

## 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 full-sized project, *Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity on the South African Wild Coast* (PIMS 1767)

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

### PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Title:	<i>Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity on the South African Wild Coast</i>
GEF Project ID:	1056
UNDP Project ID:	1767
Implementing Agency:	United Nations Development Programme
Executing Agency:	Eastern Cape Parks and Tourism Agency
Project Partners:	National Dept. of Environment Affairs & Tourism (DEAT), Eastern Cape Provincial Dept. of Economic Affairs, Environment & Tourism (DEAET) and Dept. Water Affairs & Forestry (DWAF).
Start date:	29 September, 2006
Projected completion date:	31 July, 2013

Project Outcomes and outputs	Amount (US\$)		Total (US\$)
	GEF	Co-financing	
Outcome 1: Institutional framework and capacity to facilitate co-management systems for PAs is in place.	2,442,200	903,000	3,345,200
Outcome 2: Management effectiveness is enhanced within a rationalized and more representative system of protected areas (Type 1 PAs), operating under co-management agreements with local communities and the private sector.	1,496,000	2,470,000	3,966,000
Outcome 3: A functioning network of managed resource use protected areas (Type 2 PAs – IUCN category VI) is in place, and is being effectively managed in active collaboration with local communities.	2,561,800	20,945,000	23,506,800
<b>Total full project</b>	<b>6,500,000</b>	<b>24,318,000</b>	<b>30,818,000</b>

### OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The project was designed to develop a representative PA estate on communally owned land along the Wild Coast of the Eastern Cape Province. These protected areas would be managed under a range of collaborative management (co-management) agreements between Provincial, Local and National authorities, local communities and the private sector, assuited to the management challenges facing different sites.

There are three main intervention areas:

- strengthening the institutional framework for protected areas governance and co-management;
- enhancing management effectiveness within a rationalized and more representative system of protected areas (IUCN management category II and IV – National Park, Provincial Nature Reserves and Marine Protected Area), operating under PA governance and co-management agreements with local communities and the private sector;
- developing a functioning network of effectively managed multiple resource use protected areas (IUCN management category V and VI –Protected Natural Environments and Indigenous State Forests) in active collaboration with local communities.

These interventions would be nested in a land use plan for the Wild Coast that integrates the management of PA's within the regional sustainable development framework. GEF funding would be allocated towards building capacity at the systemic, institutional and individual levels for PA governance and co-management while significant co-financing has been leveraged for accompanying environmental management and community development activities. Collectively, these interventions were expected to provide a paradigm for progressive replication elsewhere in South Africa, with the aim of strengthening the PA system.

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. 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 programming.

## EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

---

The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact**. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR (refer to 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 Regional Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders.

The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to the Wild Coast, including visiting the following sites:

- *Hluleka NR and MPA*
- *Mkambati NR*
- *Silaka NR*
- *Dwesa-Cwebe NR and MPA*
- *Pondoland MPA*
- *Wild Coast Coastal Conservation Area*
- *Indigenous State Forests*

It will be advisable for the evaluator to also meet with representatives of the following communities living in and around these sites:

- *Mtentu*

- *Mkhambathi*
- *Lambasi*
- *Port St Johns*
- *Umgazana*
- *Mpame*
- *Pagela (Coffee Bay)*
- *Nqabarha*
- *Sebeni*
- *Manubi*

Interviews should also be held with local (Wild Coast) and regional (Eastern Cape) representatives of at least the following organizations:

Category	Institution/organization	Branch/Directorate/Department
National government	Department of Rural Development and Land Reform	Land Reform and Administration Commission on the Restitution of Land Rights Spatial Planning and Land Use Management
	Department of Environmental Affairs	Biodiversity and Conservation Oceans and Coasts
	South African National Biodiversity Institute	
	Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries	Forestry and Natural Resources Management Fisheries Management
Provincial (Eastern Cape) government	Department of Economic Development, Environment Affairs and Tourism	Biodiversity Management Coastal Zone Management (OR Tambo; Amathole) Environmental Empowerment Services Environmental Compliance and Enforcement
	Eastern Cape Parks and Tourism Agency	
	Eastern Cape Development Corporation	Spatial and Rural Projects Enterprise Development Project Development
Local government	Amathole District Municipality	Land, Human Settlements and Economic Development Strategic Planning and Management
	OR Tambo District Municipality	Ntinga Development Agency
	Mbizana, Port St Johns, Nyadeni, Mbashe, Ngquza Hill, Mquma and King Sabata Dalindyebo Local Municipalities	Local Economic Development
Co-operative governance structures	Mkambati Co-management Committee Dwesa-Cwebe Co-management Committee	
Traditional Authorities	Chiefs Headman and Sub-Headman	
NGO's and other associated institutions	Save the Wild Coast WESSA TRALSO Conservation International	
Funders	Development Bank of South Africa	

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](#) of this Terms of Reference.

## EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS

---

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

<b>Evaluation Ratings:</b>			
<b>1. Monitoring and Evaluation</b>	<i>rating</i>	<b>2. IA&amp; EA Execution</b>	<i>rating</i>
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	
<b>3. Assessment of Outcomes</b>	<i>rating</i>	<b>4. Sustainability</b>	<i>rating</i>
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 also 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.

<b>Co-financing (type/source)</b>	<b>UNDP own financing (mill. US\$)</b>		<b>Government (mill. US\$)</b>		<b>Partner Agency (mill. US\$)</b>		<b>Total (mill. US\$)</b>	
	<b>Planned</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Planned</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Planned</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>
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 programs. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender.

## IMPACT

---

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.<sup>1</sup>

## CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

---

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

## IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

---

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in South Africa. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

## EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

---

The total duration of the evaluation will be 26 days according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
<b>Preparation</b>	4 days ( <i>recommended: 2-4</i> )	21 October 2013
<b>Evaluation Mission</b>	15 days ( <i>r: 7-15</i> )	4 November 2013
<b>Draft Evaluation Report</b>	5 days ( <i>r: 5-10</i> )	13 December 2013
<b>Final Report</b>	2 days ( <i>r: 1-2</i> )	10 January 2013

## EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

---

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
<b>Inception Report</b>	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission.	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
<b>Presentation</b>	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission	To project management, UNDP CO
<b>Draft Final Report</b>	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs
<b>Final Report*</b>	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC.

---

<sup>1</sup>A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office: [ROtI Handbook 2009](#)

\*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 1 international and 1 counterpart national consultant. The international consultant will be designated the Team Leader and will be responsible for finalizing the report. The consultants must have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. 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 Team members must present the following qualifications and experience:

- Minimum 5 years of relevant professional experience
- Knowledge of UNDP and GEF
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
- Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s)

## EVALUATOR ETHICS

---

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

## PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

---

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

## APPLICATION PROCESS

---

Applicants are requested to apply online (<http://jobs.undp.org>) by 16 September 2013. Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions. The application should contain a current and complete CV in English with indication of the e-mail and phone contact. **Shortlisted candidates will be requested to submit a price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs).**

UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

## ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators				
<b>Goal:</b>	A representative system of protected areas in priority bioregions is established, effectively managed and contributes to sustainable development.				
Project Purpose	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
<b>Objective:</b> An effective network of protected areas is established on the Wild Coast and provides tested co-management models for replication	1. Increase of protected area coverage through strategic additions to the conservation estate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase in the extent (ha) of provincial protected areas</li> <li>• Increase in the extent (ha) of terrestrial managed resource use protected areas</li> </ul> By year 3, the provincial protected areas (or equivalent) will increase to 26,000ha while managed resource use protected areas will increase to 56,000ha. By EOP, the terrestrial conservation estate will be increased to 95,000ha.	14,210 ha 52,116 ha	32,000 ha 63,000 ha	SANBI annual national and bioregional reports.  Provincial Growth and Development Plan annual reports;  Eastern Cape Provincial SOE reports;  Annual IDP reviews;	There is relative stability in the local economy;  Political stability, law and order are maintained;  Relationship between national, provincial and local level maintained;
	2. Percentage of the priority vegetation types included into the protected area estate as a proportion of the national conservation targets for protected areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Subtropical Estuarine Salt Marshes</li> <li>• Transkei Coastal Belt</li> <li>• Pondoland-Natal Sandstone Coastal Sourveld</li> <li>• Scarp Forest</li> <li>• Mangrove Forest</li> </ul> By EOP, the priority vegetation types contribute at least 10% of the national conservation targets for protected areas.	3.2% 1.1% 8% 16.6% 0%	8% 11% 20% 35% 15%	Annual reports of implementing agencies on Wild Coast (DEAT-MCM, DEAET, ECPB, DWAF, DLA);  Minutes of meetings of Wild Coast Steering Committee;	No significant increase in the external pressures on protected areas;  Land claims are satisfactorily processed;  Communal landowners have legitimate structures (traditional authorities, CPA's, Land Trusts, etc.) to represent their interests
	3. Compatibility of economic returns (Rands/ha/annum) from the inclusion of communal land into the protected area estate. By EOP, communal land should yield, on average, at least R110/ha per annum (calculated as TEV).	R20/ha	R110/ha/annum <sup>2</sup>	Annual Wild Coast Program M&E reports;  Minutes of co-management committee meetings	Communal landowners have legitimate structures (traditional authorities, CPA's, Land Trusts, etc.) to represent their interests
	4. Employment returns from the inclusion of communal land into the protected area estate. By Year 3, the communal land included into the PA estate	TBD	32,000 person	Total Economic Valuation (TEV) of PA estate	The legal and policy environment continue to provide incentives for the continued employment of local micro-enterprises

<sup>2</sup>Projected financial returns from PA's in the Wild Coast is higher than the estimated return on agriculture (R40-42/ha) and small stock farming.

	generates employment levels of at least 11,000 person days/year.		days/year		
	5. Number of local micro-enterprises providing a planning and management support service to the protected area estate. By EOP, 10 new local micro-enterprises have been established and a further 6 continue to provide services	TBD	10 new enterprises 6 existing enterprises		
Project Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
<b>Outcome 1:</b> Institutional framework and capacity to facilitate co-management systems for protected areas is in place.	1. Percentage of staffing in the eastern region of the ECPB that meet the competence and skills required for the following occupational levels: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Level 5: Director Strategic and program based</li> <li>• Level 4: Managerial, Project management and or high level technical</li> <li>• Level 3: Technical Supervisory and/ or mid-level technical</li> <li>• Level 2: Skilled worker, technical functions with some team leadership</li> <li>• Level 1: Laborer , non-technical functions</li> </ul> By EOP, greater than 60% of staff in the eastern region of the ECPB meet the required competence and skills standards for PA management.	45% 36% 15% 18% 65%	80% 75% 65% 60% 80%	Annual reports of implementing agency; Audited financial reports of implementing agency Organograms and staffing levels of implementing agency; Staff audits of implementing agency; Staff performance evaluations of implementing agency; Training reports for implementing agency. Survey of communal and municipal structures (Trusts, CPA's, Administrative authorities, local ward councils, Provincial House of Traditional Leaders, Chiefs, Headman).	Enabling legal and policy framework supports effective institutional arrangements; Implementing agencies are still able to pay competitive salaries; The spread of HIV Aids is controlled; Income from the ECPB can be re-invested in the protected area network; Implementing agencies continue to maintain a co-operative, collaborative working relationship. Ability to recover operating costs for MPAs from the Marine Living Resources Fund
	2. The average score of staff performance evaluations (on a performance rating of 1-5) for the eastern region of the ECPB. By year 3, average staff performance scores will exceed 2.5/5, while by EOP staff performance scores will exceed 3/5.	TBD	3/5		
	3. Total operational budget for recurrent operational costs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase (%) of budget amount appropriated for the recurrent operational management costs of the Wild Coast PAs (through development of PA usage/concession fees, new financing mechanisms and more cost-effective HR management)</li> <li>• Ratio of HR costs: recurrent operations costs</li> </ul> By year 3, the operational budget is increased by 70% and the HR:operations budget is reduced to 70:30. By EOP, the operational budget is increased by 260% and the HR: operations budget reduced to 60:40.	R10.1m/ annum 80:20	R27m/ annum 60:40		
				Public Investment	

	<p>4. Management Effectiveness of the Wild Coast Program Management Unit</p> <p>% of the funded conservation and sustainable development initiatives that are integrated and aligned with the PGDP, municipal IDP's and the Wild Coast Conservation and Sustainable Development Program.</p>	0%	90%	Programme Budgets	
<p><b>Outcome 2:</b> Management effectiveness is enhanced within a rationalized and more representative system of protected areas (Type 1 PAs), operating under co-management agreements with local communities and the private sector.</p>	<p>1. Increase of Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT) scores for targeted protected areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dwesa-Cwebe Nature reserve and MPA</li> <li>• Mkambati Nature Reserve</li> <li>• Hluleka Nature Reserve</li> <li>• Silaka Nature Reserve</li> <li>• Pondoland MPA</li> </ul> <p>By year 3, the METT scores have increased to 59, 60, 54, 60 and 52 respectively.</p> <p>2. Percentage of alien infested areas in a regular, properly funded control and eradication program. By EOP, all IAS within the Type 1 PAs are part of a structured, properly funded and managed control and eradication program.</p>	<p>50</p> <p>44</p> <p>38</p> <p>47</p> <p>25</p> <p>TBD</p>	<p>71</p> <p>74</p> <p>69</p> <p>71</p> <p>60</p> <p>100</p>	<p>Wild Coast Program annual reports</p> <p>Provincial gazettement of PAs</p> <p>Management plans for PAs</p> <p>Annual reports for PAs</p> <p>Annual plans of operations and budgets of PAs</p> <p>Mid-term and final METT analyses for PAs</p> <p>PA monitoring and evaluation program outputs</p>	<p>Institutional capacity and resources deployed to manage protected areas;</p> <p>The transfer of the rights and responsibilities of state land to communities occurs without major problems;</p> <p>Municipalities remained willing to integrate conservation in the local development agenda;</p> <p>Continuous political support for decentralization.</p>
<p><b>Outcome 3:</b> A functioning network of managed resource protected areas (Type 2 PAs) is in place and is being effectively managed in active collaboration with local communities</p>	<p>1. Extent (ha) of communal land included into managed resource use protected area estate. By year 3, at least 6000ha is included into the PA s estate</p> <p>2. Number of co-management structures developed, maintained and functional on communal land in the high priority areas. By year 3, three management structures are established, maintained and functioning effectively and by EOP, six are functioning effectively.</p> <p>3. Increase in METT scores for Type 2 PA's:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State Forests (excluding above PAs)</li> <li>• Coastal Conservation area</li> </ul> <p>By year 3, the METT scores are 41 and 45 respectively.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>1</p> <p>25</p> <p>27</p>	<p>14,000 ha</p> <p>6</p> <p>56</p> <p>65</p>	<p>Wild Coast Program annual reports</p> <p>Annual reports of implementing agencies;</p> <p>Minutes of local communal co-operative governance structures</p> <p>IDP reviews;</p> <p>Mid-term and final METT analyses for PAs</p>	<p>Land-use planning systems in place and aligned with conservation priorities;</p> <p>Communal landowners continue to be interested in establishing a form of protected area on their land;</p> <p>Current development pressures can be regulated and controlled;</p> <p>Regulations enabling the implementation of the Communal Land Rights Act are</p>

	4. Numbers of co-management models for managed resource protected developed on communal lands in the Wild Coast replicated in Southern Africa. By EOP, 2 co-management models developed and tested in the Wild Coast are replicated on communal land elsewhere in southern Africa.	0	2		promulgated;  Communal landowners have legitimate structures to represent and negotiate their interests.
--	---	---	---	--	--

Outputs	Activities	Responsibilities
<b>Output 1.1.</b> Capacity within Eastern Region of the Eastern Cape Parks Board to broker management agreements is strengthened.	<b>Activity 1.1.1.</b> Establish and equip the Co-management Active Support Unit (CASU) composed of: Project Coordinator, Skills Development Facilitator, part-time financial manager (funded by GEF for the duration of the project), community liaison officer (funded by ECPB and DEAT) and administrative assistant (funded by ECPB). The capacity of the CASU will be supplemented by a community outreach team (see <b>Activity 1.8.3</b> ), the team members of whom are located within the priority areas;	Eastern Cape Parks Board
	<b>Activity 1.1.2.</b> Design a five-year business plan for the CASU;	CASU – Project and Brokering Coordinator
	<b>Activity 1.1.3.</b> Conduct a series of highly specialized training courses for CASU and other staff of the Eastern Cape Parks Board (legal issues, fundraising, communication and negotiation skills).	CASU Consultants
<b>Output 1.2.</b> Capacity within Eastern Region of the Eastern Cape Parks Board to implement the brokered management agreements.	<b>Activity 1.2.1.</b> Conduct a training needs assessment;	CASU - Skills development facilitator
	<b>Activity 1.2.2.</b> Develop and implement a comprehensive training program.	CASU - Skills development facilitator Consultant
<b>Output 1.3.</b> Strategic key institutions (municipalities, Land Affairs, etc) have an increased capacity to actively participate in co-management agreements.	<b>Activity 1.3.1.</b> Conduct a training needs assessment;	CASU - Skills development facilitator
	<b>Activity 1.3.2.</b> Develop and implement a comprehensive training program;	CASU - Skills development facilitator Consultant
	<b>Activity 1.3.3.</b> Integrate conservation needs into IDPs (direct investments on infrastructure and poverty relief into conservation areas).	CASU –Project and Brokering Coordinator, Skills development facilitator
<b>Output 1.4.</b> Knowledge management system for establishment and implementation of co-management developed.	<b>Activity 1.4.1.</b> Comprehensive assessment of the effectiveness of co-management arrangements for each protected area based on the review undertaken in the preparation stage;	CASU – Project Coordinator and community liaison officer
	<b>Activity 1.4.2.</b> Design and produce a "how to kit" for set-up and manage various types of co-management agreement;	CASU Service Contract
	<b>Activity 1.4.3.</b> Conduct a series of stakeholder workshop at local, national and regional level and support secondments, village-to-village exchanges and study tours for ECPB staff, local government and local communities to enable knowledge sharing;	CASU Service Contract

<b>Outputs</b>	<b>Activities</b>	<b>Responsibilities</b>
	<b>Activity 1.4.4.</b> Design a set of guidelines and interventions specific for each type of co-management agreements.	CASU – Project Coordinator and community liaison officer
<b>Output 1.5.</b> Norms and standards guiding the co-management of protected areas are produced and adopted by the relevant institutions.	<b>Activity 1.5.1.</b> Develop of norms and standards for co-management of PA in the Wild Coast;	CASU Consultant (Legal)
	<b>Activity 1.5.2.</b> Translate the norms and standards in a set of regulations that will guide the implementation of various types of co-management models;	CASU Consultant (Legal)
	<b>Activity 1.5.3.</b> Conduct a series of consultations with relevant institutions in Eastern Cape and with other provincial and national agencies in South Africa;	Eastern Region of ECPB CASU – Project Coordinator
	<b>Activity 1.5.4.</b> Adopt the regulations by the Eastern Cape Parks Board.	Eastern Region of ECPB CASU – Project Coordinator
<b>Output 1.6.</b> Financial mechanism for protected area management in place.	<b>Activity 1.6. 1.</b> In-depth analysis of the potential sources of income identified in the preparation stage;	Eastern Region of ECPB Consultant (Financial)
	<b>Activity 1.6.2.</b> Negotiate with relevant institutions to generate income streams and, where required, amend the appropriate regulations/ procedures.	Eastern Region of ECPB; MCM, Consultant (Financial)
<b>Output 1.7.</b> Sustainable Resource Use policy is developed.	<b>Activity 1.7.1.</b> Carry out a baseline survey of the existing use in and around protected areas;	Eastern Region of ECPB; Consultant
	<b>Activity 1.7.2.</b> Determine the thresholds of potential concerns (TPC) for the heavily utilized and/or impacted marine and terrestrial species;	Eastern Region of ECPB; Consultant
	<b>Activity 1.7.3.</b> Develop a policy for harvesting based on the TPCs;	Eastern Region of ECPB; Consultant
	<b>Activity 1.7.4</b> Develop a practical monitoring and evaluation system to assess on an ongoing basis levels of harvesting;	Eastern Region of ECPB; MCM; Consultant
	<b>Activity 1.7.5.</b> Develop operational procedures to deal with use that exceeds TPCs.	Eastern Region of ECPB; Consultant
<b>Output 1.8.</b> Increased awareness and understanding of key stakeholders about co-management agreements.	<b>Activity 1.8.1.</b> Develop a targeted communication strategy, including a set of tools, around communities living in the priority areas;	CASU - Skills development facilitator and communication consultants
	<b>Activity 1.8.2</b> Design a series of materials translated in all local languages relevant for the priority areas;	CASU - Skills development facilitator and communication consultants
	<b>Activity 1.8.3.</b> Develop and train a community outreach team, comprising 6 team members, to implement the communication strategy.	CASU - Skills development facilitator and communication consultants
<b>Output 1.9.</b> A comprehensive monitoring and evaluation system designed and operational.	<b>Activity 1.9.1.</b> Design a comprehensive monitoring and evaluation system;	CASU; Service Contract
	<b>Activity 1.9.2.</b> Collect and process baseline information;	CASU; Service Contract
	<b>Activity 1.9.3.</b> Conduct METT annually in all selected protected areas;	CASU; Service Contract
	<b>Activity 1.9.4.</b> Annual stakeholder meetings to inform about the results of the M&E;	CASU
	<b>Activity 1.9.5.</b> Independent M&E;	CASU; Service Contract
	<b>Activity 1.9.5.</b> Independent ProjectAudit.	CASU; Service Contract
<b>Output 2.1.</b> Local community structures have an increased	<b>Activity 2.1.1.</b> Consultations with the existent community structures in protected areas, identified in the preparation stage, to identify capacity needs to implement the co-management agreements;	CASU - Community liaison officer, Community Outreach Team

Outputs	Activities	Responsibilities
capacity to negotiate management agreements for strict protected areas.	<b>Activity 2.1.2.</b> Contract a service provider to strengthen existing community structures in protected areas;	CASU - Community liaison officer, Community Outreach Team
	<b>Activity 2.1.3.</b> Contract a service provider to strengthen and formalize relationships between the protected area institution and local community institutions in priority areas, where this does relationship does not currently exist;	CASU - Community liaison officer, Community Outreach Team Consultants
	<b>Activity 2.1.4.</b> Provide relevant training (financial management; legal issues; governance; basic conservation management; negotiation and communication skills) to local community structures.	CASU - Community liaison officer, Community Outreach Team Consultants
<b>Output 2.2.</b> Adaptive management planning systems for each strict protected area are established.	<b>Activity 2.2.1.</b> Initial review of the status quo of the provincial nature reserves and Category 1 and 2 MPAs (biological, social and economic);	Eastern Region of ECPB – Regional ecologist and Conservation planner; MCM
	<b>Activity 2.2.2.</b> Establishment of small Reserve Management Planning teams composed of the reserve manager, regional conservation planner, regional ecologist, representative of community and, where appropriate, MCM;	Eastern Region of ECPB – Regional ecologist and Conservation planner
	<b>Activity 2.2.3.</b> Participatory development the strategic management plan and conservation development framework for the reserve;	Reserve Management Planning Team
	<b>Activity 2.2.4.</b> Develop an alien clearing program;	Reserve Management Planning Team
	<b>Activity 2.2.5.</b> Prepare the first annual operational plan for each protected area.	Reserve Management Planning Team
<b>Output 2.3.</b> Active Management interventions for strict protected areas.	<b>Activity 2.3.1.</b> Implementation of new alien control techniques;	Eastern Region of ECPB; Reserve manager; Specialist service provider
	<b>Activity 2.3.2.</b> Evaluating fire management requirements for coastal grasslands;	Eastern Region of ECPB
	<b>Activity 2.3.3.</b> Development of a functional knowledge management system	Eastern Region of ECPB; Reserve manager; specialist service provider
	<b>Activity 2.3.4</b> Acquire equipment to enable offshore patrolling of MPA	CASU; MCM
<b>Output 2.4.</b> Strict protected areas are expanded into adjacent communal land through co-management agreements	<b>Activity 2.4.1.</b> Prioritize the areas proposed in the preparation stage for consolidation, rationalization and expansion;	CASU; MCM
	<b>Activity 2.4.2.</b> Identify and select potential options for consolidation, rationalization and expansion based on ground-truthing of the assessments carried out in the preparation stage;	CASU
	<b>Activity 2.4.3.</b> Negotiate the most effective co-management arrangements for the selected options;	CASU
	<b>Activity 2.4.4.</b> Develop the legal co-management agreement;	CASU, specialist service provider
	<b>Activity 2.4.5.</b> Facilitate the transition of the agreement in the implementation;	CASU
	<b>Activity 2.4.6.</b> Prepare amendment to proclamation.	CASU
<b>Output 3.1.</b> The management authority for the managed	<b>Activity 3.1.1.</b> Rationalize the management authority for the CCA, MPAs and State Forests with roles and responsibilities clearly defined;	Eastern Region of ECPB – Conservation planner; Specialist Service Providers

Outputs	Activities	Responsibilities
resource use protected areas is rationalized	<b>Activity 3.1.2.</b> Rationalize protected area status;	Eastern Region of ECPB – Conservation planner
	<b>Activity 3.1.3.</b> Incorporate the coastal conservation area into provincial enabling legislation;	Eastern Region of ECPB – Conservation planner; specialist service provider
	<b>Activity 3.1.4.</b> Develop the legal co-management agreement for managed resource use Pas;	CASU and specialist service provider
	<b>Activity 3.1.5.</b> Establish the appropriate co-management structure to manage the PA’s.	CASU and specialist service provider
	<b>Activity 3.1.6</b> Analyze the options for, costs and efficacy of, community-based enforcement	CASU and specialist service provider
<b>Output 3.2.</b> Local community structures have an increased capacity to negotiate management agreements for strict terrestrial protected areas.	<b>Activity 3.2.1.</b> Consultations with the existing community structures in protected areas, identified in the preparation stage, to identify capacity needs to implement the co-management agreements;	CASU - Community liaison officer, Community Outreach Team
	<b>Activity 3.2.2.</b> Contract a service provider to strengthen existing community structures in protected areas;	CASU - Community liaison officer, Community Outreach Team, Service provider
	<b>Activity 3.2.3.</b> Contract a service provider to strengthen and formalize relationships between the protected area institution and local community institutions in priority areas, where this does relationship does not currently exist;	CASU - Community liaison officer, Community Outreach Team Consultants
	<b>Activity 3.2.4.</b> Provide relevant training (financial management; legal issues; governance; basic conservation management; negotiation and communication skills) to local community structures.	CASU - Community liaison officer, Community Outreach Team Consultants
<b>Output 3.3.</b> A cooperative governance structure for the Coastal Conservation Area is established and functional	<b>Activity 3.3.1.</b> Establish a co-operative governance structure for the CCA;	CASU and Consultant
	<b>Activity 3.3.2.</b> Update the existing planning framework (i.t.o.the Wild Coast Tourism Development Policy);	Eastern Region of ECPB Consultant; Land Use Planner
	<b>Activity 3.3.3.</b> Develop a set of guidelines and tracking tool for processing development applications;	Eastern Region of ECPB Consultant ; Land Use Planner
<b>Output 3.4.</b> Adaptive management planning systems for managed resource use protected area are established.	<b>Activity 3.4.1.</b> Development of strategic management plans and conservation development framework for indigenous state forests	Eastern Region of ECPB – Regional ecologist and Conservation planner
	<b>Activity 3.4.2.</b> Development of an alien clearing program for state forests and the CCA	Eastern Region of ECPB – Regional ecologist and Conservation planner
	<b>Activity 3.4.3.</b> Development of a set of operational guidelines for sustainable use of the natural resources within each type 2 PA	MCM; CASU; Specialist service provider
<b>Output 3.5.</b> Active Management interventions for managed resource use protected areas.	<b>Activity 3.5.1.</b> Boundary survey and demarcation of state forests, CCA and MPAs;	Eastern Region of ECPB; Reserve manager; Specialist service provider
	<b>Activity 3.5.2.</b> Establishment of a community-led monitoring service in state forests, MPAs and CCA;	Eastern Region of ECPB; MCM
	<b>Activity 3.5.3.</b> Implementation of new alien control techniques in state forests and the CCA;	Eastern Region of ECPB; Reserve manager; specialist service provider

Outputs	Activities	Responsibilities
	<b>Activity 3.5.4.</b> Development of a functional knowledge management system;	Eastern Region of ECPB; Reserve manager; specialist service provider
	<b>Activity 3.5.5</b> Rehabilitation of priority state forests.	Eastern Region of ECPB; Reserve manager; specialist service provider
<b>Output 3.6.</b> Facilitate the development of the micro-enterprises based on sustainable use of coastal resources.	<b>Activity 3.6.1.</b> Identify potential enterprises based on sustainable use of marine and terrestrial resources;	MCM; Consultant
	<b>Activity 3.6.2.</b> Identify interested commercial agencies and opportunities for brokering linkages between them and local communities;	MCM Consultant
	<b>Activity 3.6.3.</b> Identify potential local entrepreneurs;	MCM; Consultant
	<b>Activity 3.6.4.</b> Training in business and entrepreneurial skills.	MCM; Consultant
<b>Output 3.7.</b> Protected areas consolidated into viable management units through co-management agreements	<b>Activity 3.7.1.</b> Prioritize the areas proposed in the preparation stage for connectivity;	CASU
	<b>Activity 3.7.2.</b> Identify and select potential options for connectivity based on ground-truthing of the assessments carried out in the preparation stage;	CASU, specialist service provider
	<b>Activity 3.7.3.</b> Negotiate the most effective co-management arrangements for the selected options;	CASU, specialist service provider
	<b>Activity 3.7.4.</b> Develop the legal co-management agreement;	CASU, specialist service provider
	<b>Activity 3.7.5.</b> Establish the most appropriate structure to manage the implementation;	CASU, specialist service provider
	<b>Activity 3.7.6.</b> Facilitate the transition of the agreement to implementation;	CASU
	<b>Activity 3.7.7.</b> Prepare the amendment to proclamation.	CASU

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

---

### *Reference Materials:*

- ☐ *Conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity on the South African Wild Coast Project Document*
- ☐ *Quarterly and Annual Project performance Reports*
- ☐ *Project Implementation Review (PIR) Report*
- ☐ *Technical and specialist project reports (a full list of reports will be supplied by the Project Manager)*
- ☐ *Project Monitoring Evaluation Tracking Tools (METTs)*
- ☐ *Project M&E Plan*
- ☐ *Final Project Mid-Term Review Report*
- ☐ *UNDP GEF Evaluation Report Format*
- ☐ *UNDP Quality Criteria for Evaluation Report*
- ☐ *Ethical Code of Conduct for Evaluation in UNDP*
- ☐ *Evaluation Policy of UNDP*
- ☐ *Guidance for conducting terminal evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed projects*
- ☐ *Norms of Evaluation in the UN system*

## ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

*Note: These are still preliminary questions and are for indicative purposes only. The final questions will only be finalized, in consultation with the Project Manager, at the start of the terminal evaluation.*

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
<b>Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has the management effectiveness of the Wild Coast protected areas improved as a result of co-management?</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Have high priority areas targeted for protected area expansion in the Wild Coast been incorporated into protected areas under different co-management arrangements</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has the socio-economic conditions of local communities improved as a consequence of the co-management of protected areas?</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<b>Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has the institutional capacity (including regulatory, knowledge, skills, funding, equipment, etc.) to administer co-management arrangements in protected areas been improved in the responsible public institutions?</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has the collective capacity of communal landowners (including awareness, skills, knowledge, access to resources, technical and professional support, etc.) to participate as equal partners in co-management arrangements in protected areas been improved?</li> </ul>	•	•	•

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are functional co-management agreements and co-operative governance structures in place to guide and direct the ongoing implementation of co-management agreements in protected areas?</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do both the protected area agencies, the affected communities and the public sector acknowledge the value and benefits of collaborating under co-management arrangements in the planning and management of protected areas?</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<b>Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Were the funds administered cost-effectively and in accordance with the requirements of the Public Finance Management Act?</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is there a database of project information (spatial data, reports, training records, minutes, minutes of meetings, M&amp;E reports, maps, etc.) being maintained and updated by the project?</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have the project partners and co-financing institutions actively participated in and supported the project activities?</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has the project closely aligned its activities with the national, provincial and local strategies and programs (e.g. NPAES, ECPAES, IDPs of local municipalities, national norms and standards -co-management, conservation stewardship, protected area planning, etc.)?</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<b>Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent will the responsible public institutions continue to have the political will, capacity and resources to maintain the co-management arrangements initiated by the project?</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How secure is the long-term conservation tenure of</li> </ul>	•	•	•

<p>the different categories of co-managed protected areas?</p>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the likelihood of alternative land use pressures (with higher socio-economic returns to local communities) preventing the further expansion of the protected area estate under co-management arrangements?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can the community goodwill towards conservation be sustained beyond the project?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
<p><b>Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?</b></p>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have the pressures of unsustainable land use practices - and the associated loss of biodiversity - in the priority areas targeted for expansion of the PA network been reversed (or at least not increased since project inception)?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has the management of the existing protected areas resulted in a significant improvement in the status of biodiversity in these areas (e.g. fire management, IAS control, control over illegal poaching and harvesting of natural resources, fencing, etc.)?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>

## ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

<p><b>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&amp;E, I&amp;E Execution</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings</li> <li>5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings</li> <li>4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</li> <li>3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings</li> <li>2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems</li> <li>1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems</li> </ul>	<p><b>Sustainability ratings:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability</li> <li>3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks</li> <li>2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks</li> <li>1. Unlikely (U): severe risks</li> </ul>	<p><b>Relevance ratings</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Relevant (R)</li> <li>1.. Not relevant (NR)</li> </ul> <p><b>Impact Ratings:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Significant (S)</li> <li>2. Minimal (M)</li> <li>1. Negligible (N)</li> </ul>
<p><i>Additional ratings where relevant:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not Applicable (N/A)</li> <li>Unable to Assess (U/A)</li> </ul>		

## 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 wrong-doing 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 limitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

### Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form<sup>3</sup>

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

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

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

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

Signed at .....on .....

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

---

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

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

---

- i. Opening page:
  - Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
  - UNDP and GEF project ID#s.
  - Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report
  - Region and countries included in the project
  - GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program
  - Implementing Partner and other project partners
  - Evaluation team members
  - Acknowledgements
  
- ii. Executive Summary
  - Project Summary Table
  - Project Description (brief)
  - Evaluation Rating Table
  - Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons
  
- iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations  
(See: UNDP Editorial Manual<sup>5</sup>)
  
1. Introduction
  - Purpose of the evaluation
  - Scope & Methodology
  - Structure of the evaluation report
  
2. Project description and development context
  - Project start and duration
  - Problems that the project sought to address
  - Immediate and development objectives of the project
  - Baseline Indicators established
  - Main stakeholders
  - Expected Results
  
3. Findings  
(In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) must be rated<sup>6</sup>)
  
- 3.1 Project Design / Formulation
  - Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)
  - Assumptions and Risks
  - Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design
  - Planned stakeholder participation
  - Replication approach

---

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

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

<sup>6</sup> Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations.

- 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**

---

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

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

UNDP GEF RTA

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

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