

## **ANNEX I: FINAL PROJECT EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE**

### **BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE**

The Samar Island Biodiversity Project (SIBP) is a special project of the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR) with funding from the Government of the Philippines and the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) under the Global Environment Facility (GEF). It is expected to run for eight years divided into two phases of four years each. The project operation officially commenced in March 2001.

SIBP aims to establish the Samar Island Natural Park in order to conserve the rich biodiversity resources in the Island and to reduce poverty among the local communities. The SINP would cover approximately 333,300 hectares of natural forests and a buffer zone of about 125,400 hectares that spans across the three provinces, covering 36 municipalities and 1 city. The area serves as the upper catchments of 25 watersheds and a source of water for domestic, agricultural, commercial and industrial uses. It is home to almost 200,000 people, more than 90% of whom are dependent on the forest and other natural resources for food, medicines, fuel and livelihood.

The project is designed as a two-phase project. Phase I is implemented from January 1999-December 2006 (no cost extension was granted for the period January 2004-December 2006) since the project operationally started on the ground in March 2001). Phase II is planned to be implemented from January 2007-December 2008. The project will run for a total of eight (8) years as approved by GEF. The management of the SIBP is shared by the government and civil society. The Project Manager (appointed by the Department of Environment and Natural Resources) is also concurrently the Protected Area Superintendent of the Samar Island Natural Park. The NGO designated representative serves as Co-Project Manager in the management structure of the SIBP.

Presently, the Project rents two buildings inside the Catbalogan Comprehensive High School (formerly Samar Regional School of Fisheries) to house the SIBP-Project Management Office and the Protected Area Office of the Samar Island Natural Park. Within the year, construction of a central headquarters and ranger posts will commence in strategic locations within the SINP.

A team of thirty-three (33) national professionals, consultants and staff provide technical advice and implement the activities of the Phase One of SIBP. On the other hand, the SINP Protected Area Office has a complement of eleven regular DENR employees and twenty newly hired park conservation officers and community development officers. Many of these national staff are funded by the SIBP and their contracts are concurrent with the Phase One funds from UNDP-GEF.

SIBP has among its core staff a multidisciplinary team with expertise in natural and social sciences. It has specialists in forestry, biology, sociology, adult education and training, advocacy, communication, planning, law, policy development, agriculture, livelihood, financial management, GIS and community development. In addition to its in-house staff, the Project also engages the services of external experts for the conduct of studies and specialized consultancy work.

There are the seven strategic outputs that also represent the Programs and Services for which the Project is responsible.

- (a) Establishment of an adaptive management framework which includes the completion of the legal requirements leading to the establishment of the Samar Island Natural Park as a protected area, the preparation of the Five Year Management Plan, the conduct of biological resource assessment and management zoning.

- (b) Strengthening the Protected Area Institutions such as the Protected Area Management Board and the Protected Area Office
- (c) Operationalizing a community-based conservation system through the Survey and Registration of P.A. occupants and the Community Outreach Program.
- (d) Imparting awareness of conservation values and threats to key stakeholders which involves production of IEC materials and advocacy activities
- (e) Integration of conservation objectives in sectoral planning through assistance to local governments in land use planning and assistance to the Samar Island Biodiversity Foundation in strengthening its advocacy role.
- (f) Assistance in ensuring sustainable use of existing biodiversity resources through technical assistance in sustainable farming, non-timber forest products development and eco-tourism.
- (g) Fund-support generation

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 of the first phase of the SIBP will be built.

The Final Evaluation aims to review the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability of the activities and results within each component or desired outcome of the projects and recommend approaches to improve design, implementation and monitoring mechanisms for the succeeding years of project implementation (Phase II).

In addition to providing an independent in-depth review of the progress achieved so far under Phase I, this evaluation is responsive to GEF Council decisions on transparency and better access of information during implementation.

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**

### **Main Purpose**

The main purpose of the evaluation is twofold – a) to evaluate the success or otherwise of Phase one of the Project and to ascertain whether the proposed second phase is justified; and b) to provide inputs to help guide the design of any second phase. To this end, the evaluation should 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:

- Changes in the enabling environment such as policy changes, increasing stakeholder involvement, alternations in institutional capacity
- 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)
- What has been the contribution of UNDP & GEF to those changes?
- 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")

## Focus of Evaluation

The Team Leader (International Consultant) shall focus on the following based on the Seven Strategic Project outputs:

- Output 1 : Establishment of an adaptive management framework which includes the completion of the legal requirements leading to the establishment of the Samar Island National Park as protected area, the preparation of the Five Year Management Plan, the conduct of biological resource assessment and management zoning
- Output 2 : Strengthening the Protected Area Institutions such as the Protected Area Management Board and the Protected Area Management Board and the Protected Area Office
- Output 3 : Operationalizing a community-based conservation system through the Survey and Registration of P.A. occupants and the Community Outreach Program.
- Output 4 : Imparting awareness of conservation values and threats to key stakeholders which involves production of IEC materials and advocacy activities
- Output 5 : Integration of conservation objectives in sectoral planning through assistance to local governments in land use planning and assistance to the Samar Island Biodiversity Foundation in strengthening its advocacy role.
- Output 6 : Assistance in ensuring sustainable use of existing biodiversity resources through technical assistance in sustainable farming, non-timber forest products development and eco-tourism.
- Output 7 : Fund – support generation

### **Expected Outputs**

The Evaluation Team, spearheaded by the Team Leader is expected to deliver the following outputs:

1. An Inception Report with a detailed work plan for the evaluation period indicating the schedules, specific roles and responsibilities of the two members 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, with copies furnished to DENR-PAWB and the PMO;
3. A final Terminal Evaluation Report addressing the comments and recommendations of GEF/UNDP and DENR-PAWB 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, DENR-PAWB, 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, DENR and UNDP officers, and key stakeholders such as the Samar Island Biodiversity Foundation, 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 Eastern, Northern and Western Samar for on-site evaluation, field interviews and information gathering on project management and other related activities.

## Evaluation Products

A Final Evaluation Report (no more than 30 pages, excluding Executive Summary and Annexes) should be produced. The following structure is indicative only. The evaluation team may change it as necessary to meet the requirements of providing inputs to the design of the potential second phase.

- (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 could 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)

## EVALUATION TEAM

The Final Evaluation Team will be composed of one international consultant (with expertise on legal and policy environment, natural resource management and M & E) who will also function as the evaluation Team Leader, and two (2) national consultants of international caliber with similar specialization and with substantive knowledge of national policies on natural resources management (forestry, protected area, etc.). The national consultants will be composed of a field consultant and policy consultant.

Specific qualifications are as follows:

- At least ten years of proven experience with:
  - Legal and policy analysis in natural resource management

- 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:
  - 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.

## **SPECIAL ISSUES:**

The evaluation will consider and assess special issues related to the natural resources management policy environment in the Philippines in which the project operates. The evaluation shall be viewed in the context of a possible UNDP-GEF Phase Two taking into consideration the approved UNDP-GEF Project Document and the new and emerging UNDP-GEF strategic priorities and thrusts.

## **IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS**

UNDP Manila Office 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 PAWB and SIBP-PMO. It shall ensure the timely provision of travel arrangements, DSA, professional fees in accordance with the contract.

PAWB and SIBP-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 three (3) weeks commencing on *27 February to 21 March 2006*.