

Project Final Evaluation

Terms of Reference

UNDP/GEF Project

“Conservation of Inland Wetland Biodiversity in Lithuania”

I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The implementation of the UNDP/GEF Project “Conservation of Inland Wetland Biodiversity in Lithuania” began in April 2004 with an objective to optimize sustainable management of wetland biodiversity at five important sites in Lithuania. Its immediate objective is to secure the long term conservation of globally significant biodiversity of five wetland protected areas in Lithuania, which are considered globally important grounds for feeding, molting and resting of water birds and contain rare and endangered species of flora and fauna. The project’s strategic interventions include: (i) restoration of selected wetland habitats; (ii) re-conversion of farming lands to wetland-friendly agricultural activities; (iii) the adoption of biodiversity-friendly forestry protocols; (iv) strengthening enforcement of reserve regulations and boundaries, public awareness and public support activities; (v) gathering and codification of lessons and best practices; and (vi) the elaboration of a strategy for replication to other priority wetland sites.

The project document was signed in 30/03/2004 and implementation started in April 2004. The total project budget is US\$ 13,865,400. The GEF contribution is US\$ 3,261,000. The Executing Agency for the project is Ministry of Environment of Lithuania, Project Implementing Agency – Nature Heritage Fund (NHF).

II. OBJECTIVES OF THE FINAL EVALUATION

The evaluation is to be undertaken in accordance with the “GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy” (see <http://thegef.org/MonitoringandEvaluation/MEPoliciesProcedures/mepoliciesprocedures.html>), which indicates that all regular and medium size projects supported by GEF should undergo a final evaluation upon completion of implementation.

Final evaluations are intended to assess the relevance, performance and success of the project. It looks at early signs of potential impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental goals. It will also identify/document lessons learned and make recommendations that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP/GEF projects.

As per Monitoring and Evaluation Policy final evaluation at the project level in UNDP/GEF has two overarching objectives:

- a) promote accountability for the achievement of GEF objectives through the assessment of results, effectiveness, processes and performance of the partners involved in GEF activities. GEF results will be monitored and evaluated for their contribution to global environmental benefits; and
- b) promote learning, feedback and knowledge sharing on results and lessons learned among the GEF and its partners, as basis for decision-making on policies, strategies, program management, and projects and to improve knowledge and performance.

Evaluation Audience

This Final Evaluation of the UNDP/GEF Project “Conservation of Inland Wetland Biodiversity in Lithuania” is initiated by UNDP as the GEF Implementing Agency. It aims to provide managers (at the level of regulatory bodies of the Ministry of Environment, protected areas (project sites) administrations, and UNDP-GEF levels) with a comprehensive overall assessment of the project and with a strategy for replicating the results. It also provides the basis for learning and accountability for managers and stakeholders.

Objectives of the Evaluation

The overall goal of the evaluation is to measure the effectiveness and efficiency of project activities in relation to the stated objective so far, and to produce possible recommendations on its completion strategy.

The purpose of the Evaluation is:

- To assess overall performance against the Project objectives as set out in Project Document and other related documents;
- To assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the Project;
- To critically analyze the implementation and management arrangements of the Project;
- To assess the sustainability of the Project’s interventions;
- To list and document initial lessons concerning Project design, implementation and management;
- To assess Project relevance to national priorities.

Project performance will be measured based on Project Logical Framework (see [Annex 1](#)), which provides clear performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification.

The evaluation should assess:

Project concept and design

The evaluators will assess the project concept and design. He/she should review the problem addressed by the project and the project strategy, encompassing an assessment of the appropriateness of the objectives, planned outputs, activities and inputs as compared to cost-effective alternatives. The executing modality and managerial arrangements should also be judged. The evaluator will assess the achievement of indicators and review the work plan, planned duration and budget of the project.

Implementation

The evaluation will assess the implementation of the project in terms of quality and timeliness of inputs and efficiency and effectiveness of activities carried out. Also, the effectiveness of management as well as the quality and timeliness of monitoring and backstopping by all parties to the project should be evaluated. In particular, the evaluation is to assess the Project team’s use of adaptive management in project implementation.

Project outputs, outcomes and impact

The evaluation will assess the outputs, outcomes and impact achieved by the project as well as the likely sustainability of project results. This should encompass an assessment of the achievement of the immediate objectives and the contribution to attaining the overall objective of the project. The evaluation should also assess the extent to which the implementation of the project has been inclusive of relevant stakeholders and to which it has been able to create collaboration between different partners. The evaluation will also examine if the project has had significant unexpected effects, whether of beneficial or detrimental character.

The evaluation will assess the aspects as listed in evaluation report outline attached in [Annex 2](#).

In addition to a descriptive assessment, the evaluation will also provide **ratings** of Project achievements according to GEF Project Review Criteria, using the following divisions: Highly Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Marginally Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory.

Aspects of the Project to be rated are:

- Implementation approach;
- Management of globally significant species
- Outcome/Achievement of objectives (meaning the extent to which the project's environmental and development objectives were achieved).
- Stakeholder participation/public involvement
- Sustainability;
- Replication approach;
- Cost-effectiveness;
- Monitoring and evaluation

Issues of special consideration:

The Evaluation will review and assess changes in development conditions, by addressing the following questions, with a focus on the perception of change among stakeholders:

- Has the project achieved its objectives and outcomes as set in project document?
- Has the project established a management basis for long term sustainability and development of project outcomes?
- Has the project helped the protection of endangered species in Project sites? (With a special attention to indicator species mentioned in the Tracking Tool and the Logframe Matrix, see [Annex 1](#).)
- Have there been changes in local stakeholder behavior (i.e. threats, land use management practices, ...) that have contributed to improved conservation? If not, why not?
- Has the project elaborated innovative incentives to motivate the local population to apply biodiversity friendly land use and farming practices?

- Has awareness on biodiversity conservation and subsequent and nature values increased among various population groups (children, school students, protected areas staff, visitors, farmers, local population) as a result of the project?
- Is there adequate territorial planning in place, or in progress, ensuring long-term conservation of biodiversity and cultural values?
- Assess the underlying factors beyond the project's immediate control that influence outcomes and results, especially the recent changes in the governmental policy on the implementation of the agri-environmental scheme. Consider the appropriateness and effectiveness of the project's management strategies for these factors.

For future development support in the region, UNDP is especially interested in the assessment of the support model applied in the project, its implications for the long-term impact and sustainability of the project results.

The Evaluation Report will present recommendations and lessons of broader applicability for follow-up and future support of UNDP and/or the Government, highlighting the good and bad practices in addressing issues relating to the evaluation scope.

III. PRODUCTS EXPECTED FROM THE EVALUATION

The key product expected from this final evaluation is a comprehensive analytical report in English that should, at least, include the contents as indicated in [Annex 2](#) of this TOR.

The Report of the Final Evaluation will be stand-alone document that substantiates its recommendations and conclusions. The report will have to provide to the GEF Secretariat complete and convincing evidence to support its findings/ratings.

The Report will include a table of planned vs. actual project financial disbursements, and planned co-financing vs. actual co-financing in this project, according the table attached in [Annex 3](#) of this TOR.

The Report will be supplemented by Rate Tables, attached in [Annex 4](#) of this TOR.

The length of the evaluation report shall not exceed 30 pages in total (not including annexes).

IV. EVALUATION TEAM – QUALITIES AND REQUIREMENTS

A team of independent experts will conduct the evaluation. The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The evaluation team will be composed of **one International Consultant or Team Leader and one National Consultant**. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Former cooperation with GEF is an advantage.

Team Qualities:

- Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;
- Experience applying participatory monitoring approaches;
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- Recent knowledge of the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy;
- Recent knowledge of UNDP's results-based evaluation policies and procedures
- Competence in Adaptive Management, as applied to conservation or natural resource management projects;
- Recognized expertise in the management and sustainable use of wetlands in temperate ecosystems;
- Familiarity with protected area policies and management structures in Lithuania;
- Demonstrable analytical skills;
- Work experience in relevant areas for at least 10 years;
- Experience with multilateral or bilateral supported conservation projects;
- Project evaluation experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset;
- Excellent English communication skills, (the National Consultant also good Lithuanian communication skills)

Specifically, the international expert (team leader) will perform the following tasks:

- Lead and manage the evaluation mission;
- Design the detailed evaluation scope and methodology (including the methods for data collection and analysis);
- Decide the division of labor within the evaluation team;
- Conduct an analysis of the outcome, outputs and partnership strategy (as per the scope of the evaluation described above);
- Draft related parts of the evaluation report; and
- Finalize the whole evaluation report.

The National Consultant will provide input in reviewing all project documentation, especially if available only in Lithuanian, and will provide the International Consultant with a compilation of information prior to the evaluation mission.

Specifically, the national expert will perform tasks with a focus on:

- Review documents;
- Prepare a list of the outputs achieved under project;
- Organize the mission programme and provide translation/interpretation when necessary;
- Participate in the design of the evaluation methodology;
- Conduct an analysis of the outcome, outputs and partnership strategy (as per the scope of the evaluation described above);
- Draft related parts of the evaluation report;
- Assist Team leader in finalizing document through incorporating suggestions received on draft related to his/her assigned sections.

The evaluation will be undertaken in-line with GEF principles¹:

- Independence
- Impartiality
- Transparency
- Disclosure
- Ethical
- Partnership
- Competencies and Capacities
- Credibility
- Utility

Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions. Joint proposals from two independent evaluators are welcome. Or alternatively, proposals will be accepted from recognized consulting firms to field a complete team with the required expertise within the evaluation budget.

If individual evaluators are selected, UNDP will appoint one Team Leader. The Team Leader will have overall responsibility for the delivery and quality of the evaluation products. Team roles and responsibilities will be reflected in the individual contracts. If a proposal is accepted from a consulting firm, the firm will be held responsible for the delivery and quality of the evaluation products and therefore has responsibility for team management arrangements.

V. METHODOLOGY OR EVALUATION APPROACH

An outline of an evaluation approach is provided below; however it should be made clear that the evaluation team is responsible for revising the approach as necessary. Any changes should be in-line with international criteria and professional norms and standards (as adopted by the UN Evaluation Group²). They must be also cleared by UNDP before being applied by the evaluation team.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. It must be easily understood by project partners and applicable to the remaining period of project duration.

The evaluation will take place mainly in the field. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with the government counterparts, the National Project Manager, Steering Committee, project team, and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a mission to Lithuania, to Vilnius and to the 5 project sites (Viesvile, Zuvintas, Cepkeliai, Kamanos, Girutiskis) to interview the project team, project partners and key stakeholders, and to held field visits to the sites.

¹ See p.16 of the GEF's Monitoring and Evaluation Policy

² See <http://www.uneval.org/>

The evaluation team is expected to consult all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports, project budget revisions, progress reports, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other material that it may consider useful for evidence based assessment. The list of documentation to be reviewed is included in [Annex 5](#) of this Terms of Reference;

The evaluation team is expected to use interviews as a means of collecting data on the relevance, performance and success of the project. Team is also expected to visit the project sites.

The methodology to be used by the evaluation team should be presented in the report in detail. It shall include information on:

- Documentation reviewed;
- Interviews;
- Field visits;
- Questionnaires;
- Participatory techniques and other approaches for the gathering and analysis of data.

Although the evaluation team should feel free to discuss with the authorities concerned, all matters relevant to its assignment, it is not authorized to make any commitment or statement on behalf of UNDP or GEF or the project management.

The evaluation team should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

VI. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation lies with UNDP Country Office Lithuania. UNDP Lithuania will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team. Nature Heritage Fund and UNDP will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

The activity and timeframe are broken down as follows:

| Activity | Timeframe | |
|---|----------------------|-------------------------|
| | international expert | the national consultant |
| Desk review | 2 days | 4 days |
| Briefings for evaluators by PM and UNDP | 1 day | 1 day |
| Field visits, interviews, questionnaires, de-briefings | 6 days | 6 days |
| Drafting of the evaluation report | 3 days | 2 days |
| Validation of preliminary findings with stakeholders through circulation of draft reports for comments, meetings and other types of feedback mechanisms | 2 days | 4 days |

| | | |
|---|--------|-------|
| Finalization of the evaluation report (incorporating comments received on first draft) | 2 days | 1 day |
|---|--------|-------|

Working Days:

Team Leader (international expert) – 16 working days

Technical expert(s) (national expert(s)) – 18 working days

The proposed date for the in-country mission to Lithuania is June - September 2010.

The draft and final report shall be submitted to the UNDP Lithuania (Ms. Ieva Labanauskiene, address: A. Goštauto g. 40A, LT-01002 Vilnius, tel. 3705 2107405, fax 3705 2107401, e-mail: ieva.labanauskiene@undp.org)

Prior to approval of the final report, a draft version shall be circulated for comments to government counterparts and project management. UNDP and the stakeholders will submit comments and suggestions within 5 working days after receiving the draft.

Timeframe for submission of first draft of the report: within 10 working days after the mission.

The evaluation should be completed by 31 October 2010.

If any discrepancies have emerged between impressions and findings of the evaluation team and the aforementioned parties, these should be explained in an annex attached to the final report.

VII. APPLICATION PROCESS

APPLICATION: Please send your applications to a project manager, Mr. Gediminas Rascius; e-mail: g.rascius@gpf.lt and cc to andrius.sugintas@undp.org by 30 June 2010, 17:00 CET

The application should contain:

1. current and complete C.V. in English with indication of the e-mail and phone contact
2. price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment (including the daily fee, per diem and travel costs, preferably according the template attached in [Annex 6](#))
3. indication of earliest possible timing for evaluation mission and completion of report.

UNDP applies fair and transparent selection process that would 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.

Due to large number of applicants, UNDP regrets that it is unable to inform the unsuccessful candidates about the outcome or status of the recruitment process.

Project Logical Framework

| Objective | Indicator | Baseline Level | Target Level | Sources of verification | Risks and Assumptions |
|--|--|--|---|--|---|
| Sustainable management of wetland biodiversity on five important sites | 1. Evaluation of threats reduction at each site, including disturbance by trespassing, continued overgrowth of woody vegetation, on-going drainage, nutrient loading, etc. | (i) No management plan (ii) 16 ha bogs restored | (i) Management plans under implementation (ii) 980 ha of selected bogs, fens, and meadows restored | Order of the MoE on MP approval, Reports by experts, Minutes of Steering Committee meetings, PA annual reports | The combination of (i) a pool of lessons in inland wetland conservation, (ii) a functioning mechanism for replication, (iii) continued commitment from the MoE and the GoL towards wetland conservation, and (iv) appropriate budget eliminates or significantly reduces threats in other wetlands of Lithuania |
| | 2. Evaluation of (i) rate of utilization of restored habitats and wetlands by targeted species and (ii) restoration of wetland-friendly hydraulic regimes | (i) No fish bypasses and no program for reintroduction of capercaillies in Viesvile (ii) Closing 0.2 km of ditches in Kamanos | (i) Fish bypasses installed and capercaillie reintroduction program under implementation in Viesvile (ii) Closing 20 km of ditches in Kamanos, first priority measures implemented in the Dovine River basin | Technical projects, construction permits, works completion statement, pictures | |
| | 3. At least five additional sites identified for replication of lessons learned and schedule of replication of best practices formally agreed | State Register of Peatlands produced by MoE | At least five additional sites identified for replication of lessons learned | Project reports, Minutes of Steering Committee meetings | |
| | 4. Horizontal fund for wetlands management in agricultural areas has been secured (% of farms adopting environmentally friendly agricultural practices) | No farms use environmentally friendly agricultural practices | 10% farms near by Zuvintas have adopted environmentally friendly agricultural practices and have contracts with National Paying Agency | Reports by experts | |
| | 5. State Forestry Company and private forestry companies have assessed options for certification and at least 3 pilot schemes for certifying forests near wetlands are underway. | State Forest Enterprises certified according FSC standards | National legislation adopted, 3 schemes for certifying forests near wetlands is underway | Reports by experts | |
| | 6. Models for land purchase or decommissioning are being replicated in Lithuania | No current models for land purchase | Land acquisition for Nature conservation mechanism introduced into national legislation | Reports by experts | |

| | 7. Tourism action plans and user fees are being developed in at least three other wetland protected areas in Lithuania | No user fee systems | Plan for replication of lessons to other PA in Lithuania developed and agreed | Reports by experts | |
|---|--|---|---|--|---|
| Outcome | Indicator | Baseline Level | Target Level | Sources of verification | Risks and Assumptions |
| Wetland biodiversity protected in Cepkeliai Strict Nature Reserve | 8. Management plan developed and under implementation. Management effectiveness scoring (METT scores) | No management plan METT - 50.7 | Management plan under implementation METT - 60.7 | Order of the MoE on MP approval, METT sheets | The combination of harvest permits combined with better enforcement and increased public awareness is sufficient to control disturbance in Cepkeliai, which constitutes the main threat in the reserve. |
| | 9. System of tradable permits for cranberry picking in place | No alternative system of permits | System of tradable permits in place | Order of the SPAS | |
| | 10. Cutting of vegetation in bogs, meadows and open sands | 0 ha | 230 ha of selected bogs, meadows and open sand areas restored | PA annual reports | |
| | 11. Statistically significant positive changes in awareness and public support: 1) Relationship with PA, 2) Willingness to support PA | 1) Positive - 34.8%, negative - 21.9%, no relationship - 40.8%. 2) Yes/rather yes - 62.2%, no/rather no 37.8% | 1) Positive - 45%, negative - 20%, no relationship - 30%. 2) Yes/rather yes - 70%, no/rather no 30% | Public survey reports | |
| Wetland biodiversity protected in Kamanos Strict Nature Reserve | 12. Management plan developed and under implementation. Management effectiveness scoring (METT scores) | No management plan METT - 55.9 | Management plan under implementation METT - 65.9 | Order of the MoE on MP approval, METT sheets | The reconversion of up to 800 ha (at least 300 ha) of current farming and forest land combined with the closing of drainage channels eliminates the main threat to the Kamanos reserve. Habitat restoration activities in Kamanos are self-sustaining once drainage channels have been closed and original hydrological regime restored. |
| | 13. Area taken out of agriculture /forestry or reconverted to enable restoration of hydrological regime of the raised bog, closing selected ditches inside and outside the reserve | No land acquisition mechanism for nature conservation. Closing 0.2 km of ditches | 300-800 ha transformed from agriculture and forestry activity into nature protection. Closing 20 km of ditches | Technical projects, construction permits, works completion statement, pictures | |
| | 14. Cutting of vegetation in bogs, meadows | 16 ha | 80 ha of selected bogs and meadows restored | PA annual reports | |
| | 15. Statistically significant positive changes in awareness and public support: 1) Relationship with PA, 2) Willingness to support PA | 1) Positive - 44.5%, negative - 10%, no relationship - 45%. 2) Yes/rather yes - 42.5%, no/rather no 51.5% | 1) Positive - 54%, negative - 7%, no relationship - 39%. 2) Yes/rather yes - 55%, no/rather no 45% | Public survey reports | |
| Wetland biodiversity protected in Viesvile Strict | 16. Management plan developed and under implementation. Management effectiveness scoring (METT scores) | No management plan METT - 57.9 | Management plan under implementation METT - 67.9 | Order of the MoE on MP approval, METT sheets | Forest protocols that attain output needs and are compatible with biodiversity conservation in Viesvile are technically |

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|---|---|
| Nature Reserve | 17. Program for biodiversity friendly forestry use around the reserve | No program for biodiversity-friendly forestry use around the reserve | Biodiversity friendly Forest Management plan under implementation | Order of the MoE on MP approval, PA annual reports | feasible. A cranberry farm combined with better enforcement and increased public local awareness is sufficient to eliminate disturbance in Viesvile. |
| | 18. Restoration activities carried out in bogs, fens, and meadows | 0 ha restored | 10 ha of selected bogs, fens, and meadows restored | PA annual reports | |
| | 19. Establishing a pilot cranberry farm in Laukesa peat-land | No cranberry farm | Pilot cranberry farm producing yield | Project reports | |
| | 20. Investments in anti-pollution infrastructure undertaken | No investments in anti-pollution infrastructure | Sewage treatment plant | Co-financier statements | |
| | 21. Fish bypasses installed in two dams in the Viesvile river | No fish bypasses | Fish bypasses installed | Technical projects, constuction permits, works completion statement, pictures | |
| | 22. Evaluation of pilot program for reintroduction of capercaillies | No program for reintroduction | Reintroduction program under implementation | Project reports, reports by experts | |
| | 23. Statistically significant positive changes in awareness and public support: 1) Relationship with PA, 2) Willingness to support PA | 1) Positive - 34.8%, negative - 14.9%, no relationship - 49.3%. 2) Yes/rather yes - 48.2%, no/rather no 50.7% | 1) Positive - 45%, negative - 12%, no relationship - 43%. 2) Yes/rather yes - 58%, no/rather no 42% | Public survey reports | |
| Wetland biodiversity protected in Zuvintas Biosphere Reserve | 24. Management plan developed and under implementation Management effectiveness scoring (METT scores) | No management plan METT - 41.4 | Management plan under implementation METT - 51.4 | Order of the MoE on MP approval, METT sheets | A restored hydrological regime and reduced pollution loads is sufficient to ensure conservation of wetland habitat in Zuvintas. A restored hydrological regime makes habitat restoration outputs self-sustainable in Zuvintas. |
| | 25. Documentation establishing the Biosphere Reserve approved | Not inscribed into UNESCO MAB network | Site inscribed into UNESCO MAB network | Filled in the nomination form signed and submitted | |
| | 26. Farms have adopted environmentally friendly agricultural practices | 0 % of farms | 10% of farms | Reports by experts | |
| | 27. Implementation of first priority measures of water management plan in Zuvintas | No priority measures | First priority measures implemented | Technical projects, constuction permits, works completion statement, pictures | |
| | 28. Investments in water and air pollution undertaken | No investment in water and air pollution | Reconstruction of Simnas town sewage treatment plant and expansion of sewerage, establishment of sedimentation pond in Simnas fish ponds | Co-financier statements | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|---|--|
| | 29. Overgrowth of critical meadow, fen, and bog habitats halted | 0 ha | 600 ha of selected bogs, fens, and meadows restored | PA annual reports | |
| | 30. Statistically significant positive changes in awareness and public support: 1) Relationship with PA, 2) Willingness to support PA | 1) Positive - 35.5%, negative - 14.5%, no relationship - 49.0%. 2) Yes/rather yes - 30.5%, no/rather no 69.5% | 1) Positive - 47%, negative - 10%, no relationship - 43%. 2) Yes/rather yes - 45%, no/rather no 55% | Public survey reports | |
| Wetland biodiversity protected in Girutiskis Strict Nature Reserve | 31. Management plan developed and under implementation. Management effectiveness scoring (METT scores) | No management plan METT - 49.6 | Management plan under implementation METT - 59.6 | Order of the MoE on MP approval, METT sheets | The introduction of user fees combined with increased enforcement and public information campaigns is sufficient to control disturbance at Girutiskis. A restored hydrological regime makes habitat restoration outputs self-sustainable in Girutiskis. |
| | 32. Decrease of trespassing | No border markings | Building of road-blocks, barriers on the entrance roads to the reserve, elimination illegal trespassing by car | PA annual reports | |
| | 33. Users fee approved and in operation | No user fees | User fee system for tourist in place and operating | Reports by experts | |
| | 34. Overgrow of critical meadow, fen, and bog habitats halted | 0 ha | 60 ha of selected bogs, meadows and fens restored | PA annual reports | |
| | 35. Statistically significant positive changes in awareness and public support: 1) Relationship with PA, 2) Willingness to support PA | 1) Positive - 24.4%, negative - 22.9%, no relationship - 50.2%. 2) Yes/rather yes - 57.7%, no/rather no 41.3% | 1) Positive - 45%, negative - 15%, no relationship - 40%. 2) Yes/rather yes - 65%, no/rather no 35% | Public survey reports | |
| Formal intersectoral mechanism for replication of best lessons learned in conservation of inland wetland biodiversity established and operational | 36. A plan for replication of best lessons developed and an executing unit formally established | N/A | Lessons codified - instruments and guidelines from experiences in the five pilot sites, Multisectoral working group established | Order of the MoE on establishing executing unit | Agencies and institutions whose actions can potentially affect wetland biodiversity are willing to assimilate lessons from project |
| | 37. Plan for replication of best lessons approved by the institutions participating in the multisectoral working group | N/A | Ministerial orders by participating institutions | Approved action plan | |
| | 38. Draft sectoral policies and legislation prepared and submitted | N/A | Produce draft legislation on policy reforms in nature conservation, agriculture, forestry, tourism | Legal acts | |

EVALUATION REPORT: SAMPLE OUTLINE

Minimum GEF requirements³

Executive summary

- Brief description of project
- Context and purpose of the evaluation
- Main conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned

Introduction

- Purpose of the evaluation
- Key issues addressed
- Methodology of the evaluation
- Structure of the evaluation

The project(s) and its development context

- Project start and its duration
- Problems that the project seek to address
- Immediate and development objectives of the project
- Main stakeholders
- Results expected

Findings and Conclusions

(In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (*) should be rated⁴)

- Project formulation
 - Implementation approach (*)
 - Analysis of LFA (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)
 - Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project implementation
 - Country ownership/Driveness
 - Stakeholder participation (*)
 - Replication approach
 - Cost-effectiveness
 - UNDP comparative advantage
 - Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
 - Management arrangements
- Implementation
 - Implementation approach (*)
 - The logical framework used during implementation as a management and M&E tool
 - Effective partnerships arrangements established for implementation of the project with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region
 - Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management
 -

³ Please refer to GEF guidelines for explanation of Terminology (provided below)

⁴ The ratings will be: Highly Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Marginally Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory

- Financial Planning
 - Monitoring and evaluation (*)
 - Execution and implementation modalities
 - Management by the UNDP country office
 - Coordination and operational issues
- Results
 - Attainment of objectives (*)
 - Sustainability (*)
 - Contribution to upgrading skills of the national staff

Recommendations

- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
- Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
- Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives

Lessons learned

- Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success

Annexes

- TOR
- Itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- Summary of field visits
- List of documents reviewed
- Questionnaire used and summary of results

Explanation on Terminology Provided in the GEF Guidelines to Terminal Evaluations

Implementation Approach includes an analysis of the project's logical framework, adaptation to changing conditions (adaptive management), partnerships in implementation arrangements, changes in project design, and overall project management.

Some elements of an effective implementation approach may include:

- The logical framework used during implementation as a management and M&E tool
- Effective partnerships arrangements established for implementation of the project with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region
- Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project implementation
- Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management.

Country Ownership/Driveness is the relevance of the project to national development and environmental agendas, recipient country commitment, and regional and international agreements where applicable. Project Concept has its origin within the national sectoral and development plans

Some elements of effective country ownership/driveness may include:

- Project Concept has its origin within the national sectoral and development plans
- Outcomes (or potential outcomes) from the project have been incorporated into the national sectoral and development plans
- Relevant country representatives (e.g., governmental official, civil society, etc.) are actively involved in project identification, planning and/or implementation
- The recipient government has maintained financial commitment to the project
- The government has approved policies and/or modified regulatory frameworks in line with the project's objectives
- Project's collaboration with industry associations

Stakeholder Participation/Public Involvement consists of three related and often overlapping processes: information dissemination, consultation, and "stakeholder" participation. Stakeholders are the individuals, groups, institutions, or other bodies that have an interest or stake in the outcome of the GEF-financed project. The term also applies to those potentially adversely affected by a project.

Examples of effective public involvement include:

Information dissemination

- Implementation of appropriate outreach/public awareness campaigns

Consultation and stakeholder participation

- Consulting and making use of the skills, experiences and knowledge of NGOs,

community and local groups, the private and public sectors, and academic institutions in the design, implementation, and evaluation of project activities

Stakeholder participation

- Project institutional networks well placed within the overall national or community organizational structures, for example, by building on the local decision making structures, incorporating local knowledge, and devolving project management responsibilities to the local organizations or communities as the project approaches closure
- Building partnerships among different project stakeholders
- Fulfilment of commitments to local stakeholders and stakeholders considered to be adequately involved.

Sustainability measures the extent to which benefits continue, within or outside the project domain, from a particular project or program after GEF assistance/external assistance has come to an end. Relevant factors to improve the sustainability of project outcomes include:

- Development and implementation of a sustainability strategy.
- Establishment of the financial and economic instruments and mechanisms to ensure the ongoing flow of benefits once the GEF assistance ends (from the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and market transformations to promote the project's objectives).
- Development of suitable organizational arrangements by public and/or private sector.
- Development of policy and regulatory frameworks that further the project objectives.
- Incorporation of environmental and ecological factors affecting future flow of benefits.
- Development of appropriate institutional capacity (systems, structures, staff, expertise, etc.) .
- Identification and involvement of champions (i.e. individuals in government and civil society who can promote sustainability of project outcomes).
- Achieving social sustainability, for example, by mainstreaming project activities into the economy or community production activities.
- Achieving stakeholders consensus regarding courses of action on project activities.

Replication approach, in the context of GEF projects, is defined as lessons and experiences coming out of the project that are replicated or scaled up in the design and implementation of other projects. Replication can have two aspects, replication proper (lessons and experiences are replicated in different geographic area) or scaling up (lessons and experiences are replicated within the same geographic area but funded by other sources). Examples of replication approaches include:

- Knowledge transfer (i.e., dissemination of lessons through project result documents, training workshops, information exchange, a national and regional forum, etc).
- Expansion of demonstration projects.
- Capacity building and training of individuals, and institutions to expand the project's

achievements in the country or other regions.

- Use of project-trained individuals, institutions or companies to replicate the project's outcomes in other regions.

Financial Planning includes actual project cost by activity, financial management (including disbursement issues), and co-financing. If a financial audit has been conducted the major findings should be presented in the TE.

Effective financial plans include:

- Identification of potential sources of co-financing as well as leveraged and associated financing⁵.
- Strong financial controls, including reporting, and planning that allow the project management to make informed decisions regarding the budget at any time, allows for a proper and timely flow of funds, and for the payment of satisfactory project deliverables
- Due diligence due diligence in the management of funds and financial audits.

Co financing includes: Grants, Loans/Concessional (compared to market rate), Credits, Equity investments, In-kind support, other contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector and beneficiaries. Please refer to Council documents on co-financing for definitions, such as GEF/C.20/6.

Leveraged resources are additional resources—beyond those committed to the project itself at the time of approval—that are mobilized later as a direct result of the project. Leveraged resources can be financial or in-kind and they may be from other donors, NGO's, foundations, governments, communities or the private sector. Please briefly describe the resources the project has leveraged since inception and indicate how these resources are contributing to the project's ultimate objective.

Cost-effectiveness assesses the achievement of the environmental and developmental objectives as well as the project's outputs in relation to the inputs, costs, and implementing time. It also examines the project's compliance with the application of the incremental cost concept. Cost-effective factors include:

- Compliance with the incremental cost criteria (e.g. GEF funds are used to finance a component of a project that would not have taken place without GEF funding.) and securing co-funding and associated funding.
- The project completed the planned activities and met or exceeded the expected outcomes in terms of achievement of Global Environmental and Development Objectives according to schedule, and as cost-effective as initially planned.
- The project used either a benchmark approach or a comparison approach (did not exceed the costs levels of similar projects in similar contexts)

⁵ Please refer to Council documents on co-financing for definitions, such as GEF/C.20/6. The following page presents a table to be used for reporting co-financing.

Monitoring & Evaluation. Monitoring is the periodic oversight of a process, or the implementation of an activity, which seeks to establish the extent to which inputs, work schedules, other required actions and outputs are proceeding according to plan, so that timely action can be taken to correct the deficiencies detected. Evaluation is a process by which program inputs, activities and results are analyzed and judged explicitly against benchmarks or baseline conditions using performance indicators. This will allow project managers and planners to make decisions based on the evidence of information on the project implementation stage, performance indicators, level of funding still available, etc, building on the project's logical framework.

Monitoring and Evaluation includes activities to measure the project's achievements such as identification of performance indicators, measurement procedures, and determination of baseline conditions. Projects are required to implement plans for monitoring and evaluation with adequate funding and appropriate staff and include activities such as description of data sources and methods for data collection, collection of baseline data, and stakeholder participation. Given the long-term nature of many GEF projects, projects are also encouraged to include long-term monitoring plans that are sustainable after project completion.

Co-financing Table

| Co financing (Type/ Source) | IA own Financing (mill US\$) | | Government (mill US\$) | | Other Sources* (mill US\$) | | Total Financing (mill US\$) | | Total Disbursement (mill US\$) | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------|---------------------------|--------|-------------------------------|--------|-----------------------------------|--------|--------------------------------------|--------|
| | Proposed | Actual | Proposed | Actual | Proposed | Actual | Proposed | Actual | Proposed | Actual |
| Grant | | | | | | | | | | |
| Credits | | | | | | | | | | |
| Loans | | | | | | | | | | |
| Equity | | | | | | | | | | |
| In-kind | | | | | | | | | | |
| Non-grant Instruments * | | | | | | | | | | |
| Other Types | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | | | | | | | | | | |

- Other Sources refer to contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector etc.
- “Proposed” co-financing refers to co-financing proposed at CEO endorsement.
- Describe “Non-grant Instruments” (such as guarantees, contingent grants, etc):
 - *Source/amount/in-kind or cash/purpose.*
- Explain “Other Sources of Co-financing”:
 - *Source/amount/in-kind or cash*
 - ...
 -

RATE TABLES

Table 1 : Status of objective / outcome delivery as per measurable indicators

| OBJECTIVE | MEASURABLE INDICATORS FROM PROJECT LOGFRAME | END-OF-PROJECT TARGET | STATUS OF DELIVERY * | RATING ** |
|-------------|---|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------|
| Objective : | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| OUTCOMES | | END-OF-PROJECT TARGET | STATUS OF DELIVERY | RATING |
| Outcome 1: | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Outcome 2: | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Outcome 3: | - | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Outcome 4: | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Outcome 5: | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

* Status of delivery colouring codes:

Green / completed – indicator shows successful achievement

Yellow – indicator shows expected completion by the end of the project

Red – Indicator show poor achievement - unlikely to be complete by end of

Project

** **Rating:**

Highly Satisfactory = HS

Satisfactory = S

Marginally Satisfactory = MS

Unsatisfactory = U

Table 2: Project ratings

| Table 2.1 Project Ratings | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------|----|--------------|---|----|----|---|--------|
| PROJECT OBJECTIVE | COMPONENT | OR | RATING SCALE | | | | | RATING |
| | | | HU | U | MU | MS | S | HS |
| PROJECT FORMULATION | | | | | | | | |
| Conceptualization/Design | | | | | | | | |
| Stakeholder participation | | | | | | | | |
| PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION | | | | | | | | |
| Implementation Approach | | | | | | | | |
| The use of the logical framework | | | | | | | | |
| Adaptive management | | | | | | | | |
| Use/establishment of information technologies | | | | | | | | |
| Operational relationships between the institutions involved | | | | | | | | |
| Technical capacities | | | | | | | | |
| Monitoring and evaluation | | | | | | | | |
| Stakeholder participation | | | | | | | | |
| Production and dissemination of information | | | | | | | | |
| Local resource users and NGOs participation | | | | | | | | |
| Establishment of partnerships | | | | | | | | |
| Involvement and support of governmental institutions | | | | | | | | |
| PROJECT RESULTS | | | | | | | | |
| Attainment of Outcomes/ Achievement of objectives | | | | | | | | |
| Achievement of objective | | | | | | | | |
| Outcome 1 | | | | | | | | |
| Outcome 2 | | | | | | | | |
| Outcome 3 | | | | | | | | |
| Outcome 4 | | | | | | | | |
| Outcome 5 | | | | | | | | |
| Outcome 6 | | | | | | | | |
| Outcome 7 | | | | | | | | |
| OVERALL PROJECT ACHIEVEMENT & IMPACT | | | | | | | | |

List of documents to be reviewed by the Evaluators

The following documents can be used as a basis for evaluation of the project:

| Document | Description |
|------------------------------|---|
| Project document | Project Document |
| Project reports | Inception Report Progress Reports Mid Term Evaluation Report SC meeting minutes |
| Annual Project Report to GEF | Project Implementation Reviews - PIRs |
| Other relevant materials: | METT Financial Audit Reports Articles in magazines and newspapers Expert studies, reports and research results Project Homepage Publications, albums, , methodical guides, management plans, other relevant papers produced by the project Newsletters of project sites and the local initiatives |

Cost breakdown template

| | Units* | Rate | Total |
|---|---------------|-------------|--------------|
| Home office | | | |
| Desk review | | | |
| Briefings by UNDP and PM | | | |
| Drafting of the evaluation report | | | |
| Validation of preliminary findings with stakeholders through circulation of draft reports for comments, meetings and other types of feedback mechanisms | | | |
| Finalization of the evaluation report (incorporating comments received on first draft) | | | |
| Mission | | | |
| Field visits, interviews, questionnaires, de-briefings | | | |
| International travel to and from Vilnius | | | |
| Local travel (to be arranged and covered by the project) | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| DSA (overnights) | | | |
| TOTAL | | | |

* Estimates are indicated in the TOR, the applicant is requested to review and revise, if applicable.