



Armenia

## TERMS OF REFERENCE

### FOR

### MID-TERM EVALUATION OF THE UNDP/GEF Project: PIMS 3814 - “Adaptation to Climate Change Impacts in Mountain Forest Ecosystems of Armenia”

#### Contents

1.	<i>INTRODUCTION</i> .....	2
2.	<i>OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION</i> .....	2
3.	<i>DETAILED SCOPE OF WORK</i> .....	3
4.	<i>PRODUCTS EXPECTED FROM THE EVALUATION</i> .....	7
5.	<i>EVALUATION METHODOLOGY</i> .....	7
6.	<i>INDICATIVE OUTLINE OF THE MID-TERM EVALUATION REPORT</i> .....	9
7.	<i>MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS</i> .....	11
8.	<i>DURATION OF THE MID-TERM EVALUATION</i> .....	11
9.	<i>DUTIES, SKILLS AND QUALIFICATIONS OF EVALUATION EXPERT</i> .....	11
10.	<i>LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED</i> .....	13
11.	<i>EVALUATION POLICY</i> .....	14
12.	<i>APPLICATION:</i> .....	14
	<i>ANNEX 1: TENTATIVE LIST OF MEETINGS TO BE HELD</i> .....	14

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

### **1.1 Standard UNDP/GEF M&E requirements**

UNDP/GEF wishes to contract an Evaluation Expert (EE) to carry out Mid-term Evaluation (MTE) of the project “Adaptation to Climate Change Impacts in Mountain Forest Ecosystems of Armenia”.

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

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

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

In accordance with UNDP/GEF M&E policies and procedures, all projects with long implementation periods are strongly encouraged to conduct mid-term evaluations. In addition to providing an independent in-depth review of implementation progress, this type of evaluation is responsive to GEF Council decisions on transparency and better access of information during implementation.

### **1.2 Project Context**

In 2008, Armenia submitted a medium-sized project proposal to the Global Environment Facility (GEF) to receive a financial assistance for measures to enhance adaptive capacity of vulnerable mountain forest ecosystem of the Syunik region of Armenia. In December 2008, the medium-sized project: “Adaptation to Climate Change Impacts in Mountain Forest Ecosystems of Armenia” was signed by UNDP and the Government of Armenia. The project implementation started in May 2009.

The long-term development goal of this medium size project is to assist Armenia in beginning a process by which strategies to moderate, cope with, and take advantage of the consequences of climate change are enhanced, developed, and implemented. The specific objective of the project is to enhance adaptive capacities of the vulnerable mountain forest ecosystems to climate change in the Syunik region.

The duration of the project is four years. Total budget of the project is US\$ 900,000 and funded by GEF. The co-financing from the Government of Armenia amounts to US\$ 1,900,000 (cash-parallel).

UNDP is the GEF implementing agency for the project; UNDP recruited Project Task Leader and Climate Change Projects Associate are in charge of the project day-to-day management. The UNDP Armenia Climate Change Projects Coordinator is responsible for overall coordination of the project implementation. The First Deputy Minister of Nature Protection of Armenia has been appointed as UNDP Projects National Director. The project is executed by the Ministry of Nature Protection (MoNP) of Armenia. The UNFCCC National Focal Point is the National Project Coordinator (NPC). The Project Board (PB) is composed of 11 members representing the MoNP, UNDP, as well other governmental, educational and international organizations.

## **2. OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION**

The evaluation is initiated and commissioned jointly by UNDP Armenia Country Office and by the UNDP/GEF regional coordination unit in Bratislava. Mid-term evaluations are intended to identify potential project design problems, assess progress towards the achievement of objectives, identify and document lessons learned (including lessons that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP/GEF projects), and to make recommendations regarding specific actions that might be taken to improve the project. It is expected to serve as a means of validating or filling the gaps in the initial assessment of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency obtained from monitoring. The mid-term evaluation provides the opportunity to assess early signs of project success or failure and prompt necessary adjustments. To this end, the MTE will serve to:

1. Strengthen the adaptive management and monitoring functions of the project;
2. Enhance the likelihood of achievement of the project and GEF objectives through analyzing project strengths and weaknesses and suggesting measures for improvement;
3. Enhance organizational and development learning;
4. Enable informed decision-making;
5. Create the basis of replication of successful project outcomes achieved so far.

Particular emphasis should be put on the current project results and the possibility of achieving all the objectives in the given timeframe, taking into consideration the speed, at which the project is proceeding. More specifically, the evaluation should assess:

#### Project concept and design

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

#### Implementation

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

#### Project outputs, outcomes and impact

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

### **3. DETAILED SCOPE OF WORK**

The MTE expert will look at the following aspects:

#### **3.1 Project Concept**

3.1.1 Project relevance and strategy: 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. How and why project outcomes and strategies contribute to the achievement of the expected results.
- b. Examine their relevance and whether they provide the most effective way towards results.
- c. 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.
- d. Were the relevant country representatives, from government and civil society, involved in the project preparation?
- e. Does the recipient government maintain its financial commitment to the project?

3.1.2 Preparation and readiness

- a. Are the project's objectives 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?

3.1.3 Stakeholder participation during project preparation

- a. Did the project involve the relevant stakeholders through information-sharing, consultation and by seeking their participation in the project's design?

3.1.4 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

3.1.5 Project organization/Management arrangements

- a. Were the project roles properly assigned during the project design?
- b. Are the project roles in line with UNDP and GEF programme guides?
- 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

3.1.6 Project budget and duration

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

3.1.7 Design of Project Monitoring and Evaluation system

- 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.

#### 3.1.8 Sustainability and replication strategy

- a. Assess if project sustainability and replicability strategy was developed during the project design? And assess its relevance

#### 3.1.9 Gender perspective:

- a. Extent to which the project accounts for gender differences when developing project interventions.
- b. How gender considerations are mainstreamed into project interventions?

## 3.2 Project Implementation

### 3.2.1 Project's Adaptive Management

#### a. Monitoring Systems

- Assess the monitoring tools currently being used:
  - o Do they provide the necessary information?
  - o Do they involve key partners?
  - o Are they efficient?
  - o Are additional tools required?
- Reconstruct baseline data if necessary<sup>1</sup>. Reconstruction should follow participatory processes and could be achieved in conjunction with a learning exercise<sup>2</sup>
- Ensure the monitoring system, including performance indicators, at least meets GEF minimum requirements<sup>3</sup>. Apply SMART indicators as necessary.
- Apply the GEF Tracking Tool and provide a description of comparison with initial application of the tool.

#### 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:
  - o Is the UNDP-GEF Risk Management System<sup>4</sup> appropriately applied?

<sup>1</sup> See p.67 of UNDP's "Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluation for Results", available at <http://www.undp.org/gef/monitoring/policies.html>

<sup>2</sup> See Annex C of "Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation: approaches to sustainability", available at <http://www.undp.org/gef/05/monitoring/policies.html>

<sup>3</sup> See section 3.2 of the GEF's "Monitoring and Evaluation Policy", available at [http://207.190.239.143/uploadedFiles/Policies\\_and\\_Guidelines-me\\_policy-english\(1\).pdf](http://207.190.239.143/uploadedFiles/Policies_and_Guidelines-me_policy-english(1).pdf)

<sup>4</sup> UNDP-GEF's system is based on the Atlas Risk Module. See the UNDP-GEF Risk Management Strategy resource kit, available at Annex XI at <http://www.undp.org/gef/05/monitoring/policies.html>

- How can the UNDP-GEF Risk Management System be used to strengthen the project management?

c. Work Planning

- Assess the use of the logical framework as a management tool during implementation and any changes made to it
  - Ensure the logical framework meets UNDP/GEF requirements in terms of format and content
  - What impact did the retro-fitting of impact indicators, if such have on project management
- 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-based<sup>5</sup>? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning;
- Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions. Any irregularities must be noted.

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. Also called cost-effectiveness or efficacy). Any irregularities must be noted.
- Is there due diligence in the management of funds and financial audits?
- Did promised co-financing materialize? (Please fill the form on co-financing attached table 1).

e. Reporting

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

### 3.2.2 UNDP Contribution

- Assess the role of UNDP against the requirements set out in the UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Results. Consider:
  - Field visits
  - Participation in Project Board
  - Project reviews, PIR preparation and follow-up
  - GEF guidance
  - Skill mix
  - Operational support
- Consider the new UNDP requirements outlined in the UNDP User Guide<sup>6</sup>, especially the Project Assurance role, and ensure they are incorporated into the project's adaptive management framework

---

<sup>5</sup> RBM Support documents are available at <http://www.undp.org/eo/methodologies.htm>

- Assess the contribution to the project from UNDP in terms of “soft” assistance (i.e. policy advice & dialogue, advocacy, and coordination) and suggest measures to strengthen UNDP’s soft assistance to the project management.

### 3.2.3 Stakeholder Participation, Partnership Strategy

- a. Assess whether or not 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;
- b. Consider the dissemination of project information to partners and stakeholders and if necessary suggest more appropriate mechanisms;
- c. Identify opportunities for stronger partnerships;

### 3.2.4 Implementation of replication approach;

- a. Sustainability: extent to which the benefits of the project will continue, within or outside the project scope, after it has come to an end. The evaluators may look at factors such as establishment of sustainable financial mechanisms, mainstreaming project objectives into the broader development policies and sectoral plans and economies or community production;

## 3.3 Project Results (Outputs, Outcomes and Impact)

3.3.1 Progress towards achievement of intended outcomes/measurement of change: Progress towards results should be based on a comparison of indicators before and after (so far) the project intervention, e.g. by comparing current conditions for development of Protected Areas management effectiveness, financial sustainability and capacity to the baseline ones;

## 4. PRODUCTS EXPECTED FROM THE EVALUATION

- Detailed methodology, work plan and outline;
- Mid-term evaluation report with findings;
- Lessons learned and recommendations for improvement, including recommendations for the revision of project strategy, approach, outputs and activities, if necessary;
- Recommendations for a strategy for future replication of the project approach for other types of the biodiversity projects, for other countries in the region;
- Description of best practices, and an “action list” in a certain area of particular importance for the project.

## 5. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The project progress and achievements will be tested against following GEF evaluation criteria:

---

<sup>6</sup> The UNDP User Guide is currently only available on UNDP’s intranet. However UNDP can provide the necessary section on roles and responsibility from <http://content.undp.org/go/userguide/results/rmoverview/progprojorg/?src=print>

- (i) Relevance – the extent to which the activity is suited to local and national development priorities and organizational policies, including changes over time.
- (ii) Effectiveness – the extent to which an objective has been achieved or how likely it is to be achieved.
- (iii) Efficiency – the extent to which results have been delivered with the least costly resources possible.
- (iv) Results/impacts – 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.
- (v) 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 Project will be rated against individual criterion of *relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and impact/results based* on the following scale:

- 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.
- Moderately Satisfactory (MS): The project has moderate shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives.
- Moderately 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.

As for *sustainability criteria* the evaluator should at the minimum evaluate the “likelihood of sustainability of outcomes at project termination, and provide a rating for this.

The following four dimensions or aspects of sustainability should be addressed:

*Financial resources:*

- a. Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?
- b. 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)?

*Socio-political:*

- c. Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes?
- d. 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?
- e. Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow?
- f. Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project?

*Institutional framework and governance:*

- a. Do the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits?
- b. While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems for accountability and transparency, and the required technical know-how are in place.



*Environmental:*

- a. Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes? The evaluation should assess whether certain activities 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.

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.

All the risk dimensions of sustainability are critical. Therefore, overall rating for sustainability will not be higher than the rating of the dimension with lowest ratings. For example, if a project has an 'Unlikely' rating in either of the dimensions then its overall rating cannot be higher than 'Unlikely'.

The evaluator(s) should develop detailed methodology and work plan for MTE during the preparatory phase of the MTE. The MTE tools and techniques may include, but not limited to:

- Desk review;
- Interviews with major stakeholders, including UNDP/GEF project implementing and executing agencies, government representatives, etc.
- Field visits to the project sites;
- Questionnaires;
- Participatory techniques and other approaches for gathering and analysis of data.

An indicative outline of the Mid-term Evaluation Report is presented below.

## **6. INDICATIVE OUTLINE OF THE MID-TERM EVALUATION REPORT**

The key product expected from this mid-term evaluation is a comprehensive analytical report in English that should, at least, include the following contents:

- Executive summary (1-2 pages)
  - Brief description of the project
  - Context and purpose of the evaluation
  - Main conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned
- Introduction (2-3 pages)
  - Project background
  - Purpose of the evaluation
  - Key issues to be addressed
  - Methodology of the evaluation
  - Structure of the evaluation
- Project and its development context (3-4 pages)
  - Project start and its duration
  - Implementation status

- Problems that the project seek to address
  - Immediate and development objectives of the project
  - Main stakeholders
  - Results expected
- Key findings (including best practice and lessons learned, assessment of performance) (8-10 pages)
- Project formulation
    - Project relevance
    - Implementation approach
    - Country ownership/Driveness
    - Stakeholder participation
    - Replication approach
    - Cost-effectiveness
    - UNDP comparative advantage
    - Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
    - Indicators
    - Management arrangements
  - Implementation
    - Financial management
    - Monitoring and evaluation
    - Execution and implementation modalities
    - Management by the UNDP country office
    - Coordination and operational issues
    - Identification and management of risks (adaptive management)
  - Results
    - Attainment of objectives
    - Prospects of sustainability
    - Contribution to upgrading skills of the national staff
- Conclusions and recommendations (4 – 6 pages)
- Corrective actions for the design, duration, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
  - Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
  - Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
  - Suggestions for strengthening ownership, management of potential risks
- Lessons learned (3 – 5 pages)
- Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success
- Annexes
- TOR
  - Itinerary
  - List of persons interviewed
  - Summary of field visits
  - List of documents reviewed
  - Questionnaire used and summary of results

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

## 7. MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

The mid-term evaluation will be carried out by Mid-term Evaluation Expert. The logistical support and venue to the MTE Expert will be provided by the UNDP Armenia CO under overall supervision of Environmental Governance Portfolio Analyst and Portfolio Associate. The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation lies with UNDP-Armenia.

## 8. DURATION OF THE MID-TERM EVALUATION

It is expected to start MTE by the end of May / beginning of June, 2011 and is planned to be conducted within 12 consultancy days. The proposed period for the in-country mission to Armenia is the first half of June 2011. The assignment is to be completed no later than 30 June 2011.

## 9. DUTIES, SKILLS AND QUALIFICATIONS OF EVALUATION EXPERT

### International Expert

#### Duties and Responsibilities:

- Desk review of documents, development of draft methodology, detailed work plan and MTE outline (maximum 2-day homework);
- Debriefing with UNDP CO, agreement on the methodology, scope and outline of the MTE report (0.5 day);
- Interviews with project implementing partner (executing agency), relevant Government, NGO and donor representatives and UNDP/GEF Regional Technical Advisor (maximum 2 day);
- Field visit to the pilot project sites and interviews with administration key staff of Syunik(Goris) and Kapan Forest Enterprises, as well as “Arevik” National Park” (3 days);
- Debriefing with UNDP and project implementing partner (0.5 day);
- Development and submission of the first MTE report draft (maximum of 3 days). Submission due is in two weeks after the in-country mission. The draft will be shared with the UNDP CO, UNDP/GEF (UNDP/GEF RCU Bratislava) and key project stakeholders for review and commenting;
- Finalization and submission of the final MTE report through incorporating suggestions received on the draft report (maximum 1 day).

#### Required Qualifications and Competencies:

##### *Minimum qualification requirements:*

- Advanced university degree in Forest Management, Environmental and/or Natural Resource Management or other related areas;
- 7 years of working experience in providing management or consultancy services to the forest and/or environmental management projects;
- Experience in monitoring and evaluating forest and/or environmental management projects for UN or other international development agencies (at least in one project);
- Fluency in English both written and spoken;
- E-literacy;

Technical qualification criteria for short-listing:

- Higher Education
- Experience/technical knowledge:
  - a. Experience in providing management or consultancy services to the forest and/or environmental management projects;
  - b. Experience in monitoring and evaluating forest and/or environmental management projects for UN or other international development agencies;
  - c. Sound knowledge in results-based management (especially results-oriented monitoring and evaluation);
  - d. Knowledge of GEF M&E guidelines and procedures;
  - e. Knowledge of the CIS region and particularly Armenia’s context is an asset;
- Other skills: Technical writing skills in English

Competencies:

- Ability to critically analyze issues, find root-causes and suggest optimum solutions;
- Ability to interact with a wide range of partners: government officials, development agencies and etc.;
- Excellent team working and management skills;

CV and P11 should provide evidence on the abovementioned qualifications and competencies.

Evaluation Criteria:

Experts will be evaluated against combination of technical and financial criteria. Technical evaluation stage encompasses desk review of applications. Experts not meeting any of minimum technical qualification requirements will be automatically excluded from the list of candidates for further technical evaluation.

Maximum obtainable score is 100, out of which the total score for technical criteria equals to 70 points (70%) and for financial criteria 30 (30%). Candidates who pass 70% of maximum obtainable scores of the technical criteria (i.e. 70 x 70% = 49 points) as a result of a desk review of applications will be considered as short-listed candidates.

Only candidates who pass 70% of total technical score will be requested to submit financial proposals – daily consultancy fee.

A maximum of 30 points will be assigned to the lowest price offer. All other price offers will receive points in inverse proportion, using the formula:

Financial score offer X = 30\*the lowest price/price offer X, Y, etc.)

Technical score: 70 points (70%)						Financial score: 30 points (30%)	Total score: 100 points	
1. Education Background	2. Work Experience, knowledge					3. Other, English knowledge	Proposed price	Price score
<u>1.1 Minimum qualification requirement:</u> Master’s degree in Forest and/or Environmental Management or	<u>2.1.1 Minimum qualification requirement</u> 7 years of working experience in providing management	<u>2.2.1 Minimum qualification requirement</u> Experience in monitoring and evaluating forest and/or environmental management	2.3 Knowledge of the CIS region and particularly Armenia’s context: 5	2.4 Knowledge of GEF M&E guidelines and	2.5 Sound knowledge in results-based management	Fluency in English both written and spoken: 10 points		

other related areas: 10 points:  1.2 PhD – additional 5 points	or consultancy services to the forest and/or environmental management projects: 15 points  2.1.2 Between 7 and 10 years – additional 5 points;  2.1.3 More than 10 years – additional 10 points	projects for UN or other international development agencies (at least in one project): 1 points  2.2.2 2-3 projects – additional 2 points;  2.2.3 More than 3 projects – additional 4 points ;	points	procedures: 5 points	(especially results-oriented monitoring and evaluation): 5 points				
15	25	5	5	5	5	10		30	100

\*For minimum qualification criteria/requirement either maximum obtainable score or 0 (zero) should be assigned to the candidate; Applicant not meeting any of minimum qualification criteria, will be automatically excluded from the list of applicants for further evaluation

\*\* For technical criteria additional to minimum criteria any score between 0 (zero) and maximum obtainable score can be assigned to the applicants

\*\* \*Scores against criteria 1.1, 1.2; 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.1.3; 2.2.1, 2.2.2, 2.2.3; 2.3; 2.4; 2.5 and 3.0; will be assigned to the applicants based on CVs and/or filled in P11 forms.

#### Contract Type, Duration and Payment Modality:

The consultant will be hired for maximum 12 days under Individual Contract (IC) / Special Service Agreement (SSA) with maximum 6 days of home work and maximum 6 days of in-country mission to Armenia. He/she will be paid daily consultancy fee and travel costs (economy class ticket, DSA, visa, and terminal expenses). DSA payments will be made based on actual workdays spent in Armenia according to the UN official rate. Fee payments will be made after the submission of the final MTE report.

#### Duty Station:

Home based with an in-country mission to Armenia.

### **10. LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED**

1. Project document and its annexes;
2. Project Inception Report
3. Project Annual (multiyear) Work Plans;
4. Project annual work programmes;
5. Project financial work plans (recruitment and procurement) and expenditure reports;
6. Annual/Quarter operational and progress reports;
7. 2010 UNDP/GEF Project Implementation Review (APR/PIR);

8. Minutes of the PB meetings;
9. Minutes of the stockholder meetings;
10. GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policies;
11. Handbook on planning, monitoring and evaluating for development results;
12. Other upon request.

## **11. EVALUATION POLICY**

The evaluators should follow the major GEF principles for evaluation<sup>7</sup>:

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

The EE must be independent from both the policy-making process and the delivery and management of assistance. Therefore applications will not be considered from EE who have had any direct involvement with the design or implementation of the project. Any previous association with the project must be disclosed in the application.

If selected, failure to make the above disclosures will be considered just grounds for immediate contract termination, without recompense. In such circumstances, all notes, reports and other documentation produced by the evaluator will be retained by UNDP.

## **12. APPLICATION:**

A complete application package should consist of an online Personal History Form (P11), CV and a letter of motivation.

---

<sup>7</sup> See p. 22 of the GEF's Monitoring and Evaluation Policy

## ANNEX 1: TENTATIVE LIST OF MEETINGS TO BE HELD

Location	Meetings
UNDP Armenia CO	Meeting with UNDP RR or DRR, Environmental Governance Portfolio Analyst and Portfolio Associate; UNDP Climate Change Programme Coordinator, UNDP/GEF Project Task Leader and CC Programme Associate
Ministry of Nature Protection of Armenia	Meeting with First Deputy Minister/Project National Director and UNFCCC National Focal Point; Meeting at “Arevik” National Park” SNCO (Syunik region), a Responsible Partner of the project
Ministry of Agriculture of Armenia	Meeting at “Hayantar”(ArmForest) SNCO (headquarter in Yerevan and two forest enterprises in Syunik region), a Responsible Partner of the project
Ministry of Emergency Situations	Meeting at Armenian Rescue Service
Contracted Organisations	Meeting at “FREC” SNCO of MoNP; Meeting at Acopian Center for the Environment of American University of Armenia
Partner Organisations	Meeting at WWF Armenia