

## MID-TERM REVIEW TERMS OF REFERENCE

### INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, mid-term reviews are required for full sized UNDP supported projects with GEF financing, and are highly recommended for medium-sized projects with GEF financing. 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 Mid-Term Review (MTR) of the *Strengthening the Operational and Financial Sustainability of the National Protected Area System Project (PIMS 3832..* The essentials of the project to be evaluated are as follows:

### PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Strengthening the Operational and Financial Sustainability of the National Protected Area System				
GEF Project ID:	3832		<u>at endorsement</u>	<u>at completion</u>
			<u>(Million US\$)</u>	<u>(Million US\$)</u>
UNDP Project ID:	00074120	GEF financing:	2.77	
Country:	Jamaica	IA/EA own:	0.20	
Region:	LAC	Government:	0.50	
Focal Area:	PA	Other:	4.35	
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	SP1	Total co-financing:	5.05	
Executing Agency:	National Environment and Planning Agency	Total Project Cost:	7.82	
Other Partners involved:	Jamaica National Heritage Trust Forestry Department Fisheries Division	ProDoc Signature (date project began):	July 8, 2010	
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: June 2016	Actual: June 2016

### OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The project's goal is to safeguard Jamaica's globally significant biodiversity. The project's objective is to consolidate the operational and financial sustainability of Jamaica's national system of protected areas. The objective will be achieved through three components: (1) Strengthening of planning and revenue generation; (2) Rationalizing and integrating the national system of protected areas; and, (3) Increasing the effectiveness of protected area management.

The project follows the guidance of GEF's Strategic Objective One and Strategic Program One. Project activities will help secure the long-term financial sustainability of Jamaica's protected area system by: (i) harmonizing management practices to secure cost-effective conservation, (ii) building capacity for strategic conservation and financial planning, (iii) creating new protected areas to serve as replicable models for improved practices, and, (iv) establishing additional income sources for protected area management.

Jamaica is a global conservation priority with more than 1,400 known endemic species. This project's efforts will deliver the global benefits associated with a national protected area system better equipped to conserve globally significant, but currently vulnerable, ecosystems and allied species.

The project directly supports the Jamaica 2012-2016 UNDAF Outcome 1: National, local authorities and most vulnerable communities island-wide improve natural resource management and resilience to disasters (FAO, IAEA, PAHO, UNDP, UNEP, UNESCO) This outcome epitomizes effective and efficient governance of natural resources, enhanced disaster risk reduction and better preparedness and response measures, and energy security recognizing their importance for human development particularly for the poor and vulnerable. This is also aligned to Vision 2030 Jamaica Goal 3: Jamaica's economy is prosperous; National Outcome #10: Energy Security and Efficiency and Goal 4: Jamaica has a healthy natural environment; National Outcomes #13 and 14: Sustainable Management and Use of Environmental and Natural Resources; Hazard Risk Reduction and Adaptation to Climate Change. The United Nations Country Team (UNCT) in cooperation with the Government and national partners will focus efforts on creating an enabling environment for better management of natural and cultural resources, disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation, as well as improving energy security to positively enhance the human development of vulnerable people.

The project has been affected by several delays resulting in very low delivery within the first 2.5 years of the project. As at December 31, 2013 approximately 6% of the GEF and UNDP funds had been spent. This low delivery rate prompted the advancement of the schedule for the MTR.

With the objective to strengthen the project adaptive management and monitoring, mid-term reviews are intended to identify potential project design problems, assess progress towards the achievement of objectives and make recommendations regarding specific actions that might be taken to improve the project. The MTR is to review the project progress thus far and the factors affecting the timely achievement of results. The MTR provide adaptive measures and recommendations to bring the project on track. Specifically recommendations are to include how to compensate for the delays accumulated and the adjustments that will need to be made at the output and activity level. The recommendations of the MTR are to be used to ensure that the project achieves the established objective of strengthening the current national system of protected area and improve the financial capacities of the Government to better conserve biodiversity resources within these areas. The MTR is to ensure accountability for achieving the GEF objective. Through the identification and documentation of lessons learned (including lessons that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP/GEF projects) an MTR also enhances organizational and development learning. The MTR 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.

The main stakeholders of this MTR are

Stakeholder Organizations	Protected Area System Role
Forestry Department	Technical support, PAC member, input per Forest Act, and its regulations, Forest Policy and National forest Conservation and Management Plan and financial support as per Government of Jamaica recurrent and capital funding for forest reserves declaration and management
Jamaica National Heritage Trust	Technical support, PAC member, declaration of heritage and cultural assets under the JNHT Act and its regulations, and financial support as per Government of Jamaica recurrent and capital funding for the PA

Stakeholder Organizations	Protected Area System Role
	sites under its jurisdiction that environmental value alongside the cultural/heritage value
Fisheries Division	Technical support, PAC member, input per Fishing Industry Act, declaration of 8 new fish sanctuaries in 2009 and financial support as per Government of Jamaica recurrent and capital funding for the sanctuaries which are to be under co-management agreements with local entities, in addition to its core fisheries industry management role
The Nature Conservancy	Technical support, PAC advisory member, financial support, and input per mandate/ TNC objectives in nature conservation in general, but marine conservation specifically in Jamaica.
Environment Division – Ministry of Water, Land, Environment and Climate Change	Central government policy support and PAC member.
National Environment and Planning Agency	Technical support, PAC member, input per NRCA and all other Acts and regulations under NEPA responsibility and financial support as per Government of Jamaica recurrent and capital funding. Management activities include declaration and management of different kinds of protected areas under its Acts.
Institute of Jamaica	Technical support, input per IOJ mandate and financial support as per Government of Jamaica recurrent and capital funding for the management of Mason River Protected area. Research is a feature of their management.
Planning Institute of Jamaica	Technical support and advisory body on national planning.
Ministry of Finance and Planning	Financial and policy support/advice/approval required for PA trust fund implementation especially if GOJ resources from any source are to be channeled to the PA trust fund.
Urban Development Corporation	Manage a portion of the Portland Bight Protected Area. Technical support for this site, financial support as per Government of Jamaica recurrent and capital funding for its PA and other sites where there is environmental value found within and surrounding their developments
University of the West Indies	Technical and advisory support on PA research and implementation of plans for environmental and developmental matters in general through various sections of the natural and social sciences faculties and institutes such as the Institute for Sustainable Development
Montego Bay Marine Park Trust	Conduct aspects of PA management in Montego Bay Marine Park including, research, fund raising for their organisation.
Jamaica Conservation and Development Trust	Manage the Blue and John Crow Mountains National Park under a delegation agreement with NEPA. Protected area management activities include research (especially on birds and invasives), fund

Stakeholder Organizations	Protected Area System Role
	raising for their organisation.
Caribbean Coastal Area Management Foundation	Had a management role in Portland Bight Protected Area under a delegation agreement that has expired. They are developing a new management plan and continue to conduct aspects of PA management, research and fund raising.
Windsor Research Centre	Research entity in the Cockpit Country Forest Reserve.
Portland Environmental Protection Association	Conduct public education and awareness activities in Portland. Also conduct some research, fund raising for their organisation
Negril Coral Reef Preservation Society	Conduct public education and select other PA activities in, around and in support of the Negril Marine Park
Local forest or watershed management committees	Provide on the ground support for initiatives within PA's and are vehicles for funding and select actions within PAs
Negril Environmental Protection Trust	Had a delegation agreement with NEPA for managing the Negril Environmental Protection Area, but it has expired. Maintain some presence in the PA and conduct aspects of protected area management, research, and fund raising.
Parties interested in protected area co-management and concessions	Organizations and micro enterprises that may be interested in entering into shared management agreements and/or in implementing activities through already established protected area concessions.
Landowners, resource users, recreationalists, business sector, and others with social and/or economic interests within or near protected areas boundaries.	Large number of individuals with economic, recreational, land titles, land usage rights that will be affected by the establishment and management of protected areas. This may include companies or individuals interested in different forms of investment to promote conservation of natural resources and biodiversity, especially within or in proximity to PAs.

## EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

An overall approach and method<sup>1</sup> for conducting project mid-term reviews and terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over 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 ([Annex C](#)). The evaluator

<sup>1</sup> For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](#), Chapter 7, pg. 163

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 Jamaica. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: The National environment and planning Agency, Forestry Department, Fisheries Division Jamaica National Heritage Trust, The Nature Conservancy, United Nations development Programme, GEF Operational Focal Point, Protected Areas Committee, Planning Institute of Jamaica

The evaluator 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, 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](#) 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 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](#).

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)	UNDP own financing (mill. US\$)		Government (mill. US\$)		NGO (mill. US\$)		Bi-Lateral (mill. US\$)		Total (mill. US\$)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual
Grants	0.20	0.016	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Loans/Concessions	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
In-kind support	0.00	0.00	0.25	0.097	1.75	0.66	0.00	0.00	2.00	0.757
Other (cash)	0.0	0.0	0.25	0.022	*1.00	0.00	*1.60	0.00	3.05	0.038
Totals	0.20	0.016	0.50	0.12	2.75	0.66	1.60	0.00	5.05	0.80

\* Amounts are dedicated to capitalization of the Regional Trust Fund

## 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.<sup>2</sup>

## 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 *Jamaica*. 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 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 23 days according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
----------	--------	-----------------

<sup>2</sup> 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](#)

<b>Preparation</b>	4 days	June 6 2013
<b>Evaluation Mission</b>	10 days	June 17-26, 2013
<b>Draft Evaluation Report</b>	7 days	July 3, 2013
<b>Final Report</b>	2days	July 29, 2013

## EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

---

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
<b>Inception Report</b>	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission.	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
<b>Presentation</b>	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission	To project management, UNDP CO
<b>Draft Final Report</b>	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs
<b>Final Report*</b>	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on 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 *one international evaluator*. The consultant shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is required. 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 must present the following qualifications:

- Post-graduate degree in biological diversity or related environmental management field
- Minimum *five* years of experience in conducting UNDP and/or GEF evaluations
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
- Technical knowledge in protected areas management
- Experience working in the Caribbean Region
- Fluency in English both written and spoken

## 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**

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

%	Milestone
10%	At submission and approval of inception report
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 submit their application to [Nichola.carpenter@undp.org](mailto:Nichola.carpenter@undp.org) by **May 24, 2013**. 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.



## ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

<b>This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPAP or CPD:</b> Integrated land, coastal zone, water and energy management practices improved					
<b>Country Programme Outcome Indicators:</b> Amount of soil eroded and number of flora and fauna under threat. Area of land and sea protected.					
<b>Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area (same as that on the cover page, circle one):</b> 1. Mainstreaming environment and energy OR 2. Catalyzing environmental finance OR 3. Promote climate change adaptation OR 4. Expanding access to environmental and energy services for the poor.					
<b>Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program:</b> Strategic Objective 1: Catalyze sustainability of protected areas within the context of national systems. Strategic Program #1 (SP-1): Sustainable Financing of Protected Area Systems at the National Level.					
<b>Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes:</b> PA systems secure increased revenue and diversification of revenue streams to meet total expenditures required to meet management objectives; Reduction in financing gap to meet PA management objectives.					
<b>Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators:</b> Total revenue and diversification in revenue streams.					
Objective and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
<b>Project Objective:</b> To consolidate the operational and financial sustainability of Jamaica's National System of Protected Areas	NPAS operational sustainability measured by average METT score for all PAs based on the following definitions: High (75-100), Medium (55-74), Low (<55).	High: Number of PAs - 0 Medium: Number of PAs - 4 Low: Number of PAs - 28  (Data source: collated by Mark Johnstad, consultant in collaboration with relevant stakeholders, 2008)	High: Number of PAs -2 Medium: Number of PAs - 6 Low: Number of PAs -24	METT scorecard applied at MTE and FE	Changes in political circumstances and economic priorities affect Government or other stakeholders (including NGO PA managers) commitment to NPAS  Climate change, natural disasters, and other environmental impacts beyond national borders do not exceed current expectations, affect the viability of management options and distract attention from PA issues.
	NPAS financial capacity measured by Financial Sustainability Scorecard	Financial Score (Part 2): 53  (Data source: collated by Mark Johnstad, consultant in collaboration with relevant stakeholders, 2008)	Financial Score (Part 2): 122  (Note: The highest score possible is 227)	Financial Sustainability Scorecard applied at MTE and FE	
	Area of Closed Broad-leaf Forest within NPAS sustained	Closed Broad-leaf Forest: 88,000 hectares  (Data source: Forestry Department, 2008)	No change in area of Closed Broad-leaf Forest: 88,000 hectares	PA reports  Closed Broad-leaf: Forestry Department annual report submitted to FAO	

	<p>Area of living reef within 10 NPAS monitoring sites sustained</p> <p>Population of indicator species sustained in PAs proposed to be monitored:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Abundance of endemic ticki fish (<i>Gambusia melapleura</i>)</li> <li>2. Population of Queen Conch (<i>Strombus gigas</i>)</li> <li>3. Extent of swamp forest patches and number of associated indicator species (e.g. <i>Symphonia globulifera</i>, <i>Hibiscus elatus</i>, <i>Roystonea</i>)</li> </ol>	<p>Area of Reef: 3% - 30% living (Data source: Jamaica Coral Reef Monitoring Network, 2008)</p> <p>Data to be determined with project support</p> <p>Queen Conch: Depth Strata (metres) 0 -10 – 243 conch/hectare 10-20 - 145 conch/hectare 20-30 – 165 conch/hectare Biomass estimate – 12,214 metric tonne  (Data source: Fisheries Division, 2011)</p> <p>Swamp Forest patches: 18 Number of indicators species to be determined with project support  (Data source: Number of Swamp Forest Patches provided by Dr. K. McLaren, University of the West Indies,</p>	<p>No change in area of Reef: 3% - 30% living</p> <p>Same as baseline data</p> <p>No significant change in Queen Conch population : Depth Strata (metres) 0 -10 – 243 conch/hectare 10-20 - 145 conch/hectare 20-30 – 165 conch/hectare Biomass estimate – 12,214 metric tonne</p> <p>No change in number of Swamp Forest patches: 18 Number of indicators species – same as baseline</p>	<p>Annual —Status of the Reef Report submitted by Jamaica Coral Reef Monitoring Network (JCRMN) to NEPA.</p> <p>Biodiversity PA website/database reports</p> <p>Project reports</p>	<p>Fisheries management and enforcement actions are maintained at current standards; socio-economic impacts and effects do not exceed current expectations.</p> <p>Pervasive removal of swamp forest does not exceed current rates.</p>
--	--	---	---	---	---

	<i>princeps)</i>	2011)			
<b>Outcome 1:</b> Strengthening of financial planning and revenue generation	Caribbean Biodiversity (Endowment) Fund (CBF) principal and annual disbursement to NPAS	Trust Fund Principal: 0  Annual Disbursement to NPAS: 0	Trust Fund Principal: US\$ 3.35 million  Annual Disbursement to NPAS: US\$ 150,750	Trust Fund reports  Trust Fund bank statements	Government, NGOs and other donors maintain and/or improve investment and support for NPAS and Trust Fund.
	Amount of cash received by the National Conservation Trust Fund	\$0	US\$3 m	NCTF reports	Exchange, inflation and interest rates remain within predictable ranges
	Annual government funding for PAs	US\$ 4,097,000  (Data source: collated by Mark Johnstad, consultant in collaboration with relevant stakeholders, 2008)	US\$4,916,400  (20% increase)	Government and NPAS budget reports	
	Annual non-government resources	US\$1,577,446  (Data source: collated by Mark Johnstad, consultant in collaboration with relevant stakeholders, 2008)	US\$ 1,892,935  (20% increase)	NPAS budget reports	
	PAs with business plans that reflect NPAS standards	Zero (0) PAs with business plans that reflect NPAS standards	Eight (8) PAs with business plans that reflect NPAS standards  (25% increase)		
Outputs: <i>1.1 Protected Area Trust Fund (PATF) and Revolving Fund</i> <i>1.2 Model site-level business plans</i> <i>1.3 Revenue generation mechanisms in five key protected areas</i> <i>1.4 Operational plan for PA system financial strategy</i>					
<b>Outcome 2:</b> Rationalizing and integrating the NPAS	Legislation and supporting legal framework for protected area management	Current PA Acts and supporting legal framework : Beach Control Act, 1956 Forest Act, 1996 Forest Regulations, 2001 Morant & Pedro Cays Act, 1907 National Resources	Umbrella PA legislation and supporting legal framework	PAC, PA and Project reports	Decision-makers (national and local) will support and approve various legal agreements, legislation and regulations within the time frame of the project.  Critical policies or

		<p>Conservation Authority Act , 2001</p> <p>Natural Resources Conservation (Marine Parks) Regulations, 1992</p> <p>Natural Resources Conservation (National Parks) Regulations, 1992</p> <p>Natural Resources Conservation (Marine Parks) (Amendment) Regulations, 2003</p> <p>Natural Resources Conservation (National Parks) (Amendment) Regulations, 2003</p> <p>Natural Resources (Blue &amp; John Crow Mountains National Park User Fees) Regulations, 2003</p> <p>Fishing Industry Act, 1975</p> <p>Fishing Industry Regulations, 1976</p> <p>Jamaica National Heritage Trust Act, 1985</p> <p>Wildlife Protection Act, 1945</p> <p>Town &amp; Country Planning Act, 1948</p>			<p>legislation fails to pass or progress in the legislative process</p> <p>Authorities will follow collaborative PA management relationship</p>
	Number of new PA landscapes gazetted and implementing management plans that reflect integrated landscape/seascape wide approaches to combating PA threats	Zero (0) new coastal and marine PA landscapes gazetted and implementing management plans that reflect integrated landscape/seascape wide approaches to combating PA threats	One (1) new coastal and one (1) new marine PA landscape gazetted and implementing management plans that reflect integrated landscape/seascape wide approaches to combating PA threats	<p>Official Gazette</p> <p>PA management plans</p> <p>Project reports</p>	

<b>Outputs:</b> <i>2.1 National protected areas legislation and supporting legal framework</i> <i>2.2 New and expanded PA network</i>					
<b>Outcome 3:</b> Increasing PA management effectiveness	PA management effectiveness measured by METT scores	METT Scores for 28 PAs and 4 Forest Regions: ? Montego Bay Marine Park - 44 ? Blue and John Crow Mtn National Park – 72 ? Negril EPA - 32 ? Negril Marine Park – 39 ? Palisadoes-Port Royal Protected Area – 27 ? Coral Spring-Mountain Spring – 19 ? Portland Bight Protected Area – 36 ? Ocho Rios Protected Area – 19 ? Mason River protected Area - 54 ? Bogue Islands Fish Sanctuary - 14 ? Bowden Fish Sanctuary - 13 ? Airport Point Fish Sanctuary - 46 ? Discovery Bay Fish Sanctuary - 34 ? Bluefields Bay Fish	25% increase in METT scores for 50% of the PAs listed.	METT Scorecard	Continued GoJ support for PA management improvement.  PA management will complete and implement management and business plans.  Institutions and individuals successfully apply new skills.  Weak management and technical capacity undermines project outcomes  Updated information will be provided by the government entities responsible for PAs.

		Sanctuary - 33 ? Orange Bay Fish Sanctuary - 36 ? Galleon Bay Fish Sanctuary - 30 ? Salt Harbour Fish Sanctuary - 36 ? Galleon Harbour Fish Sanctuary - 32 ? Three Bays Fish Sanctuary - 32 ?Forestry Northeast - 58 ? Forestry Southeast - 56 ? Forestry Northwest - 40 ? Forestry Southwest - 45 ? Port Royal and Palisadoes - 52 ? Black River - 21 ? Spanish Town - 41 ? Titchfield Hill - 43 ? Falmouth - 35 ? Seville - 74 ? Rio Nuevo - 17 ? Mountain River Cave - 44 ? Mason River Reserve - 54  (Note that there are 102 Forest Reserves found within the four (4) Forest Regions listed as individual PAs)			
	Number of PAs that contribute to and/or access biological information through CBD Jamaica Clearing House Mechanism (JACHM).	One (1) PA contributing to and accessing the CBD JACHM.	28 PAs and 4 Forest Regions contributing to and/or accessing the CBD JACHM.	Project reports  Biodiversity CBD JACHM monitoring reports.  Reports are also to be provided by the PA management agencies	
	PAs with management	Zero (0) PAs with management	8 PAs with management		

	plans that reflect NPAS management guideline standards	plans that reflect NPAS management guideline standards	plans that reflect NPAS management guideline standards		
<p>Outputs:</p> <p><i>3.1 New and updated protected area management plans</i></p> <p><i>3.2 Monitoring and evaluation system for protected area management</i></p> <p><i>3.3 Conservation-based economic development established in or near five protected areas</i></p> <p><i>3.4 Communication strategy to raise key stakeholder awareness and build national constituency</i></p>					

## **ANNEX B: LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE EVALUATORS**

---

1. UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation for Development Results
2. Project-Level Evaluation: GEF Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported GEF-Financed Projects
3. Project Implementation Reports
4. Annual Operating Plans
5. Quarterly Reports
6. Strengthening the Operational and Financial Sustainability of the National Protected Area System - Project Document
7. Minutes of Project Steering Committee Meetings
8. Review/analysis of the document on existing regional and international environmental/conservation trust funds with recommendations on what is most feasible to satisfy requirements for the proposed National PATF
9. Review of local Trust Funds with recommendations on suitability with the proposed National PATF
10. Report on best practices gleaned from discussions with regional experts working with similar projects in establishing and operating Conservation Trust Funds
11. Trust Fund Expert report on the consultancy outlining activities conducted, achievements, challenges, meetings held, lessons learned and copies of presentations used at PSC meeting(s)
12. Report on the review of existing Protected Area business planning guidelines including recommended amendments
13. Draft business plan for Blue and John Crow Mountains National Park
14. Communications Strategy for project to include a Stakeholder Engagement Strategy
15. Knowledge Attitudes and Practice Survey Methodology
16. Analysis of results of focus group discussions and interviews and submission
17. Draft Knowledge Attitudes and Practice Survey Report
18. Draft communication and PR materials produced
19. Outcome Evaluation of UNDP's Environment and Energy Programme: A Mid-Term Perspective
20. Draft list of interviewees and possible interviewees (This document can prove useful in providing a more structured overview on the scope of the evaluation. This document can also provide a valuable input for the evaluators when refining the evaluation questions)
21. Any other additional documents deemed necessary



## ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
<b>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?</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The extent to which the activity is suited to local and national development priorities and organizational policies, including changes over time.</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the extent to which the project is in line with the GEF Operational Programs or the strategic priorities under which the project was funded.</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>are the objectives of the intervention or its design still appropriate given changed circumstances.</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<b>Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The extent to which an objective has been achieved or how likely it is to be achieved.</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<b>Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The extent to which results have been delivered with the least costly resources possible; also called cost effectiveness or efficacy.</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<b>Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The likely ability of an intervention to continue to deliver benefits for an extended period of time after completion.</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Projects need to be environmentally, as well as financially and socially sustainable.</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<b>Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The positive and negative, foreseen and unforeseen changes to and effects produced by a development intervention.</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In GEF terms, results include direct project outputs, short to medium-term outcomes, and longer term impact including global environmental benefits, replication effects and other local effects</li> </ul>	•	•	•

## ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

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

Please include the following table in the report:

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

## 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<sup>3</sup>

#### 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

<sup>3</sup>[www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct](http://www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct)

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

## ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE<sup>4</sup>

---

- 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<sup>5</sup>)
- 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<sup>6</sup>)
- 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

---

<sup>4</sup>The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

<sup>5</sup> UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

<sup>6</sup> 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.

- 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 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: \_\_\_\_\_

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