**TERMS OF REFERENCE**

**Mid Term Evaluation**

**Expanding and Diversifying the National System of Terrestrial Protected Areas in the Philippines Project (now known as New Conservation Areas in the Philippines Project – NewCAPP)**

**BACKGROUND**

The importance of the Philippines in the world terrestrial biodiversity map rests in it being one of the seventeen megadiverse countries which host 70-80% of the world’s life forms. Because of its size, the country is regarded to harbor more diversity of life than any other country on earth on a per hectare basis. Yet, it is one of the only two countries in the world – Madagascar being the other, which are both a megadiverse country and a biodiversity hotspot. The country has more than 52,177 described species, of which more than half are found nowhere else on earth. Of these, 491 threatened species already are listed in the 2004 IUCN Red List. Of more than 1,130 terrestrial wildlife species recorded for the Philippines, almost half (49%) are endemic; 157 are threatened, and 128 are threatened endemic species. The country is ranked as 5th in the world in terms of the number of plant species.

The archipelago is also now **r**ecognized as one of the most important centers of amphibian and reptile diversity in Southeast Asia. An estimated total of 359 species of amphibians (101 species) and reptiles (258 species) are now known in the country. Of the 359 species, 246 (68%) are endemic – currently the highest known percentage endemism among vertebrates. The Philippines is home to 576 species of birds, of which 395 species are resident breeders. Of the resident breeders, 195 species are endemic, while 126 are restricted range species (range size estimated to be < 50,000 sq. km.). This record makes the Philippines the 4th country in the world terms of bird endemism. About 45 species are either extinct in the wild, critical, or endangered. Forty of the 45 are endemic birds, making the Philippines the number one country in the world in terms of threatened endemic species of bird.

The archipelago is also home to one of the greatest concentration of terrestrial mammalian diversity in the world and the greatest concentration of endemic mammals in the world on a per unit basis. The most recent inventory of land living mammals includes 174 indigenous species, 111 of which are endemic, or about 64%. Despite this, the mammal assemblage in the Philippines is the 8th most threatened in the world, with 50 threatened species. The diversity and endemism is believed to be much more than what is reported due to lack of information and knowledge on many of the country’s KBAs. The country has one of the highest discoveries in the world, with 36 new species discovered in the last 10 years.

As a middle income country, the Philippines faces major threats to the biodiversity of its terrestrial areas. These include: habitat degradation and land conversion due to logging and increasing population; inappropriate land use planning; overharvesting of resources; mining threats and infrastructure development. The country’s National Integrated Protected Areas System (NIPAS) has been the main government response to place important biodiversity areas under effective management. To date, a total of 240 protected areas covering 5.4 million hectares have been established, but this represents only 35% of the identified key biodiversity areas (KBAs). In order to protect the remaining biodiversity resources and ensure their sustainable use, there is a need to address key capacity constraints. These are: (i) biogeographical representativeness; (ii) limited capacity for PA management; and (iii) limited financial sustainability.

The expansion of the national PA system to recognize new conservation areas such as those managed by indigenous peoples (IPs), local communities and local government units (LGUs) is seen as an opportunity to accelerate the coverage of the existing system, before continued degradation set in the important KBAs. In partnership with key organizations, local communities and other stakeholders, the Project will directly address key barriers and establish solid foundations for accelerated expansion of the terrestrial system in the Philippines, supported by strong management capacities, and sustainable financing. It is envisaged that such expansion can be achieved through recognition and/or establishment of new governance mechanisms for establishment of new conservation areas such as indigenous community conserved areas (ICCAs), and LGU managed local conservation areas (LCAs); and make these part or complementary to the national PA system. The expanded PA system will have comprehensive ecological coverage and strengthened links to local and indigenous communities and their domains, surrounding landscape, through the integration of new conservation areas.

The major outcomes envisaged by the Project are: (i) PA system of Philippines has been expanded under new and diverse management regimes (ancestral domain, local government and community managed areas) to cover an additional 400,000 ha. of Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs) and with enhanced potential for further expansion; (ii) improved conservation effectiveness through enhanced systemic, institutional and individual capacities; and (iii) enhanced financial sustainability of the terrestrial PA system. A copy of the Project Document and GEF CEO Endorsement is available at the PAWB and in GEF website.

The Project shall be implemented over a period of five years starting September 2010, covering ten Key Biodiversity Areas as pilot sites. It is managed by the Protected Areas and Wildlife Bureau (PAWB) which has established a Project Management Unit (PMU) to implement certain outputs and coordinate the work of partners in pilot sites. The Project will be half way into its implementation by March 2013, and a mid-term evaluation on or around this date is envisaged.

These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for the Mid Term Evaluation (MTE) of the NewCAPP.

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

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 1. Project Summary Table** | | | | |
| **Project Title : Expanding and Diversifying the National System of Terrestrial Protected Areas in the Philippines Project (otherwise known as New Conservation Areas in the Philippines Project – NewCAPP)** | | | | |
| **GEF Project ID**  **(PIMS #)** | 3530 |  | **At Endorsement (US $ M)** | **By end December 2012[[1]](#footnote-1)**  **(US $ M)** |
| **UNDP Project ID:** | 00071662 | **GEF Financing:** | 3.500 | ??? |
| **Country:** | Philippines | **UNDP** | 1.044 | ??? |
| **Region:** | Asia | **Government:** | 2.741 | ??? |
| **Focal Area:** | Biodiversity  Strategic Objective 1 | **Other (NGOs, LGUs, communities)** | 3.752 | ??? |
| **Operational Program:** | GEF-4  Strategic Program: BD-SP3 | **Total Co-financing:** | 7.537 | ??? |
| **Executing Agency:** | UNDP | **Total Project Cost:** | 11.037 |  |
| **Other Partners Involved:** | NGOs, local government units, IP and local communities | **ProDoc Signature: March 2010**  **Date Project began: August 2010 (Inception Workshop)** | |  |
| **(Operational) Closing Date:** | **September 2014** | **Proposed: September 2015** |

**OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE**

The objectives of this Mid Term Evaluation are:

* To assess implementation progress and evaluate results and any early indication of impact;
* To strengthen the adaptive management and monitoring functions of the project, to provide a basis for decision making on necessary amendments and improvements;
* To ensure accountability of resource use; and
* To document, provide feedback on, and disseminate lessons learned, so as to enhance organizational and development learning around the project.

Key evaluation questions include:

* To what extent have expected results and outcomes been achieved?
* Is there a need or opportunity to refocus any of the planned activities to make the UNDP GEF investment more effective?
* How efficient has been the use of resources to produce outputs and results?
* Which areas of work should the UNDP-GEF investment target to deliver sustainable impact beyond the current programme period?
* Are the management and administrative arrangements necessary and adequate to fully deliver the project?
* How embedded is the project in the implementing partner and in the sector?
* In light of recent developments and other donor activity in the sector, how can the project provide a strategic focus considering the remaining resources and implementation period?
* What important lessons can be brought to bear in the design and implementation of similar programs?
* How can project learnings and experiences enhance the underlying assumptions about the role of conservation areas in biodiversity conservation?
* What are the prospects for sustainability? What are the risks and how can these be effectively managed till the remaining period of implementation?

An indicative list of evaluation questions is presented in Annex D. Based on results of initial analysis, the Consultants shall review the list and present the revised questions as focus of the evaluation.

The Mid Term Evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator/s is/are expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF Operational Focal Point, UNDP Country Office, PAWB and PMU, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in Bangkok, Thailand and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Manila, including selected project sites (Annex A). Interviews will be held with the government Implementing Partner (IP) – PAWB of the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR); as well as other agencies (National Commission on Indigenous Peoples); partner NGOs; local government units; local and indigenous peoples’ communities; relevant consultants and other partner organizations. The evaluation will also hold discussions with major donor organizations with on-going and planned activities in the sector, such as GIZ’s Protected Areas Management Enhancement (PAME) Project, and USAID’s Biodiversity and Watersheds Improved for Stronger Economy and Ecosystems Resilience Project (B+WISER).

The evaluator/s will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, 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 of this Terms of Reference.

**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 C), 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 competed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in Annex E.

**Table 2. Rating of Project Performance**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Rating Project Performance** | | |
| **Criteria** | **Comments** |  |
| **Monitoring and Evaluation:** Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S) Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | | |
| Overall quality of M and E | (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| M & E design at start up | (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| M&E Plan Implementation | (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| **IA & EA Execution:** Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S) Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU),  Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | | |
| Overall Quality of Project Implementation/Execution | (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| Implementing Agency Execution | (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| Executing Agency Execution | (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| **Outcomes** Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S) Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory  (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | | |
| Overall Quality of Project Outcomes | (rate 6 point scale) |  |
| Relevance: relevant (R ) or not relevant (NR) | (rate 2 point scale) |  |
| Effectiveness | (rate 6 point scale) |  |
| Efficiency | (rate 6 point scale) |  |
| **Sustainability:** Likely (L); Moderately Likely (ML); Moderately Unlikely (MU); Unlikely (U). | | |
| Overall likelihood of risks to sustainability | (rate: 4 point scale) |  |
| Financial Resources | (rate: 4 point scale) |  |
| Socio-economic | (rate: 4 point scale) |  |
| Institutional Framework and Governance | (rate: 4 point scale) |  |
| Environmental | (rate: 4 point scale) |  |
| **Impact:** Significant (S), Minimal (M), Negligible (N) | | |
| Environmental Status Improvement | (rate 3 point scale) |  |
| Environmental Stress reduction | (rate 3 point scale) |  |
| Progress towards stress/status change | (rate 3 point scale) |  |
| **Overall Project Results** | (rate 6 point scale) |  |

**PROJECT FINANCE / CO-FINANCE ACTUALS**

The Evaluation team 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 PMU to obtain financial data on co-financing table below, which will be included in the mid-term evaluation report.

**Table 3. Status of Co-Financing, NewCAPP, as of Mid-term (March 2013)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Co Financing Type/Source** | **UNDP Own Financing**  **Million US $** | | **Government**  **Million US $** | | **Partners**  **(NGOs, LGUs and Communities)**  **Million US $** | | **Total**  **Million US $** | |
| Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual |
| Grants/Cash | 0.939 |  | 1.233 |  | 1.313 |  | 3.485 |  |
| Loans/Concessions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * In kind support | 0.104 |  | 1.507 |  | 2.438 |  | 4.049 |  |
| * Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals | 1.043 |  | 2.740 |  | 3.751 |  | 7.534 |  |

**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 within 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[[2]](#footnote-2).

**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 the Philippines. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators 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 Evaluator team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

**EVALUATION TIMEFRAME**

The Evaluation is expected to start early April 2013 and have an estimated total input of 35 working days. The final work plan will be agreed jointly by the Evaluation Team and UNDP upon submission of a draft work plan and methodology for discussion.

**Table 4. Timetable for NewCAPP MTE Preparation**

| **Activity** | **Timing** | **Completion Date[[3]](#footnote-3)** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Preparation**   * To include orientation to the assignment, initial document review, and preparation/discussion of the Evaluation Plan | 2 days | April 3, 2013 |
| **Evaluation Mission**   * Detailed document review, interviews with key project personnel and partners, stakeholder consultations, visits to selected sites | 15 days | April 18, 2013 |
| **Draft Evaluation Report**   * Analysis and preparation of draft evaluation report highlighting initial findings * Debriefing * Preparation of Draft Evaluation Report including comments provided during the debriefing meeting | 10 days | April 29, 2013 |
| **Final Report**   * Preparation of Final Evaluation Report, including addressing comments from stakeholders on the first draft | 4 days | May 14, 2013 |
| Travel (for International Consultant) | 4 days |  |

**EVALUATION DELIVERABLES**

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

**Table 5. MTE Deliverables**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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 |
| Presentation | Initial Findings | End of evaluation mission | To project management, UNDP CO |
| Draft Final Report | Full report, (per annexed  template) with annexes | Within 3 weeks of the  evaluation mission | Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs |
| Final Report[[4]](#footnote-4) | Revised report | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft | Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC. |

The Project Team in consultation with UNDP CO will be responsible for logistical arrangements for the field visits including setting up meetings and organizing in country travel. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

The evaluation will commence when formalities are completed ideally by late March 2013. The Evaluation Team will present preliminary findings to the Project Board planned for late June 2013. A draft Mid Term Evaluation Report for comments will be submitted to UNDP within 5 days following the de-briefing. UNDP will coordinate comments from partners and share consolidated written comments with the consultants within 14 days after receiving the draft MTE report. A final MTE report with comments from partners incorporated will be submitted to UNDP no later than July, 2013; for consideration in the preparation of the Annual Project Review/Project Implementation Review by UNDP-GEF.

**TEAM COMPOSITION**

The team will be constituted by two members i.e. National and International consultants to be recruited in parallel.

The International consultant who will also perform the role of a Team Leader will have the following profile/competencies:

• An effective evaluation manager with demonstrated experience in conducting international development evaluations; prior experience in GEF Project evaluations would be an advantage;

* Demonstrated strong knowledge of Monitoring and Evaluation methods for development projects; knowledge of UNDP’s results-based management orientation and practices;

• Familiarity with biodiversity conservation issues in the Philippines,

* Knowledge and experience in diversification of protected area governance regimes, including recognition of ICCAs, and strengthening the role of sub national governments in biodiversity conservation;
* Demonstrated experience with implementation and/or evaluation of capacity-building efforts in developing countries, in the area of biodiversity conservation and sustainable forest management.
* Fluency in the English language and excellent oral and written communication skills.

The team leader should have at least 10 years’ experience in the implementation of protected area management, PA system wide planning and monitoring, capacity building for PA management, and PA financing sustainability.

The 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 Leader will report to the UNDP Country Director through the Programme Manager – Energy and Environment Programme. The environment team at UNDP CO will provide support to the development of the evaluation work plan in consultation with key project partners. The project team (PMU) will serve as the reference group for the evaluation and ensure the monitoring of satisfactory completion of evaluation deliverables.

UNDP will provide office space and access to office services such as, internet and printing. Evaluators should provide their own computer and communications equipment.

In consultation with the Evaluation Team Leader and as requested, the PMU personnel will make available all relevant documentation and provide contact information to key project partners and stakeholders, and facilitate contact where needed. The team will also assist in organizing any briefing de-briefing meetings including coordination of stakeholders’ input in the evaluation draft report.

**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'.

**PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS**

Consultants will be contracted by UNDP and remunerated according to the reviewed and accepted financial proposal. The contract will be output-based and payment issued only upon delivery of satisfactory outputs/milestones.

**Table 6. Payment Schedule**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **%** | **Milestone** |
| 10% | At contract signing |
| 40% | Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report |
| 50% | Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report |

**APPLICATION PROCESS**

Applicants are requested to apply online *(http://www.undp.org.ph.jobs)* by (date). Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions.

The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in English with indication of the e‐mail and phone contact. Shortlisted candidates will be requested to submit a price offer indicating 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.

**TOR Annex A**

**LIST OF PROJECT SITES**

| **Biogeographic Zone** | **KBA**  **Name** | **Estimated Area of the KBA**  **(hectares)** | **Location** | **NewCAPP Pilot Sites** | | **Estimated Area[[5]](#footnote-5) of the Conservation Area**  **(hectares)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Greater Luzon | Balbalan-Balbalasang National Park | 20,864 | Cordillera Administrative Region  Kalinga Province | 1  2 | ICCA of Banao tribe  ICCA of Balatoc tribe | 18,714 |
| Zambales Mountains | 41,137 | Regions 1 and 3  Provinces of Zambales and Tarlac | 3  4  5  6 | ICCA of Cabangan, Zambales  ICCA of San Felipe, Masinloc  Local Conservation Area in Mt. Tapulao  Critical Habitat in Mangatarem, Pangasinan | 3,115  5,000  5,982  5,723 |
| Mts. Irid Angelo and Binuang | 115,207 | Region 4A  Provinces of Rizal, Bulacan, Quezon | 7 | ICCA of Dumagat Remontados tribe | 10,000 |
| Polilio group of islands | 20,276 | Region 4A  Province of Quezon | 8  9 | Network of local conservation areas in Polillo, Bordeos and Panukulan  Additional LCAs in Jomalig and Patnanungan | 7,921  2,408 |
| Mindoro | Mts. Iglit Baco National Park | 75,445 | Region 4B  Provinces of Mindoro Oriental and Mindoro Occidental | 10 | ICCA of Tao Buid | 33,000 |
| Greater Negros Panay | Nug as Lantoy | 10,457 | Region 7  Cebu province | 11 | LGU LCA in Alcoy, Dalaguete and Argao | 15,786 |
| Greater Mindanao | Mt. Nacolod | 14,000 | Region 8  Southern Leyte province | 12 | LGU LCA in Mt. Nacolod KBA | 14,000 |
| Mt. Hilong – hilong | 115,000 | Region 13  Provinces of Agusan del Norte, Surigao del Norte, Surigao del Sur and Agusan del Sur | 13 | ICCA of Mamanwa tribe – CADT 134 | 5,000 |
| Mt. Kalatungan | 21,248 | Region 10  Bukidnon Province | 14 | ICCA of Menuvu tribe - Idsesenggelaha | 4,000 |
| Sulu | Tawi tawi island | 5,851 | ARMM, Tawi tawi | 15 | LGU LCA in Bongao, Tawi tawi | 5,851 |
| **TOTAL KBA AREA = 439,485 hectares** | | | **TOTAL POTENTIAL ICCAs = 78,829 hectares**  **TOTAL POTENTIAL LGU MANAGED LCAs = 57,671 hectares**  **TOTAL = 136,500 hectares** | | | |

**TOR ANNEX B**

**LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE EVALUATORS[[6]](#footnote-6)**

**The evaluation will use the following methods for data collection:**

**Document Review**

* Project Document and CEO Endorsement – Expanding and Diversifying the National System of Terrestrial protected Areas in the Philippines
* Annual Reports (2010 Annual cum Inception Report, 2011 and 2012)
* Quarterly Reports
* APRs/PIRs (2011 and 2012)
* Minutes of Project Board meetings
* Work and Financial Plans (2010, 2011 and 2012)
* Draft Procedures for ICCA Documentation
* Draft Modules for Establishment of Local Conservation Areas
* Proceedings of National ICCA Conference, March 2012
* Reports of Subnational ICCA Conferences, November 2011
* Communities in Nature: State of PA Management in the Philippines
* NewCAPP Technical Bulletins
* Reports on FLUP Workshops, July and September, 2012
* Report on Capacity Assessment of PAW Sector
* Report on PA Financing Study by National Consultant
* Reports on Knowledge, Attitudes and Practices Study
* Report on Legal Review of NIPAS and related laws
* Updated PA Financing Scorecard, 2012
* METT Scorecards, 2012

**Key Informant Interviews**

The evaluation will include interviews with key stakeholders:

* Members of the Project Board
* Officials of PAWB, GEF Operational Focal Point
* Staff/Consultants of NewCAPP
* Staff of UNDP Country Office
* Officers, staff of partner NGOs and DENR Regional Offices
* Officers, staff of NCIP and DILG
* Officers, staff of GIZ supported PAME and USAID supported B+WISER
* Indigenous community representatives of pilot sites
* Local government unit officials and staff in pilot sites
* Partner organizations (UPLBCFNR, UP DIliman, PTFCF, FPE, others)

**TOR ANNEX C**

**PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK**

**PIMS 3530: Expanding and Diversifying the National System of Terrestrial Protected Areas in the Philippines**

| **Project Strategy** | **Objectively verifiable Indicators** | **Baseline** | **Target** | **Sources of Verification** | **Risks and Assumptions** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Objective:** To expand and strengthen the terrestrial PA system in the Philippines by developing new PA models and building capacity for effective management of the system | Expansion of the terrestrial PA estate:   * increased areas of KBAs under legal protection; * new governance types in new conservation areas recognized as part of the national PA system; * program for accelerated expansion of PA system | 59 terrestrial PAs covering 2.6 million hectares  New PAs are established only through the NIPAS process  No program for accelerated expansion of terrestrial PAs to cover new conservation areas | Additional 9 terrestrial PAs covering 400,000 hectares, bringing the total area of KBA under protection to 3 million hectares  At least three new governance types – IP, LGU and local community managed conservation areas recognized by Executive fiat as part of national PA system  Program for accelerated expansion of terrestrial PA system to include new conservation areas within KBAs developed and ready for implementation | Modified regulations; amended IRR of the NIPAS; or revised NIPAS law  Copies of enabling instruments which set aside new conservation areas as part of national terrestrial PA system  Program for nationwide recognition of new conservation areas as part of national PA system | Concerned parties will agree to the recognition of new conservation areas as part of the national PA system |
| Habitat range of 109 globally threatened species in 9 pilot sites protected | Expected to decrease by at least 10% per year | Increase by 200% | BMS reports  Baseline and end of project surveys |  |
| Management Effectiveness in PAs and new conservation areas | Average of 35 in all nine sites | Increase in METT scores in pilot sites by an average of at least 20% compared to baseline levels  METT scorecard applied in all PAs and new CAs as basis for supporting capacity development and implementing adaptive management | METT scorecard reports |  |
| Financing of national PA system, including new conservation areas | Governance frameworks for sustainable PA financing – 33.3%  Business planning and other tools – 19.6%  Tools and systems for revenue generation and mobilization – 17.54%  TOTAL - 24.48% | Governance frameworks for sustainable PA financing– 79%  Business planning and other tools – 57%  Tools and systems for revenue generation and mobilization – 56%  Total – 65% | Financing score card |  |
| Capacity to manage national PA system | Systemic – 43%  Institutional – 47%  Individual – 43% | Systemic – 82%  Institutional – 73%  Individual – 71% | Capacity assessment tool |  |
| **Outcome 1:**  PA system of the Philippines has been expanded under new and diverse management regimes (ancestral domain, local government and community managed areas) to cover an additional 400,000 hectares of Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs) and with enhanced potential for further expansion | Coverage of the national PA system in terms of governance types | Limited to PAs established through the NIPAS process, managed by PAMBs only | Coverage of national PA system is expanded to include new conservation areas under diverse governance types (IP, LGU and local community managed areas) | Draft legislative proposals or new administrative regulations to designate new conservation areas as part of the national PA system | There will be no legal impediment to the incorporation of new conservation areas in the national PA system |
| Extent of the national terrestrial PA system in proportion to total area of the country | 8% | 10% | Project reports; enabling orders establishing additional conservation areas under legal protection status |  |
| Representation of KBAs in biogeographic zones and ecosystem types in the national PA system | Greater Luzon BZ – 48%  Mindoro BZ – 49%  Greater Negros Panay BZ – 47%  Greater Mindanao BZ – 32%  Sulu BZ – 29% | Greater Luzon BZ – 56%  Mindoro BZ – 81%  Greater Negros Panay BZ – 50%  Greater Mindanao BZ – 37%  Sulu BZ – 46% | Project reports; enabling orders establishing additional conservation areas under legal protection status |  |
| Program for expansion and diversification of national PA system | None | Expansion and diversification of the national PA system is guided by a 5 year program | National program approved by the DENR |  |
| **Outcome 2** :  Improved conservation effectiveness through enhanced systemic, institutional and individual capacities | Capacity of PAWB and regional offices to manage national PA system | Capacity Assessment Results:  Formulate policies and plans  Systemic – 4 of 6  Institutional – 2 of 3  Implement policies and plans  Systemic –3 of 9  Institutional – 12 of 27  Individual – 5 of 12  Engage and build consensus  Systemic – 3 of 6  Institutional – 4 of 6  Individual – 1 of 3  Mobilize information and knowledge  Systemic – 1 of 3  Institutional – 1 of 3  Individual – 2 of 3  Monitoring, evaluation, reporting and learning  Systemic – 2 of 6  Institutional – 2 of 6  Individual - 1 of 3 | Capacity Assessment Results:  Formulate policies and plans  Systemic – 6 of 6  Institutional – 3 of 3  Implement policies and plans  Systemic – 6 of 9  Institutional – 18 of 27  Individual – 8 of 12  Engage and build consensus  Systemic – 5 of 6  Institutional – 6 of 6  Individual – 2 of 3  Mobilize information and knowledge  Systemic – 2 of 3  Institutional – 2 of 3  Individual – 3 of 3  Monitoring, evaluation, reporting and learning  Systemic – 4 of 6  Institutional – 4 of 6  Individual - 2 of 3 | Capacity Assessment tool |  |
| Management effectiveness at nine pilot sites | BBNP – 64  ZMR – 18  Mts. Iglit Baco – 60  Mt. Irid Angelo and Binuang – 21  Mt. Nug as Lantoy – 51  Mt. Hilong hilong – 15  Mt. Nacolod – 10  Tawi tawi – 27  Polilio islands – 47 | BBNP – 93[[7]](#footnote-7)  ZMR – 79  Mts. Iglit Baco – 87  Mt. Irid Angelo and Binuang – 76  Mt. Nug as Lantoy – 95  Mt. Hilong hilong – 79  Mt. Nacolod – 78  Tawi tawi – 74  Polilio islands – 90 | METT scorecard |  |
|  | Incorporation of BD conservation goals in local plans | Isolated efforts only by a few PAMBs and NGO partners | ADSDPP – 4 (BBNP, ZMR, Mts. Iglit – Baco, Mts. Irid Angelo and Binuang)  Resource management plans of local communities - 2 (Nug as Lantoy, Hilong hilong)  LGU land use and development plans – 3 (Tawi tawi, Mt. Nacolod, and Polilio islands) | ADSDPPs of IP groups  Resource management plans of local communities  Local development plans of LGUs |  |
| Operational Manual for local management bodies | Inadequate for use by existing PAMBs; no Manual yet for local management bodies of new conservation areas | Operational Manuals are implemented to strengthen capacities of local management bodies of existing PAs and new conservation areas | Regular project M and E reports |  |
|  | Capacities for M and E | Weak for existing PAs; no M and E protocols for new conservation areas | PAWB and local PA/CA Managers and staff have capacities to undertake M and E and use this information for adaptive management | Regular project M and E reports |  |
|  | Awareness and support from stakeholders for national PA system | Limited awareness and support, as evidenced by: (i) only 10 legislations passed to date; (ii) limited amount of IPAF (US$ 2.98 Million); (iii) high degree of threat of KBAs; (iv) high degree of threat of major biogeographic zones from infrastructure development | Increased awareness and support as evidenced by: (i) additional legislations passed to legalize establishment of more PAs and inclusion of CAs in the system; (ii) increased funding support from various sources; (iii) reduction in levels of destructive activities; and (iv) number of proposed development projects rejected for being incompatible with PA and CA management objectives | Legislations passed to support establishment of new PAs and CAs  IPAF Annual Reports  Monitoring and evaluation reports on extent of destructive activities in PAs/CAs  Reports on reviews of development project proposals submitted to National Economic and Development Authority and Local Development Councils of LGUs |  |
| **Outcome 3:**  Enhanced financial sustainability of the terrestrial PA system | National level capacity to manage financing of the PA system | Limited capacity by PAWB to manage financing for national PA system | PAWB has improved capacity to use new tools and mechanisms to sustainably manage financing of national terrestrial PA system to include new CAs | Learning guides, policies and procedures on the use of sustainable financing tools and mechanisms |  |
| PA Financial Sustainability, as measured by Financing scorecard | Legal and regulatory framework – 33.3%  Business planning – 19.6%  Tools for revenue generation – 17.54%  Total – 24.48% | Legal and regulatory framework – 79%[[8]](#footnote-8)  Business planning – 57%  Tools for revenue generation – 56%  Total – 65% | Financing Scorecard |  |
| Number of sites with capacities for financing, business planning and cost effective management | Nil | At least 3 new PA/CAs have capacities for site level financing, business planning and cost effective management | Financial performance reports |  |
| Number of PAs/CAs using new tools and mechanisms for sustainable financing | Nil | Additional PAs/CAs benefit from use of learning manual, revised policies, and replication of sustainable financing tools and mechanisms for PA/CA management | Sustainable financing plans of additional PAs/CAs |  |
| Access to IPAF and levels of collection | IPAF annual allocations legislated through General Appropriations Act  US $ 2.98 Million | 100% of IPAF collections automatically appropriated for PA management  Increase in IPAF collections by 25% or to a level of US $ 3.73 Million | IPAF reports |  |
| **Outcome 1: PA system of the Philippines has been expanded under new and diverse management regimes (ancestral domain, local government and community managed areas) to cover an additional 400,000 hectares of Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs) and with enhanced potential for further expansion**  1.1 – Modified PA regulations and/or laws to recognize new conservation areas as part of the national PA system:  1.2 – Nine ‘new-type’ PAs covering 400,000 ha are established within KBAs  1.3 – Programme for expansion of the national PA system | | | | | |
| **Outcome 2** : **Improved conservation effectiveness through enhanced systemic, institutional and individual capacities**  2.1 – Increased PAWB and DENR Regional Office capacities to provide technical assistance to PAMBs and other stakeholders in managing existing PAs and new conservation areas  2.2 – Negotiated agreements with indigenous groups and other local stakeholders at nine sites resulting in management plans that incorporate BD conservation goals and sustainable management of natural resources  2.3 – Enhanced management capacities in nine new-type PAs covering 400,000 ha  2.4 – Revised operational manual for national PAs and new manuals for ‘new-type’ conservation areas:  2.5 - Common protected area M&E frameworks and protocols  2.6 - Increased support from key stakeholders and decision-makers for the management and conservation of the national PA system, including new conservation areas | | | | | |
| **Outcome 3: Enhanced financial sustainability of the terrestrial PA system**  3.1 - Economic valuation studies of three new conservation areas  3.2 – Improved national-level sustainable financing tools and capacities  3.3 – Site-level tools for resource mobilization developed at new CAs  3.4 – Site-level tools for business planning and cost-effective management developed at new CAs  3.5 – Lesson learning and replication of sustainable finance tools among pilot sites | | | | | |

**TOR ANNEX D: EVALUATION QUESTIONS[[9]](#footnote-9)**

| **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?** | | | | |
| Is the project  relevant to UNCBD  and other international convention objectives? | How does the project support the objectives of the UNCBD?  Does the project support  other international  conventions, such as the  UNFCCC and the UNDRIP? | UNCBD priorities and areas of work incorporated in project design  Level of implementation of  UNCBD in the Philippines, Program of Work on Protected Areas and contribution of the project  Priorities and areas of work of other conventions incorporated  in project design | Project documents  National policies and strategies to implement the  UNCBD, other international  conventions, or related to  environment more generally  UNCBD and other international convention web sites | Documents  analyses  Interviews with  project team,  UNDP and other  partners |
| Is the project relevant the GEF biodiversity focal area? | How does the project  support the GEF biodiversity  focal area and  strategic priorities | Existence of a clear relationship between the project objectives and GEF biodiversity focal area | Project  documents  GEF focal areas  strategies and  documents | Documents  analyses  GEF website  Interviews with  UNDP and project  team |
| Is the project relevant to the  Philippine Development Plan and environment and sustainable development objectives? | How does the project  support the environment and sustainable development objectives of the Philippines?  How does the project support the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP)?  Is the project country-driven?  What was the level of stakeholder participation in project design?  What was the level of stakeholder ownership in implementation?  Does the project  adequately take into account the national  realities, both in terms of institutional and policy framework in its design and its implementation? | Degree to which the project  supports national environmental objectives  Degree to which the project supports implementation of the NBSAP  Degree of coherence  between the project and  nationals priorities, policies  and strategies  Appreciation from national  stakeholders with respect to  adequacy of project design  and implementation to  national realities and existing capacities  Level of involvement of government officials and other partners in the project design process  Coherence between needs  expressed by national  stakeholders and UNDP-GEF  criteria | Project  documents  National policies  and strategies  NBSAP  Key project  partners | Documents  analyses  Interviews with  UNDP and project  partners |
| Is the project addressing the needs of target beneficiaries at the local and regional levels? | How does the project support the needs of relevant stakeholders?  Has the implementation of the project been inclusive of all relevant stakeholders?  Were local beneficiaries and stakeholders adequately involved in project design and implementation? | Strength of the link between expected results from the project and the needs of relevant stakeholders  Degree of involvement and  inclusiveness of stakeholders in project design and implementation | Project partners  and stakeholders  Needs assessment  studies  Project  documents | Document analysis  Interviews with relevant  stakeholders |
| Is the project internally coherent in its design? | Are there logical linkages between expected results of  the project (log frame) and the project design (in terms of project components, choice of partners, structure, delivery mechanism, scope, budget, use of resources, etc.)?  Is the length of the project sufficient to achieve project outcomes?  Are the resources of the project sufficient to achieve project outcomes? | Level of coherence  between project expected  results and project design  internal logic  Level of coherence between project design and project implementation approach | Program and project  documents  Key project  stakeholders | Document analysis  Key interviews |
| How is the project relevant with respect to other donor-supported activities? | Does the GEF funding  support activities and objectives not addressed by other donors?  How do GEF-funds help  to fill gaps (or give additional stimulus) that  are necessary but are not covered by other donors?  Is there coordination and complementarity between donors? | Degree to which program  was coherent and complementary to other donor programming nationally and regionally | Documents from other donor supported  activities  Other donor  representatives  Project  documents | Documents analyses  Interviews with project partners and relevant  stakeholders |
| Does the project provide relevant lessons and experiences for other similar projects in the future? | Has the experience of the project provided relevant lessons for other future projects targeted at similar objectives? |  | Data collected throughout  evaluation | Data analysis |
| Are project activities relevant and appropriate to meet objectives and current development context? | How appropriate are the planned and implemented activities? (in the context of any changes that have occurred in the PAW/ENR sector in the Philippines, recent priorities and opportunities for policy change and program shifts)? |  | Data collected throughout evaluation  Project reports, and new policies in the ENR sector | Data analysis  Document review and KII |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Effectiveness: To what extent have/will the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been/be achieved?** | | | | |
| Has the project been effective in achieving  the expected outcomes and objectives? | Has the project been effective in achieving its expected outcomes?  1. PA system of the Philippines has been expanded under new and diverse management regimes (ancestral domain, local government and community managed areas) to cover an additional 400,000 hectares of Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs) and with enhanced potential for further expansion  2. Improved conservation effectiveness through enhanced systemic, institutional and individual capacities  3. Enhanced financial sustainability of the terrestrial PA system | See indicators in project document results framework and logframe | Project documents  Project team  and relevant  stakeholders  Data reported in  project annual and  quarterly reports | Documents analysis  Interviews with project team  Interviews with relevant  stakeholders |
| How is risk and risk mitigation being managed? | How well are risks, assumptions and impact drivers being managed?  What was the quality of risk mitigation strategies developed? Were these sufficient?  Are there clear strategies for risk mitigation related with long-term sustainability of the project? | Completeness of risk identification and assumptions during project planning and design  Quality of existing information systems in place to identify emerging risks and other issues  Quality of risk mitigations  Strategies developed and  followed | Project documents  UNDP, project  team, and relevant  stakeholders | Document analysis  Interviews |
| What lessons can be drawn  regarding effectiveness for other similar projects in the future? | What lessons have been learned from the project regarding achievement of outcomes?  What changes could have been/should be made (if any) to the design of the project in order to improve the achievement of the project’s expected results? |  | Data collected throughout  evaluation | Data analysis |
| **Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?** | | | | |
| Was project support provided in an efficient way? | Was adaptive management used or needed to ensure efficient resource use?  Did the project logical framework and work plans and any changes made to them use as management tools during implementation?  Were the accounting and financial systems in place adequate for project management and producing accurate and timely financial information?  Were progress reports produced accurately, timely and responded to reporting requirements including adaptive management changes?  Was project implementation as cost effective as originally proposed (planned vs. actual)  Did the leveraging of funds (co financing) happen as planned?  Were financial resources utilized efficiently? Could financial resources have been used more efficiently?  Was procurement carried out in a manner making efficient use of project resources?  How was results-based management used during project implementation? | Availability and quality of  financial and progress reports  Timeliness and adequacy of  reporting provided  Level of discrepancy between planned and utilized financial expenditures  Planned vs. actual funds  leveraged  Cost in view of results  achieved compared to costs  of similar projects from other organizations  Adequacy of project choices  in view of existing context,  infrastructure and cost  Quality of results-based management reporting (progress reporting, monitoring and evaluation)  Occurrence of change in project design/ implementation approach (i.e. restructuring) when needed to improve project efficiency  Cost associated with delivery mechanism and management structure compare to alternatives | Project documents  and evaluations  UNDP  Project team | Document  analysis  Key interviews |
| How efficient are partnership arrangements for the project? | To what extent partnerships/  linkages between institutions/organizations were encouraged and supported?  Which partnerships/linkages were facilitated? Which ones can be considered sustainable?  What was the level of efficiency of cooperation and collaboration arrangements?  Which methods were successful or not and why? | Specific activities conducted  to support the development  of cooperative arrangements  between partners,  Examples of supported  partnerships  Evidence that particular  partnerships/linkages will be sustained  Types/quality of partnership  cooperation methods utilized | Project documents  and evaluations  Project partners  and relevant  stakeholders | Document  analysis  Interviews |
| Did the project efficiently utilize local capacity in implementation? | Was an appropriate balance struck between utilization of international expertise as well as local capacity?  Did the project take into account local capacity in design and implementation of the project?  Was there an effective collaboration between institutions responsible for implementing the project? | Proportion of expertise  utilized from international  experts compared to national experts  Number/quality of analyses  done to assess local capacity  potential and absorptive  capacity | Project documents  and evaluations  UNDP  Beneficiaries | Document  analysis  Interviews |
| What lessons can be drawn regarding efficiency for other similar projects in the future? | What lessons can be learnt from the project regarding efficiency?  How could the project have more efficiently carried out implementation (in terms of management structures and procedures, partnership arrangements, etc…)?  What changes could have been made (if any) to the project in order to improve its efficiency? | Value for money of partnership arrangements and delivery mechanisms  Efficiency of alternative approaches and adaptation strategies undertaken by the project | Data collected throughout  evaluation | Data analysis |
| How efficient and effective are the management and coordination arrangements, including oversight mechanisms for the project? | Does the Project Board provide a useful management and steering function for the project activities? |  | Minutes of Project Board meetings  Project reports  Assessment reports | Document review  Interview with key staff and officials |
| Does the PMU provide a useful and effective management function? Should other alternative arrangements be explored? |
| How effective is the UNDP CO in supporting project implementation, technical assistance, and oversight? |
| How effective is PAWB overall in performing its responsibilities as Implementing Agency? |
| **Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?** | | | | |
| What are the major factors which influence sustainability of the project? | Are policies sufficient and in place to support the roll out of ICCA recognition and establishment of LGU managed conservation areas in other KBAs?  Does the DENR provide adequate priority to BD conservation as a programme and the enhancement of capacities of its agency and staff?  Is there sufficient support by key agencies (DBM, BTr, DoF, NEDA) to PA financing sustainability? Are there appropriate measures and policies to support these?  Do the stakeholders have sufficient capacities, ownership and commitment to continue the innovations and enhanced systems developed under the project?  Is there sufficient financing available or are there suitable fund sources to continue what have been initiated under the project?  Will communities and local government units continue to implement the conservation plans developed/to be developed in the pilot sites?  Were essential elements identified for a successful and sustainable roll out of new conservation areas in the Philippines, and have lessons been sufficiently documented?  Do implementation arrangements support ownership of the project outcomes by government and stakeholders?  Do project coordination mechanisms support sustainability of the project?  How can the project better make ICCAs/LGU conservation areas more valuable to the participating communities and LGUs and support them in sustaining conservation areas as a better alternative than other land uses? | Clear policies specifying procedures and mechanisms, including protection of and support to recognition of ICCAs and LGU managed conservation areas  Program and budget levels allocated by DENR to PAW, its programs and continued capacity development  Commitments, pronouncements, joint issuances between DENR/PAWB and partner agencies  Capacity assessment results  Estimates of financing required to continue innovations introduced by the project, and financing capacity assessment  Requirements for implementation of conservation plans compared with current capacities and constraints  Quality and levels of discussions on the requirements for roll out, quality of documentation made  Evidences of uptake by stakeholders  Effectiveness of coordination mechanisms, evidences of ownership  Presence of incentives and support to continue conservation objectives  Strength of commitment to conservation, as evidenced by clear choices made by communities/LGUs against alternative land uses | Data collected throughout evaluation  Community feedback  Insights/perceptions from institutions and partners  Site reports | Document review  Community FGD and interviews  KII with partners and representatives of key institutions/DENR  Rapid field assessments in selected pilot sites |
| **Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduction in threats to biodiversity in KBAs, and/or improved ecological status?** | | | | |
| Has the project made/or is likely to contribute to measurable difference to the conservation of terrestrial KBAs in the Philippines? | How will expansion of new conservation areas, which involve recognition of ICCAs and LGU managed LCAs, reduce environmental stress, improve ecological coverage, and protect important BD resources?  What evidences have there been, to establish reduction of environmental stress, prevention of incompatible land uses in and around conservation areas, and improvement of ecological status? | Status of habitats and important BD resources  Extent of habitat fragmentation, unsustainable land use practices, and/or incompatible land uses within and around KBA pilot sites | Baseline BD assessment results  BD monitoring reports in pilot sites  Project reports  Beneficiaries | Document review  Rapid field assessment  Community FGDs |

**TOR ANNEX E: RATINGS**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Rating Scales** | | |
| **Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E**  **Execution** | **Sustainability ratings:** | **Relevance ratings** |
| 6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): The project had no shortcomings  in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance,  effectiveness, or efficiency  5: Satisfactory (S): There were only minor shortcomings  4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS):there were moderate  shortcomings  3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): the project had significant shortcomings  2. Unsatisfactory (U): there were major shortcomings in the  achievement of project objectives in terms of relevance,  effectiveness, or efficiency  1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): The project had severe  shortcomings | 4. Likely (L): negligible risks  to sustainability  3. Moderately Likely  (ML):moderate risks  2. Moderately Unlikely (MU):  significant risks  1. Unlikely (U): severe risks | 2. Relevant (R)  1.. Not relevant (NR)  Impact Ratings:  3. Significant (S)  2. Minimal (M)  1. Negligible (N)  Additional ratings |
| Additional ratings where relevant:  Not Applicable (N/A)  Unable to Assess (U/A |  |  |

**ANNEX F: EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT 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[[10]](#footnote-10)**  **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: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |

**TOR ANNEX G**

**EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE[[11]](#footnote-11)**

**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

**Executive Summary**

* Project Summary Table
* Project Description (brief)
* Evaluation Rating Table
* Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons

**Acronyms and Abbreviations**

(See: UNDP Editorial Manual[[12]](#footnote-12) )

**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[[13]](#footnote-13) )

**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

**ANNEX H: 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 County Office**  Name:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Signature:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  **UNDP GEF RTA**  Name:  Signature:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |

**Annex I**

**CO-FINANCING TABLE FOR UNDP**

**SUPPORTED GEF FINANCED PROJECTS**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Co Financing Types/Sources** | **IA Own Financing**  **(Million US $)** | | **Government**  **(Million US $)** | | **Other Sources[[14]](#footnote-14)**  **(Million US $)** | | **Total Financing**  **(Million US $)** | | **Total Disbursement**  **(Million US $)** | |
| Proposed | Actual | Proposed | Actual | Proposed | Actual | Proposed | Actual | Proposed | Actual |
| Grant |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Credits |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| In Kind |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Non grant instruments[[15]](#footnote-15) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Types |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **TOTAL** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1. To be determined in January, 2013. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. 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 [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Estimates only. These will be validated during Inception. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. 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. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. The exact extent of area coverage will be confirmed during implementation, as mapping is completed for each site. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. This list will be updated before MTE as more documents become available. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. These targets will be confirmed during Inception [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. These targets will be confirmed during Inception [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. The Consultants are encouraged to develop more specific evaluation questions in the course of preparing the Inception Report [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. www.undp.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. Other Sources refer to contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector, etc. Specify each and explain “Other sources” of co-financing when possible. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. Describe “Non-grant instruments” (such as guarantees, contingent grants, etc.) [↑](#footnote-ref-15)