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Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference

INTRODUCTION

The UNDP/GEF Project on IW:Learn/CTI is a global project. The project includes 4 components and is being co-implemented by two GEF agencies – UNDP and ADB. The first, second and fourth components are being implemented by UNDP and executed by the United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS) while the third is implemented by ADB. The Project commenced in 2009 and was expected to be completed by July 2013. UNOPS as the implementing partner of UNDP has responsibility in the overall implementation of above mentioned components. In turn, UNOPS has contracted the Global Forum on Oceans, Coasts and Islands GOF, through its secretariat – International Coastal and Ocean Organization (ICO), to carry out the project activities under component one. The second component is undertaken by the IW:LEARN team and the fourth component, which is Project Coordination Unit (PCU), is under UNOPS direct management.

The third component is implemented by ADB through a regional technical assistance (RETA) project. The RETA (TA 7307(REG)) is intended to strengthen the management of coastal and marine ecosystems in the coral triangle in a more coordinated and sustainable manner. Regional cooperation among the six Coral Triangle Initiative (CTI) countries on information exchange and decision making based on scientific and technical knowledge and global best practices will be strengthened. It has four main outputs: (i) strengthened CTI regional cooperation, (ii) establishment of regional learning mechanisms, (iii) implementation of a communication and information dissemination plan, and (iv) establishment of sustainable financing schemes. Building on agreements among invited project stakeholders during the project’s Inception Workshop held at ADB on 29-30 July 2010, the scope of RETA 7307 was revised to define its focus on knowledge management (KM) and communication in three areas – (i) sustainable finance; (ii) economic studies in support of policy and sustainable financing, including payment for ecosystem services (PES), coastal valuation, and economics of climate change; and (iii) preparation of the State of the Coral Triangle Report (SCTR) – all leading to regional learning and cooperation.

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the *IW:LEARN: Portfolio Learning in International Waters with a Focus on Oceans, Coasts, and Islands and Regional Asia/Pacific and Coral Triangle Learning Processes* (PIMS #4164)

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

Project Summary Table

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Title: | and Islands and Regional Asia/Pacific and Coral Triangle Learning Processes | | | | | |
| GEF Project ID: | | 3639 |  | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | | *at completion (Million US$)* |
| UNDP Project ID: | | 4164 | GEF financing: | 1.5 (include ADB portion here) | | 1.5 |
| Country: | | Global | IA/EA own: | 1.47 | |  |
| Region: | | Global | Government: | 0.52 | |  |
| Focal Area: | | International Waters | Other: | 0.73 | |  |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): | | IW SP1-4 | Total co-financing: | 3.03 (for entire project) | |  |
| Executing Agency: | | UNOPS | Total Project Cost: | 5.73 (included fund managed by ADB) | |  |
| Other Partners involved: | | ADB, IW Learning Exchange & Resource Network (IW:Learn), International Coastal and Ocean Organizaiton (ICO) | ProDoc Signature (date project began): | | | 23 July 2009 |
|  | |  | (Operational) Closing Date: | | Proposed:  23 July 2013 | Actual:  30 July 2013 |

Objective and Scope

The project was designed to ensure that coastal and marine ecosystems, especially in the Coral Triangle, are managed sustainably, with improved linkages to river basin and groundwater management and equitable outcomes for all communities that depend on these resources for their livelihoods and with long term protection of the globally significant biological diversity in coastal and marine ecoregions.

The core operational activities of the project focus on the Asia-Pacific Coral Triangle countries, including Indonesia, Malaysia, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Solomon Islands and Timor Leste. The project incorporates a global component aimed at advancing the oceans, coasts and small island developing states targets of the 2002 Johannesburg Plan of Implementation, and at addressing emerging challenges such as climate change impacts and improved governance of marine areas beyond national jurisdiction. The project also contributes to the World Ocean Conference which was held in Manado, Indonesia in May 2009, the GEF Fifth Biennial International Waters Conference held in Cairns, Australia in October 2009, and the Fifth Global Oceans Conference, held in Paris, France, April 2010.

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

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the [UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/UNDP-GEF-TE-Guide.pdf).

Evaluation approach and method

An overall approach and method[[1]](#footnote-1) for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP-supported GEF-financed projects have been developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation 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*](#_TOR_Annex_C:)) The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence‐based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, project team and in particular the UNDP GEF Technical and Principal Advisers, UNOPS, ADB, and relevant project implementing partners. This TE is expected to be done entirely through a desk review and interviews of key stakeholders (possibly interviewing directly and via teleconference). Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at the minimum:

* Project Staff (Project Implementation Coordinator) at UNDP APRC.
* Project Focal points of component 1 from GOF, component 2 from IW:LEARN team and Component 3 from ADB
* Relevant UNDP and UNOPS staff

Although the independent evaluators should feel free to discuss with authorities concerned all matters relevant to their assignment, they are not authorized to make any commitment on behalf of UNDP, UNOPS, ADB or GEF.

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in [Annex B](#_TOR_Annex_B:) of this Terms of Reference.

The evaluator is also expected to validate the GEF IW Tracking Tools and the confiancing amounts and annexed to the final evaluation report.

Evaluation Criteria & Ratings

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

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

Project finance / cofinance

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Implementing agencies (UNDP HQ and Regional and ADB), Implementing partners, Executing agency (UNOPS) 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$) | | Government  (mill. US$) | | Partner Agency  (mill. US$) | | Total  (mill. US$) | |
| Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Actual | Actual |
| Grants |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Loans/Concessions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * In-kind support |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

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, as applicable in the IW Tracking Tools: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.[[2]](#footnote-2)

Conclusions, recommendations & lessons

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

Implementation arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP Asia-Pacific Regional Centre and UNOPS*.* The UNOPS will contract the evaluators and ensure that evaluation related costs are reimbursed in a timely manner. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews and coordinate with the implementing partners etc.

UNDP, in collaboration with ADB, shall be the main operation point for the evaluation which shall be responsible for liaising with implementing partners and the project team to set up the stakeholder interviews, arranging the field visits and coordinating with relevant partners. UNDP and ADB will also provide inputs in the review and approval of the inception report as well drafts of the final evaluation report. While UNOPS, as executing agency, shall ensure the timely provision of contracting of person, per diems and travel arrangements for the Evaluation Team Leader, according to the TOR. ADB will be responsible for procuring services and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements for the evaluation team member.

Evaluation timeframe

The total duration of the evaluation will be 25 days according to the following plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Timing | Completion Date |
| **Preparation** | 3 days | *17-19 Feb14* |
| **Inception report (Team Work plan)** | *4* days | *20-25 Feb 14* |
| **Data gathering, interview etc** | *6 days* | *3-8 Mar 14* |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | *11* days | *28 Mar 14* |
| **Final Report** | 2 days | *25 April 14* |

Evaluation deliverables

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Deliverable | Content | Timing | Responsibilities |
| **Inception Report** | Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method | No later than one week after the start of the assignment | Evaluator submits to Project Coordinator and UNDP RTA |
| **Presentation** | Initial Findings | End of desk review | Evaluator submits to Project Coordinator and UNDP RTA and ADB |
| **Draft Final Report** | Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes and GEF IW Tracking tool | Within 2 weeks of the completion of telephone interviews | Evaluator submits to Project Coordinator, project implementing partners, UNDP RTA, UNOPS and ADB for review and comments |
| **Final Report\*** | Revised report with completed GEF IW Tracking tool | Within 2 week of receiving comments from UNDP and relevant partners on draft | Sent to UNDP APRC for uploading to UNDP ERC. ADB will also receive a copy. |

\*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 two evaluation specialists*.* The first (team leader) will also have work experience in Coastal and Ocean Management and the second (team member) in Knowledge Management. The specialists may be internal or external and national or international, provided they should possess the qualifications specified in the detailed Terms of Reference. The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The Specialist is an expert in project evaluation with work experience in coastal and ocean or natural resource management. The Specialist should possess the following qualification:

* Minimum 10 years of relevant professional experience
* Experience in project design, project cycle management, and project monitoring and evaluation, familiarity with evaluation processes, UN and/or ADB procedures preferred.
* A thorough understanding of GEF principles and expected impacts in terms of global benefits;
* Notable experience with coastal and ocean, transboundary waters management or natural resource management in GEF IW project regions, particularly in East Asia.
* Academic and/or professional background in coastal and ocean or natural resource management, knowledge management, development studies or related fields, or equivalent demonstrated experience. A minimum of 10 years relevant experience is required in relevant fields;
* Experience in Knowledge Management at multi-institutional scales.
* Excellent ability to work in English, effective oral and written communication skills;
* Experience with researching and writing on international environment and/or international development issues;
* Facility and access to use of Internet email and Microsoft office (word, excel etc)

**Duties and Responsibilities for the team leader**

1. Preparation of Inception report included team work plan and schedule. The Specialist will coordinate with the other team member in developing the team’s work plan and schedule for the implementation of the final evaluation. The Specialist is expected to attend meetings and participate in team discussions and provide technical inputs relevant to his field of expertise.

* + 1. Data gathering. The Specialist will gather data through desk-top review of the available and relevant documents, and conduct interviews (via teleconference) or field visits (if necessary) to the following sites and relevant offices:
       - CTI Secretariat;
       - Relevant CT countries if deemed necessary
    2. Analysis and evaluation. The Specialist will evaluate the effectiveness of the overall project management strategies, approaches and methodology in relation to the project development objectives and the overall global environmental goals as mentioned in Evaluation Criteria & Ratings section.

Evaluator Ethics

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

Payment modalities and specifications

For the Evaluation Team Leader:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| % | Milestone |
| *30%* | Following submission and approval of the Inception report (Team Work plan) |
| *40%* | Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report |
| *30%* | Following submission and approval (UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report |

Annex A: Project Logical Framework

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Strategy** | **Objectively verifiable indicators** | | | | |
| ***Goal*** | **Coastal and marine ecosystems, especially in the Coral Triangle, are managed sustainably, with equitable outcomes for all communities that depend on these resources for their livelihoods and with long term protection of the globally significant biological diversity in coastal and marine ecoregions.** | | | | |
|  | **Indicator** | ***Baseline*** | ***Target*** | **Sources of verification** | **Risks and Assumptions** |
| **Objective of the project**  Improved management of coastal and marine ecosystems through efficient and effective inter- and intra-regional adaptive learning processes. | Effective, efficient management systems drawn from targeted learning from the GEF international waters (IW) program applied in the Coral Triangle and other areas by 2010. | Establishment of information sharing and targeted learning in previous IW:LEARN project. | Lessons learned from previous IW projects, and from World Ocean Conference applied by the six CTI countries. | Attendance at WOC in 2009  Hits on IW:LEARN website  CTI Regional Plan of Action and country action plans  CTI monitoring and evaluation system. | **Risk**: Among the many environmental and natural resource crises globally, marine and coastal ecosystems may remain relatively neglected.  **Assumption**: Development partners, including the private sector, will substantially increase external funding of coral reef management, along with increased funding from national governments. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Target** | **Sources of verification** | **Risks and Assumptions** |
| **Outcome 1:**  To foster critical thinking, creativity, learning, and partnership building towards the achievement of WSSD goals and the MDGs related to oceans, coasts, and SIDS, and in response to new ocean issues. | Strategic plan and program of work for 2010-2014 addressing the WSSD targets on oceans, coasts, and SIDS, prepared by Global Forum Working Groups completed by December 2009, in the following areas: - Climate, oceans, and security - Achieving progress markers on EBM and ICM 2010 goals - Large Marine Ecosystems management - Marine biodiversity and networks of MPAs - Fisheries and aquaculture  - SIDS and implementation of the Mauritius Strategy - Linking the management of freshwater, coasts, and oceans | Disparate plans and programs implemented by various organizations to address each of the WSSD targets on oceans, coasts, and SIDS. | Seven Strategic Plans and Program of Work that incorporate ongoing plans and programs as well as new projects to address weak areas/gaps in each. Drafts completed for presentation at GOC2010 in April 2010. | Seven Policy Briefs/Planning Documents | **Assumptions:**  The process will engage adequate representation from major stakeholders.  The approach and methods used by the Working Groups capture relevant knowledge and insights and apply best practices.  The strategic planning process will run in support of existing formal processes.  The strategic plan and program of work will be adopted, supported and carried out by stakeholders involved in the process.  **Risks:**  The planning process is carried out with excessively optimistic assumptions and expectations regarding goals, objectives, activities, timing, and resources that could be accessed to implement the plan. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Target** | **Sources of verification** | **Risks and Assumptions** |
|  | 2. Tangible recommendations from multi-stakeholder dialogues at WOC2009, on the following issues:  (i) Ocean/climate issues included in the climate negotiations and vice versa (ii) Understanding and developing policy responses to global ocean changes – ocean warming, acidification, changes in currents, changes in polar regions (iii) Promoting international commitment and funding to respond to the differential effects of climate change on different regions (iv) Encouraging adaptation in the context of EBM/ICM (v) Properly managing mitigation efforts that use the oceans, e.g. carbon storage and sequestration and iron fertilization (vi) Encouraging alternative forms of energy using the oceans (vii) Managing air pollution from ships. | Broad recommendations on areas that need further progress in research and policy development. | Specific recommendations on action in each area that could be further pursued by stakeholders and included in the strategic plan and program of work for 2010-2014, prepared by end-June 2009. | Report of the World Ocean Conference/Global Ocean Policy Day.  Manado Ocean Declaration. | **Assumptions:**  WOC2009 will draw wide participation from governments, NGOs, intergovernmental organizations, the science and business communities.  WOC2009 adapts an open and transparent stakeholder process to ensure stakeholder support and adoption of the Conference outputs, especially the Manado Ocean Declaration.  **Risks:** The Conference could be perceived as too government-dominated which could jeopardize the adoption/application of the Manado Ocean Declaration.  If multi-stakeholder dialogues during WOC2009 are not well managed, stakeholder confidence and trust, and participation in future multi-stakeholder meetings will be at risk. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Target** | **Sources of verification** | **Risks and Assumptions** |
|  | 3. 5th Global Oceans Conference successfully accomplished in April 2010. | Policy recommendations towards achieving the WSSD targets emanating from the Hanoi Conference.  400 participants from various sectors | Strategic Plan and Program of Work for 2010-2014 for each of the WSSD targets endorsed by GOC2010 participants, completed by end June 2010. 500 participants from various sectors | Conference Report. | **Assumptions:** Stakeholders will be adequately represented in the dialogue and engage in effective interaction.  Adequate resources are made available for effective stakeholder participation and representation.  Expectations among stakeholders are articulated and clear objectives and outcomes are categorically conveyed.  **Risks:**  Proliferation of loud/strong voices during the dialogue could lead to inaction or fragmentation of efforts.  Disengagement of disappointed stakeholders if dialogue outcomes are not achieved, expectations are unmet, and no follow on activities are developed. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Target** | **Sources of verification** | **Risks and Assumptions** |
|  | 4. Recommendations towards the development of a new IW program area on governance of marine areas beyond national jurisdiction (MABNJ) for consideration in the next GEF replenishment process (GEF5) produced by June 2009. | There is no program on governance of marine areas beyond national jurisdiction under the GEF IW focal area. | Governance of marine areas beyond national jurisdiction officially becomes part of the IW focal area under GEF5, as a new program by completion of the GEF5 replenishment process. | Concept proposals for regional case studies  Document for discussion submitted to the GEF Council and Technical Advisory Committee for the GEF5 replenishment. | **Assumptions:**  GEF Council will accept that the IW focal area should include governance of MABNJ and that measures of impacts could be formulated.  **Risks:** Because of the sub-optimal level of data and information available in marine areas beyond national jurisdiction, their remoteness and other confounding factors, success and performance measures may be difficult to formulate and apply; attribution to present and future interventions will be more difficult to establish |
|  | 5. Ocean leadership training program for high-level decision-makers developed and implemented at least twice for the following groups of countries by 2012.  - CTI countries and SIDS  - East Africa and CPLP | No such training program exists. | An ocean leadership training program for high-level decision-makers (with 25-30 participants per session) institutionalized under the sponsorship of a lead institution (GOF and partners) implemented in 2 sessions, with the first in September 2010. | Training Package and Report of Implementation. | **Assumptions:**  The Ocean Leadership Training will be institutionalized under the sponsorship of the Global Forum and other main collaborators. Sustainability will rely on good feedback from inclusion of an M&E program.  **Risks:** Diverse backgrounds of potential clients will require a combination of content and pedagogic techniques. A faulty training needs assessment could result in an ineffective training program. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Target** | **Sources of verification** | **Risks and Assumptions** |
|  | 6. Public education and outreach program on climate change and oceans developed and implemented by end of 2011. | No such program currently exists. | A collaborative public education program that effectively communicates the importance of integrating ocean considerations in the climate agenda and vice versa. | Program document and Report of Implementation. | **Assumptions:**  Collaborators can raise matching resources to augment the seed money provided by the GEF grant.  The key ocean information to be used in the public education program will emanate from the insights gleaned by the GOF Working Groups during their deliberations in the strategic planning process. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Target** | **Sources of Verification** | **Risks and Assumptions** |
| **Outcome 2**: Improved adaptive management of transboundary marine, coastal and freshwater systems. **Expected learning outcomes** include assessable increased GEF IW project capacity at 3 levels: (i) individual project stakeholders; (ii) organizations; and (iii) governments, fostering enabling environments for transboundary cooperation to deepen and accelerate EBM and policy reform processes. | GEF IW projects actively exchanging knowledge and expertise in regional, thematic, institutional or EBM-related COMMUNITIES OF PRACTICE.  GEF IW projects in IWC host region showing ownership and engaging actively in IWC5.  Alignment of GEF IWC with cycles of WWF & GOF in order to better feed GEF input into global processes.  GEF IW projects advance application of EBM to integrate natural resource systems management (e.g. integrated freshwater and marine, land and water, and climatic VARABILITY AND change).  Key lessons transferred through peer-to-peer learning.  Successful scientific and technical innovation and lessons from GEF IW project experience shared across global portfolio.  GEF IW projects reporting on EBM and MDGs. Worldwide dissemination of IW project success, contribution to MDGs, and media support for expansion of IW projects.  Project designs based on IW best-practice learning.  Projects replicate successful approaches of comparable projects.  Projects disseminate key information and share progress with the portfolio. | Some GEF IW projects participate on ad hoc basis in regional, thematic, institutional or EBM-related CoPs.  One host region project showcases key learning at GEF IWC.  GEF IWC not linked with global freshwater & ocean meeting cycles or processes.  Surface and groundwater and coastal management are not integrated; CLIMATIC VARIABILITY AND CHANGE NOT MAINSTREAMED  No self-sustaining mechanism for GEF IW inter-project exchange, global portfolio learning and assessment.  Partial resource base for transferring key lessons learnt from GEF IW project implementation, with room for improvement.  Projects do not regularly report on progress vis-à-vis EBM and MDGs. GEF IW projects report on immediate objectives only.  Approximately 30 IWEN’s produced, but do not sufficiently cover a suite of thematic areas  Projects are designed independently of previous IW project experience and common errors are repeated.  Less than 10% of the portfolio regularly shares their news, events, announcements and releases broadly. | AT LEAST 10 GEF IW PROJECTS PARTICIPATE (MEASURED BY AN AVERAGE OF ONE LOGIN AND CONTENT UPLOAD OR DOWNLOAD PER WEEK) in at least 4 CoPs by Q2 2010.  At least 3 Asia/Pacific IW projects commit by Q2 2009 to co-host IWC5; host region projects prepare achievements and contribute to leadership on SIDS, oceans and climate impacts  Mechanisms for linking GEF portfolio learning cycle with GOF and WWF6 agreed by Q4 2010.  I) At least 50% of GEF5 IW projects by Q4 2010 INCLUDED ACTUAL ACTIVITIES RELATED TO OR AT LEAST REFERENCING integratED ECOSYSTEM-BASED MANAGEMENT and THE MAINSTREAMING OF CLIMATIC VARIABILITY AND CHANGE. II) 10 RECOMMENDATIONS TO GEF PRODUCED AT IWC5 ON MAINSTREAMING CLIMATIC VARIABILITY AND CHANGE  I) At least 50% of GEF IWC-5 ATTENDING PROJECTS provides input for participative portfolio learning cycle and testing improvements by Q4 2009; II) 50% of IWC5-attending GEF IW project managers attend a project management training session at IWC5; At least 95% of participant evaluations FROM at least 3 pre-IWC technical workshops confirm increased capacity vs. individual baselines, and/or indicate changes to personal or institutional work plans. III) 50% of IWC5-attending GEF IW projects managers attend a project management training session at IWC5. IV) AT LEAST 10 INTER-PROJECT EXCHANGES DOCUMENT LEARNING BY Q4 2011 INCLUDING AT LEAST ONE NEW GEF IW PROJECT PER REGION, EACH FEATURING AT LEAST 2 STAKEHOLDERS.  All GEF IW projects report on their contributions to EBM and MDGs as part of regular reporting and on iwlearn.net profiles by Q4 2009.  At least 30 GEF IWENs produced for GFOCI and WWF6, by Q1 2011. At least 1 IWEN from each region and from each ecosystem-type per year.  At least 10 inter-project exchanges document learning by Q4 2011, including at least one new GEF IW project per region, each featuring at least 2 stakeholders.  25% of new GEF IW projects emulate an experience from an existing GEF IW project.  50% GEF IW portfolio syndicates their news, events, announcements and report releases via www.iwlearn.net. By 2010, 75% of active GEF IW projects report annually on their efforts to address MDGs. | Discussion threads, posted content, resources downloaded, profiles created, and/or news posted; active participation in IWC5 online collaboration website before the conference and in CoP sites post-meeting.  Host projects make plenary presentations at IWC on their key results  GEF projects featured in WWF and GOF session proceedings and IW:LEARN involved in planning process for WWF6; Integration workshop at WOC2009.  Project documents, PIFs, and CEO endorsement forms.  Project multimedia content featured on IWC5 website; Learning Exchange reports, virtual Innovation Marketplace, IWC5 report and participant evaluation.  Pre-conference workshop and working group reports, IWC5 proceedings, on GEF-IWC website or [www.iwlearn.net](http://www.iwlearn.net).  Participant evaluations; participant lists; workshop reports.  Project multimedia content featured on IWC5 website; Learning Exchange reports, virtual Innovation Marketplace, IWC5 report and participant evaluation. Pre-conference workshop and working group reports, IWC5 proceedings, on GEF-IWC website or [www.iwlearn.net](http://www.iwlearn.net).  Reporting on project profiles at www.iwlearn.net also via gefonline.org, and PIR-APR processes.  IWENs produced and posted to iwlearn.net covering process and stress reduction themes. Project design documents, post-evaluation of IW projects.  Media reports, RSS feeds to iwlearn.net, website content, and independent reviews of IW portfolio. | **Assumptions**:  Participative peer learning is perceived as valuable for all GEF IW projects.  Project stakeholders are encouraged to utilize IW:LEARN services at all levels of implementation and execution  Participants are sufficiently aware of GEF IW:LEARN and know how to both engage its services and provide their own experience to peers (via CoP participation, IWEN production IWC engagement and information syndication)  GEF IW:LEARN and partners can obtain sufficient post-intervention feedback on effectiveness through participant evaluation  Organizers of key international and regional dialogues are willing to engage the GEF portfolio  Given IW project experience is replicable by other projects  Projects possess the means to report on progress vis-a-vis MDGs    **Risks:**  Not all GEF IW projects are willing to engage in various types of portfolio learning activities or to expose any weaknesses in project implementation to external scrutiny.  Geopolitical and economic conditions enable full participation in the IWC5  Online/virtual services are inaccessible to some stakeholders for technical reasons |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Target** | **Sources of verification** | **Risks and Assumptions** |
| **Outcome 3**  Improved management system for CTI strategic planning and implementation of the CTI program of action through inter- and intra-regional adaptive learning processes. | CT countries meet targets specified in the action plan REPLACED WITH: WORKING PLATFORMS FOR KM IS ESTABLISHED  Effective management systems and strategic planning operative throughout the 6 CTI countries.  Regional learning mechanisms including regional workshops, regional training programs, and university level training established for all CTI countries.  Increased commitment of financial resources to sustainable natural resources management over a 2008 baseline. CHANGE TO : To upgrade the capacities of CT6 countries to prepare a sustainable financing plan for priority targets of NPOA implementation and identify potential sources of financing and utilize these plans to inform the development of a regional financial architecture on Sustainable Financing  Pilot projects prepared and ready for implementation by end 2011. (This indicator was removed from PIR 2011 as THIS IS NOT PART OF THE DMF) | Ineffective implementation of agreed plans.  Excessive attention on implementation progress and not on long term capacity building.  Ad hoc training activities and ineffective approach to development of centers of excellence.  Inadequate resourcing of plans of action as a major constraint on project implementation.  Ad hoc identification of projects. | AT LEAST 6 NATIONAL AND 3 REGIONAL WORKSHOP PROGRAMES ORGANIZED BY OCTOBER 2012 INCLUDING WORKSHOPS ORGANIZED TO SUPPORT THE FORCUS AREAS (SCTR, SF, PES)  Baseline assessments completed by December 2010.  Communications strategy included as part of the CTI RPoA by May 2009 and all CTI project staff adequately trained by end 2011.  First phase of implementation of the RPoA fully funded by December 2011.  At least 5 pilot projects prepared by December 2011.: (NOTE no such targets exist in the DMF) | Project/program reports and annual reports of national CTI secretariats.  Workshop reports, training curricula, and university course contents.  Annual reports of development partners, private sector, and national governments  National budgets for coral reef management, research, and training.. | **Risk**: Among the many environmental and natural resource management needs, coral reefs may not be given adequate priority.  CTI project funding may overwhelm national implementation capacity, thus diverting practitioners away from learning opportunities.  **Assumptions**: National governments will release staff for adequate periods of time to receive on-the-job and longer term training in natural resources management.  Development partners, including the private sector, will substantially increase external funding of coral reef management, along with increased funding from national governments. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome 4**  **Project Coordination and Management**  Improved coordination and integration between the global oceans and coastal agenda, the GEF international waters portfolio, and CTI. | Effective linkage of global, regional, and national level coastal and marine EBM.  Efficient, transparent, and effective results-based management of all project components. | Separate activities at global, regional and national level, missing opportunities for portfolio learning.  Separate project component management. | At least 1,000 CTI practitioners effectively linked to global best practice through IW:LEARN by December 2011.  Mid-term and final project evaluations fully satisfactory. | IW:LEARN website.  US CTI Program Integration Portal.  IWC5 participant evaluation and IWENs.  Project progress reports by PCU. | **Risk**: The challenges of integrated management and a coordinated approach may overwhelm project participants and cause them to fall back into a reliance on disparate sectoral and national approaches.  **Assumption**: Results-based management will be adopted by all components. |

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

1. UNDP policies and guidances:
   1. UNDP Evaluation policy (<http://www.undp.org/evaluation/documents/Evaluation-Policy.pdf>)
   2. Project-Level Evaluation; guidance for conducting terminal evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-Financed projects (<http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/UNDP-GEF-TE-Guide.pdf>)
   3. UNDP Results-Oriented Monitoring and Evaluation manual: UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results (<http://web.undp.org/evaluation/handbook/>)
2. GEF Monitoring and Evaluation policies: GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy 2010 (<http://www.thegef.org/gef/node/4184>)
3. Pertinent information available at the project web site: [www.iwlearn.net](http://www.iwlearn.net) and relevant websites of each component as follow:
   1. Component 1: GOF (<http://www.globaloceans.org>)
   2. Component 2: IW Learn (<http://iwlearn.net>) and the 5th GEF Biennial International Waters Conference (IWC5) report at: <http://iwlearn.net/abt_iwlearn/events/iwc5/iwc5_finalreport.pdf>
   3. Component 3: ADB (RETA 7307) (<http://www.primexinc.org/cti_km/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=57&Itemid=60>)
4. UNDP IW:Learn/CTI project document
5. ADB IW:Learn [Project Document](http://www.adb.org/Documents/TARs/REG/43126-REG-TAR.pdf) (RETA 7307)
6. ADB Evaluation Guidelines at: (<http://www.adb.org/Documents/Guidelines/Evaluation/PPER-PSO/default.asp>).
7. Inception report
8. Quarterly Operational Reports
9. Annual Performance Reports/Annual Project Implementation Reviews (APRs/PIRs)
10. GEF IW Tracking tool
11. Contracts, MOUs, MOAs
12. Organizational Chart and Functional Charts

Annex C: Evaluation Questions

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

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

Annex D: Rating Scales

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

Annex E: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form

**Evaluators:**

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

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form[[3]](#footnote-3)**

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

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

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

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

Signed at *place* on *date*

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

Annex F: Evaluation Report Outline[[4]](#footnote-4)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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[[5]](#footnote-5)) |
| **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[[6]](#footnote-6)) |
| **3.1** | Project Design / Formulation   * Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators) * Assumptions and Risks * Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design * Planned stakeholder participation * Replication approach * UNDP comparative advantage * Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector * Management arrangements |
| **3.2** | Project Implementation   * Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation) * Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region) * Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management * Project Finance: * Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (\*) * UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (\*) coordination, and operational issues |
| **3.3** | Project Results   * Overall results (attainment of objectives) (\*) * Relevance(\*) * Effectiveness & Efficiency (\*) * Country ownership * Mainstreaming * Sustainability (\*) * Impact |
| **4.** | Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons   * Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project * Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project * Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives * Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success |
| **5.** | Annexes   * ToR * Itinerary * List of persons interviewed * Summary of field visits * List of documents reviewed * Evaluation Question Matrix * Questionnaire used and summary of results * Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form |

Annex G: Evaluation Report Clearance Form

*(to be completed by the Project Coordinator 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: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](http://www.undp.org/evaluation/handbook), Chapter 7, pg. 163 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office:  [ROTI Handbook 2009](http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/M2_ROtI%20Handbook.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)