Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference

INTRODUCTION

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**“Strengthening the Protected Area System of the Komi Republic to Conserve Virgin Forest Biodiversity in the Pechora River Headwaters Region”** Project (PIMS 2496).

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

Project Summary Table

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Title: | “Strengthening the Protected Area System of the Komi Republic to Conserve Virgin Forest Biodiversity in the Pechora River Headwaters Region” | | | | | |
| GEF Project ID: | | 2035 |  | *at endorsement*  *(Million US$)* | | *at completion*  *(Million US$)* |
| UNDP Project ID: | | PIMS 2496  Atlas00059042 | GEF financing: | 4.50 | | 4.50 |
| Country: | | Russian Federation | IA/EA own: | 0.00 | | 0.00 |
| Region: | | Europe & CIS | Government: | 12.59 | | 12.59 |
| Focal Area: | | Biodiversity | Other: | 3.31 | | 10.59 |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): | | SP1 | Total co-financing: | 15.90 | | 23.18 |
| Executing Agency: | | Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MNR) | Total Project Cost: | **20.40** | | 27.68 |
| Other Partners involved: | | Department of Federal Service for Control in the Field of Nature Use (”Rosprirodnadzor”) of Komi Republic) | ProDoc Signature (date project began): | | | 22 July 2008 |
| EU Clima East project start-up: | | | July 2013 |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | | Proposed:  July 2014 (for the GEF)  July 2016 (for EU Clima East component) | Actual:  September 2014 (tbc for the GEF)  tbd for EU Clima East component |

Objective and Scope

The project was designed to improve the representation of the Scandinavian and Russian taiga and Ural montane forest tundra in the federal, regional and local system of protected areas in Russia and in particular in the Komi Republic being a key repository of biodiversity of these ecosystems. The project supports restructuring of the PA system in Komi Republic by seeking to enhance the systemic and institutional capacities so manage the redesigned system and to diversify income streams to ensure the PA System is more financially sustainable.

In addition to the GEF intervention, in early 2010, with funding from the International Climate Initiative (ICI) of the German government, UNDP launched a project targeting the boreal forests of Komi as carbon stocks which are at major risk from forest fires. The project was designed to build the capacity of local stakeholders and improves infrastructure at targeted protected areas in the Komi Republic enabling them to effectively mitigate human and climate change risks, develop, implement and monitor effectively climate change adaptation measures. Total budget for the ICI-funded project “carbon” component made up EUR 2,999,230 (USD 4,175,118.58), the component is operationally completed as of September 30, 2013.

In 2013, an agreement was reached with the European Union via the ClimaEast initiative to support yet another component of the project aimed at the conservation and restoration of ecosystems in the permafrost. The main objective of the component is to develop and demonstrate effective approaches to conservation and restoration of forests with large reserves of carbon and swamps in permafrost conditions in the Russian North, optimization of their management in a changing climate. The component was initiated in connection with the growth of international understanding of the relationship of climate and permafrost. It is implemented in the Republic of Komi and the Nenets Autonomous Okrug. Implementation of the new component is designed for 4 years (2013-2016). Total funding amounts to USD 3,246,750.00 (EUR 2.5 million), as well UNDP administration fee of 7% (USD 227,272.50). The Clima East Pilot in Russia is part of a larger EU Clima East Pilot project which involves other countries in the Europe and CIS region on issues of peatlands restoration (Belarus, Russia South and Ukraine) and pastures management (Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia and Moldova).

As the project is multi-donor funded and includes not only the GEF, but also German ICI and EU funded components which are complementary and share the same implementation approach and modality, the TE will be focused on the assessment of the GEF-funded intervention but also give an opinion of project efficiency, overall impact and sustainability of results for the extended programme and not only the GEF-funded outcomes. This overall TE for the GEF project is timed at the mid-term for the EU Clima East project and thus recommendations related to the EU contribution of the intervention should take this into account (i.e. recommendations as part of an MTE can include suggestion on improvements in further project management and effectiveness).

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, and as agreed in the EU-UNDP Financial and Administrative Framework Agreement (FAFA).

The objectives of the evaluation (from the UNDP-GEF project and German ICI perspective) 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 programming. The objectives for the MTE part of the EU Clima East component is to assess progress towards the achievement of the Clima East Pilot project objective, identify and document lessons learned (including lessons that might improve design and implementation), and to make recommendations regarding specific actions that might be taken to improve the project. The evaluation will play a critical role in the future implementation of the project by providing advice on: (i) how to strengthen the adaptive management and monitoring function of the project; (ii) how to ensure accountability for the achievement of the EU Clima East Pilot project objective; and (iii) how to enhance organizational and development learning, including among the other peatlands projects under the Clima East.

Evaluation approach and method

An overall approach and method[[1]](#footnote-1) for conducting project terminal and mid-term 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*](#_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, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region, EU Clima East Pilot Project Regional Coordinator and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Moscow and Syktuvkar (Komi Republic), including pilot project sites in Komi Republic, such as Pechoro-Ilychsky Nature Reserve and Yugyd-va National Park*.* Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: Federal Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment, Nature Protection Agency of Komi Republic, Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection of Komi Republic, Komi Forest Committee, Pechoro-Ilychsky Nature Reserve and Yugyd-va National Park, the Republican Center for the Support to Protected Areas and Natural Resource Management (Regional PA Directorate), Komi Institute of Biology, RAS Forest Institute, GazpromTransgas Ukhta Ltd., and/or other major private sector stakeholders.

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.

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](#_TOR_Annex_A:)), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The expectations of the EU Clima East project are set out in Outcome 4 of the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see  [Annex A](#_TOR_Annex_A:).1) and within the Project Description (see Annex A.2.) 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: |  |

Ratings for the criteria in the Table above will be deemed the same for the UNDP/GEF project and the EU Clima East Pilot, unless otherwise noted in the Table. It is anticipated that ratings on sustainability may differ due to the remaining time remaining in case of the latter project, and the evaluator shall note any such disparities in the Table, using footnotes of comments as deemed necessary by him/her.

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$) | | Government  (mill. US$) | | Partner Agency  (mill. US$) | | Other | | Total  (mill. US$) | |
| Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual |
| Grants | 0.00 |  | 12.59 |  |  |  | 3.31 |  | 15.90 |  |
| Loans/Concessions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * In-kind support |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals | 0.00 |  | 12.59 |  |  |  | 3.31 |  | 15.90 |  |

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.[[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 Project Support Office (PSO) in the Russian Federation. The UNDP PSO 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 up to two months; within this time period, up to *32* days working days are expected to be distributed according to the following plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Time allocation | Tentative timeframe |
| **Preparation** | *4* days | *Tentatively Sept 1-4* |
| **Evaluation Mission** | *14* days (incl.travel) | *Tentatively Sept 14-28* |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | *10* days | *Tentatively Oct 15* |
| **Final Report** | *4* days | *Tentatively Oct 31* |

Evaluation deliverables

The evaluator is expected to deliver the following:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Deliverable | Content | Timing | Responsibilities |
| **Inception Report** | Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method | No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission. | Evaluator submits to UNDP CO |
| **Presentation** | Initial Findings | End of evaluation mission | To project management, UNDP CO |
| **Draft Final Report** | Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes | Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission | Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, EU Clima East Regional Coordinator, PCU, GEF OFPs |
| **Final Report\*** | 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 will be conducted by an international evaluator with prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. 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:

* Minimum *7* years of relevant professional experience
* Knowledge of UNDP and GEF, experience in EU –funded projects is considered to be an asset;
* Previous experience with results‐based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
* Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s). Knowledge of role of biodiversity (eco-system management) in climate change issues (including GHG mitigation benefits and peatlands function as carbon pools) is considered an asset;
* Familiarity with protected area policies and management structures in Eastern Europe/CIS/Russia
* Excellent English communication and report writing skills

Evaluator Ethics

Evaluation consultant 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

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

Application process

Applicants are requested to send their applications to UNDP responsible official at [irina.bredneva@undp.org](mailto:irina.bredneva@undp.org) by June 15, 2014. The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in 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 (revised after MTE)

| Project Objective and Outcomes | Objectively verifiable indicators | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Goal | A comprehensive, ecologically representative and effectively managed national system of protected areas in the Russian Federation ensures conservation of globally significant and threatened ecosystems | | | | | |
|  | Indicator | Baseline | Mid-term target | End of project Target | Sources of verification | Risks and Assumptions |
| Objective:  A representative and effectively managed network of protected areas ensures conservation of pristine boreal forest and taiga ecosystems in the Komi Republic | Total area of PA sites replaced by new/alternative sites with the higher BD value (hectares) | No replacement; KR PA system covers 14% of the area of the KR | Proposals for at least 10,000ha of replacement PAs with higher global BD values; KR PA system covers 14% of the area of the KR | At least 10,000 ha of replacement PAs with higher global BD values; KR PA system covers 14% of the area of the KR | Maps, project reports and ground surveys | The specified Outcomes represent all the necessary changed conditions required to meet the Objective  There is significant cutting of co-financing because of the systemic crisis  Significant negative consequences of Forest Code acceptance  External changes, beyond the control of the project, do not negate the project results |
| Ecosystem coverage and representativeness in the regional PA system | Area covered by different habitat types in PAs of the Komi Republic is not defined  Area covered by various vegetation types in PAs of the Komi Republic is not defined | Coverage of habitat types identified in main geographical zones as a result of PAs inventory. Proposals for improved coverage for:  - Old-growth forests  - Mire ecosystems  - Upper reaches of rivers  - Lower reaches of rivers  - Tundra ecosystems:  - Key habitats with concentration of rare species  Coverage of vegetation types identified in main geographical zones as a result of PAs inventory. Proposals for improved coverage for:  - Dark-coniferous taiga  - Mountain boreal coniferous forests  - Birch and birch-spruce open forests  - Stony lichen tundra, with sparse mosses and lichens  - Typical tundra, with a well-developed low- shrub moss layer | Inventory of biodiversity in the regional PA system completed. Habitat types and vegetation types are identified for the whole system.  Coverage of underrepresented habitats and vegetation types increased by at least 10 % from existing PA’s areas.  A strategy for further development of regional PA system of the Komi Republic developed. | Maps, official documents, project reports and ground surveys. | Political commitment of the regional government is maintained.  State financing for PA system inventory and gap analysis materializes in time. |
| Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT) scores | Pechoro-Ilychsky Nature Reserve: 52  National Park “Yugyd va”: 30  Ichtyological reserve “Ilychsky”: 18.5  Complex reserve “Usinsky complexny”: 24.2  Marsh reserve “Ocean”: 11.5  Complex reserve “Udorsky”: 18.5 | Pechoro-Ilychsky Nature Reserve: 59  National Park “Yugyd va”: 38  Ichtyological reserve “Ilychsky”: 30  Complex reserve “Usinsky complexny”: 32  Marsh reserve “Ocean”: 18  Complex reserve “Udorsky”: 23 | Pechoro-Ilychsky Nature Reserve: 69  National Park “Yugyd va”: 51  Ichtyological reserve “Ilychsky”: 46.2  Complex reserve “Usinsky complexny”: 45  Marsh reserve “Ocean”: 33.5  Complex reserve “Udorsky”: 41.5 | Mid-term and final METT analyses for PAs | There is relative stability in the local economy;    Political stability, law and order are maintained;  No significant increase in the external pressures on protected areas; |
| Outcome 1: The PA system of Komi republic is redesigned so as to better capture globally significant BD. | Increase in coverage of undisturbed/pristine forest ecosystems in the regional PA system | 0 ha | Proposals for re-structuring completed, paperwork prepared.  Preliminary list of regional PAs to be re-designed developed as a result of inventory and gap analysis. | End-of-project target value (e.g. how many ha of pristine forests unprotected at baseline are to be covered with the regional PA system) is to be determined upon completion of the biodiversity inventory in the regional PAs | Official documents, project reports, ground verification if necessary | Institutional capacity and resources deployed to manage protected areas;  Responsible agencies remain willing to integrate conservation in the local development agenda;  Continuous political support for decentralization. |
| Senior staff of the Department of Rosprirodnadzor, MNR/KR and individual protected areas consider that there is a functioning KR PA system | 0% | 20% | 70% | Structured interviews |
| Outcome 2: Increased institutional capacity for management of protected areas within the KR PA system | Annual contribution to the KR PA system through public-private partnerships | Estimated $80,000 (check) | $140,000 | $250,000 | Annual reports of implementing agencies, audit reports | No major changes in macro-economic situation  Government commitment to supplement budgets where necessary remains strong |
| Annual contribution supporting PA infrastructure development through the Ecological Fund | $0 | Fund established | $60,000 | Project and Fund audit reports |
| Financial scorecard value | $650,000 | $1,000,000 | $1,680,000 | Financial scorecard |
| Capacity Assessment Scorecard values | Systemic: 8  Institutional: 12  Individual: 6 | Systemic: 10  Institutional: 12  Individual: 8 | Systemic: 20  Institutional: 30  Individual: 12 | Capacity scorecard conducted before project implementation, and during the MTE and FEV |
| Surveys of residents of communities close to the protected areas shows increased support for the protected areas, in terms of answers to questions such as:  Question 1: Does the protected area work for future generation interest?  Question 2: Does the protected area work in the interest of the regional local population?  Question 3: Does the protected area limit the possibilities of economical development of the region?  Question 4: How do you wish to cooperate with the protected area (proportion expressing “no wish)? | Q1: 70.9%  Q2: 28.2%  Q3: 29.5%  Q4: 15.4% | No mid-term targets (too frequent surveys may lead to survey apathy) | Q1: >82%  Q2: >60%  Q3: <20%  Q4: <8% | Surveys/interviews |
| Outcome 3: Application of business planning principles result in diversified revenue streams for the KR PA system | KR PA system business plan has identified revenue sources worth at least $250,000 annually to the system | No plan | Plan under development | Plan with identification of revenue sources amounting to $250,000 annually | Project, MNR/KR reports | No change in legal basis for control over resource management in buffer zones  Government commitment remains strong |
| Revenue from tourism on the territory of Pechora Ilych Zapovednik (including the zone of promotion) | US $22,000 | US$45,000 | U$158,000 | Project and protected area audit reports |
| Revenue from tourism on the territory of National Park “Yugyd va” (including the zone of promotion) | US $53,000 | US$146,000 | U$422,000 |  |  |
| Outcome 4:  Improved protected area system in Komi Republic for better conservation of globally important biodiversity and maintenance of carbon pools | Level of equipment of federal and regional Pas with respect to fire-prevention and CC adaptation | Basic to none | Moderate | High | UNDP monitoring, Reports by federal and regional ministries of environment of Komi |  |
| Emissions of carbon (tC/y) from forest fires at target areas | 134,484 | 94,139 | 65,964 (year 6) | Project monitoring system and annual reports of the Institute of Biology of Komi | External changes, beyond the control of the project, do not negate the project results |
| Hectares burnt annually at targeted areas | 2,328 ha | 1,900 ha | <1,400 ha | Project monitoring system and annual statistics of the regional branch of the Ministry of Emergencies | External changes, beyond the control of the project, do not negate the project results |
| Number of types of climate change adaptation activities tested at Upper Pechora forests | None | At least 2 pilot CC adaptation activities under implementation | At least 4 pilot CC adaptation activities under completion / implementation | Reports from protected area management units. |  |
| Area of high nature-value boreal forests and peatlands in Upper Pechora covered by sophisticated carbon monitoring system | 0 ha | 1.58 million ha (2 federal Pas launch proper carbon monitoring) | 1.63 million ha (all project target PAs complete installation of the carbon monitoring systems) | Reports by federal and regional ministries of environment of Komi |  |
|  | | | | | | |

**Annex A.2: EU Clima East Project description (including climate-based benefits to be achieves Table 2)**

**Protection and restoration of forest and peatland permafrost carbon pools in Komi Republic and Nenetsky Autonomous Okrug**

**Rationale**

The ecosystems of the Komi Republic, and Nenetsky Autonomus Okrug – NAO, belong mainly to the Barents Sea basin. These are rich forest and peat permafrost carbon pools, but are also a valuable source of global biodiversity and at the same time is an important area for industrial development. Komi shelters the only significant block of pristine forest oriented north-south; this has been included by WWF in the list of 200 global ecological regions and by UNESCO in the List of World Natural Heritage Sites ("Pristine forests of Komi"). The 29.2 million hectares of pristine boreal ecosystems in the Komi Republic represent almost 35% of the total pristine forest carbon pools remaining in the European Russia. Komi Republic shelters examples of pristine Scandinavian and Russian taiga which are now largely confined to areas of northeastern Russia, due to many centuries of clearance and logging over much of their former extent. In the north of the republic there are substantial areas with permafrost peatlands. Nenetsky Autonomus Okrug is known as a starting leg of the Euro-African and Eurasian flyways and it hosts the main portion of frozen or permafrost peatlands in Russian North-East.

Forest and soil carbon of the Komi and NAO are some of the key carbon pools of the globe. According to expert assessments of the Institute of Biology of Komi Republic, the 1.63 million[[3]](#footnote-3) of the forests of the Komi Republic alone [and found just in the protected areas in the Pechora river head-waters] contain around 100 million tons of carbon. In an undisturbed state, the annual build-up of sequestration from these forests amounts to over 3 mln[[4]](#footnote-4) tons of carbon. These are the highest nature value forests, mainly spruce forests, 64 % of which are mature and over-mature stands, which store maximum above-ground carbon compared to other forests of the country. At the same time these forests are highly susceptible to fires. Furthermore, under most climate change scenarios, the carbon-rich over-mature spruce stands will be receding, giving way to the proliferation of deciduous stands. Linked to this, the IPCC 4th Assessment Report further predicts that in boreal forests “the tree-line is expected to shift upward by several hundred meters”[[5]](#footnote-5). There is evidence that this process has already begun in Ural Mountains[[6]](#footnote-6).

While the impact of climate on above-ground biomass has been studied to some extent, soil carbon has recently gained international attention, and specifically the permafrost melt as a climate threat is increasingly recognized by the international research community. According to the research of the European Union, “Changes in the soil carbon stock could severely affect global greenhouse gas balance and climate. It remains one of the big unknowns in the global carbon cycle dynamics under a warming climate scenario.”[[7]](#footnote-7) The entire tundra and forest-tundra landscape in the eastern part of the Northern-European Russia is standing on two key inseparable geological layers: permafrost (beneath) and peat layer (above). Functionally, they are interconnected. On the one hand, permafrost maintains conditions for peat formation; on the other hand the peat plays a crucial role for the preservation of the permafrost. These ecosystems, therefore, are extremely vulnerable because of these connections. Changes in any one of the components will inevitably impact the other, and may lead to the drastic changes in landscape structure and biogeochemistry including significant losses in carbon storage. Carbon is released both as result of melting of frozen peat[[8]](#footnote-8) and more deep permafrost layers which may contain peat or more ancient organic structures. Whatever the cause of melting, numerous studies demonstrate the significant release of GHG from melting deep permafrost layers.[[9]](#footnote-9)

The status of peat permafrost ecosystems should be considered through the prism of pending threats. One of the main threats comes from anthropogenic influence. The threat is high, given that NAO and Komi host some of Europe’s largest on-shore oil and gas deposits. Since the 1970''s significant areas of natural ecosystems have been impacted by the extensive prospecting and exploration activities, the exploitation of oil and gas deposits in these areas started in the 1990's. These activities resulted in numerous disturbances to Arctic ecosystems and in dramatic changes in ecosystem regulation functions such as hydrology, permafrost status, carbon storage and exchange

The human activity is enhancing and in some cases is the only cause of changes in permafrost. The 'Arctic Race' will lead to the very rapid expansion of Arctic ecosystems. Buildings, roads and pipelines, open mining constructions, unregulated movement of vehicles, surface contamination are significantly affecting these areas. This makes permafrost the most vulnerable ecosystems in the northern areas. The existing permafrost areas in northern taiga are the most vulnerable permafrost wetlands occurring in boreal zone where thawing is highly probable. The dust, sand and oil pollution lead to the degradation of the peat layer which is protecting the permafrost. Every disturbance of a surface layer in shallow peat tundra leads to the irreversible changes turning carbon accumulating ecosystems into sources of carbon emissions – both directly through GHG emissions and through hydrological flows causing further emissions.

A growing threat to permafrost ecosystems stems from climate change. Since the recess of the last glacier permafrost remained stable for millenniums, accumulating and storing in its depth climatic, geochemical and biological information. But this is changing under climate warning. In the last few decades average temperature increases in the Arctic have been near twice as high as mean global increases[[10]](#footnote-10). This trend is likely to continue and the IPCC predicts increases above global averages in arctic mean temperature and precipitation[[11]](#footnote-11), both key factors regulating permafrost distribution. Abnormally high, recurrent summer precipitation increases the number of days when the organic soil is wet, thus increasing thermal conductivity and promoting permafrost thaw. For stable permafrost, the duration and thickness of winter snow cover is important, especially in discontinuous and sporadic permafrost regions[[12]](#footnote-12) where a thick snow cover acts as an effective insulator and protects the ground from low air temperatures.

According to researchers, “recent years have brought reports from the far north of tundra fires, the release of ancient carbon, CH4 bubbling out of lakes and gigantic stores of frozen soil carbon. The latest estimate is that some 18.8 million square kilometers of northern soils hold about 1,700 billion tones of organic carbon — the remains of plants and animals that have been accumulating in the soil over thousands of years. That is about four times more than all the carbon emitted by human activity in modern times and twice as much as is present in the atmosphere now. Abrupt thaw, as seen here in Alaska's Noatak National Preserve, causes the land to collapse, accelerating permafrost degradation and carbon release. We calculate that permafrost thaw will release the same order of magnitude of carbon as deforestation if current rates of deforestation continue. But because these emissions include significant quantities of methane, the overall effect on climate could be 2.5 times larger”[[13]](#footnote-13). In addition to climate effect, permafrost degradation results in radical change in hydrology, transformation of ecosystems, weakened capacity of soil to sustain infrastructure, and release of methane[[14]](#footnote-14). Thermal monitoring of Russian permafrost revealed a long-term increase of the mean annual temperature in the deep permafrost layers under peat deposits of Russian North. Degraded permafrost has extremely low regeneration capacity, since soil carbon accumulation is very slow in Arctic regions and is very limited in the sub-Arctic.

In view of the above, key ecosystem based mitigation and adaptation approaches in Russian North need to focus on:

* **Expanding and strengthening preservation of vast natural forest and permafrost pools**. It is important to change the economic paradigm in the Arctic areas so that to avoid or minimize the physical anthropogenic impact on the forest and soil cover. **According to Russian researchers those areas where a peaty permafrost has not be disrupted by human activities (e.g. through unsustainable grazing, industrial development, and transport infrastructure), the permafrost is 5 times less prone to melt.** One of the key tools to minimize and avoid destructive economic use is **establishment and maintenance of an effective, interconnected protected area system in the Russian North**. In this light, the **Komi Government committed to extend its protected areas to designate 14.6% of its territory**. Currently the Komi protected areas system includes one state nature reserve, one national park of federal jurisdiction, 165 regional nature sanctuaries and 72 regional nature monuments. A number of protected areas of regional importance are currently considered to be established by the Government. These include tundra ecosystems of the Urals, and permafrost areas near the existing Chrebtovy reserve in the Niau river canyon near Lake Bolshaka Lokhorta. The total size of protected areas in Komi is over 1.58 million hectares of unique forest and Arctic ecosystems of high biodiversity value. While several projects have recently invested in capacities of the federal-level PAs in the Russian North, capacities of the regional and local protected areas (which is the majority of all PAs) remain suboptimal. Regional-level PАs have not been equipped with infrastructure, management staff and financial resources to ensure protection of forest resources. In the most cases management plans are absent or management objectives are out of date. Existing PAs management plans focus on species conservation and do not include objectives of preserving carbon pools, emissions avoidance, maintenance of other regulating services of ecosystems. There is lack of integration of protected areas in the regional development plans and limited involvement of local communities in biodiversity conservation activities and high risk of issuing development permits without accounting for the climatic and biological functions of northern forests and permafrost areas. Climate change impacts have been detected in some of the existing protected areas, e.g. in the high altitude areas of the YUgyd Va national park. These are the loss of glaciers in the Circumpolar Urals that feed large and small rivers in the region[[15]](#footnote-15) and shift of the forest boundaries.
* **Experimenting with peatland permafrost-related ecosystem restoration** at a local level is very important, as currently there is a gap in the international knowledge if and how permafrost can be preserved. One of the primary causes of the degradation of the permafrost layer are the anthropogenic loads on the upper peat soil and vegetation layer caused by industrial companies. The overlying peat soil layer plays a critical role in the mitigation of temperature variations, thus providing a special insulation layer for the permafrost. Loss of the peat layer provokes permafrost melt and can lead to catastrophic emissions of recent and relict methane, and carbon dioxide. It should be taken into account that peat formation is no longer taking place naturally in Arctic peatlands, i.e. the accumulated peat is a relict of earlier times. Thus, the Arctic peat is strictly a non-renewable resource, and the ecosystems lost their ability to restore naturally, and restoration can only be assisted by humans. Although much can be achieved towards reducing the environmental impacts of oil and gas operations when they are active, there will be some unavoidable damage to the natural structures and functions of permafrost ecosystems which cannot be repaired until the decommissioning phase. Rehabilitation is the process of actively repairing the damage. A methodology for rehabilitation of ecosystems damaged by oil and gas development has been designed by Wetlands International in partnership with Shell and presented in the document “Study of Mitigation, Recovery and Restoration Options: Oil and Gas Industry Impacts on Arctic Wetlands”. The methodology has not yet been tested in permafrost areas, and this project will do so.
* **Advanced research and monitoring** of forest and peatland permafrost carbon pools. To date, environmental features of permafrost peatlands in the Arctic remain poorly understood. In the European North-East of Russia the southern limit of permafrost coincides with the southern boundary of the tundra ecosystems and the northern boundary of forest tundra and taiga. Here, unlike in Eastern Siberia, the permafrost layer is discontinuous in space and time. The southern-most permafrost patches of Komi and NAO are of warmer temperatures (-0-20C) than in Siberia, and are subject to higher instability and hence higher vulnerability to degradation caused by anthropogenic activities and climate warming. This makes the permafrost areas of Komi and NAO (which are quite typical for the whole southern limit of the permafrost zone), the most interesting in terms of monitoring and research of climate change impact. Gaining knowledge of the diversity, distribution patterns, and natural functions of the permafrost, on their biodiversity and gas regulation functions makes it possible to plan restoration, conservation, traditional nature management and development projects. While Russian and international researchers have been monitoring high-depth permanent permafrost in Siberia (e.g. the Page21 project), little focus has been given so far to monitoring of the peatland permafrost ecosystems of European Russian, and especially monitoring of ecosystems under different conditions (natural, disturbed or restored).

Activities

The overall objective of the project is to demonstrate effective approaches to conserving, restoring and managing carbon-rich forests and permafrost areas of the Russian North under pending climate change threats. The project will be implemented in Komi Republic and NAO building on synergies with UNDP and ICI projects, and will be highly relevant to raising the level of international knowledge on the climate-permafrost nexus. The objective will be achieved by implementing three activities as outlined below.

**Activity 6: Expanding and strengthening protection of forest and permafrost ecosystem**

In Komi and NAO the project will map and classify peatlands on permafrost, the existing and potential threats for ecosystems on permafrost; define the gradient of ecosystem resistance and resilience, define conservation measures and economic restrictions or alternatives that should apply for sensitive areas, and ultimately recommend an update of land use plans in Komi and NAO based on the preceding studies including conservation and wise use.

In order to increase the coverage of permafrost representativeness in the protected area system, the project will assist in the creation of a new regional zakaznik (20,000 ha in the Chernorechenskaya area) in the permafrost area, and will also strengthen the capacities of the largest forest-and-permafrost PA in Komi Yugyd Va National Park. The project team will assist with negotiating and obtaining necessary land use approvals, equipping protected area units with means to plan and implement conservation and patrolling activities at the PAs, including prevention of illegal logging and fires. The project will design climate mitigation and adaptation plans for these protected areas and deliver means for their implementation. Lastly it will engaging local and indigenous communities into forest fire prevention measures, conservation and adaptation activities. Success of the implementation of climate change mitigation and adaptation activities will be measured through a monitoring system established under activity R3. Further, the project will equip forest guards with means for proper surveillance and monitoring. The new regional zakaznik will become a member of the Public Private Partnership on Protected Areas which was established by UNDP with financing from GEF as a vehicle to bring additional income for protected areas from sustainable economic activities.

**Activity 7: Piloting restoration of peat permafrost ecosystems**

The project will support restoration measures in the pilot sites in Nenetsky Autonomous Okrug in the Shapkina river – including the sites of former exploration and currently exploited areas. The sites were chosen for the presence of several factors: evidence of GHG emissions from melting permafrost, biodiversity value, evidence of destructive impact on permafrost from oil and gas development activities both current and of 1970th, support of local authorities and land-users and relatively higher level of scientific data available about the sites compared to other areas. The pilot areas:

The project will engage local and indigenous communities, regional/local government, and industrial developers in a dialogue about the restoration plan and obtain the agreements. It will further design technical plans for the restoration in line with methodologies developed by experts, costing, and stakeholder involvement plan. It will deliver the equipment, machinery and hydrotechnical facilities required for the restoration, and ultimately implement the restoration projects. The effectiveness of restoration for biodiversity and carbon mitigation will be monitored under Activity R3.

The objective of rehabilitation is the re-establishment of ecological processes, functions and biotic and abiotic linkages; it leads to a persistent, resilient system integrated within its landscape. The sequence and tentative menu of restoration approaches / techniques is:

1. Hydrological restoration. A primary consideration is to reinstate hydrological conditions that are suitable for reinstallment of wetland soils and vegetation above permafrost. Restoration of hydrological regime will be achieved by maintaining drainage or adjusting spatial plans for permanent linear construction; dismantling of temporal linear constructions; adjustment of draining/flooding technologies. At some sites in order to halt further permafrost degradation/melting special cooling technologies (point soil chillers) will be used accompanied with ecosystem restoration measures. Hydrological modeling will be utilized in order to restore natural thermal and hydrological regimes favorable for peat layer maintenance.
2. Revegetation. The next step is revegetation that involves establishing vegetation cover on bare ground or where there is inappropriate or insufficient plant cover. The vegetation that is established might not resemble the original natural plant community, so some wetland functions might not be fully recovered. At the same time, the risk of invasive species increase is low which is proven through many years of research and monitoring at the NAO field research station since 1930. There is a methodology that has been tested with field research over many years. No exotic species are being used. The species that are being used during first years of revegetation activities are regional species that have no invasion potential (e.g. *Phleum, Bromus).* No exotic species will be used. As the next stage the local indigenous species are being added (e.g. cotton-grass, *Eriophorum*) and these species have experimentally been proved to be spreading effectively on their own once the soil erosion is stopped. Previous experiments demonstrate that the mire or peatland vegetation recovers soon after restoring the grass cover, and thus should equally apply for peatland-covered permafrost ecosystems.

Detailed restoration plans and final definition of appropriate restoration techniques will be determined in the first stages of the project, as they require a lot of specialized research and planning before actual restoration can proceed. After rehabilitation the lands will be transferred for use of local deer herders. This had been discussed and agreed between the NAO administration, companies, and herder communities. The communities committed to use the rehabilitated land sustainably in line with methodologies developed by project experts to insure the non-deterioration of the restored ecosystems. The lands will therefore be permanently protected from any new industrial exploitation and thus conditions will be created for rehabilitation of permafrost underlying the restored soil and vegetation layers.

**Activity 8: Monitoring and research on climate-permafrost nexus, publicizing and replicating the experience.**

Under this component, the project will facilitate establishment of a modern monitoring and research program for the permafrost areas of Russian North.

IPCC Guidelines 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories (Chapter Wetlands) do not include permafrost peatlands as specific land type objects. But "2013 Supplement to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories: Wetlands" currently under preparation by IPCC invited by UNFCCC SBSTA at 33rd Session (Dec2010) is focusing on emission and removals including rewetting and restoration of wetlands and aims to cover a range of wetlands types with wide geographical representation incl. those on permafrost. This will urgently require monitoring and research activities to test tiered methodological approaches, in situ evaluation of emission factors and uncertainties.

Within the activity monitoring of three peatland permafrost types will be tested: (1) natural ecosystems which will remain natural due to protection (control), (2) ecosystems which will continue to be subject to anthropogenic impacts, (3) degraded ecosystems after restoration. Monitoring of GHG emissions at each of the three subtypes will be undertaken by the project. Upon completion of the project, the monitoring activities (including carbon monitoring) will be continued by the local research institutes of the Russian Academy of Science

In view of the above, monitoring status will be located at:

* Shapkino 1 – the sites at the restoration area.
* Shapkino 2 – sites subject to anthropogenic impact but not restored,
* Chernorechenskaya – the site without anthropotenic impact, where taiga and tundra join. The site will be put under strict protection category (IUCN I). Under climate change the permafrost under such peatlands is most vulnerable. With geological structure – is plain. This will the one of a kind monitoring.
* Yugyd Va – the site without anthropogenic impact. Will be put under protection but not strict, but which will allow limited management activities (IUCN IV). Geologically this is mountains. Again, this is one of a kind monitoring.

The system will be tested when applied to prepare the scientific background and monitor the results of the two previous activities. It will include collection of data on carbon sequestration and fluxes in permafrost ecosystems (both inside and outside protected areas), scientific basis for the development of mitigation and adaptation measures for Activities R1 and R2. Detailed studies of carbon stocks in intact in permafrost zones (including gas exchange in soils, vegetation and bedding) and temperature monitoring in soil-geocryological complex (active-layer – permafrost) will be carried out. A study on replacement of spruce forest species with deciduous species in forest tundra; shifting altitude and latitude of forest boundaries will be implemented. The impact of climate change on the flora endemics will be carried out. The Activity will support investment in modern climate monitoring technologies to enable accurate measuring of GHG emissions and ground temperatures on pilot territories involving distance monitoring methods, gasometric methods, Eddi-covarians systems, meteostations and temperature loggers. The project results will be processed into scientific and public reports and made available nationally and internationally through a serious of meetings and publications.

*Table 2.Brief overview of climate benefits from site-based activities:*

|  | **Size of the site** | **Brief biogeological description:** | **Access to the site and partnership with land-user (concession holder responsible for decommissioning of mining activities and restoration).** | **Estimated GHG mitigation benefit, tCO2-eq/ha from avoidance of:**  **(a) Peat layer loss (total Carbon storage in 5 cm peat layer, in tCO2 eq./ha)**  **(b) flooding (CH4 emissions per year in tCO2 eq./ha)\***  **Not less than** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Shapkina river – 1 site (NAO) – old exploration site which will be subject to restoration and subsequent monitoring | 180 ha | Southernhypoarctic tundra of European-West Siberian province, Kanin-Pechora subprovince | Direct access by road from Naryan-Mar. Preliminary agreed with Lukoil | (a) 100 tCO2 eq./ha  (b) 10 tCO2 eq./ha/year |
| Shapkina river -2 site (NAO) – the current exploitation site subject to monitoring and agreements with companies to avoid degradation | 60 ha | The same | (a) 100 tCO2 eq./ha  (b) 10 tCO2 eq./ha/year |

\* Rationale behind the assessment of GHG mitigation benefits: The disturbance of vegetation cover, changes in hydrological regime (both drying of peat and flooding), increase of water and wind erosion, permafrost melting and water contamination lead to different processes that end up in GHG emissions. These are:

1. peat layer degradation and loss through direct decomposition and mineralization with further emissions of CO2;
2. peat erosion with later production of GHGs (CO2 under dry and CH4 under wet conditions) from removed organic material (DOC and POC);
3. CH4 emissions due to flooding and permafrost melting.

Estimated GHG mitigation benefits from ecosystem restoration and avoidance of negative impacts include the following:

* avoidance of Carbon release to atmosphere from peat degradation is assessed as total Carbon storage in 5 cm peat layer equated to tones CO2 equivalent/ha. Total avoided GHG efflux in project sites is estimated at 100 tCO2-eq per ha;
* avoidance of GHG (mainly CH4) release due to flooding and permafrost melting mainly because of road/pipe line damming and other influences. Annual avoided GHG efflux is estimated at 10 tCO2-eq per ha (based on non-frost period of 120 days).

Partners

The project will be managed on a national level by the UNDP Office in Russia. UNDP has been implementing a series of protected area project with the Ministry of natural resources and environment of Russian over the past decade. The Ministry has been utilizing lessons, methodologies and management models generated by the UNDP project for further replication through the network of federal protected areas.

The key national partner of the project is the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MNRE), which with its subordinate Federal Service to Hydrological Monitoring and Meteorology (Roshydromet) is responsible for monitoring and reporting on green house gas emission within UNFCCC including those derived from land use change. The Ministry is also responsible for protected areas policies and management of federal protected areas (including the Ugyd Va National Park). The Government of the Komi Republic is another key stakeholder of the project responsible for decision making on land use and the regional protected areas system (regional sanctuaries). Key regional partners will include the Ministry of natural resources of the Komi Republic and the Forestry Service of the Komi Republic. The Administration of the Nenetsk Autonomous Okrug (NAO) will be engages as a partner for permafrost peatlands restoration activities in the NAO pilot site.

To secure high level of professional expertise the project will cooperate with and engage as appropriate the institutes of the Russian Academy of Science (e.g. Institute of Biology of the Komi Scientific Centre, Institute of Forest Science and others) and international expertise through professional international NGOs (such as Wetlands International).

The project will be implemented in close coordination with the UNDP/GEF/BMU project "Strengthening Protected Areas System of the Komi Republic”. The proposed EU project will utilize existing management capacities, professional networks and implementation instruments developed for the UNDP/GEF/BMU project thus achieving considerable efficiencies and savings in management costs.

Relying on the expertise obtained within the project INTAS 08-1000028-9182 “Remote sensing methods for environmental assessment of Eurasian peatlands and associated ecosystems under climate change” (PACINE Project) implemented by the Institute of Forest Science RAS in 2007–2008 the project team will combine methods of field monitoring and remote sensing. The arctic ecosystems restoration methodologies will be applied based on the results of the project “Study of Mitigation, Recovery and Restoration Options: Oil and Gas Industry Impacts on Arctic Wetlands” carried out by Wetlands International in cooperation with Shell and aimed to develop information and guidance for decision making. The project will also use experience and methodologies emerging from two projects funded by the German Government (ICI/BMU): “Capacity Development for a sustainable energy- and climate-policy in Eastern Europe, Russia and Central Asia - development of a Decision Support System for peatlands restoration” (2010-2011) and “Restoring Peatlands in Russia – for fire prevention and climate change mitigation”.

This work will build upon the on-going ICI project financed by the German Government in the Komi Republic. The ICI project is aimed at strengthening the Komi protected areas system with the view of biodiversity conservation and enhancing carbon sinks in forest and peatland ecosystems. The ICI project is implemented in the southern and central regions of the Komi Republic without permafrost. The key focus of the project is on the fire prevention. The new ClimaEast project will build upon the on-going research and extend upon permafrost areas. It will allow assessing climate change induced warming of permafrost soils, related impacts on ecosystems and carbon pools in the Far North ecosystems (tundra and forest tundra). Based on this information it will be possible to produce practical recommendations for land users for permafrost protection in the changing climate.

The project experience in carbon monitoring and permafrost restoration will be further replicated through the Russian and international scientific networks and conferences. In doing so the project will rely on the partnerships with the Russian Academy of Science and IPCC expert networks. The work will contribute to the design of LULUCF programming in other regions and countries in the Northern hemisphere. The project work in the protected areas (restoration, monitoring, improved adaptation capacities) will be replicated and up-scaled through the Ministry of natural resources and environment of Russia. The project demonstrations on permafrost restoration has a potential for replication throughout Russia’s Arctic regions and Siberia where there is an evidence of permafrost degradation due to industrial development and climate change.Importantly, Clima East will seek synergies and exchange of methodologies and results with the ambitious, recently started research-project Page21 ('Changing permafrost in the Arctic and its Global Effects in the 21st Century') which is funded by DG RTD through the EU science framework programme FP 7. The total budget of Page21 is 9,3 MEUR, out of which 7 MEUR are financed by EU FP7. During its four year implementation, the project will measure GHG-emissions from different types of thawing permafrost through flux chambers and other methods. The project is coordinated by the Alfred Wegener Institute for Polar and Marine Research. On the Russian side, the Institute for Biological Problems of Cryolithozone and the Moscow State University are official partners. A contact with individual scientists participating in Page21 has already been established by UNDP, and there shall be a regular exchange of information between Page21 and Clima East during the implementation of both projects.

For the Yugyd'va protected areas, since it is planned to be included in Emerald Network (and EC has been supporting its deployment in Russia), synergies between the first activity of this project and EC Emerald project will be sought with respect to strengthening the park management.

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

* Project document
* Inception Report
* Annual Project Implementation Reports
* Tracking tools
* Mid-term evaluation report
* Management response to Mid-Term evaluation report
* Project Steering Committee meeting minutes
* Notes from project monitoring missions
* Financial management documents, such as project budget revisions and audit reports
* Various reports and documents available on the project website/with the PIU

Annex C: Evaluation Questions

*This is a generic list, to be further elaborated during the evaluation mission.*

| **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? | | | | |
|  | * Did the project’s objectives fit GEF strategic priorities? |  |  |  |
|  | * Did the project’s objectives fit within national priorities, priorities of the local government and local communities? |  |  |  |
|  | * Do the project’s objectives support implementation of the relevant multi-lateral environmental agreement? |  |  |  |
| Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? | | | | | |
|  | * To what extent have the project Objective and Outcomes have been achieved? | * Logframe indicators at the level of project Objective and Outcomes achieved as planned/otherwise | * Project Logframe, last year PIR |  | |
|  | * How did stakeholder involvement and public awareness contribute to the achievement of project objective and outcomes? | * Stakeholder pools from the project show raise of interest to project objective and activities; corresponding Logframe indicator values show progress as planned; interview with the project management and key stakeholders confirmed/otherwise PM reports on stakeholder involvement | * Last year PIR, Project Logframe, interviews |  | |
|  | * Which were the key factors that contributed to project success/underachievement; can positive key factors be replicated in other cases, or could negative factors have been anticipated and minimized? |  |  |  | |
| Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards? | | | | | |
|  | * Was the project cost-effective? In case its implementation was delayed, did that affect cost-effectiveness? Were expenditures in line with international standards and norms? Was co-financing received at the level anticipated in the project document? | * Project expenditures for each of the outcomes correspond with rates agreed in the project document; project management costs did not exceed acceptable levels; project audits revealed no questionable costs and/or violation of procurement, financial and HR administration rules | * Project financial statements, co-financing reports, PIRs, NIM audit reports |  | |
|  | * Was the project management effective? Were there any particular challenges with the management process? Did the project Steering Committee provide the anticipated input and support to project management? Were risks assessed in time and adequately dealt with? Was the level of communication and support from the implementing agency adequate and appropriate? | * Project management arrangements contributed/otherwise to attainment of project objective and outcomes, and were implemented according to the established principles and procedures | * Interviews with key project stakeholders, incl. National Implementing Agency and UNDP; project risk log, project Steering Committee minutes |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
| Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? | | | | | |
|  | * What is the likelihood that any required financial resources will be available to sustain the project results once the GEF funding is over? | * Major project endeavors (such as financial instruments, institutional arrangements, infrastructure support) will get financial support and be maintained without GEF funding | * Interviews with stakeholders, project reports, financial data if available |  | |
|  | * What is the likelihood that institutional and technical achievements, legal framework, policies and governance structures and processes will allow for the project results to be sustained? Are there key institutional and governance risks to sustainability? | Major institutional changes, technical solutions, legal framework amendments get strong support at policy and decision-making levels | Interviews with stakeholders, project reports, |  | |
|  | * Are there any environmental risks that can undermine the post-project impact and global environment benefits? |  |  |  | |
| **Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?** | | | | | |
|  | * Did the project achieve its planned impacts? Why or why not? |  |  |  | |
|  | * Which where the key lessons learned in course of project implementation? |  |  |  | |

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[[16]](#footnote-16)**

**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[[17]](#footnote-17)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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[[18]](#footnote-18)) |
| **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[[19]](#footnote-19)) |
| **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 |

The report on MTE of the Clima-East component could be prepared as an annex (up to 20 p.) to the GEF FE report, and according to the following outline:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **i.** | Opening page:   * Title of GEF project component financed by the EU * Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report * Region and countries included in the project * Evaluation team members |
| **1.** | Introduction   * Purpose of the evaluation * Scope & Methodology * Structure of the evaluation report |
| **2.** | Project description   * Project start and duration * Problems that the project sought to address * Expected Results |
| **3.** | Project implementation pattern   * Management arrangements * Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region) * M&E activities * Project Finance |
| **3.3** | Project Results   * Progress towards the achievement of the Clima East Pilot project objective and Overall results (should be rated according to the methodology applied for the GEF-financed projects described above) * Relevance * Effectiveness & Efficiency * Country ownership * Mainstreaming * Sustainability * Impact |
| **4.** | Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons   * Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project, and corrective actions to improve project performance * Lessons learned (including lessons that might improve design and implementation) |

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
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