

**PILOTING NATURAL RESOURCE VALUATION WITHIN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT
ASSESSMENTS**

Jamaica

Terms of reference for conducting the Mid Term Evaluation

November, 2010

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 assess performance and impacts, including achievements;
- ii) to identify and analyze lessons learned;
- iii) to promote accountability and transparency, including ensuring adherence to agreed implementation arrangements; and
- iv) to make recommendations on changes in implementation arrangements to improve project performance, delivery, and institutional sustainability of expected outcomes

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.

In accordance with UNDP/GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized projects supported by the GEF should undergo a Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE).

Mid-Term Evaluations are intended to review the project strategy, design, and implementation, and assess the performance and impacts of the project to date. The mid-term evaluation looks at early warning signs for potential issues and adherence to guidelines and is intended to track and benchmark progress towards meeting the project objectives. The MTE will make recommendations for the adaptive collaborative management of the project in such a way that performance and delivery are improved to meet project objectives, while at the same time maintaining the overall global character of the project. Adaptive collaborative management (ACM) is an approach that takes a holistic view of a project, as well as uses broad-based stakeholder participation and collaboration to identify and assess risks and management alternatives. Sound application of the ACM approach will better inform and legitimize policy and programme decisions to modify the project's strategy, design, and activities while preserving the agreed consensus on the project goal and objectives. As a result, projects are expected to have a greater chance of achieving institutionally sustainable outcomes.

1.2 The project objectives and its context

This project will strengthen the implementation of Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA) in Jamaica, as well as contribute to the implementation of Strategic Environmental Assessments (SEAs) through the development and application of natural resource valuation (NRV) tools. The project was designed to work in parallel with the Environmental Action Programme (ENACT) as its main thrust was the development of SEAs which are undertaken on various sectoral policies, programmes and plans. The project will 'top-up' capacity development activities of training and sensitization of the value of SEAs, that had been implemented by the ENACT Programme. The Project will also address enforcement and compliance of EIAs with training and sensitization on the utility of natural resource valuation as a means to meeting both national and global environmental objectives over the long-term.

The global environmental objective of this project is to facilitate decisions that promote environmentally sound and sustainable development within the framework of Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs), given their explicit priority within the Rio Convention and national reports and communications. The proposed project will pilot natural resource valuation tools within the framework of an EIA, in the Cockpit Country, an area of high biodiversity and endemism, storing over 30% of Jamaica's water supply, and containing vast mineral wealth in the form bauxite. The Cockpit Country is under increasing threat by bauxite extraction resulting from developments within the sector and national priorities for socio-economic development.

The development of natural resource valuation tools will provide an opportunity for these to be institutionalized. In this way, SEAs will be greatly improved in being able to make better predictions of possible consequences of policy interventions, facilitating the development of strategies to reduce policy resistances and facilitate the consideration of environmental risks and impacts associated with the

implementation of government policies. By providing a more robust and comparable valuation method for natural resources, consequences of development policies, programmes and plans will be better evaluated so as to promote biodiversity conservation; minimize, if not reduce the risks associated with land degradation; encourage climate change mitigation and adaptation strategies; and promote environmentally sound and sustainable development.

The project is being executed by the National Environment and Planning Agency (NEPA). A Project Management Unit (PMU) was set up within NEPA. Given the cross-cutting nature of the project, strong coordination has been facilitated through the leadership of the Project Steering Committee, particularly to undertake the joint consideration of the natural resource valuation tools and techniques, and to ensure similar levels of interpretations. UNDP provides support to the execution of the project, both from the Country Office and the Regional Coordination Office based in Panama. The development of this project benefited from in-country consultations with representatives of all key stakeholder groups, including a stakeholder workshop to deliberate on the draft project strategy developed on the basis of individual consultations.

LINK WITH THE EVALUATION OF PROTECTED AREAS PROJECT (EVPA) - The NRV Project was developed to satisfy one of the strategies outlined in the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NSBAP), but its approval was delayed due to GEF internal procedures. Consequently, the EVPA project was conceptualized and developed for Jamaica by the Environment Management Division – Office of the Prime Minister (EMD-OPM) through funds which became available through a UNDP/GEF/UNOPS Global project entitled Supporting Country Action for CBD Programme of Work on Protected Areas, which focused on valuation within Protected Areas. The EMD-OPM therefore included some of the objectives of the previously designed NRV into the concept for the EVPA. The NRV was then approved by the GEF for implementation, and soon after the UNOPS/UNDP (New York) also approved. Jamaica was implementing two projects from the GEF with similar goals and objectives. The EMD-OPM asked NEPA to implement the EVPA on their behalf and recognizing that the two projects had similar objectives, NEPA could best combine both to avoid duplication of effort. During the process of implementation similar activities were merged such as 1) Development of the Valuation Tool 2) Training and sensitization on the use of the tool and 3) Incorporation of valuation into policy. The projects were also aligned for both to benefit from each other, but implementation delays for both projects have caused this alignment to be distorted.

2 OBJECTIVE OF THE MID-TERM EVALUATION

The Mid Term Evaluation (MTE) is a requirement of UNDP and GEF and thus it is principally initiated by UNDP Country Office in Jamaica . It will be conducted according to guidance, rules and procedures for such evaluations established by UNDP and the Global Environment Facility.

The overall objective of the MTE is to assess the progress that the project has made to date towards meeting its agreed objectives, as stated in the project document. This includes an in-depth analysis of the project's performance and delivery, achievements made, identify lessons learned, and make specific recommendations to address project weaknesses and threats, as well as to capitalize on relevant opportunities. Through the use of the capacity development scorecard, this evaluation will contribute to an overall assessment of the impacts that the GEF cross-cutting capacity development are making.

The main GOJ Agencies involved in this MTE are: National Environment and Planning Agency, Planning Institute of Jamaica, and the Office of the Prime Minister.

Against the framework of the agreed objectives in the project document, the MTE will provide a comprehensive and systematic account of the performance of the project by assessing its strategy, design, implementation arrangements, deliverables (activities and outputs), and likelihood that project outcomes will be sustainable.

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

3 EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluator is expected to deliver the following products:

Oral presentation of main findings of the evaluation: This should be presented to UNDP CO before the evaluation is concluded in order to clarify key issues.

Evaluation written report: This report will be submitted to the UNDP Country 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 2 weeks 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. The RCU and CO will sign a formal clearance form to be submitted with the final evaluation report (see Annex 5). The format of the evaluation report should be structured using the report outline provided in 7.2.

General considerations of the report:

- Formatting: Times New Roman – Font 11; single spacing; left justified; paragraph numbering and table of content (automatic); page numbers (centered bottom); graphs and tables and photographs (where relevant) are encouraged.
- Length: Between 50 and 70 pages, excluding annexes
- Timeframe of submission: first draft within 2 weeks of completion of the country mission

4 EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The project will be monitored and evaluated in accordance with established UNDP/GEF procedures. The project management reports will be presented to the Project Steering Committee (PSC) for endorsement before they will be distributed to the relevant stakeholders.

The evaluation will employ a set of methods to collect and analyze data and information, in accordance with accepted professional norms and standards as adopted by the UN Evaluation Group². Any modification to the evaluation methodology must be cleared by UNDP before being applied by the evaluator.

- (i) **Documentation review** (desk study): A preliminary list of documentation is provided in Annex 2, with additional documents made available at during the mission. All the documents will be provided in advance by the Project Team and by the UNDP Country Office. The Project Team and UNDP Country office will provide an annotated cover note for each document describing the relative importance of each document. 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.
- (ii) **Interviews** will be held in order to ensure that the full breadth of stakeholder views and experiences with the project is determined. Interviews may be undertaken with individual stakeholders, with two or three stakeholder representatives, or in larger groups of stakeholders using the focus group format. The specific interview method will be at the discretion of the evaluation team, in consultation with UNDP and NEPA. Annex 5 provides a list of key project stakeholders, all of whom should be consulted. **Survey:** The evaluation team should consider undertaking a survey to assess the project performance and deliverables. The interview questions can be modified in survey form, and can include the capacity development scorecard (see below). In consultation with UNDP and NEPA, the evaluation team should agree on the delivery mechanism for the survey, either in person, through a stakeholder workshop, focus group (but at the beginning of the focus group), or a blend of the three. However, an online survey is not recommended due to its limitation of respondent self-selection.

² www.uneval.org

- (iii) **A Field visit** should be made to **Cockpit Country** (to include a tour of the Windsor Research Centre)

The project will use a capacity development monitoring and evaluation scorecard to monitor the project capacity development progress. It will monitor **the all fifteen indicators in the five categories of capacity development** for this project,(see table below). Although this scorecard was used at the time of project inception, it was incomplete. The MTE will rate the capacity development indicators at the mid-point of project implementation. A later evaluation at the end of project implementation will be undertaken.

Capacity Result / Indicator	Contribution to which Outcome
CR 1: Capacities for engagement	
Indicator 1 – Degree of legitimacy/mandate of lead environmental organizations	
Indicator 2 – Existence of operational co-management mechanisms	1
Indicator 3 – Existence of cooperation with stakeholder groups	
CR 2: Capacities to generate, access and use information and knowledge	
Indicator 4 – Degree of environmental awareness of stakeholders	
Indicator 5 – Access and sharing of environmental information by stakeholders	
Indicator 6 – Existence of environmental education programmes	
Indicator 7 – Extend of the linkage between environmental research/science and policy development	
Indicator 8 – Extend of inclusion/use of traditional knowledge in environmental decision-making	
CR 3: Capacities for strategy, policy and legislation development	
Indicator 9 – Extend of the environmental planning and strategy development process	
Indicator 10 – Existence of an adequate environmental policy and regulatory frameworks	1
Indicator 11 – Adequacy of the environmental information available for decision-making	1
CR 4: Capacities for management and implementation	
Indicator 12 – Existence and mobilization of resources	
Indicator 13 – Availability of required technical skills and technology transfer	2
CR 5: Capacities to monitor and evaluate	
Indicator 14 – Adequacy of the project/programme monitoring process	
Indicator 15 – Adequacy of the project/programme evaluation process	

5 EVALUATOR

A single evaluator with at least ten years of working experience, with primary expertise in natural resources management and experience in the valuation of natural resources and capacity building is required. Experience in mid-term or final evaluations of GEF and /or UNDP projects is also a requirement. The evaluator must be able to work effectively and efficiently in multi-cultural settings and be a good communicator, and able to interface with state agencies, non-governmental organisations and the international donor community. Experience in project evaluations of a multi-disciplinary nature and cross-sectoral issues is required. The evaluator will have sole responsibility for data gathering, document review, application of survey instruments, meetings with stakeholders and report preparation. The evaluator must not have any conflict of interest associated with the project, i.e., have been involved directly or indirectly in the design or implementation of the project, or having any other stake in the project at any time.

6 IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

6.1 Management Arrangements

The evaluation is being solicited by UNDP, and led by the UNDP Country Office in Jamaica as project Implementing Agency. The consultant will be supported by the UNDP-CO in Jamaica, which has the overall responsibility for the coordination and logistical arrangements of the evaluation,, as well as day-to-day support to the evaluation team (travel, accommodation, office space, communications, etc) and timely

provision of per diems and contractual payments. The UNDP-CO, Jamaica will also organize the site missions (travel arrangements, meetings with key stakeholders and beneficiaries, interviews, field trips). The evaluator 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 evaluator will be contracted directly from the project budget. Payment will be 50% at the submission of the first draft to the UNDP-CO, and the other 50% once the final report has been completed and cleared by both 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 RCU, 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 duration of the evaluation will be **22** days according to the following plan:

Preparation before field work: Three (3) days.

- Acquaintance with the project document and other relevant materials with information about the project (PIRs, quarterly reports, etc);
- Familiarization with overall development situation of country (based on reading of UNDP- Common Country Assessment and other reports on the 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: Ten (10) days

- Meeting with UNDP Country Office team;
- Meetings with key stakeholders in Jamaica
- 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: Seven (7) days:

To be provided within two weeks of mission completion

- Final interviews / cross checking with UNDP CO, UNDP RCU and Project team.
- 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 Two (2) day

- Presentation of final evaluation report

7 SCOPE AND CRITERIA OF THE MID-TERM EVALUATION

General information about the evaluation

The MTE report will provide information on when the evaluation took place; places visited; who was involved; key questions; and the evaluation methodology.

Assessment of Project Outcomes and Outputs

The MTE should properly examine and assess the perspectives of all stakeholders by consulting with their legitimate representatives at a minimum. The MTE will include travel to the relevant sites with stakeholders are located, to the extent feasible, in order to ascertain a holistic interpretation of the project's progress towards meeting agreed objectives. The MTE will also assess the financial health of the project, in particular the allocation and disbursement of project funds to ensure that the project has maintained GEF financial eligibility and demonstrated cost-effectiveness.

The following criteria are to be applied against the project's expected outcomes, objectives, and outputs as stated in the original project document:

- **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/will be 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 MTE will assess the project's deliverables (outputs), the extent to which expected outcomes are being realized, and the implementation arrangements to achieve both. The MTE will, at a minimum, assess the progress made towards delivering outputs and achieving expected outcomes. This assessment seeks to determine the extent to which the project outputs will be achieved within the stipulated timelines, and assess the extent to which the project has or will lead to any other positive or negative consequences. While assessing a project's outcomes, the MTE will attempt to determine the extent to which the stated objectives will be met and identify any barriers to 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. Outcomes are those expected results and impacts that emerge as a result of the project, for example, stronger institutional capacities, higher public awareness, and policy frameworks that give greater priority to the global environment while sustaining national sustainable development priorities. The Capacity Development Scorecard is to be applied at the outcome level.

The evaluation will be as objective as possible and will include sufficient and convincing empirical evidence. Project deliverables (outputs and key activities) 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.

Assessment of Sustainability of project outcomes

The MTE will assess, at a minimum, the likelihood that expected outcomes will be sustainable upon project termination. The fifteen indicators spread among the five categories of the Capacity Development Scorecard cumulatively speak to the likelihood of project sustainability. For this reason, all indicators must be rated for the project as a whole. Individual project deliverables must also be assessed to the extent of their sustainability, although this will only be relevant for key project activities. This is because the project by design should have built in an exit strategy by institutionalizing project outputs and key activities. The sustainability assessment will give special attention to the risks that have in the past and 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. More details on the sustainability assessment are provided in the Template for ToR provided in Annex 2.

Catalytic role

The mid term evaluation will also describe any potential 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

There were delays in the approval of the project within GEF. Project implementation was also delayed due to the initial difficulty in identifying the lead consultant for the project resulting in changes to the original terms of reference and culminating in the decision to hire local experts. This issue as well as the effectiveness of measures implemented by NEPA to ensure the timely completion of the project will be the subject of review by the Mid term Evaluator.

The evaluator should consider the following specific issues:

- Role, efficiency and effectiveness of the Project Steering Committee in project oversight and technical support
- Time frame between project design and project implementation
- Adjustment of workplan to facilitate project delays
- Impact of project delays on delivery
- Impact of the linking the activities of the project with the EVPA project

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 and Tracking Template

Annex 5: Clearance form

Annex 6: Guidelines for the format and structure of the Evaluation Report

Annex 7: list of Key Stakeholders

ANNEX 1 - LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE EVALUATOR

1. UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation for Development Results
2. Piloting Natural Resource Valuation within Environmental Impact Assessments (NRV) - Project Document
3. Project Implementation Reports
4. Annual Operating Plans
5. Quarterly Reports
6. Minutes of Project Steering Committee Meetings
7. Evaluation of Three Protected Areas (EVPA) - Project Document
8. Contract with University of the West Indies Institute for Sustainable Development (to include a review of the Terms of reference contained therein)
9. Deliverables submitted under the contract with University of the West Indies Institute for Sustainable Development
10. Outcome Evaluation of UNDP's Environment and Energy Programme: A Mid-Term Perspective

ANNEX 2. EXPLANATION OF GEF TERMINOLOGY

The following terminology serves to add some clarity to the use of the concepts and approaches employed by GEF projects. However, a number of these terms, their definitions and concepts are subject to different interpretations as a result of emerging science and scholarship. The evaluator may seek further clarification from the UNDP/GEF Capacity Development Advisor.

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.

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 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 is demonstrated by the extent to which expected outcomes continue, outside the project domain, from a particular project or programme after GEF assistance and other external support has come to an end. Factors that can improve the sustainability of project outcomes include, but are not limited to:

- Development and implementation of an exit and sustainability strategy
- Establishment of the financial and economic instruments and mechanisms to ensure that key activities continue 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 expected outcomes.
- 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 the 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 MTE.

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).

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 (*)										
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 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: _____

Annex 6: Guidelines for the format and structure of the Evaluation Report

1. Executive summary (4-6 pages)

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

2. Introduction (1 page)

- Purpose of the evaluation
- Key issues addressed

3. Project Background (max 3 pages)

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

4. Evaluation Methodology (max 2 pages)

- Structure of the evaluation
- Methods employed

5. Findings (15-20 pages)

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/Driveness: 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 the 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 is the project being 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 the implementation (R): This should include assessments of the mechanisms for 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 MTE. 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: *Is project implementation being done in an efficient and effective manner? Is there effective communication between critical actors in response to the needs of implementation? Are the administrative costs of the Project reasonable and cost efficient?*

4.3. Outputs and Outcomes

Attainment of Outcomes/ Achievement of project objective (R): This MTE seeks to determine the extent to which the project's outcomes and project objective will be achieved and if there has been any positive or negative impact. For this it is important to determine factors that may limit project achievement and potential 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 :
 - **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)?
 - **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 MTE 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**

6. Lessons learned

The evaluators will present lessons and recommendations on all aspects of the project that they consider relevant in the MTE report. The evaluators will be expected to give special attention to analyzing lessons

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.

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.

5. Conclusions (4 pages)

6. Recommendations (2-4 pages). This may be provided in tabular or list form.

This section must provide the concluding points to this evaluation and specific recommendations. Recommendations should be as specific as possible indicating to whom this is being addressed. 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 outputs, expected outcomes, and objectives;
- 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.

Annexes

- Evaluation TORs
- Itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- Summary of field visits
- List of documents reviewed or referenced
- 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
- Financial Planning – Co-Financing Table
- Capacity Development M&E Scorecard

Annex 7: List of Key Stakeholders

- UNDP Jamaica Country Office
- National Environment and Planning Agency
- Planning Institute of Jamaica
- GEF Operational Focal Point,
- Windsor Research Centre
- Forestry Department
- Ministry of Finance and Planning
- Institute of Sustainable Development, University of the West Indies.
- Ministry of Tourism
- Jamaica Bauxite Institute
- Ministry of Agriculture
- Jamaica Conservation Trust
- Office of the Prime Minister
- The Nature Conservancy
- USAID
- Water Resources Authority
- Department of Geography and Geology (UWI).