

Terms of Reference

Title: International Mid Term Monitoring and Evaluation Consultant
Project: Mainstreaming karst peatlands conservation into key economic sectors (KARST)
Cluster: Energy and Environment
Reporting to: E&E Programme analyst
Duty Station: Livno/Sarajevo, BiH
Duration: from February 5th to March 12th, 2011. (maximum 20 working days)

BACKGROUND

a) Purpose

The scope of work shall identify potential project design problems, assess progress towards the achievement of objective, 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. It is expected to serve as a tool 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.

b) Objective

The objective of the project includes conservation of biodiversity in Livanjsko Polje through securing a variety of activities compatible with the preservation of the habitat value of the field. In the long run this specific activity, among others will assess progress in establishing the information baseline, reducing threats, and identifying any difficulties in project implementation and their causes, and recommend corrective course of action. Effective action to rectify any identified issues hindering implementation will be a requirement prior to determining whether implementation should proceed.

c) Background Information

The UNDP Bosnia and Herzegovina (within the Energy and Environment Cluster) has, in cooperation with the Government of Hercegbosanski Canton (C10), started implementing activities of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) medium-sized project on biodiversity conservation in Livanjsko polje: "Mainstreaming karst peatlands conservation into key economic sectors".

The barriers which hamper mainstreaming karst biodiversity conservation requirements into the spatial planning segment are lack of capacities for an economic and environmental research of a long-term vision of karst fields, including poor local enforcement capacity. The project aims to remove the above barriers by developing a model for imbedding karst biodiversity conservation concerns into policies and regulations governing spatial planning at the cantonal level, as well as into the said sectors.

DESCRIPTION OF RESPONSIBILITIES

Scope of work

1. The Mid Term Monitoring and Evaluation is initiated by UNDP Country Office in BiH in line with the UNDP-GEF M&E guidelines in order to assess the overall project progress, make sure the project is on track to deliver the agreed outcomes, and produce recommendations on any adjustments needed. This evaluation is to be undertaken taking into consideration the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation policy that can be downloaded from: <http://thegef.org/MonitoringandEvaluation/MEPoliciesProcedures/mepoliciesprocedures.html> as well as the UNDP-GEF Monitoring and Evaluation policy that can be downloaded from: <http://www.undp.org/gef/05/monitoring/policies.html>
2. The evaluation will be undertaken by a team composed of an International Consultant (Evaluation Team Leader) and a Local Consultant. They will receive the support of UNDP Country Office and Project Management Team, and will be assisted by a translator/interpreter (when needed).
3. The international consultant is the team leader and will be responsible to deliver the expected output of the mission with the help of local consultant. Specifically, he/she will perform the following tasks:
 - Lead and manage the evaluation mission;
 - Design the detailed evaluation methodology and plan;
 - Conduct desk-reviews, interviews and site-visits in order to obtain objective and verifiable data to substantive evaluation ratings and assessments, including:
 - Verification and commenting of the Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool data, as collected and reported by the project;
 - Detailed assessment of risks which are listed in project document and updated in inception reports.
 - Draft the evaluation report and share with the key stakeholders for comments;
 - Finalize the evaluation report based on the inputs from key stakeholders.

Deliverables and timelines

The consultant is responsible for the following deliverables:

Deliverables (outputs)	Deadline
Inception Report: Desk review, development of methodology, updating time table, preparing mission programme	February 12th, 2011
In-country field visits, interviews	February 25 th , 2011
Drafting report	March 2 nd , 2011
Draft report circulation	February 8 th , 2011
Finalization of report	March 12 th , 2011

Each document will be presented as a draft version, to be finalized after interactive participatory discussions and clearance.

Additional Annexes to these ToRs will be distributed to the incumbent (general information, specific reference documents, etc.).

COMPETENCIES

Qualifications

Education:	Advanced university degree in environmental field or related area
Experience:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Minimum 10 years experience and proven track record with policy advice and/or project development/implementation in biodiversity in transition economies• Proven track record of application of results-based approaches to evaluation of projects focusing on protected area management/biodiversity (relevant experience

	<p>in the CIS region and within UN system would be an asset);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum 2 years of experience in monitoring and evaluation in environment field. • Familiarity with priorities and basic principles of protected area management, biodiversity and sustainable development and relevant international best-practices; • Knowledge of and recent experience in applying UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures; • Proven ability and practical experience in monitoring and evaluation of international projects
Language Requirements:	Excellent knowledge of English.

Award Criteria: The award will be based on the:

- Lowest financial offer of the technically suitable candidates.

Applicants are required to submit an application including:

- Letter of interest/ Proposal;
 - Explaining why do you consider yourself the most suitable for the work
 - Provide a brief methodology, if applicable, on how you will approach and conduct the work
- Personal CV including past experience in similar projects and contact details (e-mail addresses) of referees
- Financial proposal indicating the breakdown of your consultancy fee with a lump sum (including travel expenses and all other applicable fees, depending on the nature and complexity of the assignment).

SIGNATURES

Incumbent <i>(if applicable)</i>		
Name	Signature	Date
Supervisor		
Name	Signature	Date
<div style="display: flex; align-items: center;"> <div style="font-size: 2em; margin-right: 10px;">X</div> <div style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; flex-grow: 1;"></div> </div> <p>TOR Approved by</p>		

Annexes

- Annex 1: GEF Terminology and Project Review Criteria
- Annex 2: Scope and Methodology of Evaluation
- Annex 3: Mid Term Evaluation Report Structure
- Annex 4: List of Documents to be Reviewed by the Evaluators
- Annex 5: Revised Project Logical Framework
- Annex 6: Rate Tables
- Annex 7: Co-financing Tables

Annex 1. GEF terminology and project review criteria

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/Drivenness 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/drivenness 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/drivenness 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 consist 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:

- Identification of potential sources of co-financing as well as leveraged and associated financing¹.
- 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.

¹ 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.

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)

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.

Financial Planning - Cofinancing

Cofinancing (Type/Source)	IA own Financing (mill US\$)		Government (mill US\$)		Other* (mill US\$)		Total (mill US\$)		Total Disbursement (mill US\$)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual
– Grants										
– Loans/Concessional (compared to market rate)										
– Credits										
– Equity investments										
– In-kind support										
– Other (*)										
Totals										

* 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 2: SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY OF EVALUATION

A. SCOPE OF EVALUTION

The evaluation will focus on the range of aspects described below. In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (R) should be rated using the following divisions: *Highly Satisfactory*, *Satisfactory*, *Marginally Satisfactory*, *Marginally Unsatisfactory*, *Unsatisfactory*, *Highly Unsatisfactory*. All ratings given should be properly substantiated:

1. Project concept/design, relevance and strategy

1.1 Project relevance, country ownership/drivenness (R): the extent to which the project is suited to local and national development priorities and organizational policies, including changes over time as well as the extent the activities contribute towards attainment of global environmental benefits:

- a. Is the project concept in line with the sectoral and development priorities and plans of the country?
- b. Are project outcomes contributing to national development priorities and plans?
- c. How and why project outcomes and strategies contribute to the achievement of the expected results.
- d. Examine their relevance and whether they provide the most effective way towards results.
- e. Do the outcomes developed during the inception phase still represent the best project strategy for achieving the project objectives (in light of updated underlying factors)? *Consider alternatives.*
- f. Were the relevant country representatives, from government and civil society, involved in the project preparation?
- g. Does the recipient government maintain its financial commitment to the project? Has the government approved policies or regulatory frameworks in line with the project's objectives?

1.2 Preparation and readiness:

- a. Are the project's objective and components clear, practicable and feasible within its timeframe?
- b. Were the capacities of executing institution and counterparts properly considered when the project was designed?
- c. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated in the project design?
- d. Were the partnership arrangements properly identified and the roles and responsibilities negotiated prior to project approval?
- e. Were counterpart resources (funding, staff, and facilities), enabling legislation, and adequate project management arrangements in place at project entry?

1.3 Stakeholder involvement (R):

- a. Did the project involve the relevant stakeholders through information-sharing, consultation and by seeking their participation in the project's design?
- b. Did the project consult and make use of the skills, experience and knowledge of the appropriate government entities, NGOs, community groups, private sector, local governments and academic institutions in the design of project activities?

1.4 Underlying factors/assumptions:

- a. Assess the underlying factors beyond the project's immediate control that influence outcomes and results. Consider the appropriateness and effectiveness of the project's management strategies for these factors.
- b. Re-test the assumptions made by the project management and identify new assumptions that should be made.
- c. Assess the effect of any incorrect assumptions made by the project.

1.5 Management arrangements (R):

- a. Were the project roles properly assigned during the project design?
- b. Are the project roles in line with UNDP and GEF programming guidelines?
- c. Can the management arrangement model suggested by the project be considered as an optimum model? If no, please come up with suggestions and recommendations.

1.6 Project budget and duration (R):

- a. Assess if the project budget and duration were planned in a cost-effective way?

1.7 Design of project M&E system (R):

- a. Examine whether or not the project has a sound M&E plan to monitor results and track progress towards achieving project objectives.
- b. Examine whether or not the M&E plan includes a baseline (including data, methodology, etc.), SMART indicators and data analysis systems, and evaluation studies at specific times to assess results and adequate funding for M&E activities.
- c. Examine whether or not the time frame for various M&E activities and standards for outputs are specified.

1.8 Sustainability:

- a. Assess if project sustainability strategy was developed during the project design?
- b. Assess the relevance of project sustainability strategy

2. Project implementation

2.1 Project's adaptive management (R):

- a. Monitoring systems
 - Assess the monitoring tools currently being used:
 - Do they provide the necessary information?
 - Do they involve key partners?
 - Are they efficient?
 - Are additional tools required?
 - Assess the use of the logical framework as a management tool during implementation and any changes made to it.
 - What impact did the retro-fitting of impact indicators have on project management, if such?
 - Assess whether or not M&E system facilitates timely tracking of progress towards project's objectives by collecting information on chosen indicators continually; annual project reports are complete, accurate and with well justified ratings; the information provided by the M&E system is used to improve project performance and to adapt to changing needs.
- b. Risk Management
 - Validate whether the risks identified in the project document and PIRs are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate. If not, explain why.
 - Describe any additional risks identified and suggest risk ratings and possible risk management strategies to be adopted.
 - Assess the project's risk identification and management systems:
 - Is the UNDP-GEF Risk Management System² appropriately applied?
 - How can the UNDP-GEF Risk Management System be used to strengthen the project management?
- c. Work Planning
 - Assess the use of routinely updated work plans.
 - Assess the use of electronic information technologies to support implementation, participation and monitoring, as well as other project activities.
 - Are work planning processes result-based³? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning.
- d. Financial management
 - Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions. (Cost-effectiveness: the extent to which results have been delivered with the least costly resources possible.). Any irregularities must be noted.
 - Is there due diligence in the management of funds and financial audits?
 - Did promised co-financing materialize (please fill out the co-financing form provided in Annex 1)?
- e. Reporting

² UNDP-GEF's system is based on the Atlas Risk Module. See the UNDP-GEF Risk Management Strategy resource kit, available as Annex XII at <http://www.undp.org/gef/05/monitoring/policies.html>

³ RBM Support documents are available at <http://www.undp.org/geo/methodologies.htm>

- Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management.
- Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

f. Delays

- Assess if there were delays in project implementation and what were the reasons.
- Did the delay affect the achievement of project's outcomes and/or sustainability, and if it did then in what ways and through what causal linkages?

2.2 *Contribution of Implementing and Executing Agencies:*

- Assess the role of UNDP and C10 Ministries (spatial planning and agriculture) and MoFTER (Ministry of Foreign trade and economic relations) against the requirements set out in the UNDP Programme and Operations Policies and Procedures⁴. Consider:
 - Field visits
 - Participation in Steering Committees
 - Project reviews, PIR preparation and follow-up
 - GEF guidance
 - Operational support
- Consider the new UNDP requirements outlined in the UNDP Programme and Operations Policies and Procedures, especially the Project Assurance role, and ensure they are incorporated into the project's adaptive management framework.
- Assess the contribution to the project from UNDP and C10 Ministries (spatial planning and agriculture) and MoFTER (Ministry of Foreign trade and economic relations) in terms of "soft" assistance (i.e. policy advice & dialogue, advocacy, and coordination).
- Suggest measures to strengthen UNDP's soft assistance to the project management.

2.3 *Stakeholder participation, partnership strategy (R):*

- Assess whether or not and how local stakeholders participate in project management and decision-making. Include an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the approach adopted by the project and suggestions for improvement if necessary.
- Does the project consult and make use of the skills, experience and knowledge of the appropriate government entities, NGOs, community groups, private sector, local governments and academic institutions in the implementation and evaluation of project activities?
- Consider the dissemination of project information to partners and stakeholders and if necessary suggest more appropriate mechanisms.
- Identify opportunities for stronger partnerships.

2.4 *Sustainability:*

- Assess the extent to which the benefits of the project will continue, within or outside the project scope, after it has come to an end; commitment of the government to support the initiative beyond the project.
 - The evaluators may look at factors such as mainstreaming project objectives into the broader development policies and sectoral plans and economies.
- 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. The following four dimensions or aspects of sustainability will be addressed:
 - *Financial resources:* Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes? What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being 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)?

⁴ Available at <http://content.undp.org/go/userguide/results/project/>

- *Socio-political*: Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) 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 risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits? While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems for accountability and transparency, and the required technical know-how are in place.
- *Environmental*: Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes? The terminal evaluation should assess whether certain activities will pose a threat to the sustainability of the project outcomes.
-
- On each of the dimensions of sustainability of the project outcomes will be rated as follows:
 - *Likely (L)*: There are no or negligible risks that affect 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.

3. Project results (outputs, outcomes and objectives)

3.1 Progress towards achievement of intended outputs, outcomes/measurement of change:

Progress towards results should be based on a comparison of indicators before and after (so far) the project intervention.

- To determine the level of achievement of project outcomes and objectives following three criteria should be assessed:
- *Relevance*: Are the project's outcomes consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies and country priorities?
- *Effectiveness*: Are the actual project outcomes commensurate with the original or modified project objectives? In case the original or modified expected results are merely outputs/inputs then the evaluators should assess if there are any real outcomes of the project and if yes then whether these are commensurate with the realistic expectations from such a project.
- *Efficiency*: Is the project cost effective? Is the project the least cost option? Is the project implementation delayed and if it is, then does 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.
-
- Outcomes and the whole project should be rated as follows for relevance, effectiveness, efficiency:
- *Highly Satisfactory (HS)*: The project has no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives.
- *Satisfactory (S)*: The project has minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives.
- *Marginally Satisfactory (MS)*: The project has moderate shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives.
- *Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU)*: The project has significant shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives.
- *Unsatisfactory (U)*: The project has major shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives.
- *Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)*: The project has severe shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives.
-

B. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

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 Group⁵). 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.

Evaluators should seek guidance for their work in the following materials, which could be found at (www.undp.org/gef):

- UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluation for Results
- UNDP/GEF M&E Resource Kit
- Measuring Results of the GEF Biodiversity Programme

It is recommended that the evaluation methodology include the following:

- Documentation review (desk study), to include Project Document, Project CEO Approval Document, Inception Report, GEF Project Implementation Reviews, Minutes of the Project Steering Committee meetings, GEF quarterly project updates;
- Interviews with Project Management Unit and key project stakeholders, including UNDP Country Office in BiH, GEF Regional Coordination Unit in Bratislava, relevant ministries, project local management unit and other stakeholders, as necessary;
- In-country field visits.

⁵ See <http://www.uneval.org/>

ANNEX 3: Mid-Term Evaluation Report Structure

The core product of the Mid-Term Evaluation will be the Mid-Term Evaluation Report that includes:

- Findings with the rating on performance;
- Conclusions drawn;
- Recommendations for improving delivery of project outputs;
- Lessons learned concerning best and worst practices in producing outputs;
- A rating on progress towards outputs.

The report is proposed to adhere to the following basic structure:

1. Executive summary
 - Brief description of project
 - Context and purpose of the evaluation
 - Main conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned
2. Introduction
 - Project background
 - Purpose of the evaluation
 - Key issues to be addressed
 - The outputs of the evaluation and how will they be used
 - Methodology of the evaluation
 - Structure of the evaluation
3. The project and its development context
 - Project start and its duration
 - Implementation status
 - Problems that the project seeks to address
 - Immediate and development objectives of the project
 - Main stakeholders
 - Results expected
 - Analysis of the situation with regard to outcomes, outputs and partnership strategy
4. Findings and Conclusions
 - 4.1 Project formulation
 - Project relevance
 - Implementation approach
 - Country ownership/Driveness
 - Stakeholder participation
 - Replication approach
 - Cost-effectiveness
 - Sustainability
 - Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
 - Management arrangements
 - 4.2 Project implementation
 - Financial management
 - Monitoring and evaluation
 - Management and coordination
 - Identification and management of risks (adaptive management)
 - 4.3 Results
 - Attainment of outputs, outcomes and objectives
 - Project Impact
 - Prospects of sustainability
5. Conclusions and recommendations
 - Findings
 - Corrective actions for the design, duration, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
 - Actions to strengthen or reinforce benefits from the project
 - Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
 - Suggestions for strengthening ownership, management of potential risks

6. Lessons learned

- Good practices and lessons learned in addressing issues relating to effectiveness, efficiency and relevance

7. Annexes

- Evaluation TOR
- Itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- Summary of field visits
- List of documents reviewed
- Questionnaire used (if any) and summary of results
- Comments by stakeholders (only in case of discrepancies with evaluation findings and conclusions)
- Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool

The Report will be supplemented by Rate Tables, attached in Annex 6 of this TOR.

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 7 of this TOR.

The expected length of the report is around 50 pages in total. The first draft of the report is expected to be submitted to the UNDP Country Office in BiH within 2 weeks of the in-country mission for subsequent circulation to the key project stakeholders for comments. Any discrepancies between the interpretations and findings of the evaluator and the key project stakeholders will be explained in an annex to the final report.

ANNEX 4 LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE EVALUATORS

General Documentation

- UNDP Programme and Operations Policies and Procedures
- UNDP Handbook for Monitoring and Evaluating for Results
- GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy

Project Documentation

- Project Document
- Project CEO Approval Document
- Inception Report
- Annual Project Reports
- Project Implementation Review
- Quarterly Reports
- Steering Committee Meeting Minutes
- Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT midterm)

ANNEX 5

G. REVISED LOGICAL FRAMEWORK MATRIX

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators				
	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
Goal	The project's goal is to ensure conservation of the internationally important natural karst systems in BiH				
Objective of the project: To strengthen the policy and regulatory framework for mainstreaming the requirements for conservation of karst and peatland biodiversity into productive sectors (mining, water use) and spatial planning at Cantonal level	Population size of the indicator species: 1. Great Bittern at Zdravac Blato 2. Corncrake at 12x6 km in the northern part of Polje (peatland area monitored by ornithologists)	1. 5 calling males singing male across the Blato ⁶ 2. 200 callers	Stabilization at baseline level.	Project tracking tool. Methods of standard census using transects or count points. GPS data collection.	There is a moderate risk that the on-going Constitutional reform will drive transfer of more responsibilities from entity to state level. The project's focus, however, is cantonal spatial planning. By this, project largely mitigates the risk if shifting power within the entity-state couple, as responsibilities and mandates of entities are expected to remain the same, at least in the area of spatial planning.
	Share of indicator plant wetland communities (<i>Carex</i>) in renaturalized 750 ha of peatland habitat	10%	Distribution and size of the <i>Carex</i> sedges does not decrease compared to baseline findings, and the share of this plant communities increases by 20% or shows the potential to further increase after project closure	Project tracking tool. Annual botanic monitoring of total area (ha) of habitat in the project sites. Compilation of botanic maps based on field visits and aerial photos.	
Outcome 1: Karst and peatland needs integrated in the BiH cantonal spatial planning policies and procedures	Expert maps compiled delineating the geographic and physical boundaries of potentially damaging activities at Livno Polje (mining, water management, logging)	None	A set of maps approved by Cantonal and Federal Government as an addendum to the Spatial plan or as a basis set of documentation for future spatial planning activities	Project report and official statement in newspapers	There is a moderate risk that more authority in the environmental matters will be transferred from cantonal to municipality level. However, the project's main thrust is internalizing environment within spatial plan. It is highly unlikely that cantons in FBiH are going to be abolished altogether.

⁶ Both indicators: M. Schneider-Jacoby *et al.*: A preliminary assessment of the ornithological importance of Livanjsko Polje (Cetina River Basin, Bosnia and Herzegovina).

Project Strategy		Objectively verifiable indicators			
	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Number of environmental government officials and inspectors at cantonal, federal, and municipal level with increased understanding of the ecological values of karst systems and ways for their proper management	0	10	Surveys specifically developed to check the level of competency	The project inputs of integrating karst biodiversity concerns may be taken in account as an additionality to the plan and may not be included in spatial plan due to discrepancy in the timeframe of activities between the two projects/tasks. The risk will be mitigated by coordination and up-to-date information sharing with the BL Planning Institute in order to attempt to include the KARST findings as an annex to the plan or in a scenario where the spatial plan is already approved by the Cantonal authorities, to distribute the findings as an additional publication and envisage them as future basis within spatial planning of other BiH Cantons.
<p><u>Output 1.1</u> Spatial plans for karst fields, which fully covers the Livno Polje field, integrate biodiversity concerns.</p> <p><u>Output 1.2</u> Municipal by-laws and policies for karst field use developed; capacity for their enforcement strengthened among municipal and cantonal officers and inspectors.</p>					

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators				
	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
Outcome 2: Water use and mining policies in BiH reflect karst and peatland biodiversity conservation requirements	Ground water table at renaturalized peatland in the North-Western part of the karst field	During October – March the groundwater table at 700 ha in the southern part of the peatland stays below 30 cm.	Stabilization in year 3 and 4 of the project, according to the following pattern: during months October – March the table is not lower than 15 cm below soil at the renaturalized 700 ha in the southern part of the peatland area	Data of extraction companies and inspectorates of environment. Project monitoring reports and tracking tool	<p>One of the main project's assumptions is the willingness of the peat mining companies (primarily FinVest) to cooperate. Project preparation stems from understanding that this willingness is present, and solutions suggested will be mutually beneficial. Back up of the Cantonal government is also a mitigating element.</p> <p>During the course of the project, coal mining for oil production may materialize into a threat. Canton government back up will make sure that the spatial plan discusses and properly defines places eligible for coal mining. Project will closely monitor development of the coal mining prospects in view of this pledge and in the works case scenario seek adaptation of project strategy through a Project board Meeting</p> <p>Peatland renaturalization works may suffer from lack of national expertise, for which the project will draw best available international expertise from siste GEF projects and insure through targeted training building up of local capacities.</p> <p>Finally, there may be difficulties in reaching a cross-border water management agreement with Croatia. If a stand-alone water management agreement with Croatia is not possible during the life of the project, it will prepare all the necessary documentation and help conduct a transboundary Strategic Environmental Assessment, leading both countries as close as possible to accepting the agreement.</p>
	Number of municipalities preparing to integrate project approaches and lessons into their municipal spatial planning closer to the end of the project	0	3	Evidence of correspondence/communication with municipalities	<p>Results and lessons learnt from the project are assumed to be positive and will be clearly presented to range of different audiences</p> <p>The project assumes that based on its lessons, there will be municipalities willing to replicate the process, meaning integrate biodiversity concerns into municipal planning. Such interest is also assumed among other cantons in FBiH</p>
<p><u>Output 2.1</u> By-laws and methodological guidance on ecologically safe peat mining developed and validated at 750 ha of karst peatlands</p> <p><u>Output 2.2</u> Internationally accepted (Croatia-BiH) agreement and plan for cross-border water management</p> <p><u>Output 2.3</u> Lessons extracted and shared on sectoral mainstreaming for peatlands and karst biodiversity.</p>					

ANNEX 6: RATE TABLES

Table: 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	MEASURABLE INDICATORS FROM PROJECT LOGFRAME	END-OF-PROJECT TARGET	STATUS OF DELIVERY	RATING
Outcome 1:				
Outcome 3:				
Outcome 3:				

* 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

** Ratings codeas are detailed in Annex 2.

ANNEX 7: CO-FINANCING

Cofinancing (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
Grants										
Loans										
Credits										
Equity										
In-kind										
Non-grant Instruments										
Other Types										
Totals										

* 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