****

**DETAILED TERMS OF REFERENCE**

**FOR**

**INDEPENDENT MID-TERM EVALUATION OF THE PROJECT**

**“Strengthening Seychelles’ protected area system through NGO management modalities”**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Title: | Strengthening Seychelles’ protected area system through NGO management modalities | | | | | |
| GEF Project ID: | | 3925 |  | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | | *at completion (Million US$)* |
| UNDP Project ID: | | 00076774 | GEF financing: | 2,100,000 | |  |
| Country: | | Seychelles | IA/EA own: | (same as Government ) | |  |
| Region: | | Africa | Government: | 1,500,000 | |  |
| Focal Area: | | Biodiversity | Other: | 2,480,624 | |  |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): | | SO1 – SP2 and SP3 | Total co-financing: | 1,762,783 | |  |
| Executing Agency: | | Ministry of Environment and Energy | Total Project Cost: | 5,362,783 | |  |
| Other Partners involved: | | UNDP, GIF, MCSS, Nature Seychelles, SIF, SNPA, Denis Island Development Pty, LTD, North Island Company. | ProDoc Signature (date project began): | | | 28/ 03/2011 |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | | Proposed:  31/03/2015 | Actual: |

# BACKGROUND

The Government of Seychelles (GOS), in partnership with the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) is currently implementing a programme of Strengthening Seychelles’ protected area system through NGO management modalities.

|  |
| --- |
| Seychelles has a system of 21 formal protected areas covering a total area of 54,813ha, of which 24,978ha (~5.5% of the total landmass) is terrestrial and 29,836ha (<0.001% of the Economic Exclusion Zone EEZ) is marine. The marine and terrestrial protected areas (and other conservation areas) are under the administration of a number of different government institutions, parastatals and NGOs, including the: Ministry of Land Use and Housing (MLUH); Seychelles National Park Authority (SNPA); Seychelles Fishing Authority (SFA); Seychelles Islands Foundation (SIF); Island Conservation Society (ICS) and Nature Seychelles (NS). With limited resources, and geographical isolation from global centers of excellence, it is imperative that these diverse government and non-government partners in Seychelles work more closely together in partnerships to augment their individual capacities, knowledge and skills in the planning and management of a more representative system of protected areas.  This project aims to create an enabling environment for optimizing the synergies between current government conservation efforts, and those of non-government partners (private sector, NGOs and resource users). At a local level, it will support the development of models that demonstrate the cost-effectiveness of involving NGOs in the planning and management of protected areas.  The project’s development goalis to ‘*Facilitate working partnerships between diverse government and non-government partners in the planning and management of the protected area system in Seychelles*’. The project’s objective isto ‘*Demonstrate effective models for protected area management by non-governmental organizations in the Seychelles, and enable their inclusion into a strengthened protected area system*’.  The project has two components– along with their associated outcomes, outputs and activities - which will contribute towards achieving the project objective. These are: Component 1- *Strengthened management framework for protected areas in Seychelles*; and Component 2- *Expanded and strengthened management of protected areas in Seychelles*.  At the systemic level(i.e. creating the enabling conditions) project outputs include:   * Define spatial targets and priorities for the expansion of the protected area system * Improve the policy, legislative and governance framework for collaborative management between state and non-state partners in the management of this representative system of protected areas * Support the establishment of an information management system to improve decision-making in the PA system.   At the institutional and individual level(i.e. strengthening capacity) project outputs are to improve NGO capacity in:   * Assessing the environmental, social and economic feasibility of designating privately owned islands, and adjacent marine habitats, as formal PAs * Undertaking cost-benefit analyses of options for administering larger protected areas that may incorporate both marine and terrestrial habitats * Consultation, cooperation and collaboration with other state and non-state partners (including SNPA, other NGOs, private sector and natural resource user groups) in PA/conservation area establishment and management processes * Evaluating the efficacy of different approaches to marine and terrestrial ecosystem restoration and * Testing a range of co-management models for protected/conservation areas under different ownership, management and financing arrangements.   The project will also invest resources in improving the capacities of the relevant government institutions - SFA, SNPA and the DOE – to:   * Constructively support the establishment processes for newly designated PAs * Implement an oversight role for the entire protected area system * Participate in negotiating and implementing co-management agreements with NGOs, resource users and the private sector * Maintain consultative forums involving all state and non-state partners. |

# undp/gef monitoring and evaluation (m & e) policy

Project monitoring and evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP/GEF. The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) policy at the project level in UNDP/GEF has four objectives:

* To monitor and evaluate results and impacts
* To provide a basis for decision making on necessary amendments and improvements
* To promote accountability for resource use
* To document, provide feedback on, and disseminate lessons learned. A mix of tools is used to ensure effective project M & E. These might be applied continuously throughout the lifetime of the project – e.g. periodic monitoring of indicators, or as specific time-bound exercises such as mid-term reviews, audit reports and independent evaluations.

MTEs are beneficial for project implementation as they provide an independent in-depth review of implementation progress, thus being responsive to GEF Council decisions on transparency and better access of information during implementation.

MTEs are intended to identify potential project design problems, assess progress towards achievement of objectives, identify and document lessons learned (including lessons that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP/GEF projects), and to make recommendations regarding specific actions that might be taken to improve the project. It is expected to serve as a means of validating of filling the gaps in the initial assessment of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency obtained from monitoring. The mid-term evaluation provides the opportunity to assess early signs of project success or failure and prompt necessary adjustments.

# OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE

This evaluation is being initiated by the Government of Seychelles/UNDP/GEF Programme Coordination Unit (PCU), through its executing agency the Department of Environment (DoE), Ministry of Environment and Energy.

The specific objectives of the MTE are to:

* Identify potential project design problems
* Assess progress being made toward the achievement of outcomes and identify course correction if needed.
* Identify and document lessons learned (including lessons that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP/GEF projects)
* Make recommendations for enhanced implementation during the remainder of the project
* Analyze project performance up to the time of the MTE in the context of institutional and policy frameworks in the Seychelles.

The overall objective of the evaluation is to identify strengths and weaknesses of the project implementation process, progress towards targeted outcomes and to reinforce what works well and make corrections to weaknesses. The evaluation will therefore focus, among other areas, on the following:

* Project progress made towards meeting set targets and indicators
* Effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation
* Highlighting of issues requiring decisions and actions will be highlighted, and presenting of initial lessons learned about project design, implementation and management
* Review institutional and management arrangements of the project
* Undertake a stakeholder analysis, with a view to recommend appropriate strategies for engagement
* Assess the monitoring capacity of DoE, PCU and UNDP Country Office (CO)
* Recommend measures for improving project implementation and achieving project objectives.
* Outline any lessons already learnt.

The following stakeholders will be consulted during the mid-term evaluation:

* Ministry of Environment and Energy
* Ministry of Land Use and Habitat
* Attorney General
* Island Conservation Society
* Marine Conservation Society, Seychelles
* Green Islands Foundation
* Nature Seychelles
* Plant Conservation Action Group
* Seychelles Islands Foundation
* Seychelles Fishing Authority
* Seychelles National Parks Authority
* Fishermen’s Associations
* Private Island Owners
* Protected Area Project Steering Committee
* UNDP Country Office in Seychelles and Mauritius
* UNDP Environment and Energy (EEG) Group Regional Coordination Unit.

# EVALUATION CRITERIA AND RATINGS

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework, 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 according to the obligatory rating scales included in Annex 1.

# EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The evaluation methodology guidelines are provided below. Any changes to the methodology should be in conformity with international criteria and professional norms and standards (as adopted by the UN Evaluation Group 7). They must also be cleared by UNDP before being applied by the evaluation team.

**The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful.** It must be easily understood by project partners and applicable to the remaining period of project duration. The evaluation should provide as much gender disaggregated data as possible. The evaluation will be carried out by the team through:

***Documentation review*** (desk study): The list of documentation to be reviewed is included in Section IV of these TORs. These documents will be availed by CEGENS/Project Office and/or UNDP, including the Country Office and the Regional Coordination Unit.

***Interviews***: The evaluator will consult and gather information locally through meetings with the various stakeholders (MHET, PCU, UNDP, donor agencies, NGOs and private sector representatives).

**Field visits** should be made to the various demonstration sites or proposed demonstration sites in the vicinity of the main granitic islands of Mahe and Praslin.

# DELIVERABLES

Products expected from the evaluation:

* An Inception Report (within 5 working days of signing the contract), this should provide details of the methodological approach to be used by the evaluator to undertake the study and include an evaluation matrix.
* A Mid-Term Evaluation Report of approximately 40-50 pages, excluding annexes, according to the attached detailed breakdown (Annex 1). The report will be in English and will be prepared and submitted in MS Word, with tables in Excel where necessary.
* A PowerPoint presentation (20–30 slides) covering the key points of the MTE with the main findings and recommendations will also be provided. [Depending upon the complexity of the evaluation findings, the UNDP Office in Mauritius may consider organizing a stakeholders’ meeting (e.g. an extraordinary project steering committee meeting) at which to make a presentation of preliminary findings to the partners and stakeholders.]

A draft of the Mid-Term Evaluation Report and the PowerPoint presentation should be submitted within one week of the end of data collection and meetings. The final copy will be submitted within a week of receiving written comments on the drafts from GOS/UNDP/GEF and partners.

If there are any significant discrepancies between the impressions and findings of the evaluation team and stakeholders these should be explained in an Annex attached to the final report.

# IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation lies with the UNDP Office in Mauritius. The Programme Coordinating Unit through the Project Manager will be responsible for liaising with the evaluator to set up the stakeholder interviews, arrange the field visits and co-ordinate with Government counterparts. The UNDP Office in Mauritius will contract the evaluator and ensure, in collaboration with the project coordination, the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the Seychelles. The Terms of Reference follow the UNDP/GEF policies and procedures, and together with the final agenda will be agreed upon by the UNDP/GEF Regional Coordinating Unit, UNDP Country Office Mauritius/Seychelles and the Government. These three parties will receive a draft of the final evaluation report and provide comments on it prior to its completion.

**Logistical Support**

UNDP/GEF will provide a vehicle for field visits and appointments with key interviewees. The UNDP/GEF PCU in Seychelles will coordinate the study and keep abreast of the mission’s activities during the evaluator’s stay. It is expected that the project manager will accompany the evaluator during visits in order to facilitate and provide clarifications where necessary.

Office space will be provided at the Programme Coordination Unit or the UNDP office in Seychelles.

**Reporting Arrangements**

The evaluator will report to the UNDP Office in Mauritius on all technical and contractual obligations.

# MISSION TIMETABLE

The timetable presented in this section is indicative and, to a certain extent, negotiable. Candidates are welcome to propose an alternative timetable in their application, which will be considered when assessing their candidatures.

The proposed time of the evaluation will be from **29 August 2013 to 04 October 2013**, with the draft report being available for comment no later than 2 weeks after the completion of the mission. The schedule of activities comprises a maximum of **six (6) effective working weeks (30 working days**) divided between time in the field and home-based work, as indicated below:.

| **Activity** | **Consultant days** | **Tentative due date(s)** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Desk review of documents, obtain necessary non-project background or supporting documents, finalize evaluation methodology, prepare learning sessions and surveys, etc., develop hypotheses about the project strategies and management and consider methods for testing hypotheses, and preparation of an inception report including evaluation matrix. A telephone interview with the UNDP EEG Regional Technical Advisor should be arranged during this period. (home-based) | 5 days | 02 August |
| Travel for consultant | 1 day |  |
| Presentation of Inception Report to PCU/UNDP | 1 day | 05 August |
| Fieldwork in Seychelles. With the evaluation’s emphasis on the project’s adaptive management framework, the evaluator is expected to work closely with the project team. The in-country period will include learning sessions with the project team and other PA management organisations. The Power Point Presentation should be produced while still in country. | 12 days (excluding weekends) | 06 – 21 August |
| Power point presentation of field work findings to key stakeholders | 1 day | 22 August |
| Travel for consultant (return to home base) | 1 day | 23 August |
| Prepare and submit Draft Report. The first draft Mid-term Evaluation Report (in English) should be submitted to the UNDP Resident Representative in Mauritius. The UNDP Office in close collaboration with the project team, the government executing agency and the UNDP-GEF Region-based Technical Advisor should analyze, provide comments and share it with different stakeholders. | 6 days (over 2 weeks) | 06 September |
| Time allowed for comments on draft report. |  | 27 September |
| Integration of the comments and finalization of the evaluation report.The evaluator will incorporate the comments into the final version within one week of receiving the comments. The evaluator is responsible for ensuring matters of fact are revised in the report, but matters of opinion may be reflected at their discretion. The final report must be cleared and accepted by the UNDP Office in Mauritius. In the case of any unresolved difference of opinions between any of the parties, the UNDP Office in Mauritius may instruct the evaluation team to set out the differences in an annex to the final report | 3 days | 04 October |
| TOTAL | 30 days |  |

# EVALUATOR RESPONSIBILITIES AND REQUIREMENTS

The MTE will be carried out by an **International Consultant** who will be responsible for the production of the MTE report, its content and also for the overall fulfilment of the MTE TORs. She/he will work closely with the Project Manager and the Programme Coordinator of the PCU who will assist in understanding the national context, sourcing data, information, checking facts and ensuring the overall national usefulness of the MTE process and report. The Consultant is expected to combine international calibre evaluation expertise with knowledge of the environment issues, preferably also with specific knowledge of biosecurity issues.

***Consultant’s Required Qualifications:***

* Recent knowledge of result-based management evaluation methodologies
* Recent knowledge of participatory monitoring approaches
* Experience in applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios
* Experience with the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy
* Experience applying UNDP’s results-based evaluation policies and procedures
* Competence and good understanding in protected area management
* Demonstrable good analytical and communication skills
* Experience with multilateral or bilateral conservation projects, including experience in SIDS and preferably in the Indian Ocean region.
* Fluency in English is essential.

***Overall Profile of the Consultant:***

The consultant should be an internationally respected development specialist with experience in biodiversity conservation, mainstreaming, project cycle management, and monitoring and evaluation in particular. Previous experience in evaluation, preferably of UNDP/GEF projects, will be sought during the selection process. Specific knowledge of the management of protected areas in the context of SIDS is an added plus.

The consultant should become fully familiar with the project through a review of relevant documents prior to travelling to the country / initiation of the assignment. These documents include:

* Project document
* Work plans and project budgets
* Inception Report
* Project Implementation Reports (PIRs)
* NEX project audit reports
* Minutes of steering committee meetings
* The GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy 2011[[1]](#footnote-1)
* The Evaluation Policy of UNDP 2011[[2]](#footnote-2)
* Recent project reports and publications.

The above-referenced documents shall be available to the evaluator in advance of the mission and, to the extent possible, in electronic format. Any other reports produced in the realm of the project (including those of the PPG Phase), website, publications, correspondence, etc., which are considered relevant to the evaluation may availed by the consultant after arrival in Seychelles.

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

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

**IMPORTANT:** The evaluator must be independent from both the policy-making process and the delivery and management of development assistance that is relevant to the project’s context. Therefore, applications will not be considered from evaluators who have had any direct involvement with the design or implementation of the project. Any previous association with the project, the government executing agency in Seychelles, UNDP Office in Mauritius, the Programme Coordination Unit in Seychelles or the satellite office in Seychelles or other partners/stakeholders must be disclosed in the application. If selected, failure to make the above disclosures will be considered just grounds for immediate contract termination, without remuneration. In such circumstances, all notes, reports and other documentations produced by the evaluator will be retained by UNDP.

# APPLICATION PROCESS

Applicants are requested to apply online at <http://jobs.undp.org> by **< date >.**  Individual consultants are invited to submit applications comprising:

* A cover letter indicating their interest in the position
* A current and complete C.V. in English with indication of their e-mail and phone contacts and names of three referees.
* A price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs).

UNDP/GEF 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 1: EVALUATION REPORT: INDICATIVE OUTLINE

The components of the final evaluation report are as follows:

1. Executive Summary

* Brief description of the project
* Context and purpose of the evaluation
* Matrix of evaluation ratings (using the UNDP/GEF six-point rating scales for progress towards project objectives AND for project implementation) – overall and per project outcome – with brief justifications
* Main conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned (preferably numbered and with cross reference to recommendations and lessons included in the main text).

1. Introduction

* Purpose of the evaluation
* Key issues addressed
* Methodology of the evaluation
* Structure of the evaluation

1. The Project and its Development Context

* Project start and its duration
* Problems that the project seeks to address
* Immediate and development objectives of the project and the context of these within the country
* Main stakeholders
* Results expected

1. Findings and Conclusions
   1. Project Formulation:

*Conceptualisation/Design:* This should assess the approach used in design and an appreciation of the appropriateness of problem conceptualization and whether the selected intervention strategy addresses the root causes and principal threats in the project area. It should also include an assessment of the logical framework and whether the different project components and activities proposed to achieve the objective were appropriate, viable and responded to contextual institutional, legal and regulatory settings of the project. It should also assess the indicators defined for guiding implementation and measurement of achievement and whether lessons from other relevant projects (e.g. same focal area) were incorporated into project design.

*Country Ownership/Driveness:* Assess the extent to which the project idea/conceptualization had its origin within national, sectoral and development plans and focuses on national environmental and development interests.

*Stakeholder Participation:* Assess information dissemination, consultation and stakeholder participation in design stages.

*Replication Approach:* Determine the ways in which lessons and experiences coming out of the project were/are to be replicated or scaled up in the design and implementation of other projects (this is also related to actual practices undertaken during implementation).

*Linkages* between the project and other interventions within the sector and the definition of clear and appropriate management arrangements at the design stage.

* 1. Project Implementation:

*Implementation Approach:* This should include assessments of the following aspects:

1. The use of the logical framework as a management tool during implementation and any changes made to this as a response to changing conditions and/or feedback from M&E activities if required. The project adjusted certain activities and indicators within the logical framework and this should be reviewed against the original logical framework and assessed. Other elements of adaptive management such as comprehensive work plans routinely developed that reflect adaptive management and/or changes in management arrangements to enhance implementation.
2. An assessment of the adequacy of the project institutional and management arrangements within the context of the project being managed as part of a portfolio of projects by a Programme Coordination Unit.
3. An assessment and analysis of the outputs: whether these are being achieved as per schedule and/or whether there is a need to modify or change some of these, reasons for any shortfalls and whether there are any unexpected results.
4. An assessment and analysis of the outcome: whether these are being achieved, reasons for any shortfalls and whether there are any unexpected results.
5. An analysis of factors within and beyond DoE and PCU’s control that are influencing performance and success of the project (including the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats) in contributing to the realization of the outputs and outcomes;
6. An analysis of whether the project’s interventions can be credibly linked to achievement of the outcome, including the key outputs and assistance provided, both soft and hard;
7. Whether the project’s partnership/co-management strategy has been appropriate and effective including the range and quality of partnerships and collaboration developed with government, civil society, donors, the private sector and whether these have contributed to improved project delivery. The degree of stakeholder and partner involvement in the various processes related to the outputs and outcome. How can synergies be built with other projects within the sector?
8. Technical capacities associated with the project and their role in project development, management and achievements.

Specifically, the evaluation report should assess the relevance of the project within the local, national, regional and global context. The potential sustainability of results should be addressed and strategies to improve this element suggested. The evaluation report should also indicate how well the project has performed.

*Monitoring and Evaluation:* Including an assessment as to whether there has been adequate periodic oversight of activities during implementation to establish the extent to which inputs, work schedules, other required actions and outputs are proceeding according to plan; whether formal evaluations have been held and whether action has been taken on the results of the monitoring oversight and evaluation reports.

*Stakeholder Participation:* This should include assessments of the mechanisms for information dissemination in project implementation and the extent of stakeholder participation in management, emphasizing the following:

1. The production and dissemination of information generated by the project including the importance of mainstreaming biodiversity into the different production sectors in Seychelles.
2. Local resource users and NGOs participation in project implementation and decision making and an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the approach adopted by the project in this arena.
3. The establishment of partnerships and collaborative relationships developed by the project with local, national and international entities and the effects they have on project implementation.
4. Involvement of governmental institutions in project implementation, the extent of governmental support of the project.

*Financial Planning:* Including an assessment of:

* 1. The actual project cost by objectives, outputs, activities
  2. The cost-effectiveness of achievements
  3. Financial management (including disbursement issues)
  4. Co-financing: are the commitments being met? The co-financing and leveraged resources table must be completed and included here (Annex 2).
  5. Results

*Attainment of Outcomes / Achievements of Objectives:* Include a description and rating of the extent to which the project’s objectives were achieved using Highly Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Marginally Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory and Highly Unsatisfactory ratings. Rating of progress towards meeting development objective will be based on the following criteria:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Highly Satisfactory (HS)** | Project is expected to achieve or exceed all its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as “good practice”. |
| **Satisfactory (S)** | Project is expected to achieve most of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings. |
| **Marginally Satisfactory (MS)** | Project is expected to achieve most of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve some of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits. |
| **Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU)** | Project is expected to achieve of its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only some of its major global environmental objectives. |
| **Unsatisfactory (U)** | Project is expected not to achieve most of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits. |
| **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)** | The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, any of its major global environment objectives with no worthwhile benefits. |

Rating of progress in implementation will be based on the following criteria:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Highly Satisfactory (HS)** | The project was managed in **very** effective and efficient manner in accordance with the work plan, schedule and budget. The project can be presented as “good practice”. |
| **Satisfactory (S)** | The project was managed in a **reasonably** effective and efficient manner, largely in accordance with the workplan, schedule and budget. |
| **Marginally Satisfactory (MS)** | The project was managed in an **acceptable** manner but not fully in accordance with the workplan, schedule and budget. |
| **Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU)** | The project was managed in a **marginally** effective and responsive manner but not fully in accordance with the workplan, schedule and budget. |
| **Unsatisfactory (U)** | The project was managed in a **less than** effective manner due to internal or external factors and not in accordance with the workplan, schedule and budget. |
| **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)** | The project was managed in an **ineffective** manner particularly due to internal factors and clearly not in accordance with the workplan, schedule and budget. |

*Sustainability:* Including an appreciation of the extent to which benefits will continue, within or outside the project domain after GEF assistance/external assistance has come to an end.

1. Recommendations

* Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
* Actions to follow up or reinforce benefits from the project
* Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives.

1. Lessons Learned

This should highlight the best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success.

1. Evaluation Report Annexes

* Evaluation ToRs
* Evaluation matrix
* Project logframe with annotations if needed
* Itinerary
* List of persons consulted
* Summary of field visits
* List of documents reviewed
* Questionnaire/s used and summary of results
* Evaluation consultant code of conduct agreement forms.

# Annex 2: Co-financing and Leveraged Resources

A. Co-financing

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

* “Proposed co-financing” refers to co-financing proposed at CEO endorsement
* Please describe “Non-grant Instruments” (such as guarantees, contingent grants, etc)
* Please explain “Other Types of Co-financing”
* Please explain “Other Sources of Co-financing”

Projects that have not realized expected co-financing levels must provide explanations. Please describe in 50 words the resources the project has leveraged since inception and indicate how these resources are contributing to the project’s global environmental objective.

1. http://www.thegef.org/gef/node/4184 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. http://web.undp.org/evaluation/policy.htm [↑](#footnote-ref-2)