

# **“Sustainable Island Resource Management Mechanism”**

**Antigua and Barbuda**

**Terms of reference for conducting the Mid-Term Evaluation**

**February 2011**

# **1 INTRODUCTION**

## **1.1 UNDP/GEF Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) policy**

The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) policy at the project level in UNDP/GEF has four objectives:

- i) to monitor and evaluate results and impacts;
- ii) to provide a basis for decision making on necessary amendments and improvements;
- iii) to promote accountability for resource use;
- iv) to document, provide feedback on, and disseminate lessons learned.

A mix of tools is used to ensure effective project M&E. These might be applied continuously throughout the lifetime of the project – e.g. periodic monitoring of indicators -, or as specific time-bound exercises such as mid-term reviews, audit reports and final evaluations.

Mid-term evaluations are intended to assess the relevance, performance and design of the project so far. 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 this project or other UNDP/GEF projects.

## **1.2 The project objectives and its context**

Environmental Resource Management has long been recognized as a serious problem in Antigua and Barbuda. This project was therefore created to support the implementation of a comprehensive cross-sectoral ecosystem approach, a strategy for sustainable Island Resource Management (SIRM), that provides for ecosystem functionality and biodiversity conservation within a landscape that enhances sustainable livelihood options and opportunities for sustainable economic development. The initiative will strengthen capacity at the systemic, institutional and individual level to enable the implementation of innovative approaches to sustainable land management and resource use among key stakeholder groups. Enhanced partnership between the private and public sector will optimize integrated land and water management practice in the country and especially in four demonstration projects covering an area of 11.274 ha, with the aim of enhancing and generating global benefits for biodiversity. Given that the island represents a single landscape unit cross-focal synergies will be capitalized. The GEF incremental contribution to this project will assist Antigua and Barbuda to 1) set up an Environmental Information management and Advisory system that directly addresses cross-sectoral integration, decision making and awareness; 2) Realign and strengthen policy legislation and institutional capacity; 3) Develop a strategic SIRM implementation plan; 4) Implement the SIRM approach. This four year project has GEF incremental cost funding of \$2,995,930 and co-financing of \$4,683,200.

# **2 OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION**

The mid-term evaluation (MTE) is a requirement of UNDP and GEF and thus it is principally initiated by UNDP Sub-Regional Office for Barbados and the Eastern Caribbean. It will be conducted according to guidance, rules and procedures for such evaluations established by UNDP and the Global Environment Facility.

This MTE should identify potential project design problems, assess progress towards the achievement of objectives, identify and document lessons learned (including lessons that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP/GEF projects), and to make recommendations regarding specific actions that might be taken to improve the project and its design. It is expected to serve as a means of validating or filling the gaps in the initial assessment of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency obtained from monitoring. The MTE provides the opportunity to assess early signs of project success or failure and prompt necessary adjustments.

The main stakeholders of this MTE are 1) The Ministry of Environment, 2) The Ministry of Agriculture, 3) The Department of Tourism, 4) The department of Physical Planning and Land management, 5) The water authority, 6) UNDP, 7) Co-financers, 8) National Consultants, 9) GEF operational Focal point, 10) CCD, UNFCCC, and CBD convention Focal Point.

Please refer to section 7 for further details on the scope of this evaluation.

### 3 PRODUCTS EXPECTED FROM THE EVALUATION

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following products:

Oral presentation of main findings of the evaluation: This should be presented to UNDP Sub regional, Barbados and offices by video- or teleconference before the mission is concluded in order to allow for clarification and validation of evaluation findings.

Evaluation written report: This report will be submitted to the UNDP Sub-regional Office, the UNDP-GEF regional Coordination Unit (RCU) and project team electronically within 2 weeks after the evaluation mission has been concluded. These parties will review the document and provide feedback to the evaluation team within 1 month after the evaluation report draft has been submitted. The evaluator will address these comments and provide a final report within a period of 1 week. In case of discrepancy between parties and the evaluation team an annex should be included at the end of the document explaining the discrepancies. The RCU and CO will sign a formal clearance form to be submitted with the final evaluation report (see Annex 5). The evaluation report outline should be structured using the report outline provided in section 7.

General considerations of the report:

- Formatting: Times New Roman – Font 11; single spacing; paragraph numbering and table of content (automatic); page numbers (centered bottom); graphs and tables and photographs (where relevant) are encouraged.
- Length: Maximum 50 pages in total excluding annexes
- Timeframe of submission: first draft within 2 weeks of completion of the country mission

### 4 METHODOLOGY OR EVALUATION APPROACH

An outline of the 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 Group<sup>21</sup>. Any change must be cleared by UNDP before being applied by the evaluation team.

- (i) **Documentation review** (desk study): the list of documentation is included in Annex 2. The evaluator should consult all relevant sources of information, including but not limited to the following list of documentation: UNDP and GEF evaluation policy, the project document, project reports, Project Steering Committee minutes and decisions, project budgets, project work plans, progress reports, PIRs, project files, UNDP guidance documents, national legislation relevant to the project and any other material that they may consider useful. The Project Manager will also provide a report of the project's accomplishments and lessons.
- (ii) **Interviews** will be held with the following organizations and persons as a minimum The permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Environment, the project manager, UNDP Energy and Environment Program Manager, Partners selected for the implementation of the Demo projects.
- (iii) **Field Visits** should be made to the **three demonstration sites**.
- (iv) **Semi-structured interviews** – the team should develop a process for semi-structured interviews to ensure that different aspects are covered. Focus group discussions with project beneficiaries will be held as deemed necessary by the evaluation team.

---

<sup>11 2.</sup> [www.uneval.org](http://www.uneval.org)

(v) **Questionnaires**

(vi) **Participatory Techniques and other approaches for the gather and analysis of data**

## **5 EVALUATION TEAM**

A minimum of 2 consultants will be required to undertake this evaluation. The lead consultant will be responsible for the more technical aspects of the evaluation, including the technical background; project progress with emphasis on conformity to the logical framework; and the delivery of outcomes in accordance with the GEF objectives. The lead consultant will also be responsible for the finalization of the report. The second consultant will be looking more towards qualitative aspects of the coordination of the project on the ground, being responsible for reporting on national implementation issues; stakeholder involvement and satisfaction; impact at the various levels; financial management and national response; and satisfaction with the project. A consultancy firm may apply by presenting individual applications.

Lead consultant:

*Responsibilities:*

- Evaluate the project design, the strategy and the set objectives.
- Evaluate aspects of sustainability, ownership, monitoring and evaluation and efficiency
- Assess the achievements of projects results, objective and impacts
- Evaluate the project management and financial management aspects, in line with the requirements stipulated in Appendices 2 and 3
- Elaborate the evaluation report in line with the structure as set out in the ToR with the required appendixes

*Required profile:*

- Experience in conducting design and/or evaluation of natural resource management projects, preferably on small islands in the Caribbean
- Technical knowledge of natural resource management, ecosystem management or related fields;
- Understanding of the Logical Framework
- Experience with UNDP-GEF projects would be an asset.

Second consultant:

*Responsibilities:*

- Analysing the interaction between the various actors involved, the division of responsibilities, their collaboration and the capacity to comply with their roles and responsibilities
- Assess the intersectoral linkages and the institutional and social context that have contributed to or slowed down the execution and efficient achievement of the project objectives
- Evaluate coordination between this and other projects on the ground.
- Analyze the delivery of the project

*Required profile:*

- Experience in conducting design and/or evaluation of natural resource management projects, preferably on small islands in the Caribbean
- A good understanding of the local environment
- Familiarity with current planning and development projects and processes in Antigua and Barbuda
- Familiarity with the local government structure
- Understanding of the Logical Framework would be an asset
- Experience with UNDP-GEF projects would be an asset.

## **6 IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS**

### **6.1 Management Arrangements**

The evaluation is being solicited by UNDP, led by the UNDP Sub-Regional Office in Barbados as project Implementing Agency. The evaluation team will be briefed by the UNDP Country Office and the RCU upon the commencement of the assignment, and will also provide a terminal briefing. Other briefing sessions may be scheduled, if deemed necessary.

Payment modalities and specifications: The evaluators will be contracted directly from the project budget. Payment will be 50% at the submission of the first draft to the UNDP-CO, UNDP-GEF RCU and PT, and the other 50% once the final report has been completed and cleared by both the UNDP-CO and UNDP-GEF RCU. The quality of the evaluator's work will be assessed by the UNDP-CO and UNDP-GEF- RCU. If the quality does not meet standard UNDP expectations or UNDP-GEF requirements, the evaluators will be required to re-do or revise (as appropriate) the work before being paid final installments.

These Terms of Reference follow the UNDP-GEF policies and procedures, and together with the final agenda will be agreed upon by the UNDP-GEF Regional Coordination Unit, UNDP Country Office and the Project Team. The final report must be cleared and accepted by UNDP before being made public, therefore, the UNDP-CO and UNDP-GEF-RCU will have to formally clear the report (please see Annex 5).

## **6.2 Timeframe, resources, logistical support and deadlines**

The total duration of the evaluation will be 20 days according to the following plan:

Preparation before field work: (3 days including travel time)

- Acquaintance with the project document and other relevant materials with information about the project (PIRs, TPR reports, and other evaluation report, etc);
- Familiarization with overall development situation of country.
- Detailed mission programme preparation, including methodology, in cooperation with the UNDP Country office and the Project team.
- Initial telephone discussion with UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor

Mission: (8 days)

- Virtual meeting with UNDP Country Offices' teams;
- Meetings with key stakeholders in Antigua and Barbuda.
- Joint review of all available materials with focused attention to project outcomes and outputs
- Visit to Project site
  - Observation and review of completed and ongoing field activities, (capacity development, awareness /education, sustainable use demonstration activities, community development, etc)
  - Interviews with key beneficiaries and stakeholders, including representatives of local authorities, local environmental protection authorities, local community stakeholders, etc.

Draft report (7 days): To be provided within two weeks of mission completion

- Final interviews / cross checking with UNDP CO, UNDP Barbados, UNDP RCU and Project team (via teleconference where relevant)
- Drafting of report in proposed format
- Telephone review of major findings with UNDP CO and UNDP-GEF RTA
- Completing of the draft report and presentation of draft report for comments and suggestions within 1 month

Final Report (2 days)

- Presentation of final evaluation report

## **7 SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION AND SPECIFIC ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED**

The MTE will include field visits to ascertain project accomplishments and interviews of the key stakeholders at national and, where appropriate, local levels. It also analyses the use of GEF and co-financing resources in the broader context of the country.

In general it is expected that evaluations in the GEF explore the following five major criteria<sup>2</sup>:

- **Relevance.** The extent to which the activity is suited to local and national development priorities and organizational policies, including changes over time.
- **Effectiveness.** The extent to which an objective has been achieved or how likely it is to be achieved.
- **Efficiency.** The extent to which results have been delivered with the least costly resources possible; also called cost effectiveness or efficacy.
- **Results.** The positive and negative, and foreseen and unforeseen, changes to and effects produced by a development intervention. In GEF terms, results include direct project outputs, short- to medium-term outcomes, and longer term impact including global environmental benefits, replication effects, and other local effects.
- **Sustainability.** The likely ability of an intervention to continue to deliver benefits for an extended period of time after completion. Projects need to be environmentally as well as financially and socially sustainable.

The following should be covered in the MTE report:

### ***General information about the evaluation.***

The MTE report will provide information on when the evaluation took place; places visited; who was involved; the key questions; and, the methodology. More details are provided in the template of Terms of Reference (**ToR**) in Annex 2.

### ***Assessment of Project Results***

MTEs will at the minimum assess achievement of outputs and outcomes and will provide ratings for outcomes. This assessment seeks to determine the extent to which the project outcomes have been achieved, or are expected to be achieved, and assess if the project has led to any other positive or negative consequences. While assessing a project's outcomes, the MTE will seek to determine the extent of achievement and shortcomings in reaching the project's objective as stated in the project document, and also indicate if there were any changes and whether those changes were approved and achieved. If the project did not establish a baseline (initial conditions), the evaluator- together with the Project Team- should seek to estimate the baseline condition so that achievements and results can be properly established. Since most GEF projects can be expected to achieve the anticipated outcomes by project closing, assessment of project outcomes should be a priority. Outcomes are the likely or achieved short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention's outputs. Examples of outcomes could include but are not restricted to stronger institutional capacities, higher public awareness (when leading to changes in behavior), and transformed policy frameworks or markets. It is encouraged that the evaluators assess the project results using indicators and relevant Tracking Tools.

To determine the level of achievement of project results and objectives following three criteria will be assessed in the MTE:

- **Relevance:** Were the project's outcomes consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies and country priorities? The evaluators should also assess the extent outcomes specified in the project appraisal documents are actually outcomes and not outputs or inputs.
- **Effectiveness:** Are the project outcomes commensurable with the expected outcomes (as described in the project document) and the problems the project was intended to address (i.e. original or modified project objectives)? In case in the original or modified expected outcomes are merely outputs/inputs then the evaluators should assess if there were any real outcomes of the project and if yes then whether these are commensurate with the realistic expectations from such projects.
- **Efficiency:** Was the project cost effective? Was the project the least cost option? Was the project implementation delayed and if it was then did that affect cost-effectiveness? Wherever possible the

evaluator should also compare the cost-time vs. outcomes relationship of the project with that of other similar projects.

The evaluation of relevancy, effectiveness and efficiency will be as objective as possible and will include sufficient and convincing empirical evidence. Ideally the project monitoring system should deliver quantifiable information that can lead to a robust assessment of project's effectiveness and efficiency. Since projects have different objectives assessed results are not comparable and cannot be aggregated. To track the health of the portfolio, project outcomes will be rated as follows:

**Highly Satisfactory (HS):** The project had no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

**Satisfactory (S):** The project had minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

**Moderately Satisfactory (MS):** The project had moderate shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

**Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU):** The project had significant shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

**Unsatisfactory (U)** The project had major shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

**Highly Unsatisfactory (HU):** The project had severe shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

The evaluators will also assess positive and negative actual (or anticipated) impacts or emerging long term effects of a project. Given the long term nature of impacts, it might not be possible for the evaluators to identify or fully assess impacts. Evaluators will nonetheless indicate the steps taken to assess project impacts, especially impacts on local populations, local environment (e.g. increase in the number of individuals of an endangered species, improved water quality, increase in fish stocks, reduced greenhouse gas emissions) and wherever possible indicate how the findings on impacts will be reported to the GEF in future.

### ***Assessment of Sustainability of project outcomes***

The TE will assess, at a minimum, the “likelihood of sustainability of outcomes at project termination, and provide a rating for this.” The sustainability assessment will give special attention to analysis of the risks that are likely to affect the persistence of project outcomes. The sustainability assessment should also explain how other important contextual factors that are not outcomes of the project will affect sustainability..

### ***Catalytic role***

The mid-term evaluation will also describe any catalytic or replication effect of the project. If no effects are identified, the evaluation will describe the catalytic or replication actions that the project carried out.

### ***Assessment of monitoring and evaluation systems***

The MTE will assess whether the project met the requirements for project design of M&E and the application of the Project M&E plan. GEF projects must budget adequately for execution of the M&E plan, and provide adequate resources for the implementation of the M&E plan. Project managers are also expected to use the information generated by the M&E system during project implementation to improve and adapt the project. Given the long duration of many GEF projects, projects are also encouraged to include long-term monitoring plans to measure results (such as environmental results) after project completion. The MTE reports will include separate assessments of the achievements and shortcomings of these two types of M&E systems.

## **7.1 Specific Topics to Consider**

Inadequate conservation, planning and management of Antigua and Barbuda's limited, resources has resulted in both a loss of species diversity and degradation of the functionality of the island ecosystem. Ecosystems have been affected primarily by unsustainable agro-pastoral practices agro-chemicals, overgrazing and

uncontrolled fires), the introduction of invasive species, unregulated fishing and sand mining, as well as *ad hoc* coastal and urban construction for residential and tourism developments. In order to address this situation the project proposed implementing a Sustainable Island Resource Management (SIRM) approach to protect the vital island ecosystem assets.

These barriers are:

#### 1. Management and Coordination

Responsibility and management of interrelated and closely linked elements of the overall island ecosystem and its resources are fragmented and uncoordinated. Land management is disconnected and handled unsystematically in relation to the 15 or so different agencies within 8 separate Ministries that ‘share’ responsibilities for various aspects of spatial planning. The exact responsibilities of individual agencies have been poorly defined even within the enacted legislation.

#### 2. Information and Awareness

The information gathering, analysis and reporting process in relation to SIRM is equally as fragmented and uncoordinated as the management process. This is hardly surprising as the one is an inevitable requirement and foundation for the other. Currently there is a limited amount of information available on island resources, and environmental and climatic variability, and this absence of information equates to an overall inadequate understanding and awareness of island ecosystem functions and their interrelated nature.

#### 3. Fiscal Policies and Financial Instruments

Fiscal policies fail to address some of the fundamental concepts related to SIRM. The economy of Antigua and Barbuda is heavily dependent on its natural resources (landscape and seascape, fisheries, healthy watersheds, vegetative cover, etc). Logic would therefore dictate that environmental planning and management for the maintenance and protection of such natural resources would be a paramount imperative for all residents and for the nation’s government. However, current financial support for environmental management is far too limited to address the key issues of management and coordination.

#### 4. Capacity and Training

Antigua and Barbuda share the same constraints as most small islands in the context of having limited human resources and capacity. This impairs the institutional capability to collect and process information, to monitor the status of island resources and ecosystem functions, to ensure compliance with regulations and legislation, to provide accurate and up-to-date advice to policy-makers and managers, and to develop more appropriate management practices.

#### 5. Contingency for Environmental Variability and Extreme Events

Other than prediction followed by some level of preparedness there is little that can be done to lessen the direct impact from extreme events such as tropical storms, hurricanes or other severe climatic conditions such as droughts.

#### 6. Alternative Options for Sustainable Practices and Self-Sufficiency

Little attention has been focused on options and possibilities for alternative technologies or livelihoods, or to the adoption of best practices for SIRM. There is a clear and urgent need to develop these within the specific context of Antigua and Barbuda and to demonstrate their efficacy in action, on the ground.

#### 7. Legislation, Regulation and Policy

Weak or misdirected legislation and policy along with the absence of logical self-regulatory approaches within the private sector, represent overall constraints to management, fiscal support for SIRM, institutional activities and capacities (including information gathering and processing for awareness and decision-making).



## 7.2 Final report Outline

### 1. Executive summary

- Brief description of project
- Context and purpose of the evaluation
- Main conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned
- Table summarizing main ratings received

### 2. Introduction

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

### 3. 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

### 4. Findings

In addition to the Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency assessment described above, a descriptive assessment must be provided. All criteria marked with **(R)** should be rated using the following divisions: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). Please see Annex 2 for an explanation on the GEF terminology.

#### 4.1. Project Formulation

This section should describe the context of the problem the project seeks to address. It should describe how useful the project conceptualization and design has been for addressing the problem, placing emphasis on the logical consistency of the project and its Logical Framework. This section should seek to answer the following questions: *Was the project well-formulated? Were any modifications made to the Project's LogFrame during implementation, and if so, have these modifications resulted or are expected to result in better and bigger impacts?*

- **Conceptualization/Design (R):** This should assess the approach used in design and an appreciation of the appropriateness of problem conceptualization and whether the selected intervention strategy was the best option to address the barriers in the project area. It should also include an assessment of the logical framework and whether the different project components and activities proposed to achieve the objective were appropriate, viable and responded to contextual institutional, legal and regulatory settings of the project. It should also assess the indicators defined for guiding implementation and measurement of achievement and whether lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) were incorporated into project design.
- **Country-ownership/Drivenness:** Assess the extent to which the project idea/conceptualization had its origin within national, sectoral and development plans and focuses on national environment and development interests.
- **Stakeholder participation in design (R):** Assess information dissemination, consultation, and “stakeholder” participation in design stages.

- Replication approach: Determine the ways in which lessons and experiences coming out of the project were/are to be replicated or scaled up in the design and implementation of other projects (this also relates to actual practices undertaken during implementation).
- Other aspects: to assess in the review of Project formulation approaches, the comparative advantage of UNDP as IA for this project; the consideration of linkages between projects and other interventions within the sector and the definition of clear and appropriate management arrangements at the design stage.

## 4.2. Project Implementation

- Implementation Approach (R): Independent from the issue of whether the project was well designed or not, the next question should be *how well has the project been implemented?* This section should include an assessment of the following aspects:
  - (i) The use of the logical framework as a management tool during implementation and any changes made to this as a response to changing conditions and/or feedback from M & E activities if required.
  - (ii) Other elements that indicate adaptive management such as comprehensive and realistic work plans routinely developed that reflect adaptive management; and/or changes in management arrangements to enhance implementation.
  - (iii) The project's use/establishment of electronic information technologies to support implementation, participation and monitoring, as well as other project activities.
  - (iv) The general operational relationships between the institutions involved and others and how these relationships have contributed to effective implementation and achievement of project objectives.
  - (v) Technical capacities associated with the project and their role in project development, management and achievements.
- Monitoring and evaluation (R): Including an assessment as to whether there has been adequate periodic oversight of activities during implementation to establish the extent to which inputs, work schedules, other required actions and outputs are proceeding according to plan; whether formal evaluations have been held and whether action has been taken on the results of this monitoring oversight and evaluation reports. For evaluating this, it is proposed that evaluators use the following criteria: i) to evaluate if the project has an appropriate M&E system to follow up the progress towards achieving the project result and objectives ii) to evaluate if appropriate M&E tools have been used, i.e baselines, clear and practical indicators, data analysis, studies to evaluate the expected results for certain project stages (results and progress indicators). iii) to evaluate if resources and capacities to conduct an adequate monitoring are in place and also if the M&E system has been utilized for adaptive management
- Stakeholder participation in implementation (R): This should include assessments of the mechanisms for decision making and information dissemination in project implementation and the extent of stakeholder participation in management, emphasizing the following:
  - (i) The production and dissemination of information generated by the project.
  - (ii) Local resource users and NGOs participation in project implementation and decision making and an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the approach adopted by the project in this area.
  - (iii) The establishment of partnerships and collaborative relationships developed by the project with local, national and international entities and the effects they have had on project implementation.
  - (iv) Involvement of governmental institutions in project implementation, the extent of governmental support of the project.

- **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. See more details and explanation of concepts in Annex 3 This section should include:
  - (i) The actual project cost by objectives, outputs, activities
  - (ii) The cost-effectiveness of achievements (has the project been the cost effective?)
  - (iii) Financial management (including disbursement issues)
  - (iv) Co-financing Apart from co-financing analysis the evaluators should complete the co financing and leverages resources table provided in Annex 3.
- **Execution and implementation modalities.** This should consider the effectiveness of the UNDP counterpart and Project Co-ordination Unit participation in selection, recruitment, assignment of experts, consultants and national counterpart staff members and in the definition of tasks and responsibilities; quantity, quality and timeliness of inputs for the project with respect to execution responsibilities, enactment of necessary legislation and budgetary provisions and extent to which these may have affected implementation and sustainability of the Project; quality and timeliness of inputs by UNDP and the Government and other parties responsible for providing inputs to the project, and the extent to which this may have affected the smooth implementation of the project. This section should seek to answer questions such as: *Was the project's implementation done in an efficient and effective manner? Was there effective communication between critical actors in response to the needs of implementation? Were the administrative costs of the Project reasonable and cost efficient?*

### 4.3. Results

**Attainment of Outcomes/ Achievement of project objective (R):** This TE seeks to determine the extent to which the project's outcomes and project objective were achieved and if there has been any positive or negative impact. For this it is important to determine achievements and shortfalls of the project in achieving outcomes and objectives. If the project did not establish a baseline (initial conditions), the evaluators, with the Project Team, should seek to determine it through the use of special methodologies so that achievements, results and impacts can be properly established. This analysis should be conducted based on specific project indicators.

This section should also include reviews of the following:

- **Sustainability:** Including an appreciation of the extent to which benefits continue, within or outside the project domain after GEF assistance/external assistance in this phase has come to an end. The sustainability assessment will give special attention to analysis of the risks that are likely to affect the persistence of project outcomes. The sustainability assessment should also explain how other important contextual factors that are not outcomes of the project will affect sustainability. Following four dimensions or aspects of sustainability will be addressed. Each of the dimensions of sustainability of the project outcomes will be rated as shown in footnote below<sup>3</sup>:
  - **Financial resources:** Are there any financial risks involved in sustaining the project outcomes? What is the likelihood that financial and economic resources will not be available once the GEF assistance ends (resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and trends that may indicate that it is likely that in future there will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project's outcomes)?

---

Likely (L): There are no risks affecting this dimension of sustainability.

Moderately Likely (ML): There are moderate risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.

Moderately Unlikely (MU): There are significant risks that affect this dimension of sustainability

Unlikely (U): There are severe risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.

- *Sociopolitical:* Are there any social or political risks that can undermine the longevity of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project?
  - *Institutional framework and governance:* Do the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes pose any threat to the continuation of project benefits? While assessing on this parameter also consider if the required systems for accountability and transparency, and the required technical know-how is in place.
  - *Environmental:* Are there any environmental risks that can undermine the future flow of project environmental benefits? The TE should assess whether certain activities in the project area will pose a threat to the sustainability of the project outcomes. For example, construction of dam in a protected area could inundate a sizable area and thereby neutralizing the biodiversity related gains made by the project.
- Contribution to upgrading skills of the national staff

## 5. Conclusions and recommendations

This section must provide the concluding points to this evaluation and specific recommendations. Recommendations should be as specific as possible indicating to whom this are addresses. Please complete the relevant columns of the management response Table provided in Annex 4 with main recommendations made. This section should include:

- Final remarks or synthesis on relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, results and sustainability of the project;
- Final remarks on the achievement of project outcomes and objective;
- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project;
- Actions to follow up on to reinforce initial benefits from the project;
- Proposals for future directions that reinforce the main objectives.

## 6. Lessons learned

The evaluators will present lessons and recommendations on all aspects of the project that they consider relevant in the TE report. The evaluators will be expected to give special attention to analyzing lessons and proposing recommendations on aspects related to factors that contributed or hindered: attainment of project objectives and results, sustainability of project benefits, innovation, catalytic effect and replication, and project monitoring and evaluation. Some questions to consider are:

- Is there anything noteworthy/special/critical that was learned during project implementation this year that is important to share with other projects so they can avoid this mistake/make use of this opportunity?
- What would you do differently if you were to begin the project again?
- How does this project contribute to technology transfer?
- To what extent have UNDP GEF projects been relevant to national / local efforts to reduce poverty / enhance democratic governance / strengthen crisis prevention and recovery capacity / promote gender equality and empowerment of women? Please explain.
- Has this project been able to generate global environmental benefits while also contributing to the achievement of national environmental management and sustainable development priorities? If yes, please elaborate.

## 7. Evaluation report Annexes

- Evaluation TORs

- Itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- Summary of field visits
- List of documents reviewed
- Questionnaire used and summary of results
- Comments by stakeholders (only in case of discrepancies with evaluation findings and conclusions)
- Clearance and revision form from RCU and CO

## **VIII. ANNEXES**

Annex 1: List of Documents to be reviewed by the evaluators

Annex 2. Explanation on GEF Terminology

Annex 3: Financial Planning – Co-financing

Annex 4: Management Response Table

Annex 4. Clearance form

**ANNEX 1- LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE EVALUATORS**

Project Document of the Sustainable Island Resource Management Mechanism

Auditors Reports for 2009 and 2010

PIR for 2009 and 2010

Project Inception Workshop report

Project board meeting report

## ANNEX 2. EXPLANATION OF TERMINOLOGY

**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.

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

For projects whose main focus and actors are in the private-sector rather than public-sector (e.g., IFC projects), elements of effective country ownership/driveness that demonstrate the interest and commitment of the local private sector to the project may include:

- The number of companies that participated in the project by: receiving technical assistance, applying for financing, attending dissemination events, adopting environmental standards promoted by the project, etc.
- Amount contributed by participating companies to achieve the environmental benefits promoted by the project, including: equity invested, guarantees provided, co-funding of project activities, in-kind contributions, etc.
- 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
- Fulfillment 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:

- 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 in the management of funds and financial audits.

**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). A benchmark approach in climate change and ozone



projects measures cost-effectiveness using internationally accepted threshold such as 10\$/ton of carbon equivalent reduced, and thresholds for the phase out of specific ozone depleting substances measured in terms of dollars spent per kg (\$/kg) of each type of ODS reduced.

**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.

### ANNEX 3: Financial Planning – Co-financing

Co financing (Type/Source)	IA own Financing (US\$ in thousands)		Government (US\$ in thousands)		Other* (US\$ in thousands)		Total (US\$ in thousands)		Total Disbursement (US\$ in thousands)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual
Grants										
Loans/Concessional (compared to market rate)										
Credits										
Equity investments										
In-kind support										
Other (*)										
<b>Totals</b>										

\* Other is referred to contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector and beneficiaries.

#### Leveraged Resources

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.

## ANNEX 4- Management Response and Tracking Template

Evaluation Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluation Completion Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Key issues and Recommendations	Management Response*				Tracking**	
	Response	Key Actions	Timeframe	Responsible unit(s)	Status***	Comments

\* Unit(s) assigned to be responsible for the preparation of a management response will fill the columns under the management response section.

\*\* Unit(s) assigned to be responsible for the preparation of a management response will be updating the implementation status. Assigned with an oversight function monitors and verifies the implementation status.

\*\*\* **Status of Implementation:** Completed, Partially Completed, Pending

**ANNEX 5: Clearance Form to be completed by CO and RCU and included in final document**

Reviewed and Cleared by

***UNDP Country Office***

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

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

***UNDP- GEF- RCU***

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

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