

ANNEX 13:FINAL EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

Background and Rationale

The Biodiversity Conservation and Management of the Bohol Marine Triangle Project (BMTP) is a special project of the Foundation for the Philippine Environment with funding from the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) under the Global Environment Facility (GEF). The project was designed to set-up a system of governance for biodiversity conservation of species-rich but threatened marine areas spanning the islands of Panglao, Balicasag and Pamilacan in Bohol Province in Central Philippines. The system is not part of the National Integrated Protected Areas System (NIPAS), and is intended to be managed by a body consisting of local communities, non-government organizations and local government representatives.

There are seven strategic outputs for which the project is responsible. A more effective, equitable and sustainable planning, implementation, monitoring and enforcement of biodiversity conservation is established in the project through these outputs:

- a. strengthened government and community institutions to facilitate application of a coastal management framework, with the establishment and maintenance on marine reserves as a major component;
- b. development and application of policies and guidelines that will facilitate the elimination of destructive activities
- c. relevant and reliable information for monitoring and inventory as basis to establish sustainable harvesting
- d. compliance with environmental guidelines improved through a programme of education and awareness building
- e. alternative conservation –enabling livelihood activities are sustained through established benefit sharing and revolving fund schemes
- f. targeted ecosystem rehabilitation will improve overall ecosystem health and contribute to improve well-being of local communities
- g. an integrated Master Plan for BMT is established and operationalized

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 iii) to document, provide feedback on, and disseminate lessons learned. Final Evaluations are intended to assess the relevance, performance and success of the project. It will primarily look at the impact and sustainability of results, including contribution to capacity development and achievement of global environmental goals. It will also identify/document lessons learned and make recommendations that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP/GEF projects.

Like any project monitoring and evaluation activity, this final evaluation is conducted in accordance with established UNDP and GEF procedures and is to be undertaken by the project team and the UNDP CO, who will commission an independent consultant, with support from UNDP/GEF. The Logical Framework matrix provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. These, along with the objectives, procedures and tools described in the M&E plan presented in the project document will form the basis on which the proposed final evaluation will be built.

The final evaluation is a *systematic and participatory learning exercise*. Given this challenge, this exercise will be structured in such a way that it *generates relevant knowledge for project partners* while at the same time ensuring that this knowledge can and will be *applied in practical and immediate ways*. A consultative rather than an advisory process would dispel fears among some partners that evaluation is about finding fault and a proxy for measuring individual or institutional performance, rather than a sharing of knowledge and experiences amongst peers.

Objectives

9.1 Main Purpose

The purpose of the evaluation is to analyze and assess the relevance, sustainability, impact and effectiveness of the strategies, project design, implementation methodologies and resource allocations that have been adopted for the purpose of achieving the objectives stated in the project document.

The specific objectives of the evaluation are as follows:

- To identify and evaluate the effectiveness and outcome of strategies and activities of the project.
- To identify and evaluate the constraints and problems, which have been or are being encountered, the effectiveness of resource utilization and the delivery of project outputs.
- To assess progress towards attaining the project's global environmental objectives per GEF Operational Programme concerned (OP Nos. 3 and 4).
- To assess policy, institutional and financial instruments which have been identified and developed both at the national and local levels to ensure long-term sustainability of project-initiated activities beyond the life of the programme;
- To identify the manner and extent to which the project has leveraged co-financing and policy changes
- To assess the level of public involvement in the project and recommend on whether public involvement has been appropriate to the goals of the project;
- To review and evaluate the extent to which project impacts have reached the intended beneficiaries, both within and outside project sites;
- To assess the likelihood of continuation of project outcomes and benefits after completion of GEF funding;

In pursuit of the above, the following key issues should be carefully looked at:

1. Changes in the enabling environment such as policy changes, increasing stakeholder involvement, alternations in institutional capacity
2. Within the 5 years of implementation, how has the state of biodiversity changed? Proxy indicator to use changes in human behavior (i.e. changes in pressures and responses)
3. What has been the contribution of UNDP & GEF to those changes?
4. Impact: Aside from direct and obvious impacts, the project may have generated indirect or collateral impacts. These are difficult to quantify, but may be usefully illustrated according to types and examples and evaluated using narrative approaches, through case studies, evaluations, for example. A few examples of indirect or collateral impacts of GEF activities include:
 - *Political influence*: Contributing to an enhanced political profile for biodiversity and the CBD;
 - *Higher profile* of biodiversity concerns;
 - *Enhancement of information and access to it*: Generating and disseminating new data on biodiversity and its status that contributes to the global and regional information base

- *Replication*: Promoting the adoption of successful GEF approaches in other locations and projects
- *Catalytic effects*: Generating other positive steps, catalyzing state legislation that is outside the project's objectives
- *Financial leverage*: Prompting the availability of new and additional resources and co-financing, but possibly causing a negative diversion of funds, as suggested by some NGOs (Further analysis is needed to explore this and identify solutions.)
- *Synergy*: Fostering positive synergies across conventions and focal areas.
- *Empowerment*: Boosting the stature and power of focal points and ministries through finance, information, and projects (not only in terms of resources, but a “place at the table”)

B. Expected Outputs

The following are the expected outputs:

1. An Inception Report with a detailed work plan for the evaluation period indicating the schedules, specific roles and responsibilities \ of the evaluation team ;
2. A draft terminal evaluation report in the format following Section IV below, including a discussion on the special issues to be submitted to UNDP Manila on _____, with copies furnished to FPE and the PMO;
3. A final Terminal Evaluation Report addressing the comments and recommendations of GEF/UNDP and FPE within 15 days from receipt thereof.

The draft Terminal Evaluation Report will be circulated to the other key stakeholders for comments to be consolidated by the PMO and, together with the comments of GEF/UNDP, shall be transmitted to the team leader. The Team Leader shall finalize the Terminal Evaluation Report addressing the comments of the key stakeholders. Any discrepancies between the impressions of the evaluators and findings of these parties should be explained in an annex attached to the final report.

Approaches and Methodology

The approaches and methodology to be employed by the team in undertaking the evaluation will include:

1. Develop a work plan for the team indicating the schedules, specific roles and responsibilities of each member;
2. Brief and debrief UNDP, FPE, BMTP- PMO and relevant key stakeholders if deemed necessary;
3. Complete a desk review of the relevant documents regarding the project;
4. Conduct interviews with relevant project management and staff FPE and UNDP officers, and key stakeholders, partner NGOs and peoples' organizations in the field, local government unit (LGU) officials, church leaders, and other groups as necessary.
5. Conduct field visits in at least one site (barangay) in Panglao, Balicasag and Pamilacan for on-site evaluation, field interviews and information gathering on project management and other related activities.

IV. Evaluation Products

A Final Evaluation Report (no more than 30 pages, excluding Executive Summary and Annexes) structured as follows:

- (i) **Acronyms and Terms**

- (ii) **Executive Summary (no more than 4 pages)**
The Executive Summary should briefly explain how the evaluation was conducted and provide the summary of contents of the report and its findings.
- (iii) **Project Concept and Design Summary**
This section should begin with the context of the problem that the project is addressing. It should describe how effectively the project concept and design can deal with the situation
- (iv) **Project Results**
Progress towards attaining the project's regional and global environmental objectives and achievement of project outcomes. It should also try to answer the question: What has happened and why? The performance indicators in the logframe matrix are crucial to completing this section.
- (v) **Project Management**
This section covers the assessment of the project's adaptive management, partnerships, involvement of stakeholders, public participation, roles and responsibilities, monitoring plans, assistance from UNDP and IMO , etc.
- (vi) **Recommendations**
Here, the evaluators should be as specific as possible. To whom are the recommendations addressed and what exactly should that party do? Recommendations might include sets of options and alternatives.
- (vii) **Lessons Learned**
This is a list of lessons that may be useful to other projects.

List of Annexes (Terms of Reference, Itinerary, Persons Interviewed)

V. Evaluation Team

The Final Evaluation Team will be composed of two (2) local consultants with expertise on legal and policy environment, natural resource management and Monitoring & Evaluation. Specific qualifications are as follows:

At least ten years of proven experience with:

- Legal and policy analysis in natural resource management
- The logical framework approach and other strategic planning approaches;
- M&E methods and approaches (including quantitative, qualitative and participatory);
- Planning, design and implementation of M&E systems;
- Experience and training on M&E development and implementation and/or facilitating learning-oriented analysis sessions of M&E data with multiple stakeholders;
- Data and information analysis
- Report writing.

She/He must also have:

- A solid understanding of environmental management , with a focus on participatory processes, joint management, and gender issues;
- Familiarity with and a supportive attitude towards processes of strengthening local organizations and building local capacities for self-management;
- Willingness to undertake regular field visits and interact with different stakeholders, especially primary stakeholders;
- Computer skills in word processing and other basic MS Word Office operations
- Leadership qualities, personnel and team management (including mediation and conflict resolution);

- Excellent writing and reporting skills in the English Language is required.

Desirable:

- Extensive substantive knowledge of the biodiversity focal area in which the project operates;
- Understanding of UNDP and GEF procedures;
- Experience in data processing and with computers.
- Experience in the evaluation of technical assistance projects, preferably with UNDP or other United Nations development agencies and major donors. If possible, experience in the evaluation of GEF-funded biodiversity conservation projects or international waters projects.

VII. Implementation Arrangements

The UNDP Manila shall be the main operation point for the evaluation, which shall be responsible for liaising with the evaluation team and relevant persons to set-up the stakeholders interviews and meetings, arranging field visits in coordination with FPE and BMT-PMO.

BMT PMO shall provide the necessary logistical support (for field arrangements and stakeholders interviews and meetings). It shall also provide all project information and documents for review by the evaluators.

The evaluation will be conducted for a period of twelve (12) days commencing on _____.

VII. Proposed schedule and itinerary of Final Evaluation Team

The evaluation shall be accomplished following the implementation schedule proposed below:

DATE & TIME		ACTIVITIES
Day 1		Briefing at UNDP * Courtesy Call * Meeting with Environment Unit and FPE <i>Agenda: TOR, Expected Outputs, Workplan/ Schedule and other Logistical Requirements</i> Initial Data Gathering and Document Review
Day 2		Travel to Bohol Meeting with PMO and BMT Management Board
Day 3		Meeting with Partner NGOs Documents Review and Data Gathering
Day 4		Site Visit and Interview
Day 5		Site Visit and Interview
Day 6-10		Debriefing with PMO, FPE and UNDP Preparation of the Draft Report
Day 11		Travel to Manila Presentation of the draft Report
Day		Submission of the Final Report