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**TERMS OF REFERENCE**

**Title:** International Consultant for Mid-Term Evaluation

**Project:** Ensuring Financial Sustainability of the Protected Area System of Serbia

**Reporting to:** Portfolio Manager

**Duty Station:** Belgrade

**Contract Type:** Individual Contract (IC) – for free lance consultant or

Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA) - if the consultant is working with institution or government or university

**Duration:** Output based consultancy, 20 working days within the period of 2 months (August 1 – September 30, 2012)

**Background**

**a. Purpose**

The purpose of this consultancy is to undertake the Mid Term Evaluation of the "Ensuring Financial Sustainability of the Protected Area System of Serbia" project of Serbia, funded by the Global Environmental Facility (GEF).

**b. Objective**

The objective of this Mid Term Evaluation is to measure the up-to-date effectiveness and efficiency of project activities in relation to the stated objective, and to produce possible recommendations on how to improve the management of the project until its completion (please see Annexes for more detailed description).

**c. Background Information**

The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), acting as an implementing agency of the Global Environment Facility (GEF), is providing assistance to the Serbian Ministry of Environment, Mining and Spatial Planning (MEMSP) in the implementation of the GEF Medium Size Project (MSP) “Ensuring Financial Sustainability of the Protected Area System of Serbia”.

The objective of the project is to improve the financial sustainability of Serbia’s protected area system (please see Annex 1 for more detailed description). This objective will be realized through the following three components: Component 1. Enabling legal and policy environment for improved PA financial sustainability; Component 2. Increasing revenue-streams for the PA system; and Component 3. Institutional and individual capacity of PA institutions to raise PA management cost-effectiveness. The first component will provide the legal and policy groundwork for long-term gains in the sustainability of the PA system as well as produce a Protected Areas Financing Plan (PAFP) that will integrate the results of the entire project in a key guidance document. The second component is focused on expanding potential revenue streams from activities compatible with the conservation goals of the protected areas network to provide clear pilot projects that show financial sustainability is feasible without commercial logging activities. The third component builds on the various pilots and policy work to increase institutional capacity for cost-effective management and financial sustainability. One key activity of the third component is the development of a business planning process for the PAs of Serbia with 21 pilot sites included and the capacity to extend the process to all PAs of Serbia that require strategic planning. The Project was planned for four years (2010- 2014).

The Project Document signed between the Serbian Government and UNDP Serbia is available at: [http://gefonline.org/projectDetailsSQL.cfm?projID=3946](http://gefonline.org/projectDetailsSQL.cfm?projID=3946%20). More information on project background is available in Annex 1.

**Description of Responsibilities**

**a. Scope of work**

UNDP Serbia invites applications from qualified international consultants in order to conduct evaluation of the GEF financed project in Serbia. Specifically, the international expert will perform the following tasks:

* Lead and manage the evaluation mission;
* Design the detailed evaluation scope and methodology (including the methods for data collection and analysis);
* Conduct an analysis of the outcome, outputs and partnership strategy (as per the scope of the evaluation described above);
* Draft the evaluation report; and
* Finalize the whole evaluation report.

The evaluation with the following assessments is to be conducted (for details see Annex 2):

* Project concept and design,
* Implementation,
* Project outputs, outcomes and impact.

The Mid-term Evaluation will also cover the following aspects (please see Annex 2 for more detailed description):

1) Progress towards Results,

2) Project’s Adaptive Management Framework,

3) Underlying Factors,

4) UNDP Contribution,

5) Partnership Strategy.

Methodology or evaluation approach

An outline of an evaluation approach is provided in Annex 5 of this ToR. However it should be noted that the evaluation team is responsible for revising the approach as necessary. Any changes should be in-line with international criteria and professional norms and standards (as adopted by the UN Evaluation Group[[1]](#footnote-1)). They must be also cleared by UNDP before being applied by the evaluation team. The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. It must be easily understood by project partners and applicable to the remaining period of project duration.

The methodology to be used by the evaluation team should be presented in the report in detail. It shall include information on:

* Documentation review (desk study)
* Tracking tools review (METT and Financial scorecard)
* Interviews
* Field visits
* Questionnaires
* Participatory observation and other approaches for the gathering and analysis of data.

The consultant should also provide ratings of Project achievements according to GEF Project Review Criteria (please see Annex 5 for more detailed description).

**b. Deliverables and timelines**

The key deliverable expected from this mid-term evaluation is a comprehensive analytical report in English that should, at least, include the following contents (please see Annex 3 for more detailed description):

* Executive summary
* Introduction
* The Project and its development context
* An analysis of the situation with regard to the outcomes, the outputs and the partnership strategy;
* Key findings (including best practice and lessons learned, assessment of performance)
* Conclusions and recommendations
* Lessons learned
* Annexes

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

Prior to approval of the final report, a draft version shall be circulated for comments to government counterparts, Bratislava RCU, project team and UNDP Country Office. If any discrepancies have emerged between findings of the evaluation team and information available at the aforementioned parties, these should be explained in an annex attached to the final report.

A team of independent experts will conduct the evaluation and the international evaluator will be accompanied by a national consultant. The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The deliverables and timeframe are broken down as follows:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Deliverables** | **Expected work input** | **Deadline** |
| Inception Report including work plan based on desk review prepared and accepted | 2 days | 10 days upon signing the contract |
| Draft Evaluation Report prepared and accepted (based on desk review, briefings, field visits, interviews and questionnaires) | 8 days | 20 days upon signing the contract |
| Draft Evaluation Report with comments incorporated prepared and accepted | 6 days | 10 days upon receiving comments |
| Final evaluation report incorporating all comments received comments prepared and accepted | 4 days | 7 days upon receiving comments |

This is an output based consultancy, expected to require 20 working days over the period of 2 months (1 August 2012 – 30 September 2012). The evaluation should be completed by September 30, 2012. The proposed dates for the in-country mission to Serbia are September 3-7, 2012 (five working days).

Travel costs (transport, accommodation and living costs) should be included in consultant’s lump-sum offer and payable as agreed prior to start of the mission. Payments for the deliverables will be made in up to 2 installments, upon billing by the consultant and subject to quality review, clearance and acceptance by UNDP Portfolio Manager.

**Competencies**

* Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability;
* Displays ability to synthesize research and reach empirically based conclusions on related subjects;
* Possesses knowledge of inter-disciplinary development issues;
* Proven capacity to produce reports;
* Focuses on result for the client and responds positively to feedback;
* Consistently approaches work with energy and a positive, constructive attitude;
* Remains calm, in control and good humored even under pressure;
* Excellent English communication skills**;**
* **Computer skills: IT literacy;**

**Qualifications**

* Advanced university degree in social science, public administration, economics, organizational science or another relevant field;
* Work experience in relevant areas for at least 10 years;
* Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;
* Experience applying participatory monitoring approaches;
* Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
* Recent knowledge of the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy;
* Recent knowledge of UNDP’s results-based evaluation policies and procedures;
* Competence in Adaptive Management, as applied to conservation or natural resource management projects;
* Recognized expertise in the sustainable management and conservation of temperate ecosystems;
* Familiarity with protected area policies and management structures in Serbia;
* Demonstrable analytical skills;
* Experience with multilateral or bilateral supported conservation projects;
* Project evaluation experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset.

**Application Procedure:**

Individual consultants are invited to submit applications for these positions.

The consultant must be independent from both the policy-making process and the delivery and management of assistance. Therefore applications will not be considered from consultants who have had any direct involvement in the design or implementation of the project. This may apply equally to consultant who is associated with organizations, universities or entities that are, or have been, involved in the delivery of the project. Any previous association with the project, the Ministry of Environment, Mining and Spatial Planning, UNDP Serbia or other partners/stakeholders 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 consultant will be retained by UNDP.

**Please send your application together with your CV, a brief concept paper (no more than 3 pages outlining the approach and methodology you will apply to achieve the assignment) and Financial offer (including costs breakdown/possible travel costs) to Procurement, UNDP Serbia, Internacionalnih brigada 69, 11000 Belgrade, Serbia, email:** [**vacancy.rs@undp.org**](mailto:vacancy.rs@undp.org)**. Deadline for applications is May 20, 2012.**

**ToR Annexes**

Annex 1: Background information 7

Annex 2: Objectives of the Mid Term Evaluation 8

Annex 3: Products expected from the evaluation 11

Annex 4: Evaluation team – qualities and requirements 13

Annex 5: Methodology or evaluation approach 15

Annex 6: Implementation Arrangements 16

Annex 7: Project Results Framework 17

Annex 8: List of documents to be reviewed by the Evaluators 20

Annex 9: Co-financing and Leveraged Resources, 21

Annex 10: Rate tables 22

# Annex 1: Background information

The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), acting as an implementing agency of the Global Environment Facility (GEF), is providing assistance to the Serbian Ministry of Environment, Mining and Spatial Planning (MEMSP) in implementation of the GEF Medium Size Project (MSP) “**Ensuring Financial Sustainability of the Protected Area System of Serbia**”.

Serbia covers 8,836,100 ha, divided into three major landscape complexes. The North of the country is composed of lowland areas (approximately 1/3 of the territory) comprising part of the South-Eastern Pannonian Plain. South of Belgrade the plains rise to hilly woodlands and low mountain ranges, interrupted by wide valleys created by the Morava and Sava rivers. Further South, as well as towards the East and West of Serbia, high mountain systems can be found; e.g. the Carpathian-Balkans, Rhodope and the Dinaric mountain systems, many of them exceeding 2000 meters in height above sea level. Particularly important is found in the North of Serbia – the largest in South Eastern Europe –which constitutes one of the most important European bird reserves. Serbia’s status as a centre of biodiversity in Europe is to a high degree determined by its geological age, geomorphology, and climatic conditions and, in particular, by its role as refuge for a number of species during the glacial periods. Thus, the Balkan and Pannonian regions harbor numerous endemic-relict floral elements from previous geological ages. Serbia hosts 39% of Europe's vascular plant species, 51% of its fish fauna, 74% of its bird fauna and 67% of all mammal species. Furthermore the country offers a resting place for many migratory species, including endangered ones. The total number of all species that live in Serbia represents 43.3% of all existing species in Europe.

Serbia has recently started to reinforce its biodiversity conservation framework and is seeking to develop better ecological representation and a sustainably funded PA system. Currently, Serbia has five national parks, 98 nature reserves, 16 landscape protected areas, 296 nature monuments and 24 nature parks. In total there are 464 protected areas (and 797 protected plant and animal species). The protected areas covers 547,176 ha, or 6.19% of Serbia’s area.

**Project Objective and Outcomes**

The objective of the project is to improve the financial sustainability of Serbia’s protected area system. This objective will be realized through the following three components:

Component 1. Enabling legal and policy environment for improved PA financial sustainability;

Component 2. Increasing revenue-streams for the PA system; and

Component 3. Institutional and individual capacity of PA institutions to raise PA management cost-effectiveness.

The first component will provide the legal and policy groundwork for long-term gains in the sustainability of the PA system as well as produce a Protected Areas Financing Plan (PAFP) that will integrate the results of the entire project in a key guidance document. The second component is focused on expanding potential revenue streams from activities compatible with the conservation goals of the protected areas network to provide clear pilot projects that show financial sustainability is feasible without commercial logging activities. The third component builds on the various pilots and policy work to increase institutional capacity for cost-effective management and financial sustainability. One key activity of the third component is the development of a business planning process for the PAs of Serbia with 21 pilot sites included and the capacity to extend the process to all PAs of Serbia that require strategic planning.

The Project Document signed between the Serbian Government and UNDP Serbia is available at: http://gefonline.org/projectDetailsSQL.cfm?projID=3946

Associated with these outcomes there are a number of Outputs (please see Annex 7 - Project Results Framework). Progress towards them is reported in 2011 Annual Project Implementation Review. The Project was planned for four years (2010- 2014).

# Annex 2: Objectives of the Mid Term Evaluation

This evaluation is to be undertaken taking into consideration the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy, available at <http://www.thegef.org/gef/node/4184>

and the UNDP/GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy, available at [http://api.ning.com/files/q21NtCDxX3Ww5ICf9bKJcn3KgJrTJp4Mgylk51qCvSI\*Q-DmpdUeHXtsQl1mqkFHWHwJ-6nfRRxpWWCci8U3SzsJLfz40vIh/UNDPevaluationguidancedraft\_forEvaluationTeam\_versionMarch172011.pdf](http://api.ning.com/files/q21NtCDxX3Ww5ICf9bKJcn3KgJrTJp4Mgylk51qCvSI*Q-DmpdUeHXtsQl1mqkFHWHwJ-6nfRRxpWWCci8U3SzsJLfz40vIh/UNDPevaluationguidancedraft_forEvaluationTeam_versionMarch172011.pdf)

The Mid Term Evaluation is initiated by the UNDP Serbia as the Implementation Agency for this project and it aims at providing managers (Ministry of Environment, Mining and Spatial Planning, UNDP and the GEF Secretariat) with strategy and policy options for more effectively and efficiently achieving the project’s outputs and outcomes. It also provides the basis for learning and accountability for managers and stakeholders.

The objective of this Mid Term Evaluation is to measure the up-to-date effectiveness and efficiency of project activities in relation to the stated objective, and to produce possible recommendations on how to improve the management of the project until its completion in 2014.

The Mid Term Evaluation Report is expected to provide further advice on how to:

* strengthen the adaptive management and monitoring function of the project;
* ensure accountability for the achievement of the GEF objective;
* enhance organizational and development learning; and
* enable informed decision – making.

The report will have to provide to the GEF Secretariat complete and convincing evidence to support its findings/ratings. The consultant should prepare specific ratings on seven aspects of the project, as described in the 'Reporting' section of this Terms of Reference. Particular emphasis should be put on the current project results and the possibility of achieving all objectives in the established timeframe, taking into consideration the speed, at which the project is proceeding.

The evaluation should assess:

Project concept and design

The evaluators will assess the project concept and design. He/she 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 evaluator will assess the achievement of indicators and review the work plan, planned duration and budget of the project.

Implementation

The evaluation 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 evaluation is to assess the Project team’s use of adaptive management in project implementation.

Project outputs, outcomes and impact

The evaluation will assess the outputs, outcomes and impact achieved by the project as well as the likely sustainability of project results. This should encompass an assessment of the achievement of the outcomes and the contribution to attaining the overall objective of the project. The evaluation 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 evaluation will also examine if the project has had significant unexpected effects, whether of beneficial or detrimental character.

The Mid-term Evaluation will also cover the following aspects:

1. Progress towards Results

Changes in development conditions: Address the following questions, with a focus on the perception of change among stakeholders:

* Have the financial resources allocated to protected areas administration changed (i.e., increased, diversified) since the inception of the project?
* Have innovative tools such as financial information management systems and payments for environmental services/environmental mechanisms been gradually implemented in the Serbian Protected Areas lately?
* Have there been changes in national stakeholder behavior with regard to the support for the project that may have contributed to improved conservation?
* Has awareness on biodiversity conservation and subsequent public participation in biodiversity management increased as a result of the project?

Measurement of change*:* Progress towards results should be based on a comparison of indicators before (i.e., baseline) and after (up-to-date) the project intervention. Progress can also be assessed by comparing conditions within the project boundaries to conditions in similar unmanaged areas.

Project strategy: how and why outputs in the project document and strategies contribute to the achievement of the expected results. Examine their relevance and whether they provide the most effective route towards results.

Sustainability: Extent to which the benefits of the project will continue, within or outside the project boundaries, after it has come to an end. Relevant factors include for example: development of a sustainable financing strategy, design and implementation of novel financial and economic instruments and mechanisms, mainstreaming project objectives into the cross-cutting economic sectors, etc.

2. Project’s Adaptive Management Framework

1. Monitoring Systems

* Assess the monitoring tools currently being used:
  + - Do they provide the necessary information?
    - Do they involve key partners?
    - Are they efficient?
    - Are additional tools required?
* Reconstruct baseline data if necessary[[2]](#footnote-2). Reconstruction should follow participatory processes and could be achieved in conjunction with a learning exercise[[3]](#footnote-3);
* Ensure the monitoring system, including performance indicators, at least meets GEF minimum requirements[[4]](#footnote-4). Apply SMART indicators as necessary;
* Apply the GEF Tracking Tools and provide a description of comparison with initial application of the tool.

1. Risk Management

* Validate whether the risks identified in the project document and PIRs are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate. If not, explain why. Describe any additional risks identified and suggest risk ratings and possible risk management strategies to be adopted;
* Assess the project’s risk identification and management systems:
  + - Is the UNDP/GEF Risk Management System appropriately applied?
    - How can the UNDP/GEF Risk Management System be used to strengthen project management?

1. 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 have on project management?
* Assess the use of routinely updated workplans;
* Assess the use of electronic information technologies to support implementation, participation and monitoring, as well as other project activities;
* Are the work planning processes result-based[[5]](#footnote-5)? 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.

1. 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.

3. Underlying Factors

* 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;
* Re-test the assumptions made by the project management and identify new assumptions that should be made;
* Assess the effect of any incorrect assumptions made by the project.

4. 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
    - Steering Committee/TOR follow-up and analysis
    - PIR preparation and follow-up
    - GEF guidance
* Consider the new UNDP requirements outlined in the UNDP User Guide[[6]](#footnote-6), especially the Project Assurance role, and ensure they are incorporated into the project’s adaptive management framework;
* Assess the contribution to the project from UNDP “soft” assistance (i.e. policy advice & dialogue, advocacy, and coordination). Suggest measures to strengthen UNDP’s soft assistance to the project management.

5. Partnership Strategy

* Assess how partners are involved in the project’s adaptive management framework:
  + - Involving partners and stakeholders in the selection of indicators and other measures of performance
    - Using already existing data and statistics
    - Analyzing progress towards results and determining project strategies.
* Identify opportunities for stronger substantive partnerships;
* Assess how local stakeholders participate in project management and decision-making; Include an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the approach adopted by the project and suggestions for improvement if necessary;
* Consider the dissemination of project information to partners and stakeholders and if necessary suggest more appropriate mechanisms.

# Annex 3: Products expected from the evaluation

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**
  + - Brief description of the project
    - Context and purpose of the evaluation
    - Main conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned
* **Introduction**
  + - Project background
    - Purpose of the evaluation
    - Key issues addressed
    - The outputs of the evaluation and how will they be used
    - Methodology of the evaluation
    - Structure of the evaluation
* **The Project and its development context**
  + - 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
* **An analysis of the situation with regard to the outcomes, the outputs and the partnership strategy;**
* **Key findings (including best practice and lessons learned, assessment of performance)**
* Project formulation
  + - Implementation approach
    - Country ownership/driveness
    - Stakeholder participation
    - Replication approach
    - Cost-effectiveness
    - UNDP comparative advantage
    - Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
    - Management arrangements
* Implementation
  + - Financial planning
    - Monitoring and evaluation
    - Execution and implementation modalities
    - Management by the UNDP country office
    - Coordination and operation issues
    - Identification and management of risks (adaptive management)
* Results
  + - Attainment of objective
    - Prospects of sustainability
* **Conclusions and recommendations**
  + - Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
    - Actions to strengthen or reinforce benefits from the project
    - Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
    - Suggestions for strengthening ownership, management of potential risks
* **Lessons learned**
  + - Good practices and lessons learned in addressing issues relating to effectiveness, efficiency and relevance.
* **Annexes: TOR, itinerary, summary of field visits, list of persons interviewed, list of documents reviewed, questionnaire used and summary of results, co-financing table, rating tables, mid-term METT and Financial scorecard, etc.**

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

# Annex 4: Evaluation team – qualities and requirements

A team of independent experts will conduct the evaluation. The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The evaluation team will be composed of one International Consultant or team leader and one National Consultant that UNDP CO will recruit. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Former cooperation with GEF is an advantage.

Team Qualities:

1. Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;
2. Experience applying participatory monitoring approaches;
3. Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
4. Recent knowledge of the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy;
5. Recent knowledge of UNDP’s results-based evaluation policies and procedures;
6. Competence in Adaptive Management, as applied to conservation or natural resource management projects;
7. Recognized expertise in the sustainable management and conservation of temperate ecosystems;
8. Familiarity with protected area policies and management structures in Serbia;
9. Demonstrable analytical skills;
10. Work experience in relevant areas for at least 10 years;
11. Experience with multilateral or bilateral supported conservation projects;
12. Project evaluation experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset;
13. Excellent English communication skills.

Specifically, the international expert (team leader) will perform the following tasks:

* Lead and manage the evaluation mission;
* Design the detailed evaluation scope and methodology (including the methods for data collection and analysis);
* Assist in drafting terms of reference of the national consultant(s)
* Decide the division of labor within the evaluation team;
* Conduct an analysis of the outcome, outputs and partnership strategy (as per the scope of the evaluation described above);
* Draft related parts of the evaluation report; and
* Finalize the whole evaluation report.

The National Consultant will provide input in reviewing all project documentation and will provide the International Consultant with a compilation of information prior to the evaluation mission. Specifically, the national expert will perform tasks with a focus on:

* Review documents;
* Prepare a list of the outputs achieved under project;
* Organize the mission programme and provide translation/interpretation when necessary;
* Participate in the design of the evaluation methodology;
* Conduct an analysis of the outcome, outputs and partnership strategy (as per the scope of the evaluation described above);
* Draft related parts of the evaluation report;
* Assist Team leader in finalizing document through incorporating suggestions received on draft related to his/her assigned sections.

Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions. Joint proposals from two independent evaluators are welcome. Alternatively, proposals will be accepted from recognized consulting firms to field a complete team with the required expertise within the evaluation budget.

The evaluation will be undertaken in-line with GEF principles:

* Independence
* Impartiality
* Transparency
* Disclosure
* Ethical
* Partnership
* Competencies and Capacities
* Credibility
* Utility

The evaluators must be independent from both the policy-making process and the delivery and management of assistance. Therefore applications will not be considered from evaluators who have had any direct involvement in the design or implementation of the project. This may apply equally to evaluators who are associated with organizations, universities or entities that are, or have been, involved in the delivery of the project. Any previous association with the project, the Ministry of Environment, Mining and Spatial Planning, UNDP Serbia or other partners/stakeholders must be disclosed in the application. This applies equally to firms submitting proposals as it does to individual evaluators.

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.

If individual evaluators are selected, UNDP will appoint one Team Leader, who will have overall responsibility for the delivery and quality of the evaluation products. Team roles and responsibilities will be reflected in the individual contracts. If a proposal is accepted from a consulting firm, the firm will be held responsible for the delivery and quality of the evaluation products and therefore has responsibility for team management arrangements.

# Annex 5: Methodology or evaluation approach

An outline of an evaluation approach is provided below. However it should be noted that the evaluation team is responsible for revising the approach as necessary. Any changes should be in-line with international criteria and professional norms and standards (as adopted by the UN Evaluation Group[[7]](#footnote-7)). They must be also cleared by UNDP before being applied by the evaluation team.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. It must be easily understood by project partners and applicable to the remaining period of project duration.

The methodology to be used by the evaluation team should be presented in the report in detail. It shall include information on:

* + Documentation review (desk study) - the list of documentation to be reviewed is included in the Annex 8 to this Terms of Reference;

In preparation for the evaluation mission, the project manager, with assistance from UNDP country office, will arrange for the completion of the tracking tools (METT and Financial scorecard). The tracking tools will be prepared well in advance before evaluation mission and endorsed by the relevant implementing agency or a qualified national research/scientific institution, and not by the international consultant or UNDP staff. The tracking tools will be submitted to the international evaluation consultant for quality evaluation. The evaluator will need to provide his/her comments on it. Upon incorporation of the comments from the international evaluation consultant to the tracking tool, it will be finalized and attached as mandatory annex to the MTE report.

* + Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at minimum: UNDP Serbia, UNDP/GEF RTA from Bratislava, Ministry of Environment, Mining and Spatial Planning, members of the National Project Board, Portfolio Manager; Serbian Association of National Parks and Protected Areas (NAPS), other protected areas (not members of the NAPS), etc.
  + Field visits;
  + Questionnaires;
  + Participatory observation and other approaches for the gathering and analysis of data.

The consultant should also provide **ratings** of Project achievements according to GEF Project Review Criteria. Aspects of the Project to be rated for its relevance, effectiveness and efficiency are:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1 | Implementation approach; |
| 2 | Country ownership/drivers |
| 3 | Outcome/Achievement of objectives (the extent to which the project's environmental and development objectives were achieved). |
| 4 | Stakeholder participation/public involvement |
| 5 | Sustainability; |
| 6 | Replication approach; |
| 7 | Financial management and Cost-effectiveness; |
| 8 | Monitoring and evaluation |

In assessing the project performance evaluators will use the rating scales corresponding with GEF Guidelines for evaluations (http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/Policies-TEguidelines7-31.pdf).

The following rating scale should be used for assessment of outcomes:

a. Highly satisfactory (HS). The project had no shortcomings in the achievement

of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency.

b. Satisfactory (S). The project had minor shortcomings in the achievement of

its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency.

c. Moderately satisfactory (MS). The project had moderate shortcomings in the

achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency.

d. Moderately unsatisfactory (MU). The project had significant shortcomings

in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or

efficiency.

e. Unsatisfactory (U). The project had major shortcomings in the achievement

of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency.

f. Highly unsatisfactory (HU). The project had severe shortcomings in the

achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency.

# Annex 6: Implementation Arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation lies with UNDP Serbia. UNDP Serbia will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team. UNDP Serbia and Ministry of Environment, Mining and Spatial Planning will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

This is an output based consultancy of 20 working days over the period of 2 months (1 August 2012 – 30 September 2012). The evaluation should be completed by September 30, 2012. The proposed dates for the in-country mission to Serbia are September 3-7, 2012. The report shall be submitted to the UNDP Serbia office. Prior to approval of the final report, a draft version shall be circulated for comments to government counterparts, Bratislava RCU, project team and UNDP Country Office. If any discrepancies have emerged between findings of the evaluation team and information available at the aforementioned parties, these should be explained in an annex attached to the final report.

# Annex 7: Project Results Framework

|  |
| --- |
| **This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPAP or CPD:** Sustainable development plans/policies effectively respond to the need of stakeholders, as well as promote employment and environmental protection. |
| **Country Programme Outcome Indicators:** Legal and policy environment is conducive to sustainable financing, revenue stream are increased and diversified, and institutional capacity increases improving cost effectiveness |
| **Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area (same as that on the cover page, circle one):** 1. Catalyzing Environmental Finance |
| **Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program:** SO: Catalyze Sustainability of Protected Area Systems; SP: Sustainable finance of protected area systems at the national level |
| **Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes:** Biodiversity conserved and sustainably used in protected area systems; Strategic Programme: PA systems secure increased revenue and diversification of revenue streams to meet total expenditures required to meet management objectives; Reduction in financing gap to meet PA management objectives |
| **Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators:** Total revenue and diversification in revenue streams |

| **Project Strategy** | **Objectively Verifiable Indicators** | **Baseline** | **Target** | **Sources of verification** | **Risks and Assumptions** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Objective:** To improve the financial sustainability of Serbia’s protected areas system | Overall score of the Financial Scorecard: | 27.6% | 45% | Financial scorecards. Financial reports (income, expenses, needs and financial gaps). Environmental monitoring data. | Risks: Political conflicts between forest administration and MESP slows down project efforts.  Assumptions: The political will to implement the new Law on Nature Protection is strong and the government seeks support for this. The strong interest in the project indicated by the stakeholders allows strong communication and collaboration leading to building project success. Collaboration with INP, Environment Fund, key government players and key PA managers successfully ties all stakeholders to project objectives. |
| Population trends of *Picea omorika, Pinus heldreichii* H.Christ, Griffon Vulture and Great Bustard at key PAs | Decreasing | Stable |
| Coverage of Serbian Protected Areas with ensured financial sustainability | 0 ha | 550,000 ha |
| **Component 1.** Enabling legal and policy environment for improved PA financial sustainability | Number of PA finance by-laws and regulations completed | 0 | 7 | Government publications | Risks: Lack of coordination and partnerships among different types of PA Managers reduced opportunities for system based approach.  Assumptions: Strong interest in improving the financial sustainability of PA management at all levels including Public Enterprises and Ministries. |
| PAFP integrated into PA policy and regulations | No | Yes (in 2012) | PAFP, Reports on financial gaps reductions, PAFP implementation reports.  Financial and auditing reports |
| Cost-effectiveness reporting incorporated into annual State of the Environnement Report | No | Yes (in 2012) | State of the Environment Report |
| **Component 2.** Increasing revenue-streams for the PA system | Increased revenues at PA’s from nature based tourism and NTFPs | 0 PAs | 4 PAs | Annual PA reports, financial reporting | Risks: Nature based tourism is an inappropriate revenue generation source  Assumptions: Rapid initial success with nature based tourism will lead to increased interest in project’s activities. Strong interest by the Environment Fund to increase funding PAs. |
| Number of grants acquired by PAs | <5 per year | >10 per year |
| Amount of funding provided to PAs from the Environment Fund | $320,000 US | > $1 million US | Annual reports of Environment Fund |
| **Component 3.** Institutional and individual capacity of PA institutions to raise PA management cost-effectiveness | # of PA’s in Serbia with business plans and cost-effectiveness strategies | 1 | 21 | Business Plans | Risks: Lack of cooperation or mandate for INP to participate in capacity building for financing and cost effectiveness.  Assumptions: Openness and willingness to participate in business planning process by the wide range of PA Managers, the INP and the Environment Fund. Willingness of the INP or the Environment Fund to house the Help Desk. Capacity and interest of MESP and Institute to manage financial information in addition to scientific information for annual reporting. |
| # of PA, INP, Environment Fund, and MESP staff trained in effective financial management of PAs | 0 | 30 | Training reports |
| # of INP staff trained for supporting PAs through the Help Desk | 0 | 10 |
| Existence of a country –wide PA results based financial reporting system with reports sent to MESP and INP. Traceable expenses, costs, needs and gaps by program and PA | No | Yes (in 2012) | Financial reports, Environment Fund grant reports, State of the Environment Report. |
| METTs for 21 PAs | Baseline:   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Karadjordjevo | 18% | | Pcinja | 26% | | Ludas | 34% | | NP Fruska Gora | 43% | | Veliko ratno ostrvo | 54% | | NP Sara | 58% | | Slano Kopovo | 64% | | Ovcarsko-kablarska klisura | 64% | | NP Djerdap | 65% | | Golija | 65% | | Mokra Gora | 66% | | Sicevo | 67% | | NP Kopaonik | 67% | | Carska bara | 68% | | Delblatska pescara | 68% | | NP Tara | 69% | | Tresnjica | 69% | | Resavska pecina | 70% | | Gornje Podunavlje | 71% | | Jegricka | 75% | | Zasavica | 84% | | Target:   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Karadjordjevo | 38% | | Pcinja | 46% | | Ludas | 54% | | NP Fruska Gora | 60% | | Veliko ratno ostrvo | 65% | | NP Sara | 65% | | Slano Kopovo | 75% | | Ovcarsko-kablarska klisura | 75% | | NP Djerdap | 75% | | Golija | 75% | | Mokra Gora | 75% | | Sicevo | 75% | | NP Kopaonik | 75% | | Carska bara | 80% | | Delblatska pescara | 80% | | NP Tara | 85% | | Tresnjica | 85% | | Resavska pecina | 90% | | Gornje Podunavlje | 90% | | Jegricka | 90% | | Zasavica | 95% | | METT scores |

# Annex 8: List of documents to be reviewed by the Evaluators

Following documents can be used as a basis for evaluation of the project:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Document** | **Description** |
| Project document | The Project Document and Revisions |
| Project reports | Project Inception Report |
| Annual Project Report to GEF | Project Implementation Report (PIR) for 2011 |
| Other relevant materials: | Co-financing agreements  Mission Reports of International Consultant  Project reports and deliverables  GEF Tracking Tools (METT and Financial Scorecard)  Minutes of Project Board meetings and project team meetings  Proceedings of the Workshop and the minutes of other workshops/work meetings  Research results |
| GEF and UNDP/GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy | <http://www.thegef.org/gef/node/4184>  [http://api.ning.com/files/q21NtCDxX3Ww5ICf9bKJcn3KgJrTJp4Mgylk51qCvSI\*Q-DmpdUeHXtsQl1mqkFHWHwJ-6nfRRxpWWCci8U3SzsJLfz40vIh/UNDPevaluationguidancedraft\_forEvaluationTeam\_versionMarch172011.pdf](http://api.ning.com/files/q21NtCDxX3Ww5ICf9bKJcn3KgJrTJp4Mgylk51qCvSI*Q-DmpdUeHXtsQl1mqkFHWHwJ-6nfRRxpWWCci8U3SzsJLfz40vIh/UNDPevaluationguidancedraft_forEvaluationTeam_versionMarch172011.pdf) |
| Atlas Risk Management System | UNDP-GEF Risk Management Strategy available at <http://www.beta.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/operations/evaluation/overview.html> |

# Annex 9: Co-financing and Leveraged Resources,

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Co financing (Type/**  **Source)** | **IA own  Financing (mill US$)** | | **Multi-lateral Agencies (Non-GEF)**  **(mill US$)** | | **Bi-laterals**  **Donors (mill US$)** | | **Central Government (mill US$)** | | **Local Government (mill US$)** | | **Private Sector (mill US$)** | | **NGOs (mill US$)** | | **Other Sources\***  **(mill US$)** | | **Total Financing (mill US$)** | | **Total**  **Disbursement (mill US$)** | |
|  | **Proposed** | **Actual** | **Proposed** | **Actual** | **Proposed** | **Actual** | **Proposed** | **Actual** | **Proposed** | **Actual** | **Proposed** | **Actual** | **Proposed** | **Actual** | **Proposed** | **Actual** | **Proposed** | **Actual** | **Proposed** | **Actual** |
| Grant |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Credits |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Loans |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| In-kind |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Non-grant Instruments**\*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Types**\*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **TOTAL** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

* “Proposed” co-financing refers to co-financing proposed at CEO endorsement.
* Please describe “Non-grant Instruments” (such as guarantees, contingent grants, etc): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* Please explain “Other Types of Co-financing”: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* Please explain “Other Sources of Co-financing”: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* Projects that have not realized expected co-financing levels must provide explanations. Please describe in 50 words the resources the project has leveraged since inception and indicate how these resources are contributing to the project’s global environmental objective.

# Annex 10: Rate tables

Table 1 Status of objective / outcome delivery as per measurable indicators

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **OBJECTIVE** | **MEASURABLE INDICATORS FROM PROJECT LOGFRAME** | **END-OF-PROJECT TARGET** | **STATUS OF DELIVERY\*** | **RATING\*\*** |
| **Objective** : |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **OUTCOMES** |  | **END-OF-PROJECT TARGET** | **STATUS OF DELIVERY** | **RATING** |
| **Outcome 1:** |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 2:** |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 3:** |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 4:** |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 5:** |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

###### *\* Status of delivery colouring codes:*

Green / completed – indicator shows successful achievement

Yellow – indicator shows expected completion by the end of the project

Red – Indicator show poor achievement - unlikely to be complete by end of Project

Table 2: Project rating

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **PROJECT COMPONENT OR OBJECTIVE** | **Rating scale** | | | | | | **RATING** |
|  | **HU** | **U** | **MU** | **MS** | **S** | **HS** |  |
| **Project Formulation** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Conceptualization/Design** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Stakeholder participation** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Project Implementation** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Implementation Approach** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The use of the logical framework |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Adaptive management |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Use/establishment of information technologies |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Operational relationships between the institutions involved |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Technical capacities |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Monitoring and evaluation** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Stakeholder participation** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Production and dissemination of information |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Local resource users and NGOs participation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Establishment of partnerships |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Involvement and support of governmental institutions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Project Results** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Attainment of Outcomes/ Achievement of objectives** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Achievement of objective |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Outcome 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Outcome 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Outcome 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Outcome 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Outcome 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Outcome 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Outcome 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **OVERALL PROJECT ACHIEVEMENT & IMPACT** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1. See http://www.uneval.org/ [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. See p.67 of UNDP’s “Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluation for Results”, available at <http://www.undp.org/evaluation/methodologies.htm> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. See Annex C of “Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation: approaches to sustainability”, available at <http://portals.wi.wur.nl/files/docs/ppme/UNDP_PME_capacity_21.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. See section 3.2 of the GEF’s “Monitoring and Evaluation Policies and Procedures”, available at <http://www.thegef.org/gef/node/4184> [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. RBM Support documents are available at <http://www.undp.org/eo/methodologies.htm> [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. 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> [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. See http://www.uneval.org/ [↑](#footnote-ref-7)