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**GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY**

**UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME**

**Terms of Reference**

**for TERMINAL Evaluation:**

**Project Title**: Strengthening policy and regulatory framework for mainstreaming biodiversity into fishery sector

**Functional Title:** International Consultant for Terminal Evaluation

**Duration:** Estimated 15 working days during the period of: November 2012

**Terms of Payment:** Lump sum payable upon satisfactory completion and approval by UNDP of all deliverables, including the Evaluation Report

**Duty station:** Travel to Kyrgyzstan and home based

Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the **Strengthening policy and regulatory framework for mainstreaming biodiversity into fishery sector (PIMS No 3217)**

The essentials of the project to be evaluated are as follows:

Project Summary Table

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Project Title:  | Strengthening policy and regulatory framework for mainstreaming biodiversity into fishery sector |
| GEF Project ID:UNDP GEF Project ID (PIMS): | 31923217 |   | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | *at completion (Million US$)* |
| Atlas award ID:Atlas project ID:  | 0004844800058610 | GEF financing:  | USD 950,000 |       |
| Country: | Kyrgyzstan  | IA/EA own: | UNDP USD 430,000 |       |
| Region: | Central Asia | Government: | Government of Kyrgyzstan USD 1,000, 000 |       |
| Focal Area: | BD | Other: | NGOs USD 1,690,000 |       |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): |  | Total co-financing: | USD 2,690,000 |       |
| Executing Agency: | UNDP | Total Project Cost: | USD 4,070,000 |       |
| Other Partners involved: |  | ProDoc Signature (date project began):  | 26/02/2008 |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | Proposed:26/02/2012  | Actual:31/12/2012 |

Objective and Scope

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects, in the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation policy: http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/ME\_Policy\_2010.pdf

and guidelines for conducting evaluations: www.thegef.org/gef/node/1905; as well as the UNDP Monitoring and Evaluation Policy: http://web.undp.org/evaluation/policy.htm

The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

Terminal Evaluations (TE) are intended to provide an objective and independent assessment of project implementation and impact, including achievement of global environmental benefits and lessons learned to guide future Biodiversity Conservation efforts. Specifically, the TE will assess the extent to which the planned project outcomes and outputs have been achieved, as well as assess the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of the project as defined in the guidelines for Terminal Evaluations.

The evaluation will also evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of project design, implementation, monitoring and adaptive management and sustainability of project outcomes, including the project exit strategy. The evaluation covers the entire project including non-GEF financed components. The particular objectives are:

1. To assess overall performance against the project objective and outcomes as set out in the Project Document, project’s Strategic Results Framework (SRF) and GEF Increment, and other related documents[[1]](#footnote-1);
2. To assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the project;
3. To analyze critically the implementation and management arrangements of the project;
4. To assess the progress to date towards achievement of the outcomes;
5. To recommend the project in improving/updating its Outcomes’ indicators;
6. To review planned strategies and plans for achieving the overall objective of the project within the timeframe;
7. To assess the sustainability of the project’s interventions;
8. To list and document initial lessons concerning project design, implementation and management[[2]](#footnote-2);
9. To assess project relevance to national priorities (including achieving gender equality goals);

The main stakeholders of the evaluation are: UNDP Country Offices in Kyrgyzstan, governments of the Kyrgyzstan, and the UNDP/GEF Regional Center for Europe and CIS (Bratislava).

The overall purpose of the evaluation is to evaluate the project’s impact and relevance in regard to the objectives of the GEF Biodiversity focal area, and to learn lessons regarding the design and implementation of future similar projects.

Project background

The GEF/UNDP **Strengthening policy and regulatory framework for mainstreaming biodiversity into fishery sector** project was approved by GEF in 2008. The project is a 4 year being implemented in Kyrgyzstan. The inception workshop was organized in November 2008. The project officially commenced in May 2008 and will terminate in December 2012.

The project is financed by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) through its operational program for Biodiversity Protection, and implemented by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). The project is directly executed (DEX) by UNDP CO in Kyrgyzstan. In GEF terminology it is a “medium-size” project i.e. it has a contribution from GEF less than USD 1 million. The total project is valued at USD **4,070,000** of which GEF financing is USD 950,000 with following cash and in-kind contributions:

**UNDP USD** 430,000 (cash)

**Government USD** 1,000,000 (in-kind)

**NGOs USD** 1,690,000 (in-kind)

Kyrgyzstan has over 900 mountain lakes and in most of them the native fish species are seriously threatened by alien species and over fishing. The primary root causes to the predicted loss of endemic species and the associated threat of extinction are: (i) a massive increase in unregulated fishing over recent years; (ii) a virtual cessation of the artificial restocking of the lake with juveniles of the 4 commercially endemic species; and (iii) the introduction of alien predatory species that are currently not subject to any control or eradication activities. The Government of Kyrgyzstan is trying to provide a long-term prospect in promoting the sustainable development of national resources, and fisheries development in particular. However, a number of barriers constrain the attention that can be paid to integrating the requirements for endemic fish conservation into the fishery management regime. The project strategy is to address the overall concerns relating to fisheries management in Kyrgyzstan by demonstrating a new fishery management regime within Lake Issyk Kul as it relates to: (i) the conservation of globally significant biodiversity (endemic fish species); and (ii) within the context of socio-economic concerns, especially poverty and livelihoods. One of the key elements of the project is the Biodiversity Friendly Fisheries Management Regime (BDFMR) which will be a package of national laws, by-laws and regulations developed and enforced with the objective of stabilizing the endemic fish species in the lake within the framework of a viable, sustainable and enforceable commercial fishery. Stabilization will be achieved through limiting current fishing, controlling the size of introduced species, as well as restocking native species. The project will create the mechanism to ensure that the lessons learned in this project will be captured and replicated initially to other large lakes in Kyrgyzstan with high economic values for fisheries

The project is designed to produce two **outcomes**:

**Outcome 1. Strengthened systemic and institutional capacity for biodiversity friendly fisheries Management Regime.**

1.1. A biodiversity friendly fishery management regime developed and tested at Lake Issyk Kul

One of the key elements of the project is the Biodiversity Friendly Fisheries Management Regime (BDFMR) which will be a package of national laws, by-laws and regulations developed and enforced with the objective of stabilizing the endemic fish species in the lake within the framework of a viable, sustainable and enforceable commercial fishery. Stabilization will be achieved through limiting current fishing, controlling the size of introduced species, as well as restocking native species. The BDFRM will be elaborated by Fisheries Advisory Group (FAG) - a working group of national and international experts, as well as lawyers, legislators, fish breeders and representatives of the fishing communities. The elaboration will be highly participatory and once the new fishery management regime for Lake Issyk Kul is cleared by the key stakeholders (governmental, private, local communities) it will be presented to the Kyrgyz Parliament for adoption. The BDFMR will provide for an adaptive management framework based on ecosystem approach to remove the pressures on the endemic fish species. This will consider:

* 1. establishing new set-aside areas to protect spawning grounds of the endemic fish species
	2. developing the fishing licensing scheme
	3. regulating fishing practices across the lake:
	4. institutional assignment, training and enforcement mechanisms:

1.2. The capacity to deliver and implement the biodiversity – friendly fishery management regime is strengthened

1.3. Financial mechanism for the implementation of the biodiversity friendly fishery management regime is in place

1.4. Awareness and support of biodiversity-friendly fishery management

* + 1. Effective development and disbursement of knowledge products and educational materials through an NGO partner;
		2. Appropriate education and awareness materials for targeting schools, communities, government agencies and civil service groups, high-level policy and decision-making personnel in the public and private sector;
		3. Formal distribution agreements with appropriate media (newspapers, radio, television, e-networks).

**Outcome 2. Sustainable fisheries demonstrated which contribute to the conservation of endemic fish species and to improve livelihoods**

2.1. Alternative supplies to meet market demands and propagation for re-stocking of lakes with endemics

2.2. A strategy to active control and reduction/eradication of introduced alien species for Issyk Kul is developed.

2.3. Alternative Livelihood program which supports the transition of individuals and businesses away from activities that threaten endemics toward activities in support of sustainable fisheries management

2.4. Direct assistance to support conservation of the endemic fish species of Issyk Kul

2.5. An Information and Knowledge Product Management System

Evaluation approach and method

An overall approach and method[[3]](#footnote-3) for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has been developed over the time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact,** as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR (*see* [*Annex C*](#_TOR_Annex_C:)). The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence‐based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Kyrgyzstan. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

* UNDP Country Office;
* Project Team;
* GEF OFP, BD FP;
* State agency for Environmental Protection and Forestry under the Government of the Kyrgyz Republic (SAEPF);
* Department of Fisheries under the Ministry of Agriculture of the Kyrgyz Republic (DoF);
* Issyk-Kul Biosphere Reserve Administration
* Local Beneficiaries
* FAO Project on Support to Fishery and Aquaculture Management in the Kyrgyz Republic (FAO Project)

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in [Annex B](#_TOR_Annex_B:) of 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 tool (BD2 TT for final stage). The tracking tool should be consistent with general information included in baseline and mid-term TTs. It will be completed/endorsed by the relevant implementing agency or qualified national research /scientific institution, and not by the international consultant or UNDP staff. The tracking tool will be submitted to the international evaluation consultant, who 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 Terminal evaluation report.

Evaluation Criteria & Ratings

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see [Annex A](#_TOR_Annex_A:)), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact.** Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in  [Annex D](#_TOR_Annex_D:).

|  |
| --- |
| **Evaluation Ratings:** |
| **1. Monitoring and Evaluation** | ***rating*** | **2. IA& EA Execution** | ***rating*** |
| M&E design at entry |       | Quality of UNDP Implementation |       |
| M&E Plan Implementation |       | Quality of Execution - Executing Agency  |       |
| Overall quality of M&E |       | Overall quality of Implementation / Execution |       |
| **3. Assessment of Outcomes**  | **rating** | **4. Sustainability** | **rating** |
| Relevance  |       | Financial resources: |       |
| Effectiveness |       | Socio-political: |       |
| Efficiency  |       | Institutional framework and governance: |       |
| Overall Project Outcome Rating |       | Environmental : |       |
|  |  | Overall likelihood of sustainability: |       |

Project finance / cofinance

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Co-financing(type/source) | GEF Grant financing (mill. US$) | Government & NGOs(mill. US$) | Implementing Agency (UNDP)(mill. US$) | Total(mill. US$) |
| Planned | Actual  | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Actual | Actual |
| Grants  | 0,95 | 0,95 |  |  | 0.43 | 0.43 | 1,38 | 1,38 |
| Loans/Concessions  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * In-kind support
 |  |  | 1,0 | 1,0 |  |  | 1,0 | 1,0 |
| * Other
 |  |  | 1,69 | 1,69 |  |  | 1,69 | 1,69 |
| Totals | 0,95 | 0,95 | 2,69 | 2,69 | 0,43 | 0,43 | 4,07 | 4,07 |

Mainstreaming

UNDP supported GEF financed projects are key components in UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programmes. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender.

Impact

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.[[4]](#footnote-4)

Conclusions, recommendations & lessons

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions**, **recommendations** and **lessons**.

Implementation arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Kyrgyzstan.The UNDP CO will contract the evaluator and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

Evaluation timeframe

The total duration of the evaluation will be 15 days according to the following plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Timing | Completion Date |
| **Preparation (desk review)**  | *3* days (7-9 November 2012) |  *November 10 , 2012* |
| **Evaluation Mission (in-country field visits, interviews)**  | *7* days (10-16 November 2012) | *November 17 , 2012* |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | *3* days (17-19 November 2012) | *November 20 , 2012* |
| **Final Report** | *3* days (20-22 November 2012) | *November 23 , 2012* |

Evaluation deliverables

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Deliverable | Content  | Timing | Responsibilities |
| **Inception Report** | Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method  | No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission.  | Evaluator submits to UNDP CO and PMU |
| **Presentation** | Initial Findings  | End of in-country evaluation mission | To project management, UNDP CO and key stakeholders |
| **Draft Final Report**  | Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes | Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission | Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PMU, GEF OFPs |
| **Final Report\*** | Revised report  | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP and key stakeholders’ comments on the draft  | Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC.  |

\*When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluator is required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report.

Team Composition

The evaluation team will be composed of *1 international and 1 national evaluator.* The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The international Consultant will be a team leader and bear responsibility over submission of final report. The selected evaluators should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The Team members must present the following qualifications:

**International evaluator**

* Master degree or equivalent in social or natural sciences;
* Minimum *10* years of professional experience in the fields of Biodiversity conservation or protected area management;
* Knowledge of UNDP and GEF projects and implementation procedures;
* Previous experience with results‐based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
* Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s);
* Previous working experience in the environmental field in the Central Asian region will be an asset;
* Excellent English communication skills, knowledge of Russian would be an asset.

**National consultant**

* Master degree or equivalent in social or natural sciences;
* Minimum *5* years of professional experience in the fields of Biodiversity conservation or natural resources’ management;
* Basic knowledge of UNDP and GEF projects and implementation procedures;
* Previous experience with results‐based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
* Excellent English and Russian communication skills.

Evaluator Ethics

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex E) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the [UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'](http://www.unevaluation.org/ethicalguidelines)

Payment modalities and specifications

(*this payment schedule is indicative, to be filled in by the CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on their standard procurement procedures)*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| % | Milestone |
| *100%* | Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report  |

Application process

Applicants are requested to apply online at <http://jobs.undp.org> by October 12, 2012. Individual consultants are invited to submit letter of interest, current and complete P11 form in English and duly filled / signed Financial proposal (the templates can be downloaded from the next web link: <http://www.undp.kg>). A financial proposal should indicate the total cost of the assignment (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs).

UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

EVALUATION process

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The selection of candidates will be done in 2 stages:**1st stage: Desk review assessment** is carried out in accordance with the requirements set forth below. Technical proposal (letter of interest) and CV of the candidates will be evaluated by following evaluation criteria:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| # | Criteria | Score |
| 1 | Master degree or equivalent in social or natural sciences; | 20 |
| 2 | Minimum 10 years of professional experience in the fields of Biodiversity conservation or protected area management; | 25 |
| 3 | Knowledge of UNDP and GEF projects and implementation procedures; | 20 |
| 4 | Previous experience with results based monitoring and evaluation methodologies; | 15 |
| 5 | Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s); | 10 |
| 6 | Previous working experience in the environmental field in the Central Asian region | 10 |

Applicants scored 70% out of 100% possible will participate in the next stage of evaluation.**2nd stage: - assessment of the "Financial proposals".** This specification provides for the piece-rate basis as a condition for payment, where the total budget will be paid in tranches based on the provision of relevant products, shown in the table "Expected results". All financial proposals shall include all expenses related to fulfillment of the TOR (fee and all other related costs). Contract award shall be recommended to the applicant achieving the highest cumulative score based on the below formula:**B= (Clow/C \* 0.3)+ (T/Thigh)\*0.7**Where:C = Evaluated bid priceClowest= The lowest of all proposalsT = The total score(for all previous stages) awarded to the evaluated candidateThighest = The highest Technical Score**Applicant obtained the highest score will be recommended for contracting by the tender evaluation committee.** |

Annex A: Project Logical Framework

**Strengthening policy and regulatory framework for mainstreaming biodiversity into fishery sector Project**

| **PROJECT STRATEGY** | **OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS** |
| --- | --- |
| **Goal** | The goal of the project is to conserve the globally significant biodiversity of Kyrgyz lakes |
|  | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Target** | **Sources of verification** | **Risks and Assumptions** |
| **Objective of the project :**To strengthen the policy and regulatory framework to integrate requirements for endemic fish conservation into the fishery management regime | Productivity / population size of endemic fish species(*Leuciscus schmid,i Leuciscus bergi, Schizothorax issyk-kuli, Diptychus dybovskii)* showing continuing trend of significant increase by end of project. | Low numbers of 4 endemics -unable to quantify | At Issyk Kul:Nake Osman 40 tons per year per lake,Chebak 150 tons per year per lake,Marinka 40 tonos per year per lake. | Monitoring records and data analyses of fish populations and species distributions.  | No other factors impacting sustainability of endemics (i.e. water quality, disease, etc). Monitoring is accurate. |
| Ratio of endemic to non-endemic species: significantly reduced number of alien species by end of project, particularly those in direct competition or predating on endemics.  | Over 60 percent non-endemic species in the lake | 60/40 endemic to non-endemic population size ration by project end,90/10 ration 5 years after project completion | Catch statistics. Reports from Biological Station | Alien species are removable or controllable. Alien species may now be an important component of an altered ecosystem. |
| Newly established set aside area (fishing moratorium) | 0 ha | 56,000 ha | Lake Issyk Kul management plan  | The decision for setting area aside might face opposition from fishermen, especially involved in poaching. The strategy of wider stakeholder consultations will be applied to mitigate the risk. |
| Reduced fishing effort directly attributable to changes in livelihoods within fishers | 1,500 persons fishing in lake. | 1000 (reduced by 1/3) | Fisheries Management statistics. Reports to SteerCom | Fishers willing to stop fishing. May be difficult to evaluate. |
| **Outcome 1**Strengthened systemic and institutional capacity for biodiversity friendly fisheries management regime  | Effectiveness of policies and mechanisms for biodiversity friendly fishing | Absence of fisheries management plans | BDFMR adopted by the Gov. and providing for sustainable management targeting endemics  | A formally endorsed and gov’t-adopted BDFMR document.  | Political will to adopt BDFMR in a form that does not compromise its effectiveness Other agencies willing to relinquish responsibility (and associated budgeting) |
| Effectiveness of a management bodies (esp. Fisheries Advisory Committee) to deliver the biodiversity friendly regime in the long-term perspective. | Institutional fragmentation | FAC established and implementing effective policy | Minutes of FAC meetings. Project represented on FAC | Appropriate members selected. Assumes need for separate Committee. Role might be filled by SteerCom |
| Percent of fisheries under control and monitoring  | 90% fishing illegal. Catches uncontrolled and unmonitored | 90% of fishing legally licensed. Illegal fishing routinely prosecuted.  | Database of licences. Records of prosecutions. Reports from Fisheries Officers. Independent assessment.  | Government prepared to act to eradicate corruption in ranks. Transparent enforcement procedures adopted and applied. Support from legislative arm and Courts |
| Percent endemic lake fish species harvested | Endemics targeted as preferred catches | Reduced % of endemics in catches. Reduced overall fisheries catch from lake. | Catch statistics published by Management Body. Fisheries database established and accessible. Survey of markets. | Possible to target non-endemics without endemic by-catch. Can change market demand or provide alternate supply of popular endemic food fish (through pond culture) |
| **Outcome 2**Sustainable fisheries demonstrated which contribute to the conservation of endemic fish species and to improve livelihoods | The degree of the effectiveness of the breeding and restocking programs in sustain the viable endemic fish population | Limited restocking | Re-stocking rates: Marinka *Schizothorax issyk-kuli –* 500,000 per yearNaked Osman *Diptychus dybovskii* – 240,000 per year | Project records. Reports from Biological Stations. Records of breeding plants | Possible to successful breed and release all spp. of endemics. Knowledge of number of individuals required.  |
| Average license period for fishing rights for a particular plot, assigned to one user/fishermen | Non-existing  | At least 10 years | BDFMR document | Local fishermen may oppose establishment of long tenure. There is a need for a transparent bidding process behind the distribution of long-term fishing rights, and the process should incorporate assessment of the fishing experience and qualifications. These are the risk mitigation measures the project will incorporate |
| Volumes of commercial fish supply produced from artificial ponds (higher volumes will contribute to reduction in required fishing effort). | Little to no pond culture | 10 ponds producing commercial spp. for market (>500 mt)  | Project records. Site visits by Evaluators. Pond operator’s records.  | Suitable ponds available. Pond cultured fish are acceptable to market. Cost-effective alternative to wild- caught fish |
| The trend of changes in the levels of introduced alien fish species showing significant results.  | No control or attempts to reduce alien species | Active control. Alien species number and sizes reduced | Field monitoring. Reports from Biological Station. Catch records. | Accurate information available on existing numbers and life-cycle/habitats. Control is feasible. |
| The trend of employment of local people in livelihood fishing (a dropping trend will signify a relaxation of the catch loads) | Heavy concentration on fishing for livelihood. Ltd opportunities for other employment | Increase in other forms of employment. Decrease in fishing effort.  | Fishing licences. Independent survey. Local record of businesses and employment. | Other livelihoods are available and attractive alternative. Fishers willing to work in other trades |

Annex B: List of Documents to be reviewed by the evaluators

**General documentation**

* UNDP Programme and Operations Policies and Procedures (POPP);
* UNDP Handbook for Monitoring and Evaluating for Results;
* GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy;
* GEF Guidelines for conducting Terminal Evaluations

**Project documentation**

* Project document;
* Annual Work Plans;
* Annual Project Reports;
* Project Implementation Review;
* GEF Operational Quarterly Reports;
* MTE report;
* Management response to MTE;
* Revised Project Log frames;
* Project Board Meeting minutes.
* Final stage BD2 tracking tool

Annex C: Evaluation Questions

*This is a generic list, to be further detailedwith more specific questions by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on the particulars of the project.*

| **Evaluative Criteria Questions** | **Indicators** | **Sources** | **Methodology** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards? |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?**  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Annex D: Rating Scales

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution*** | ***Sustainability ratings:***  | ***Relevance ratings*** |
| 6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings 5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS)3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems | 4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability | 2. Relevant (R) |
| 3. Moderately Likely (ML):moderate risks | 1.. Not relevant (NR) |
| 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks1. Unlikely (U): severe risks | ***Impact Ratings:***3. Significant (S)2. Minimal (M)1. Negligible (N) |
| *Additional ratings where relevant:*Not Applicable (N/A) Unable to Assess (U/A |

Annex E: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form

**Evaluators:**

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people’s right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people’s right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders’ dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form[[5]](#footnote-5)**

**Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System**

**Name of Consultant:** \_\_     \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Name of Consultancy Organization** (where relevant)**:** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.**

Signed at *place*on *date*

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Annex F: Evaluation Report Outline[[6]](#footnote-6)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **i.** | Opening page:* Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
* UNDP and GEF project ID#s.
* Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report
* Region and countries included in the project
* GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program
* Implementing Partner and other project partners
* Evaluation team members
* Acknowledgements
 |
| **ii.** | Executive Summary* Project Summary Table
* Project Description (brief)
* Evaluation Rating Table
* Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons
 |
| **iii.** | Acronyms and Abbreviations(See: UNDP Editorial Manual[[7]](#footnote-7)) |
| **1.** | Introduction* Purpose of the evaluation
* Scope & Methodology
* Structure of the evaluation report
 |
| **2.** | Project description and development context* Project start and duration
* Problems that the project sought to address
* Immediate and development objectives of the project
* Baseline Indicators established
* Main stakeholders
* Expected Results
 |
| **3.** | Findings (In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) must be rated[[8]](#footnote-8))  |
| **3.1** | Project Design / Formulation* Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)
* Assumptions and Risks
* Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design
* Planned stakeholder participation
* Replication approach
* UNDP comparative advantage
* Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
* Management arrangements
 |
| **3.2** | Project Implementation* Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
* Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)
* Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management
* Project Finance:
* Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (\*)
* UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (\*) coordination, and operational issues
 |
| **3.3** | Project Results* Overall results (attainment of objectives) (\*)
* Relevance(\*)
* Effectiveness & Efficiency (\*)
* Country ownership
* Mainstreaming
* Sustainability (\*)
* Impact
 |
| **4.**  | Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons* Corrective actions for the design, 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
* Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success
 |
| **5.**  | Annexes* ToR
* Itinerary
* List of persons interviewed
* Summary of field visits
* List of documents reviewed
* Evaluation Question Matrix
* Questionnaire used and summary of results
* Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form
* Co-financing table
* Final stage Tracking tool (BD2 TT)
 |

Annex G: Evaluation Report Clearance Form

*(to be completed by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and included in the final document)*

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

UNDP GEF RTA

Name: Mr. Maxim Vergeichik

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. Such as UNDP KGZ Country Gender Mainstreaming Strategy [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Including achieving gender equality goals, setting gender-sensitive indicators and ensuring gender balance among the project’s beneficiaries and target groups [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](http://www.undp.org/evaluation/handbook), Chapter 7, pg. 163 and Guidelines for conducting Terminal Evaluations (http://www.thegef.org/gef/node/1905). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office:  [ROTI Handbook 2009](http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/M2_ROtI%20Handbook.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Moderately Satisfactory, 3: Moderately Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see Guidelines for conducting Terminal evaluations: http://www.thegef.org/gef/node/1905. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)