



GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY
UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME



TERMS OF REFERENCE

TERMINAL EVALUATION OF UNDP-GEF PROJECT “CONSERVATION AND SUSTAINABLE USE OF PAMIR ALAY AND TIEN SHAN ECOSYSTEMS FOR SNOW LEOPARD PROTECTION AND SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITY LIVELIHOODS”

Project Title: *PIMS 5437 Tajikistan - UNDP-GEF project “Conservation and sustainable use of Pamir Alay and Tien Shan ecosystems for snow leopard protection and sustainable community livelihoods”*

Functional Title: International Consultant and National Consultant for Terminal Evaluation

Duration: Estimated 25 days (per consultant) over a period of June - July 2022, including 10-day field mission to Tajikistan.

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 **“Conservation and sustainable use of Pamir Alay and Tien Shan ecosystems for snow leopard protection and sustainable community livelihoods” (PIMS 5437)** implemented through the **National Biodiversity and Biosafety Center under the Committee for Environmental Protection under the Government of the Republic of Tajikistan**. The project started on the **03 August 2016** and 2022 is its **7th and last** year of implementation.

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

Project title:	Conservation and sustainable use of Pamir Alay and Tien Shan ecosystems for snow leopard protection and sustainable community livelihoods		
UNDP Project ID:	00085264	Project financing:	At endorsement (Million \$US)

			23,791,370
ATLAS Project ID:	00092973	GEF financing:	4,181,370
Country	Tajikistan	UNDP cost-sharing (TRAC):	410,000 + 30,000 for extension period
Region	CIS	National Government (co-financing):	10,000,000
		Local Government (co-financing):	1,200,000
		UNDP (co-financing):	6,000,000
		NGOs and Private Sector	2,000,000
Focus Area	Biodiversity, Land Degradation, Sustainable Forest Management	Total project budget:	4,591,370
GEF Focal Area Strategic Program	BD-1, BD-2 & BD-4 LD-3 SFM-1, SFM-2 & SFM-3	Total project expenditures by the time of TE	4,314,216.71
Executing Agency	National Biodiversity and Biosafety Center (NBBC)	% delivery	93.96
Other Partners involved	Committee for Environmental Protection, State Institution for SPNA, National Academy of Sciences and its subordinate institutes, Ministry of Agriculture, Committee for Land Management, Geodesy and Cartography, Forestry departments, and others.	ProDoc signature (project start date)	3 August 2016
		Planned closing date	2 August 2021
		Revised closing date	31 July 2022
		# of non-cost extensions granted	12 months

2. PROJECT BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

Situated in the far west of the species distribution range, the total habitat of the snow leopard in Tajikistan is reported to be about 85,700 km². Tajikistan forms an important link between the southern and northern range populations of snow leopards and serves as a vital corridor for the genetic interchange between these populations. Although no precise population estimate is available for the country, the current population estimates for snow leopards is around 220 individuals - significantly lower than the approximately 1,000 individuals prior to the 1980's.

The Government of Tajikistan is a party to The Bishkek Declaration on the Conservation of Snow Leopards (2012). Within the framework of the 'Bishkek Declaration', the Global Snow Leopard & Ecosystem Protection Program (GSLEP, 2013) seeks to bring together governments of snow leopard range countries to collectively recognize the threats to snow leopards, and commit to coordinated national and

international action. The foundation of the GSLEP is a set of 12 National Snow Leopard and Ecosystem Priorities (NSLEP) developed by each range country government.

This project directly supports the implementation of the priority actions contained in the NSLEP for Tajikistan. It seeks to: (i) prevent the further fragmentation of snow leopard and prey landscapes in Tajikistan; (ii) maintain and/or restore the quality of key snow leopard and prey habitats within these landscapes; (iii) improve the conservation status of, and sustainability of pasture and forest use in, these key snow leopard and prey habitats; and (iv) reduce the direct threats to the survival of snow leopards and prey populations living in these key habitats.

The project strategy is focused around four strategic areas of intervention as follows:

Conservation areas – improving the conservation tenure and conservation security of protected areas and community-based conservancies by building the institutional and individual capacities to implement a smart patrol system;

Livestock pasture areas – improving sustainable management of pasture lands across the snow leopard range by incentivising changes to unsustainable practices and reducing the extent and intensity of conflicts between pastoralists and snow leopard and their prey by enhancing the survival rate of livestock;

Forest areas – improving the ecological integrity of forests in the snow leopard range by: (i) rehabilitating degraded forests; and (ii) reducing the extent and intensity of harvesting of wood from these forests by encouraging the adoption of other fuel sources; and

Knowledge – expanding the reach of research, monitoring and planning efforts about snow leopard, snow leopard prey and their habitats by building institutional capacities, resources and partnerships.

The project is structured into three components, with each component comprising a complementary suite of two to four outputs which collectively contribute to realizing the targeted outcome for the component.

The first component supports the development and implementation of a smart patrol system in two sections of the Tajik NP, a World Heritage Site. Work under this component is focused around four key areas of project support: (i) Secure the conservation status and boundaries of protected areas (Output 1.1); (ii) Develop the capacity to implement a smart patrolling system in protected areas (Output 1.2); (iii) Improve the equipment and infrastructure to support the implementation of a smart patrolling system in protected areas (Output 1.3); and (iv) Enhance community involvement in, and beneficiation from, protected areas (Output 1.4).

The second component assists in improving the planning and management of the high altitude livestock pastures and indigenous forests located along, or immediately adjacent to, the key snow leopard migration routes within the Hissar-Alay and Vakhsh-Darvaz areas. Work under this component is focused around three key areas of project support: (i) Reduce impacts on, and improve the management of, livestock pastures (Output 2.1); (ii) Reduce impacts on, and improve the management of, forests (Output 2.2); and (iii) Strengthen wildlife monitoring and enforcement capacities (Output 2.3).

The third component strengthens the state of knowledge of, and collaboration in, the conservation of snow leopard and their ecosystems. Work under this component is focused around two key areas of project support: (i) Enhance the state of knowledge on snow leopard and prey populations (Output 3.1); and (ii) Improve the coordination of, and cooperation in, snow leopard conservation and monitoring (Output 3.2).

The total cost of envisaged investment in the project was estimated at US\$23,791,370, of which US\$ 4,181,370 constituted grant funding from GEF, US\$ 440,000 was TRAC commitment from UNDP; and US\$19,200,000 comprised co-financing from national government, local government, the private sector, NGOs and UNDP.

The National Biodiversity and Biosafety Center is the main institution responsible for different aspects of project implementation. The NBBC works in close cooperation with the Committee for Environmental Protection (CEP), State Institution for Specially Protected Natural Areas and local forestry departments on project sites. The NBBC coordinates all project activities at the local level, in close collaboration with the district (Jamoat) government authorities in each of the targeted regions.

Throughout the project's development, the following affected national and local government institutions are directly involved as well in project development, including the Committee for Environmental Protection, Ministry of Agriculture, Committee for Land Management, Geodesy and Cartography, The Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Tajikistan and its subordinate institutes.

3. TE PURPOSE

The **purpose** of the evaluation is to provide an independent external view of the progress of the project at its completion, and to provide feedback and recommendations to UNDP and project stakeholders.

The overall **objective** of the evaluation is to 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 specific **objectives** of the Terminal Evaluation are to:

- Assess progress toward achievement of expected project objective and outcomes
- Identify and document lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project and
- Make recommendations necessary to help consolidate and support sustainability of the project results.

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the [UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects](#).

4. TE APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

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

The International Evaluation Consultant will be supported by a National Consultant to undertake this assignment and will be responsible for the preparation of a high-quality report and timely submission.

The International Evaluation Consultant and the National Consultant will form the Terminal Evaluation Team. 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 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 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, 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 government counterparts, in particular the Committee for Environmental Protection and the GEF Operational Focal Point, State Institution for Specially Protected Natural Areas and local forestry departments on project sites, Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Tajikistan and its subordinate institutes; UNDP Country Office and project team; executing agencies, senior officials and task team/component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project beneficiaries, academia, local government and CSOs, etc.

Additionally, the TE team is expected to conduct field missions to the key snow leopard ecosystems of the Tien Shan and Pamir-Alay and project interventions sites in Khatlon region, the Districts of Republican Subordination, Sughd region and the Gorno-Badakhshan Autonomous Region of Tajikistan, which may include the following project sites: Dashtijum (Samsiddin Shokhin District), Sarikhosor (Baljuvan district), Sangvor and Lyakhsh sections of the Tajik National Park (Sangvor and Lyakhsh districts), Iskanderkul (Aini district), Shakhristan District, Khorog city, Murgab district.

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

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

Important Note. If a data collection/field mission is not possible to/within the country due to security or any other relevant reasons, then remote interviews may be undertaken through telephone or online (skype, zoom etc.). International evaluation consultant can work remotely with the national consultant in the field if it is safe for them to operate and travel.

5. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE TE

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see TOR Annex A), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification.

The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness (results/achievements towards objective and expected outcome), impact, efficiency, sustainability** as defined and explained in the [UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects](#). A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this. Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The timeframe of terminal evaluation covers the beginning of the project to the time when terminal evaluation is initiated.

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

Project finance / co-finance

The TE will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data need to be well analysed, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits and implementation of audit recommendations should be taken into consideration.

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.

Impact

The TE team will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluation report include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.

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

ToR Table 2: Evaluation Ratings Table for UNDP-GEF project “Conservation and sustainable use of Pamir Alay and Tien Shan ecosystems for snow leopard protection and sustainable community livelihoods” (PIMS 5437)

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

6. TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the TE will be approximately 25 working days (including 10 days field mission to Tajikistan) over a period of 7 weeks starting on 1st June 2022 and ending by 14th July 2022. The tentative TE timeframe is as follows:

Timeframe	Activity
1 st June 2022	Selection of TE team (contract signing)
1 st June – 7 th June 2022 – 5 days	Preparation period for TE team (handover of documentation), Document review and analysis for TE Inception Report Preparation
8 th June 2022 – 1 day	Submission of 1 st Draft Inception Report

¹ 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)

10 th June – 13 th June 2022 - 2 days	Finalization and Validation of TE Inception Report; latest start of TE mission
15 th June – 23 rd June 2022 – 9 days	TE mission ² : stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits, etc.
24 th June 2022 – 1 day	Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings; earliest end of TE mission
27 th June – 1 st July 2022 - 5 days	Preparation of draft TE report
4 ^d July – 5 th July 2022	Circulation of draft TE report for comments
6 th July – 7 th July 2022 - 2 days	Incorporation of comments on draft TE report into Audit Trail & finalization of TE report
12 th July 2022	Preparation and Issuance of Management Response
13 th July 2022	Approval of the final TE Report
14 th July 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: 13 th June 2022 ³	TE team submits Inception Report to Commissioning Unit and project management
2	Presentation	Initial Findings	End of TE mission: 24 th June 2022	TE team presents to Commissioning Unit and project management
3	Draft TE Report	Full draft report <i>using guidelines on report content in ToR Annex C</i> with annexes	Within 2.5 weeks of end of TE mission: 1 st July 2022	TE team submits to Commissioning Unit; reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP
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	Within 1 week of receiving comments on draft report: 7 th July 2022	TE team submits both documents to the Commissioning Unit

² In case if the travel to the country is restricted due to Covid-19 and it is not possible to travel to or within the country for the TE mission then the TE team should develop a methodology that takes this into account the conduct of the TE virtually and remotely, including the use of remote interview methods and extended desk reviews, data analysis, surveys and evaluation questionnaires. This should be detailed in the TE Inception Report and agreed with the Commissioning Unit.

³ If all or part of the TE is to be carried out virtually then consideration should be taken for stakeholder availability, ability or willingness to be interviewed remotely. 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.

		template in ToR Annex H)		
--	--	--------------------------	--	--

*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

8. IMPLEMENTATION 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 Tajikistan**.

A team of two independent evaluators will conduct the TE – one international (1) and one national (1) consultants.

If it is not possible to travel to or within the country for the TE mission then the terminal evaluation is to be carried out virtually, and then consideration should be taken for stakeholder availability, ability or willingness to be interviewed remotely.

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 UNDP CO and Snow Leopards' Project team and with national evaluator support in the field if it is safe for them to operate and travel. Qualified and independent national consultants can be hired to undertake the TE and interviews in country as long as it is safe to do so.

The UNDP Tajikistan Country Office 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.

Travel:

- 10-day international travel will be required to *Tajikistan and regions of Tajikistan* during the TE mission;
- The BSAFE course must be successfully completed prior to commencement of travel;
- Individual Consultants are responsible for ensuring they have vaccinations/inoculations when travelling to certain countries, as designated by the UN Medical Director.
- Consultants are required to comply with the UN security directives set forth under: <https://dss.un.org/dssweb/>
- All related travel expenses will be covered and will be reimbursed as per UNDP rules and regulations.

9. TE TEAM COMPOSITION

The International Consultant will be the team leader and will work closely with the National Consultant. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed

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

projects is an advantage. The International Consultant will have the overall responsibility for the conduct of the evaluation exercise as well as quality and timely submission of reports (inception, draft, final etc). The International Consultant will be accountable to UNDP for the delivery results on this assignment.

The work will be undertaken over period of 1 June to 7 July 2022 by the TE Team (International/ National Consultants) to undertake project terminal evaluation assignment within Tajikistan. In accordance with expected outputs and deliverables, the TE team submit reports to UNDP IRH/ RTA, UNDP Climate Resilience and Environmental Sustainability Cluster and UNDP Snow Leopard Project Manager for review outputs, comments, certify approval/acceptance of works afterwards. In case of any delays to achieve the expected outputs, the TE Team should notify the UNDP Climate Resilience and Environmental Sustainability Cluster and UNDP HCFC Project Manager in advance to take necessary steps.

If the situation with Covid-19 worsens and restrictions to travel to country are imposed, then the International Consultant should clearly describe in the methodology the stepwise activities to be carried-out and clearly enumerate the past experiences in implementation of terminal evaluation of GEF/UNDP projects remotely, through engagement of UNDP CO and project teams as well as national consultants/ experts to conduct the terminal evaluation virtually.

The evaluators 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:

A. Team Leader- International Consultant (100%)

Education

- A Master's degree in biodiversity conservation, natural resource management, environmental economics, or other closely related field.

Experience

- At least 5 years of demonstrated working experience in conducting project mid-term or terminal evaluations preferably for GEF (biodiversity conservation, land degradation, sustainable forest management, etc.) and results-based management evaluation methodologies.
- Minimum 10 years of experience in relevant technical areas.
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios.
- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to GEF's Biodiversity (BD), Land Degradation (LD) and Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) Focal Areas.
- Experience in evaluating projects at the national / country level.
- Knowledge of and experience working in CEE and Central Asia countries.
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and GEF's Biodiversity (BD), Land Degradation (LD) and Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) Focal Areas; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis.
- Excellent communication skills; demonstrable analytical skills; and project evaluation/review experience within United Nations system will be considered an asset.

Language

- Proficiency in English is a requirement. Knowledge of Russian is an asset.

RESPONSIBILITIES

- Conduct document review and data gathering;
- Design and develop appropriate, detailed evaluation methodologies for TE;
- Lead the TE Team in planning, conducting, and reporting on the evaluation with clear division of labor within the Team, ensuring timeliness of reports;
- Lead drafting and finalization of the Inception Report for the Terminal Evaluation;
- Use of best practice methodologies in conducting evaluation;
- Lead presentation of the draft evaluation findings and recommendations;
- Organize the de-briefing to the UNDP Country Office in Dushanbe and Project Management Team;
- Lead the drafting and finalization of the Terminal Evaluation Report

B. NATIONAL CONSULTANT

National consultant must have not been involved in design, implementation, or Mid-term Review (MTR) of the Snow Leopards' project.

Education

- University degree in a discipline relevant to biodiversity conservation, natural resource management, environmental science & development studies or other closely related field.
- Postgraduate degree(s) in a discipline relevant to biodiversity conservation, natural resource management, environmental economics or other closely related field will be an advantage.

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 GEF's Biodiversity (BD), Land Degradation (LD) and Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) Focal Areas.
- Experience in evaluating projects in the team with international consultants.
- Experience in relevant technical areas, preferably in the field of environmental management/biodiversity conservation, for at least 5 years.
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and GEF's Biodiversity (BD), Land Degradation (LD) and Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) Focal Areas, experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis.
- Project evaluation/review experience within United Nations system will be considered an asset.
- Excellent communication skills.
- Demonstrated analytical skills.

Language

- Proficiency in English,
- Russian and Tajik both written and spoken is essential.

RESPONSIBILITIES

- Collection of background materials upon request by Team Leader/International Consultant.
- Provision of important inputs in developing methodologies, work plans, and evaluation report outlines;
- Lead data collection in the field and assist in desk review of materials;
- Participation in debriefings with UNDP CO representatives;
- Assistance to the Team Leader in conducting interviews with relevant stakeholders; provide both oral and written translation from/to English/Russian/Tajik, whenever necessary;
- Field visit and assistance to the Team Leader in interviewing local stakeholders at project sites;
- Participation in debriefing with UNDP and project implementing partners;
- Assistance to the Team Leader in developing the first draft of the MTR report;
- Assistance to the Team Leader in finalization of the MTR report.

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 Unit⁵
- 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%⁶:

⁵ Due to the COVID-19 restriction and if not travel to the country will be possible the contract is subject to amendment and reduced payment might occur.

⁶ 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:

- 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.

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

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

12. APPLICATION PROCESS⁷

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

- a) **Offeror's Letter to UNDP Confirming Interest and Availability** using the [template](#)⁸ provided by UNDP
- b) **CV**, including Education/Qualification, Professional Certification, Employment Records /Experience ([P11 form](#))⁹
- 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.

All application materials should be submitted to the address: 734024, 39 Aini Street, Dushanbe, Tajikistan indicating the following reference **"Consultant for Terminal Evaluation of "Conservation and sustainable use of Pamir Alay and Tien Shan ecosystems for snow leopard protection and sustainable community livelihoods (PIMS 5437)"** full sized project or by email at the following address ONLY: (elbids.tj@undp.org) by (10 June 2022). Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

https://popp.undp.org/layouts/15/WopiFrame.aspx?sourcedoc=/UNDP_POPP_DOCUMENT_LIBRARY/Public/PSU_Individual%20Contract_Individual%20Contract%20Policy.docx&action=default

⁷ Engagement of evaluators should be done in line with guidelines for hiring consultants in the POPP

<https://popp.undp.org/SitePages/POPPRoot.aspx>

⁸<https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/psa/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx>

⁹ http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc

Criteria for Evaluation of Proposal: Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated. Applications obtaining a minimum of 70 points for Technical Criteria would be considered for the Financial Evaluation. 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.

Technical Criteria for Evaluation for internationals (Maximum 70 points):

- Criteria-01: a Master's degree in biodiversity conservation, natural resource management, environmental economics, or other closely related field (**Max Point: 10**);
- Criteria-02: at least 5 years of demonstrated working experience in conducting project mid-term or terminal evaluations preferably for GEF (biodiversity conservation, land degradation, sustainable forest management, etc.) and results-based management evaluation methodologies – **Max Point: 25**;
- Criteria-03: Previous experiences with project design/implementation in relevant thematic areas (i.e. biodiversity conservation, land degradation and sustainable forest management, etc.) - **Max Point 15**;
- Criteria-04: Experience of working in CEE and Central Asia countries - **Max Point 15**;
- Criteria-05: Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and biodiversity conservation, land degradation and sustainable forest management; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis - **Max Point 5**.

Technical Criteria for Evaluation for national candidates (Maximum 70 points):

- Criteria-01: University degree in social sciences, ecology or other related field in a discipline relevant to biodiversity conservation, natural resource management, environmental science & development studies or other closely related field (15 points); and postgraduate degree(s) in biodiversity conservation, natural resource management, environmental economics or other closely related field will be an advantage (5 points) - **Max Point 20**;
- Criteria-02: Relevant experience with results-based management evaluation methodologies, particularly GEF financed project evaluations, with proven knowledge of evaluation methodologies - **Max Point 15**;
- Criteria-03: Previous experience in evaluating projects in the team with international consultants in relevant thematic areas (i.e. biodiversity conservation, land degradation and sustainable forest management) - **Max Point 20**;
- Criteria-04: Proven experiences in project evaluation/review experience within United Nations system and applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios - **Max Point 10**;
- Criteria-05: Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and biodiversity conservation, land degradation and sustainable forest management; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis - **Max Point 5**.

Financial Evaluation (Total 30 marks)

All technical qualified proposals will be scored out 30 based on the formula provided below.

The maximum points (30) will be assigned to the lowest financial proposal. All other proposals received points according to the following formula:

$$p = y (\mu/z)$$

Where:

- p = points for the financial proposal being evaluated;
- y = maximum number of points for the financial proposal;
- μ = price of the lowest priced proposal;
- z = price of the proposal being evaluated.

Please combine all your documents into one (1) single PDF document as the system only allows to upload maximum one document.

UNDP is committed to achieving workforce diversity in terms of gender, nationality and culture. Individuals from minority groups, indigenous groups and persons with disabilities are equally encouraged to apply. All applications will be treated with the strictest confidence.

UNDP does not tolerate sexual exploitation and abuse, any kind of harassment, including sexual harassment, and discrimination. All selected candidates will, therefore, undergo rigorous reference and background checks.

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

14. ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR THE RECOMMENDED CONTRACTOR

Statement of Medical Fitness for Work

Individual Consultants/Contractors whose assignments require travel and who are over 62 years of age are required, at their own costs, to undergo a full medical examination including x-rays and obtaining medical clearance from UN -approved doctor, prior to taking up their assignment.

Where there is no UN office nor a UN Medical Doctor present in the location of the Individual Contractor prior to commencing the travel, either for repatriation or duty travel, the Individual Contractor may choose his/her own preferred physician to obtain the required medical clearance.

Inoculations/Vaccinations

Individual Contractors are required to have vaccinations/inoculations when travelling to certain countries, as designated by the UN Medical Director. The cost of required vaccinations/inoculations, when foreseeable, must be included in the financial proposal. Any unforeseeable vaccination/inoculation cost will be reimbursed by UNDP.

ToR Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework

	Indicator	Baseline (2015)	Target/s (End of Project)	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
Project Objective: <i>Conservation and sustainable use of Pamir Alai and Tien-Shan ecosystems for snow leopard protection and sustainable livelihoods</i>	Extent (ha) of protected areas under a secure, and effectively managed, monitoring and enforcement regime	0	>427,400ha	Annual reports of the Department of Specially Protected Natural Areas (Forestry Agency)	Assumptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The GoT remains committed to supporting efforts to increase the management effectiveness of SPNAs, and improving the ecological integrity and productivity of high altitude pastures and forests, in the country; – The responsible public institutions will continue to actively administer, monitor and enforce the existing conservation legislation and regulations. Risks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – State institutions responsible for the administration of protected areas, pastures and forests do not have adequate capacity, or demonstrate the necessary political will; – Low levels of compliance with environmental legislation, and a reluctance to adopt more sustainable
	Extent (ha) of high altitude grasslands (above 1,500m) in the Hissar-Alay and Vakhsh-Darvaz areas under a regulated and sustainable management regime	<5,000 ha	>100,000 ha	Annual reports of the Pasture Trust (Ministry of Agriculture) and CEP	
	Extent (ha) of high altitude forest (above 1,500m) in the Hissar-Alay and Vakhsh-Darvaz areas under a sustainable management regime	<2,000 ha	>15,000 ha	Annual reports of the Forestry Agency and CEP	
	Number of primary snow leopard prey populations: Marco Polo Sheep (NT) Siberian Ibex (LC) Heptner's markhor (EN)	Marco Polo Sheep: ~1,125 Siberian Ibex: ~4,190 Heptner's markhor: ~1,018	Marco Polo Sheep: >1,400 Siberian Ibex: >5,000 Heptner's markhor: >1,400	Population census reports Snow leopard Information Management System	
	Total snow leopard population in Tajikistan	180-220	>220	Snow leopard Information Management System	

	Indicator	Baseline (2015)	Target/s (End of Project)	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Number of individuals (number of women as a proportion of the total) involved in, and directly benefiting from project investments in the conservation and sustainable use of snow leopard, snow leopard prey and snow leopard habitats	NA	Involvement: >2000 (>60%) Direct benefits: >450 (>60%)	Project reports	<p>natural resource use practices;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Low levels of coordination and cooperation between public institutions, tenure holders, rights holders, land owners, NGOs/CBOs and natural resources users; – The increasing aridisation of high altitude habitats, as a result of the effects of climate change; – Complex global and regional trends of financial crises 2015-2016 affected the national banking system of Tajikistan, that became particularly evident in key systemically important bank branches across the country; and – High-tech smart software globally developed for organization of anti-poaching patrolling has extremely complex parameters, which makes it difficult to adapt to the conditions of Tajikistan.
Outcome 1: <i>Conservation and sustainable management of key biodiversity areas</i>	Outputs: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.1 Secure the conservation status and boundaries of protected areas 1.2 Develop the capacity to implement a smart patrolling system in protected areas 1.3 Improve the equipment and infrastructure to support the implementation of a smart patrol system in protected areas 1.4 Enhance community involvement in, and beneficiation from, protected areas 				

	Indicator	Baseline (2015)	Target/s (End of Project)	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Total extent (ha) of IUCN Category I and Category II protected areas	2,777,018 ha	2,837,018 ha	Annual performance reports of the Department of Specially Protected Natural Areas (Forestry Agency)	Assumptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Stakeholders will constructively participate in the design, development and implementation of a smart patrol system in Tajik NP; – The Forestry Agency will budget adequately for the continued employment of project-funded ranger staff, and the ongoing maintenance of new equipment and infrastructure procured by the project; – The Forestry Agency will commit to facilitating the involvement and beneficitation of local communities living adjacent to Tajik NP Risks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – State institutions responsible for the administration of protected
	Total annual budget (US\$/annum) allocation for the management of IUCN Category I – IV protected areas	US\$250,000/annum	>US\$450,000/annum	Annual financial reports of the Forestry Agency	
	METT scores for: Tajik NP (Jirgital section) Tajik NP (Tavildara section, including Sangvor)	Jirgital: 20 Tavildara: 20	Jirgital: 44 Tavildara: 40	Annual METT reporting, annual project reports which contain tracking tools	
	Number of active patrol rangers in the Jirgital and Tavildara (including Sangvor) sections of Tajik NP	Jirgital: 10 Tavildara: 8	Jirgital: 18 Tavildara: 16	Smart patrol system Annual performance reports for Tajik NP	
	Extent (as a percentage of the total area) of Jirgital and Tavildara (including Sangvor) sections of Tajik NP under a secure and effective monitoring and enforcement regime	Jirgital: <15% Tavildara: <12%	Jirgital: >85% Tavildara: >60%	Smart patrol system Annual performance reports for Tajik NP	

	Indicator	Baseline (2015)	Target/s (End of Project)	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Number of (i) poaching (of snow leopard and prey); and (ii) other illegal (encroachments for crops and grazing, wood harvesting) incidents recorded (and prosecuted) per annum by ranger patrol staff from the Jirgital and Tavildara sections of Tajik NP	(i) >15 (1)/annum (ii) >45 (2)/annum ¹⁰	(i) <5 (4) /annum (ii) <60 (40) /annum ¹¹	Smart patrol system Annual performance reports for Tajik NP	areas do not have adequate capacity, or demonstrate the necessary political will; – Low levels of compliance with environmental legislation; – Low levels of coordination and cooperation between public institutions, tenure holders, rights holders, land owners, NGOs/CBOs and natural resources users; – The increasing aridisation of high altitude habitats, as a result of the effects of climate change; and – High-tech smart software globally developed for organization of anti-poaching patrolling has extremely complex parameters, which makes it difficult to adapt to the conditions of Tajikistan.
	Number of individuals from targeted villages directly involved in (proportion of women), and financially benefiting from (proportion of women), the management of the Jirgital and Tavildara sections of Tajik NP	Involvement in: <100 (<15) Direct financial beneficiation ¹² from: <10 (1-2)	Involvement in: >2000 (>1100) Direct financial beneficiation from: >150 (>80)	Project reports Annual performance reports for Tajik NP	
Outcome 2: <i>Ecosystem resilience and habitat connectivity</i>	Outputs: 2.1 Reduce impacts on, and improve the management of, livestock pastures 2.2 Reduce impacts on, and improve the management of, forests 2.3 Strengthen wildlife monitoring and enforcement capacities				

¹⁰ The low baseline is an under-representation of the actual number of illegal activities because of the exceptionally poor state of patrolling in the the Jirgital and Tavildara sections of Tajik NP.

¹¹ The increased number of reported incidents of illegal activities is a direct consequence of the improved coverage of smart patrols, and not an indication of an increase in the number of illegal incidents *per se*. It is anticipated that the implementation of the smart patrol system should reduce the actual number of illegal activities occurring in the Jirgital and Tavildara sections of Tajik NP by at least 50%.

¹² As a sub-set of the individuals involved in the management of the Jirgital and Tavildara sections of Tajik NP.

	Indicator	Baseline (2015)	Target/s (End of Project)	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
<i>in wider landscape outside protected areas</i>	Number of days of use ¹³ of high altitude pastures in the Hissar-Alay and Vakhsh-Darvaz areas: Spring and autumn Summer	Spring/Autumn: 85-90 days Summer: 90-100 days	Spring/Autumn: 45-55 days Summer: 60-70 days	Annual reports of <i>Jamoats</i> Annual reports of Pasture Trust (Ministry of Agriculture)	Assumptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Development partners, NGOs, micro-loan banks, CBOs and local authorities (<i>jamoats</i> and <i>hukumats</i>) will constructively cooperate with the project in supporting the establishment and administration of PUUs and PFM Committees – The NBBC, Academy of Sciences the Forestry Agency and/or the Ministry of Agriculture (Pasture Trust) will maintain monitoring plot data in order to evaluate the efficacy of project interventions; – The GoT will actively support the formalisation of PUUs and PFM committees
	Productivity (tons/ha) of the high altitude pastures in the Hissar-Alay and Vakhsh-Darvaz areas.	<0.3 t/ha	>1 t/ha	Permanent pasture monitoring plots Annual reports of Pasture Trust (Ministry of Agriculture)	
	Percentage (as an average of the total grass/forb/herb cover per hectare) of palatable and edible species ¹⁴ for ungulates and livestock in the high altitude pastures of the <i>Hissar-Alay</i> and <i>Vakhsh-Darvaz</i> areas	<30%	>50%	Permanent pasture monitoring plots Annual reports of Pasture Trust (Ministry of Agriculture)	
	Number of Pasture User Unions (PUUs) with approved pasture management plans under implementation in the high altitude pastures of the <i>Hissar-Alay</i> and <i>Vakhsh-Darvaz</i> areas	0	>10	Annual reports of <i>Jamoats</i> Annual reports of Pasture Trust (Ministry of Agriculture)	Risks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – State institutions responsible for the administration of pastures and forests do not have

¹³ The average number of days of use per annum will vary, depending on the specific location and nature of the pastures being grazed/browsed.

¹⁴ The increase in cover of unpalatable species is a direct consequence of the effects of unsustainable levels of grazing and forage collection, increased compaction and erosion and short fire regimes.

	Indicator	Baseline (2015)	Target/s (End of Project)	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Number of households in the <i>Hissar-Alay</i> and <i>Vakhsh-Darvaz</i> areas directly benefiting from project technical and grant funding support for: (a) implementation of sustainable pasture management practices; (b) adoption of alternative fuel and energy technologies; and (c) community ranger pilot project	NA	Sustainable pasture management: >40 Fuel and energy technologies: >10 Community ranger: 5	Project reports	<p>adequate capacity, or demonstrate the necessary political will;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Low levels of compliance with environmental legislation, and a reluctance to adopt more sustainable natural resource use practices; – Low levels of coordination and cooperation between public institutions, tenure holders, rights holders, land owners, NGOs/CBOs and natural resources users; – The increasing aridisation of high altitude habitats, as a result of the effects of climate change; and – Complex global and regional trends of financial crises 2015-2016 affected the national banking system of Tajikistan, that became particularly evident in key systemically important bank branches across the country.
	Extent (ha) of degraded high altitude pastures and forests of the <i>Hissar-Alay</i> and <i>Vakhsh-Darvaz</i> areas under active rehabilitation or restoration	Pastures: 0 ha Forests: <100 ha	Pastures: 10,000 ha Forests: 6,000 ha	Annual reports of <i>leskhoz</i> (Forestry Agency) and CEP	
	Number of Participatory Forest Management (PFM) committees actively involved in the planning, management and monitoring of high altitude forests of the <i>Hissar-Alay</i> and <i>Vakhsh-Darvaz</i> areas	0	>3	Annual reports of <i>leskhoz</i> (Forestry Agency) and CEP	

	Indicator	Baseline (2015)	Target/s (End of Project)	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Number (per annum) of individuals involved in wildlife monitoring and enforcement training and skills development programmes	5-7/annum	>100/annum	Training records Project reports	
Outcome 3: <i>Support to international cooperation</i>	Outputs: 3.1 Enhance the state of knowledge on snow leopard and prey populations 3.2 Improve the coordination of, and cooperation in, snow leopard conservation and monitoring				
	Establishment and maintenance of a: (i) national snow leopard Monitoring and Reporting (M&R) system (ii) national snow leopard Information Management (IM) system	M&R: No IM: No	M&R: Yes IM: Yes	Project reports Annual reports of the NBBC	Assumptions: – Development partners and NGOs will constructively participate in the planning, research, monitoring, information management and evaluation activities under the project; – There are no political conflicts between neighbouring countries which may undermine any transboundary cooperation efforts. Risks: – Low levels of coordination and cooperation between public institutions, tenure
	National coverage (as a % of the total snow leopard range) of snow leopard and prey monitoring activities	Snow leopard: <10% Prey: <5%	Snow leopard: >25% Prey: >20%	Snow Leopard Information Management System	
	Approved and implemented National Action Plan for snow leopard conservation.	No	Yes	Annual reports of the NBBC	

	Indicator	Baseline (2015)	Target/s (End of Project)	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Number of managers, scientists, researchers and academics participating in: (i) regional snow leopard and prey conservation initiatives; and (ii) regional monitoring and report-back meetings	2 0	15 10	Project reports Annual reports of the NBBC	holders, rights holders, land owners, NGOs/CBOs and natural resources users; and – The increasing aridisation of high altitude habitats, as a result of the effects of climate change.
	Number of meetings per annum of National Snow Leopard Conservation Committee	0	2	Project reports Annual reports of the NBBC	
	Number of trans-boundary agreements (Afghanistan, Uzbekistan, China, Kyrgyzstan) addressing collaboration in the management of wildlife crime under implementation	1	3	Annual reports of the NBBC and CEP	

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 (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)
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
<i>Additional documents, as required</i>	
REPORTS	

S/L	TITLE OF THE REPORT	CONTRIBUTORS
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		
6.		
7.		
8.		
9.		
10.		
TRAINING MODULE		
S/L	TITLE OF THE MODULE	CONTRIBUTORS
11.		
12.		
13.		
14.		
15.		
PROCEEDINGS / WORKSHOPS		
S/L	TITLE OF THE PROCEEDINGS	CONTRIBUTORS
16.		
17.		
18.		
19.		
20.		
21.		
MEETING MINUTES		
S/L	TITLE OF THE MINUTES	CONTRIBUTORS
22.		
23.		
24.		
25.		
26.		
27.		
PROGRESS REPORT		
S/L	TITLE OF THE REPORT	CONTRIBUTORS
28.		
29.		
30.		
31.		

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 rating¹⁵)
 - 4.1 Project Design/Formulation
 - Analysis of Results Framework: project logic and strategy, indicators
 - Assumptions and Risks

¹⁵ See ToR Annex F for rating scales.

- Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g. same focal area) incorporated into project design
 - Planned stakeholder participation
 - Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
- 4.1 Project Implementation
- Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
 - Actual stakeholder participation and partnership arrangements
 - Project Finance and Co-finance
 - Monitoring & Evaluation: design at entry (*), implementation (*), and overall assessment of M&E (*)
 - UNDP implementation/oversight (*) and Implementing Partner execution (*), overall project implementation/execution (*), coordination, and operational issues
 - Risk Management, 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

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF Focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national 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?			
Covid-19 specific question: To what extent the pandemic Covid-19 impacted/ influenced the timely and quality implementation and achievement of the project activities/ results.			
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			

(Expand the table to include questions for all criteria being assessed: Monitoring & Evaluation, UNDP oversight/implementation, Implementing Partner Execution, cross-cutting issues, etc.)

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

ToR Annex H: TE Audit Trail

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

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

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

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