservation, sustainable use, and access and benefit sharing of natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystems. Indicator: 1) Number of properties registered 2) Percentage of area analyzed/regularized: 3) Number of properties supported with the preparation of a proposal on	Latest Baseline ¹⁰ : In the ten municipalities the SICAR has 15,410 properties registered as of (1/12/2016): The following provides number of properties registered in each of the 10 municipalities we are going to work in	1) All 17,000 properties have been registered 2) And 30% of the area of all registered properties have been analyzed	All 17,000 properties have been registered Through support to the environmental agencies, 50% of the total area of all registered properties	The assumption is that approximately 90% of all properties have been registered and that the total number of properties in the 10 municipalities is around 17,000 properties The analysis of the registered properties will

⁷ Baseline, mid-term and end of project target levels must be expressed in the same neutral unit of analysis as the corresponding indicator. Baseline is the current/original status or condition and need to be quantified. The baseline must be established before the project document is submitted to the GEF for final approval. The baseline values will be used to measure the success of the project through implementation monitoring and evaluation.

⁸ Target is the change in the baseline value that will be achieved by the mid-term review and then again by the terminal evaluation.

⁹ Risks must be outlined in the Feasibility section of this project document.

¹⁰ Per the phone call with the GEF SEC and UNDP on December 22nd, we have encountered new information regarding the registration of properties under the Forest Code, since it has been 1 year. We have included the latest baseline information on the number of properties registered above, and in addition, we had included before only indicators on the number of properties registered rather than the percentage of area that would be analyzed and regularized. This was always part of the project, but it was missing indicators here. Registration is only one of the steps in assuring that the Forest Code is implemented successfully, thus the analysis and regularization component that this project will support, will be crucial for the long-term sustainable development of this region.

	<p>how to restore or offset their deficit</p>	<p>and the area analyzed¹¹ so far in percentages of the total area of private lands registered: Area below is in hectares</p> <p>Palmas Properties: 877 Total area: 82,594 Analyzed: 4,885 (6%)</p> <p>Porto Nacional Properties: 989 Area: 216,894 Analyzed: 17,385 (8%)</p> <p>Monte do Carmo Properties: 515 Area: 215,121 Analyzed: 5,995 (3%)</p> <p>Silvanópolis Properties: 289 Area: 77,322 Analyzed: 7,213 (9%)</p> <p>Santa Rosa do TO Properties: 288 Area: 109,372 Analyzed: 3,721 (4%)</p> <p>Formosa do R.Preto Properties: 3253 Area: 1,100,614 Analyzed: 453,131 (41%)</p> <p>Riachão das Neves Properties: 1742 Area: 308,589</p>		<p>have been analyzed and validated;</p> <p>Through support for farmers, 25% of all the properties (0,25% *3,400 = 850 properties, see assumption) with a deficit in Permanent Protection Areas or Legal Reserves have been supported with the preparation of a proposal on how to restore or offset their deficit</p>	<p>provide information about the deficit in permanent protection areas and legal reserves. However, it is assumed that at least 20%, of all properties, or 3,400 properties have a deficit in either or both.</p>
--	---	--	--	--	---

¹¹ Analysis of the property: The registrations received by SiCAR will need to be validated by the competent environment agencies. the documents and information presented. Inconsistencies will be communicated to the person responsible for the registration, so that the declared information is revised,.. Source: <http://www.brasil.gov.br/meio-ambiente/2014/05/conheca-o-passo-a-passo-para-afetuar-o-cadastro-ambiental-rural>

		<p>Analyzed: 38,478 (12%)</p> <p>Barreiras Properties: 2416 Area: 499,786 Analyzed: 30,565 (7%)</p> <p>Luis Eduardo Magelhães Properties: 736 Area: 296,853 Analyzed: 14,618 (5%)</p> <p>São Desidèrio Properties: 4305 Area: 1,079,962 Analyzed 81,562 (8%)</p> <p>Total Properties: 15,410 Area: 3,987,107 Analyzed: 657,553 (16,5%)</p>			
	2: Number of direct project beneficiaries (women and men)	<p>Base line: 0 beneficiaries have formally regularized their properties</p>	<p>25% of farms analyzed and validated, benefitting 17,000 farmers/family members</p> <p>(8500 men and 8500 women). Project Indicator: It is estimated that 10% of soy farmers are women; however, it is assumed that per property there are four</p>	<p>50% of farms analyzed and validated. 34,000 farmers and their family members (17,000 men and 17,000 women) are directly beneficiaries in having their properties regularized.</p>	<p>All properties are registered in the SICAR and 50% of all area are analyzed and validated and for those that show a deficit in permanent protection areas and legal reserves a proposal for regularization submitted.</p>

			members, with 50% males, 50% females		
	3: Deforestation rates in Matopiba region.	<p>7,249 km²/year (2011) (waiting for 2013 figures to be established in Year 1</p> <p>The deforestation rates refer to the whole Cerrado. In the baseline period, most of the deforestation was concentrated in the Matopiba area. An overall reduction with 1000 km² over a three-year period as a result of improved environmental management is feasible, but it is difficult to attribute the indirect and direct impact. As the project is working around 8.5% of the Matopiba region., the rationale is that we may claim as a direct impact of this project 8.5% of the reduction in deforestation .</p>	<p>Reduction to rates below 2013 figures</p> <p>As no recent data on deforestation in the Cerrado or the Matopiba region are available it is estimated that a gradual reduction with 1000 km² by 2020 is feasible, which would change the deforestation rate to 6000km².</p>	<p>Reduction to rates around 6000km²</p> <p>Reduction by 1000km² over three years. Better monitoring and control and the implementation of the Forest Code is expected to reduce the annual deforestation rate by 1000 km² at the end of the project.</p>	<p>The assumption is that the rural environmental registry (CAR) will prove to be an effective monitoring tool and that deforestation rates will regularly be monitored¹²</p>

¹² In accordance with the FAO EX-ACT, in Forest Zone 412 which possible resembles best the different phytophysiomies of the Cerrado, this is equivalent to a reduction of 11,961,769 tCO₂eq. The area that the project is directly working in, covers 8.5% of the total area. We assume that 8.5% of the reduction in CO₂ emissions from deforestation can be attributed to the project. This is equivalent to 1,016,750 tCO₂eq

<p>Component/Outcome 1.1:</p> <p>A shared vision on expansion of the production of agricultural commodities in the Matopiba region in combination with the conservation of biodiversity and ecosystem services through sustainable land management and the creation of sustainable productive landscapes.</p>	<p>4: Number of policy recommendations taken up by policy makers including gender sensitive proposal</p>	<p>0 (zero)</p>	<p>Proposals/ recommendations prepared</p>	<p>4 significant proposals taken up (turned into policy or operational instructions) by municipal, state or federal governments</p>	
<p>Component/Outcome 1.2:</p> <p>Improved environmental management.</p>	<p>5: Percentage of productive area registered in the SICAR system, analyzed, validated and regularized</p>	<p>Base line Analyzed: (16,5%) Validated 0% Regularized 0%</p> <p>Indicator: Percentage of properties Note: 15,410 properties have been registered out of 17,000.</p>	<p>Analyzed: 30% Validated: 20% Regularized 15%</p>	<p>With support from the GEF, the goal is: Analyzed: 70% of area Validated: 50% Regularized¹³ 50% 10% or 850 properties with some deficit in permanent protection areas or legal reserves have been supported to prepare and submit proposals for restoration or offset;</p>	<p>Most large properties with an interest in registration in the SICAR (to avoid fines) would have registered before the May 2016 deadline. Most of the properties not registered by May 2016 will be smallholder properties that are more difficult to mobilize and reach.¹⁴</p> <p>The assumption is that under the Business as Usual scenario, the environmental agencies would be able to have only 30% of the total area analyzed</p>

¹³ Regularized: This means they have gone through the registration, validation, and they have been found compliant with the program.

¹⁴ 50% of the total area under cultivation is roughly 1,970,000 hectares (1,617,900 in Bahia and 348,152 hectares in Tocantins). Of this, it is estimated -based on the Forest Code- that 20% of the private lands in Bahia (or 323,580 hectares) and 35% of the private lands in Tocantins (or 121,853) hectares should have been set aside. This amounts to a total of 445,433 hectares consisting of legal reserves and permanent protection areas (along rivers and on hilltops). Based on current data it is impossible to know how much of these 445,433 hectares is indeed still covered by native forest. There is also no way to be certain that avoided deforestation as a result of the environmental regularization process has not already been included in the calculations with respect to the reduction of deforestation rate, thus we are not estimating carbon for this area, but rather looking at deforestation rates for the area where this project will intervene.

	6: Area under restoration	The total deficit in Permanent Preservation Areas in Tocantins is 241,233 hectares. Extrapolating from this, results in an estimate of 648,612 hectares for the Matopiba region and 50,000 hectares in the 10 focal municipalities.	2.5% of the total APP deficit under restoration (1,250 hectares).	5% of the total APP deficit under restoration (2,500 hectares).	The assumption is that strengthening of the restoration supply chain will make different forms of restoration cheaper and more feasible.
--	---------------------------	---	---	---	--

	7: Number and size of traditional lands protected through safeguards	See annex M for baseline about recognized/ regulated and unrecognized lands. In the whole Matopiba area this amounts to 28 indigenous lands (4.16 million hectares) and 35 communities of former slaves (231,438 hectares)	Established in assessment about critical lands in Year 1.	Final targets will be established based on the assessment of critical lands.	The assumption is that there are traditional communities living in the focal area that are being affected by the expansion of soy production and that the project will be able to establish with local governments, farmers and trading organizations ways to limit the impacts on the livelihoods of these communities.
Component/Outcome 2.1: A system of support in the four focal areas prepared and implemented that will help	8: Proxy Indicators: Projects in the ten municipalities financed by the ABC program to finance among others: no-till; biological fixation of nitrogen;	In 10 municipalities, the ABC ¹⁵ program	Mid-term: 1222 loans	Final target: In 10 municipalities, our goal is to triple the	The assumption is that better knowledge and access to technical support for the preparation of loan

¹⁵ The ABC Plan is a credit initiative that provides low-interest loans to farmers who want to implement sustainable agriculture practices. These include no-till agriculture, the restoration of degraded pasture, the planting of commercial forests, biological nitrogen fixation, treatment of animal wastes and the integration of crops, livestock and forest. The programme's ambitious goals include rehabilitating 15 million hectares of degraded pastures and increasing the area under zero tillage from 25 million hectares to 33 million hectares by 2020. It also intends to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 160 million tonnes of CO2 equivalent annually, before 2020. Initial uptake was slow, with only 5 projects approved in the first year, representing USD 1.7 million in loans (Neate 2013).

farmers to adopt sustainable management of their properties and sustainable agricultural practices.	restoration of degraded areas, and others	supported between January 2013 and December 2016 611 loans to farmers for agricultural crops Baseline: 611 loans to farmers ¹⁶		participation in the ABC program (for agricultural crops), in three years, to 1833 loans to farmers With the above intervention it will be possible to double the uptake in the period 2017-2019. Hence by 2019/2020 a total of 1833 loans would have been contracted.	proposals as well as capacity building of loan assessors will increase the uptake of loan proposals.
---	---	--	--	--	--

Component/Outcome 3.1: Improved planning for expansion of production and conservation.	9: Area under integrated management identified and agreed (proposals for conservation units submitted and management plans agreed) Goal is to protect 10,000 hectares of Cerrado Forest. No carbon calculation was prepared, first because it is not expected to involve land use change and second because part of the balance may already be included in the reduction of deforestation calculations	0 (zero)	3,500 hectares	10,000 hectares	Integrated management includes APPs in restoration, conservation areas on private lands (RPPNs) and other conservation units; sustainable use conservation areas for which management plans were agreed).
--	---	----------	----------------	-----------------	---

¹⁶ Data from Banco Central do Brasil shows that from 2013-2016 in the ten municipalities 611 ABC loans for agricultural production were contracted. It is assumed that without project intervention a similar number will be contracted over the next period of three years

	<p>10: Area under legal protection as percentage of total area of the Matopiba region (including indigenous lands, conservation areas, lands of quilombolas and forest code preservation areas).</p>	<p>Baseline: Forest code preservation areas to be defined in the first year of the project. Currently the Conservation areas are: 3,725,752 hectares (full protection), 5,158,138 hectares (sustainable use), 20,364 hectares (on private lands), 231,438 hectares (quilombolas lands) and 4,158,962 hectares (indigenous lands).</p> <p>The first-year goal is to identify the forest code preservation areas and to find out the total percentage of areas that are under legal protection as a percentage of the whole Matopiba area. Above, we have the public and private land that are currently under protection. Once the project starts we will define the forest code preservation areas to calculate total percentage of areas that are under protection.</p>	<p>Mid-term:</p> <p>Area in compliance with the forest code (regularized) in the whole Matopiba area (XXX) + conservation areas (13.294.654 hectares) / 73.173.972 hectares * 100%</p>	<p>Goal is to have 40% of all the total Matopiba area covered with native vegetation and, hence protected as: either conservation area; indigenous or former slaves' areas or under the forest code.</p> <p>As the current area of protected areas adds up to 13.294.654, in order to have 40% of the total area under legal protection 15.974.935 hectares of native vegetation need to be protected on private lands and should therefore be formally regularized. The project itself will not achieve this, but will rather contribute indirectly.</p>	<p>It is assumed that project activities will substantially contribute to efforts to achieve zero illegal deforestation and to reduce legal deforestation.</p> <p>As the project will only directly intervene in 10 municipalities it is assumed that project activities will be brought to scale and indirectly influence the whole region</p>
--	--	--	--	---	---

Component/Outcome 4.1: Increased market demand for responsibly sourced soy	11: From WWF ProDoc: <i># of companies that have increased capacity to make and implement commitments to source reduced deforestation commodities</i> <i>Note that this will be implemented and monitored under WWF's demand child project</i>	0 (to be measured during project implementation)	Y2 30	Y4 60	
	12 From WWF ProDoc # companies with increased capacity to use decision-relevant information developed by the Transparency portal to inform their strategies <i>Note that this will be implemented and monitored under WWF's demand child project</i>	0 (portal not yet developed)	Y26 (3 for each commodity)	Y4 6 (3 for each commodity)	
	13:	2016: 0 jurisdictions where beef/soy is	5570 (soy), 17 (beef)	5570 (soy), 17 (beef)	

	<p>From WWF Prodoc: <i># assessments conducted and successfully shared with relevant stakeholders</i></p> <p><i>Note that this will be implemented and monitored under WWF's demand child project</i></p>	mapped from origin to destination			
<p>Component/Outcome 4.2: Financial sector engaged in the promotion of sustainable soy</p>	<p>14: # of new long-term finance products developed based on findings from the business base analysis</p> <p><i>Note that this will be implemented and monitored under IFC's transactions child project</i></p>	0	0	1 new long-term finance product developed based on findings from the business case analysis	
	<p>15: Identification of pilot landscapes or farmers to test the long-term finance product through workshops</p>	0	4	6-8 workshops	
<p>Component/Outcome 5.1: Project coordinated and lessons learned disseminated</p>	<p>16: Number of lessons learned and disseminated</p>	0	2	4	Lessons learned in our focal areas are relevant for other areas in the Matopiba region

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

#	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

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 rating¹⁷)
 - 4.1 Project Design/Formulation
 - Analysis of Results Framework: project logic and strategy, indicators
 - Assumptions and Risks
 - Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g. same focal area) incorporated into project design
 - Planned stakeholder participation
 - Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector

¹⁷ See ToR Annex F for rating scales.

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

4.2 Project Results

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

5. Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons

- Main Findings
- Conclusions
- Recommendations
- Lessons Learned

6. Annexes

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

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

ToR Annex D: Evaluation Criteria Matrix template

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 a the local, regional and national level?			
<i>(include evaluative questions)</i>	<i>(i.e. relationships established, level of coherence between project design and implementation approach, specific activities conducted, quality of risk mitigation strategies, etc.)</i>	<i>(i.e. project documentation, national policies or strategies, websites, project staff, project partners, data collected throughout the TE mission, etc.)</i>	<i>(i.e. document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc.)</i>
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in line with international and national norms and standards?			
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-political, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
Gender equality and women’s empowerment: How did the project contribute to gender equality and women’s empowerment?			
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
Adaptability: How was the project implemented to achieve its goals considering an adaptative management approach (flexibility, responsiveness, and inclusivity)? How was the team able to respond during moments considered vital to ensure project execution?			

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 & Evaluation Ratings Table

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>

Evaluation Ratings Table	
Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E)	Rating ¹⁸
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	

¹⁸ Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution, Relevance are rated on a 6-point rating scale: 6 = Highly Satisfactory (HS), 5 = Satisfactory (S), 4 = Moderately Satisfactory (MS), 3 = Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), 2 = Unsatisfactory (U), 1 = Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). Sustainability is rated on a 4-point scale: 4 = Likely (L), 3 = Moderately Likely (ML), 2 = Moderately Unlikely (MU), 1 = Unlikely (U)

Environmental	
Overall Likelihood of Sustainability	

ToR Annex G: TE Report Clearance Form

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

ToR Annex H: TE Audit Trail

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

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

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

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