TOR for INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANT

Project name: PIMS 1275 BD FSP Strengthening governance and financial of the national protected area system in Ukraine

Description of the assignment / Post title: International Consultant on project final evaluation
Country / Duty Station: Kyiv, Rivne, Lutsk, Shatsk, Liubeshiv (Ukraine); home country
Expected places of travel (if applicable): Kyiv, Rivne, Lutsk, Shatsk, Liubeshiv (Ukraine)
Starting date of assignment: October 1, 2012
Duration of assignment / or end date (if applicable): 10 business days
Supervisor’s name and functional post: Mr. Vasyl Tolkachov, Project Coordinator

Payment arrangements: Lump Sum (payments linked to deliverables)

Administrative arrangements: The working space will be provided by the project.

Selection method: Interview

1. BACKGROUND
In accordance with UNDP/GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full-sized and medium-sized projects supported by the GEF should undergo a final evaluation upon completion of implementation.

This Final Evaluation is initiated by the UNDP Ukraine as the Implementing Agency for this project and is aimed to provide a comprehensive assessment of the project performance and achievement of project objectives; as well as provide lessons learned and recommendations for future projects, policies, or portfolios.

This evaluation is to be undertaken taking into consideration the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation policy (http://thegef.org/MonitoringandEvaluation/MEPoliciesProcedures/mepoliciesprocedures.html) and the Guidelines for GEF Agencies in Conducting Terminal Evaluations (www.gefweb.org/uploadedFiles/Policies-TEguidelines7-31.pdf).

PROJECT OVERVIEW

Strengthening governance and financial of the national protected area system in Ukraine project was approved by GEF in February 2008 and signed by UNDP and Government in March 2008. The Inception workshop was organized in August 2008. By that time the project team was hired as well as the main consultants. The project life time is 4 years. The total budget is 5,866,000 USD (GEF contribution is 1,800,000 USD, Government – 3,116,000 USD, UNDP (in-kind) – 50,000 USD, Frankfurter zoological society – 200,000 USD and Locally leveraged financing under Mini-projets Program – 700,000 USD).

The goal of the project is to secure long-term conservation of biodiversity within Ukraine’s Nature Reserve Fund, specifically focusing on PAs of global, national or regional significance (henceforth referred to as the PA system). The objective of the project is to enhance the financial sustainability and strengthen institutional
capacity of the PA system in Ukraine. The normative solution will be pursued through the systematic emplacement of earmarked revenue capture mechanisms to complement budgetary subventions to the PA system, and through improvements to PA governance that ensure PA revenue streams are employed efficiently so that impact is optimized per unit of investment.

The project is designed to produce three outcomes: (i) Development and implementation of a strategic vision for PA financial sustainability – which will include: (a) the development of a comprehensive national strategy for PA financing, a set of regulations governing PA revenue generation and implementation of feasible revenue generating options; (b) introduction of business planning as a standard practice in PAs; (c) testing private public sector partnerships as a model for maximizing and fairly sharing revenues from activities such as tourism, and engaging local people in conservation activities such as hay-cutting. (ii) Improved governance of the national PA system – will support the following interventions: (a) testing decentralized governance systems for PAs; (b) developing mechanisms to facilitate PA management across administrative jurisdictions (i.e. local governments known as oblast’s in Ukraine); (c) providing for staff training; (d) establishing an association of PA managers/ Directors; and (e) introducing systems to monitor management effectiveness as a feed-in to decision making processes; and (iii) Capacity in place to replicate the improved management approach across the national PA system.

The Project has four primary outcomes summarized below:

- Outcome I: Implementation of a strategic vision for PA financial sustainability
- Outcome II: Improved governance of the national PA system
- Outcome III: Enhanced capacity to replicate the project’s PA management approach throughout the national system

In accordance with UNDP/GEF M&E policies and procedures the mid-term evaluation was conducted in May-June 2010.

2. MAIN OBJECTIVES OF THE ASSIGNMENT

EVALUATION OBJECTIVES

The overall purpose of the evaluation is to measure the effectiveness and efficiency of project activities in relation to the stated objectives endorsed by the GEF, including any agreed changes in the objectives during project implementation and any other results.

Final evaluation has the following complementary purposes:

a) To promote accountability and transparency, and to assess and disclose levels of project accomplishment;

b) To synthesize lessons learned that may help improve selection, design and implementation of future GEF activities.

To provide feedback on issues that are recurrent across the portfolio and need attention, and on improvements regarding previously identified issues.

3. DESCRIPTION OF RESPONSIBILITIES / SCOPE OF WORK

SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

The GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy, minimum requirement 3, specifies that final evaluation shall assess, at minimum:

- achievement of outputs and outcomes and provide ratings for the targeted objectives and outcomes;
- likelihood of sustainability of outcomes at project termination, and provide rating for this.

The Final Evaluation serves as an agent of change and plays a critical role in supporting accountability. The emphasis of the evaluation should be the following:
**Project indicators** The evaluators will assess the achievement of indicators and review the work plan, planned duration and budget of the project.

**Implementation** The evaluation will assess the implementation of the project in terms of quality and timeliness of inputs and efficiency and effectiveness of activities carried out. Also, the effectiveness of management as well as the quality and timeliness of monitoring and backstopping by all parties to the project should be evaluated. In particular, the evaluation is to assess the Project team’s use of adaptive management in project implementation and the Project team’s fulfillment of management responses to evaluation recommendations made during the mid-term evaluation in September 2009.

**Project outputs, outcomes and impact** The evaluation will assess the outputs, outcomes and impact achieved by the project as well as the likely sustainability of project results. This should encompass an assessment of the achievement of the immediate objectives and the contribution to attaining the overall objective of the project. The evaluation should also assess the extent to which the implementation of the project has been inclusive of relevant stakeholders and to which it has been able to create collaboration between different partners. The evaluation will also examine if the project has had significant unexpected effects, whether of beneficial or detrimental character.

The evaluation will focus on the range of aspects described below. In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (R) should be rated using the following divisions: Highly Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Marginally Satisfactory, Marginally Unsatisfactory, Unsatisfactory, Highly Unsatisfactory. All ratings given should be properly substantiated:

1. **Project concept/design, relevance and strategy**
   1.1 Project relevance, country ownership/driverness (R)
   1.2 Preparation and readiness:
   1.3 Stakeholder involvement (R):
   1.4 Underlying factors/assumptions:
   1.5 Management arrangements (R):
   1.6 Project budget and duration (R):
   1.7 Design of project M&E system (R):
   1.8 Sustainability:
   1.9 Gender perspective:
2. **Project implementation**
   2.1 Project’s adaptive management (R):
   2.2 Contribution of Implementing and Executing Agencies:
   2.3 Stakeholder participation, partnership strategy (R):
   2.4 Sustainability:
   o On each of the dimensions of sustainability of the project outcomes will be rated as follows:
   - Likely (L): There are no or negligible risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.
   - Moderately Likely (ML): There are moderate risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.
   - Moderately Unlikely (MU): There are significant risks that affect this dimension of sustainability
   - Unlikely (U): There are severe risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.
3. **Project results (outputs, outcomes and objectives)**
3.1 Progress towards achievement of intended outputs, outcomes/measurement of change.

Progress towards results should be based on a comparison of indicators before and after the project intervention to the baseline ones.

Outcomes and the whole project should be rated as follows for relevance, effectiveness, efficiency:
- **Highly Satisfactory (HS):** The project has no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives.
- **Satisfactory (S):** The project has minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives.
• Marginally Satisfactory (MS): The project has moderate shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives.

• Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU): The project has significant shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives.

• Unsatisfactory (U): The project has major shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives.

Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): The project has severe shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives.

4. DELIVERABLES
DELIVERABLES / PRODUCTS EXPECTED FROM THE FINAL EVALUATION
The key product expected from the final evaluation is a comprehensive analytical report in English on the evaluation of UNDP-GEF project “Strengthening governance and financial of the national protected area system in Ukraine” (PIMS 1275 BD FSP) that should, in line with The GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy, minimum requirement 3, include:

- the basic data on the evaluation (when the evaluation took place, places visited, who was involved, the key questions, and the methodology- including application of the five evaluation criteria),
- basic data of the project, including actual GEF and other expenditures;
- lessons of broader applicability
- information regarding the composition and expertise of the evaluation team (in an annex)
- the ToR of the evaluation (in an annex).

The evaluation report outline/content should be structured as follows:

1. Executive summary
• Brief description of project
• Context and purpose of the evaluation
• Main conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned

2. Introduction
• Purpose of the evaluation
• Key issues addressed
• Methodology of the evaluation
• Structure of the evaluation

3. The project(s) and its development context
• Project start and its duration
• Problems that the project seek to address
• Immediate and development objectives of the project
• Main stakeholders
• Results expected

4. Findings and Conclusions
4.1. Project Formulation
  o Conceptualization/Design
  o Country-ownership/Driveness.
  o Stakeholder participation
  o Replication approach.
  o Other aspects

4.2. Project Implementation
  o Implementation Approach
  o Monitoring and evaluation
  o Stakeholder participation
  o Financial Planning:
4.3. Results

- Attainment of Outcomes/ Achievement of objectives
- Sustainability

5. Recommendations

- 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

6. Lessons learned

7. Evaluation report Annexes

- Evaluation TORs
- Itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- Summary of field visits
- List of documents reviewed
- Questionnaire used and summary of results
- Comments by stakeholders (only in case of discrepancies with evaluation findings and conclusions)

5. MONITORING/REPORTING REQUIREMENTS
METHODOLOGY OR EVALUATION APPROACH

An outline of an evaluation approach is provided below, however the evaluator is responsible for revising the approach as necessary. Any changes should be in-line with international criteria and professional norms and standards (as adopted by the UN Evaluation Group).

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

The evaluation should provide as much gender disaggregated data as possible.

The methodology to be used by the evaluation team should be presented in the report in detail.

It shall include information on:

- Documentation review (desk study);
- Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at minimum: UNDP – Ukraine, NEA, project team, other stakeholders.
- Field visits;
- Questionnaires;
- Participatory techniques and other approaches for the gathering and analysis of data.

IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE FINAL EVALUATION

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation lies with UNDP Country Office in Ukraine.

UNDP Ukraine will contract the evaluator and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country.

The evaluator shall report to UNDP Ukraine CO Management.

The Project implementation unit will be responsible for liaising with the evaluation team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Executing Agency and other arrangements.
The evaluation mission will be supported by the Project team and UNDP Senior Programme Manager responsible for the Environment area.

The mission will coordinate its work closely with the NEA and UNDP. The mission will take responsibility for its own schedule (though support will be provided by the Project team).

The final evaluation will be undertaken by an independent international consultant. He/she will receive the support of UNDP Country Office and Project Management Team. The evaluator selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities. The evaluator shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Former cooperation with GEF is an advantage.

The International Consultant will be responsible to deliver the expected output of the mission. Specifically, he/she will perform the following tasks:

- Lead and manage the evaluation process;
- Design the detailed evaluation scope and methodology (including the methods for data collection and analysis);
- Ensures full coordination of evaluation process;
- Conduct desk-reviews, interviews and site-visits in order to obtain objective and verifiable data to substantive evaluation ratings and assessments, including:
  - Assessment of adequacy of the level and proposed modes of enforcement of the regulatory and programmatic documents developed within the project;
  - Verification of the Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool data, as collected and reported by the project;
- Ensures that evaluation report inputs are available in a timely manner;
- Assumes overall responsibility for the evaluation report submission (draft and final):
  - Draft the evaluation report and share with the key stakeholders for comments;
  - Finalize the evaluation report based on the inputs from key stakeholders.

The evaluation mission will take place in the beginning of October 2012. The total duration of the assignment will be 10 working days. The following timetable is recommended for the evaluation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desk review, development of methodology</td>
<td>2 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-country field visits, interviews</td>
<td>5 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drafting report</td>
<td>2 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalization of report</td>
<td>1 day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The final version of the evaluation report should be submitted in electronic format (MS Word) to UNDP Country Office in Ukraine no later than October 31, 2012.

6. EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS REQUIREMENTS

Competencies

- Extensive (at least 10-year) experience and proven track record with policy advice and/or project development/implementations in protected area management/biodiversity;
- Proven track record of application of results-based approaches to evaluation of projects focusing on protected area management/biodiversity (relevant experience in the CIS region and within UN system would be an asset);
- Familiarity with priorities and basic principles of protected area management and relevant international best-practices;
- Knowledge of and recent experience in applying UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures;
- Demonstrable analytical skills;
- Good interpersonal skills.

Qualifications
University degree in environmental sciences or related area; Excellent English communication skills, knowledge of Russian would be an asset;

7. DOCUMENTS TO BE INCLUDED WHEN SUBMITTING THE PROPOSALS
Applicants shall submit the following documents:

Required [PLEASE TICK THE APPROPRIATE CHECKBOXES]

☐ Letter of interest/proposal, explaining why the applicant considers him- or herself the most suitable for the work.
☐ Letter of interest/proposal, providing brief methodology on how the work will be conducted and/or approached.
☒ Personal CV, including information about past experience in similar projects/assignments and contact details for referees.
☒ Financial proposal.
☐ Other documents: Click here to enter text.

8. FINANCIAL PROPOSAL
(ONLY ONE OPTION MUST BE SELECTED. FOR RETAINER CONTRACTS AND/OR LTAs PLEASE DISCUSS WITH PROCUREMENT UNIT):

☒ Lump sum contract
The financial proposal shall specify a total lump sum amount, and payment terms around specific and measurable (qualitative and quantitative) deliverables (i.e. whether payments fall in installments or upon completion of the entire contract). Payments are based upon output, i.e. upon delivery of the services specified in the TOR. In order to assist the requesting unit in the comparison of financial proposals, the financial proposal will include a breakdown of this lump sum amount (including travel, per diems, and number of anticipated working days).

OR
☐ Contracts based on daily fee
The financial proposal will specify the daily fee, travel expenses and per diems quoted in separate line items, and payments are made to the Individual Consultant based on the number of days worked.

Travel costs
All envisaged travel costs will be calculated and covered by the project in accordance with the plan of the mission, agreed with the consultant. The project will not cover travel costs exceeding those of an economy class ticket. Should the IC wish to travel on a higher class he/she should do so using their own resources. In the case of unforeseeable travel, payment of travel costs including tickets, lodging and terminal expenses should be agreed upon, between the respective business unit and Individual Consultant, prior to travel and will be reimbursed.

9. EVALUATION CRITERIA
- Educational background – 20 points max [20pts – PhD degree; 15pts – Specialist/Master’s degree; 10pts – Bachelor degree];
- Practical previous experience relevant to the announced TOR – 50 points max [50 pts – 7 years and more; 40 pts – 5 up to 7 years; 30 pts – 3 up to 5 years; 20 pts – less than 3 years];
- Language Skills – 15 points max [15 pts – English and Russian; 5 pts - only English];
- Previous work with UNDP/GEF projects – 15 points.

Maximum available technical score - 100 points.
EVALUATION METHOD (ONLY ONE OPTION MUST BE SELECTED):

☐ Lowest price and technically compliant offer
Contract award shall be made to the incumbent whose offer has been evaluated and determined as both:
a) responsive/compliant/acceptable (fully meeting the TOR provided), and
b) offering the lowest price/cost

OR

☒ Cumulative analysis
Contract award shall be made to the incumbent whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:
a) responsive/compliant/acceptable, and
b) having received the cumulative highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial
criteria specific to the solicitation.
* Technical Criteria weight: 70%
* Financial Criteria weight: 30%

Only candidates obtaining a minimum 70% from the maximum available technical score would be considered
for the Financial Evaluation

The maximum number of points assigned to the financial proposal is allocated to the lowest price proposal and
will equal to 30. All other price proposals will be evaluated and assigned points, as per below formula:

30 points [max points available for financial part] x [lowest of all evaluated offered prices among responsive
offers] / [evaluated price].

The proposal obtaining the overall cumulatively highest score after adding the score of the technical proposal
and the financial proposal will be considered as the most compliant offer and will be awarded a contract.

Prepared by

[Signature]
Vasyl Tolkachov, Project Coordinator

Approved by

[Signature]
Sergei Volkov, Senior Program Manager

Source of funds: The contract will be financed from the 2012 budget to be approved later this year
E-req #: Click here to enter text.

OR
Chart field of Accounts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line #</th>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Oper. unit</th>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>Dept ID</th>
<th>PC Bus Unit</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Impl. agent</th>
<th>Donor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>71205</td>
<td>UKR</td>
<td>62000</td>
<td>B582</td>
<td>UKR10</td>
<td>00053098</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>002300</td>
<td>10003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OR
Financial Authorization ref. #