**INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANT PROCUREMENT NOTICE**

Date: 15 May 2014

**Country: Regional (Jordan, Egypt and Lebanon)**

**Description of the assignment:**

**International Consultant to Conduct a Mid-term Review**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Post Title:** | **International Consultant to Conduct a Mid-term Review** |
| **Starting Date:** | July 2014 |
| **Duration:** | 26 working days during period June/July – Aug 2014, **out of which 14 working days in the region.** |
| **Location:** | Jordan, Lebanon, Egypt and home based |
| **Project:** | Mainstreaming Conservation of Migratory Soaring Birds into Key Productive Sectors along the Rift Valley / Red Sea flyway |

To apply, kindly read the procurement notice, attach the following documents as one file and attach to the following link: <http://jobs.undp.org/>

1. CV
2. Technical proposal
3. Financial proposal

No later than 15 June, 2014

Any request for clarification must be sent in writing, or by standard electronic communication to the address or e-mail to [mohammad.alatoom@undp.org](mailto:mohammad.alatoom@undp.org), Mr. Alatoom will respond in writing or by standard electronic mail and will send written copies of the response, including an explanation of the query without identifying the source of inquiry, to all consultants.

* 1. **BACKGROUND & CONTEXT**

Please refer to below website of the project <http://migratorysoaringbirds.undp.birdlife.org/>

Project at glance

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Title: | Mainstreaming Conservation of Migratory Soaring Birds into Key Productive Sectors along the Rift Valley / Red Sea flyway | | | |
| UNDP Project ID: | 1878 | **Project financing** | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | *at MTE (Million US$)* |
| ATLAS Project ID: |  | GEF financing: | 6,243,244 |  |
| Country: |  | IA/EA own: |  |  |
| Region: | Arab States | Government: |  |  |
| Focal Area: |  | Other: |  |  |
| GEF Focal Area Strategic Program |  | Total co-financing: | 4,490232 |  |
| Executing Agency: | BirdLife International | Total Project Cost **in cash**: | 10,733,476 |  |
| Other Partners involved: | RSCN, Jordan  Ministries of Environment in Lebanon & Egypt  BirdLife Partners | ProDoc Signature (date project began): | |  |
|  | Planned closing date: | Revised closing date:  April 2015 |

**PROJECT GOAL, OBJECTIVES and OUTCOMES:**

The Rift Valley/Red Sea flyway is the second most important flyway for migratory soaring birds (raptors, storks, pelicans and some ibis) in the world, with over 1.5 million birds of 37 species, including five globally threatened species, using this corridor between their breeding grounds in Europe and West Asia and wintering areas in Africa each year. The aim of the Migratory Soaring Birds Project is to mainstream migratory soaring bird considerations into the productive sectors along the flyway that pose the greatest risk to the safe migration of these birds – principally hunting, energy, agriculture and waste management – while promoting activities in sectors which could benefit from these birds, such as ecotourism. The project seeks to integrate flyway issues into existing national or donor-funded "vehicles" of reform or change management in the key sectors through the provision of technical tools, content, services and support.

Project outcomes:

Outcome 1: Raised awareness of the flyway and altered social and cultural behaviors among target groups that threaten MSBs in the key sectors, decision-makers and the general public

Outcome 2: Increased national and regional capacity to effect double mainstreaming and application of flyway concept

Outcome 3: Content and tools to enhance flyway friendly practice developed, delivered, and mainstreamed effectively into sector processes and programmes

Outcome 4: Learning, evaluation and adaptive management increased

1. **Scope of work**

UNDP seeks the recruitment of an international and independent consultant to undertake a project Mid-term review (MTR). The MTR will assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document (ProDoc), and assess early signs of project success or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made to set the project on-track to achieve results. The MTR will also review the project’s strategy, its risks to sustainability and the project’s preparation of a strategy for when UNDP-GEF project support ends.

The scope of the MTR will cover all activities undertaken in the framework of the project. The MTR consultant will compare planned outputs of the project to actual outputs and assess the actual results to determine their contribution to the attainment of the project objectives. He/she will also to evaluate the efficiency of project management, including the delivery of outputs and activities in terms of quality, quantity, timeliness and cost efficiency as well as features related to the process involved in achieving those outputs and the impacts of the project. The MTR will also address the underlying causes and issues contributing to targets not adequately achieved.

The key product expected from the Mid-term review is a comprehensive analytical report in English that should, at least, follow the requirements as indicated in Annex E.

The Mid-term Review report will be a stand-alone document that substantiates its recommendations and conclusions. The report will have to provide convincing evidence to support its findings/ratings.

The report together with its annexes shall be presented in electronic form in MS Word format.

The consultant is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring engagement with the project team, project partners and key stakeholders in the region covered by the project.

The consultant is expected to use project data, third-party data and interviews as a means of collecting data on the performance and success of the project. Questionnaires prepared by the consultant can be distributed to national project partners, facilitated by participating implementing agencies.

The consultant will assess the following three categories of project progress. For each category, the review team is required to rate overall progress using a six-point rating scale outlined in Annex C:

* 1. **Progress towards Results**

Project design:

* Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions made by the project. Identify new assumptions.
* Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards results.
* Review how the project addresses country priorities.
* Review the baseline data included in the project results framework and GEF Tracking tool and suggest revisions as necessary.

Progress:

* Assess the outputs and progress toward outcomes achieve so far and the contribution to attaining the overall objective of the project.
* Examine if progress so far has led to, or could in the future lead to, beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women’s empowerment, improved governance etc...) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.
* Examine whether progress so far has led to, or could in the future lead to, potentially adverse environmental and/or social impacts/risks that could threaten the sustainability of the project outcomes. Are these risks being managed, mitigated, minimized or offset? Suggest mitigation measures as needed.
* Review the extent to which the implementation of the project has been inclusive of relevant stakeholders and to which it has been able to create collaboration between different partners. Identify opportunities for stronger substantive partnerships.
  1. **Adaptive management**

Work Planning

1. Are work planning processes result-based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results.
2. Examine the use of the project document logical/results framework as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start. Ensure any revisions meet UNDP-GEF requirements and assess the impact of the revised approach on project management?

Finance and co-finance:

1. Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.
2. Complete the co-financing monitoring table (see table below).
3. Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.

Monitoring Systems.

1. Review the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required?
2. Ensure that the monitoring system, including performance indicators, meet GEF minimum requirements. Apply SMART indicators as necessary.
3. Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively. Develop SMART indicators, including disaggregated gender indicators as necessary;
4. Review the mid-term GEF Tracking Tool (s) as appropriate and comment on progress made, quality of the submission, and overall value of the GEF Tracking Tool.
5. Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to M&E? Are these resources being allocated effectively?

Risk Management

1. Validate whether the risks identified in the project document, APR/PIRs and the ATLAS Risk Management Module are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate. If not, explain why?
2. Describe any additional risks identified and suggest risk ratings and possible risk management strategies to be adopted.

Reporting

1. Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management, and shared with the Project Board.
2. Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

Recommendations for Tranche II

1. Consider and make any recommendations for any adjustments that are needed in relation to the sectors that need to be addressed by the project and in each country during tranche II.
2. Consider and make any recommendations for any adjustments that are needed to the project framework, including outcomes and outputs, for tranche II
3. Make any other recommendations for adjustments to the project that should be taken into account in the preparation of a new project document for tranche II of the project
   1. **Management arrangements**
4. Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the project document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement.
5. Review the quality of execution of the project Implementing Partners and recommend areas for improvement.
6. Review the quality of support provided by UNDP and recommend areas for improvement.
7. **Analyse the best scenarios for enhancing management arrangements in Tranche II, and as appropriate and needed propose options for alternative management arrangements for Tranche two of this project , (as an separate standalone report).**
8. **METHODOLOGY**

The MTR must provide evidence based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The MTR team will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Environmental & Social Safeguard Policy, the Project Document, project reports including APR/PIRs, project budget revisions, lesson learned reports, other project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based review). The MTR team will review the baseline GEF focal area Tracking Tool submitted to the GEF at CEO endorsement, and the midterm GEF focal area Tracking Tool that must be completed before the MTR field mission begins.

The MTR team is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), the UNDP Country Office(s), UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisers, and other key stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to (list); executing agencies, senior officials and task team/ component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project stakeholders, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. Additionally, the MTR team is expected to conduct field missions to (location), including the following project sites (list).

The final MTR report should describe the full MTR approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the review.

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

**Project finance / co-finance**

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$) | | Total  (mill. US$) | |
| Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Actual | Actual |
| Grants |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Loans/Concessions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * In-kind support |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Impact**

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts.

**Conclusions, recommendations and 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 Jordan CO. UNDP Jordan will issue and manage the contract. The Project Team and Country Office will be responsible for liaising with the MTR consultant to set up stakeholder interviews, coordinate with the partners, etc.

*Although the Consultant should feel free to discuss with the authorities concerned all matters relevant to his/her assignment, he/she is not authorized to make any commitment or statement on behalf of UNDP, the GEF or the project management.*

**Evaluator ethics**

The MTR consultant will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex D) 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).

**4. DELIVERABLES**

Below are the required activities and expected outputs (deliverables), based on the objectives and scope of work stated above, respective timelines/deadlines and number of working days:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Output** | **Timeline** |
| 1. Work plan and agenda of meetings and report submission time-plans | 7 days after signing the contract and dis with Project’s management team for initial sources of information |
| 1. Debriefing meeting on MTR results with Project stakeholders, and delivery of an inception report | After first mission completed |
| 1. A first draft of the MTR report | 30 days after signing the contract |
| 1. Final MTR report responding to all comments from Project stakeholders, with a response matrix that outlines how all comments were handled. | 40 days after signing the contract |
| 1. Report shows suggested options for management arrangements in Tranche II of this Project | 45 days after signing the contract |

1. **REQUIREMENTS FOR EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS**

**A) Education:**

* Advanced university degree in energy, environment, engineering, physical science or another relevant subject.

**B) Professional Experiences & Skills:**

* Preferably 10 years of professional experience in fields relevant to biodiversity, environment or relevant fields.
* Preferably experience of Biodiversity.
* Minimum 5 years’ experience in conducting evaluation of similar UNDP and/or GEF projects; experience with regional projects is preferred but not required.
* Sound knowledge of results-based management (especially results-oriented monitoring and evaluation).
* Fluency in written and spoken English. Arabic is valuable but not required.
* Full computer literacy.

**C) Competencies**

* Strong interpersonal skills, communication and diplomatic skills, ability to work with stakeholders including governments.
* Ability to plan and organize his/her work, efficient in meeting commitments, observing deadlines and achieving results
* Openness to change and ability to receive/integrate feedback
* Ability to work under pressure and stressful situations
* Strong analytical, reporting and writing abilities

**D) Consultant Independence**

The MTR consultant cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project’s related activities.

1. **DOCUMENTS TO BE INCLUDED WHEN SUBMITTING THE PROPOSALS.**

* Interested individual consultants must submit the following documents/information to demonstrate their qualifications:
* 1. Proposal:

(i) Explaining why they are the most suitable for the work

(ii) Provide a brief methodology on how they will approach and conduct the work.

* 2. Financial proposal
* 3. Personal CV including past experience in similar projects and at least 3 references

**FINANCIAL PROPOSAL**

**Lump sum contracts**

The financial proposal shall specify a total lump sum amount including fees, travel cost to the region and between 3 countries Jordan, Egypt and Lebanon (total of two weeks mission), tickets, DSAs, accommodation. While local transportations (local travel means inside each country will be covered by the project. Payments are based upon output, i.e. upon delivery of the services specified in the TOR. In order to assist the requesting unit in the comparison of financial proposals, the financial proposal will include a breakdown of this lump sum amount.

1. **EVALUATION OF CANDIDATES**

Individual consultants will be evaluated based on the following methodologies:

Cumulative analysis

When using this weighted scoring method, the award of the contract should be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

a) responsive/compliant/acceptable, and

b) Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation.

\* Technical Criteria weight; 70%

\* Financial Criteria weight; 30%

Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 50 point would be considered for the Financial Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Criteria*** | ***Weight*** | ***Max. Point*** |
| *Technical* | *70%* |  |
| Having carried out similar or related work |  | *35* |
| Technical approach and methodology and work plan demonstrating a clear understanding of the job to be done |  | *35* |
| *Financial* | *30%* | *30* |

1. **DURATION OF MISSION**

# The expected duration of this assignment is up to XXX weeks maximum, expected to consist of approximately XXXX working days to conduct necessary meetings and finalize the evaluation report.

**Annex A Project Results Framework:**

Logical Framework and Objectively Verifiable Impact Indicators

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project Strategy (**showing relevant outcomes and outputs according to Tranche) | **Objectively verifiable indicators** |
| Goal | **Globally threatened and significant populations of soaring birds that migrate along the Rift Valley/Red Sea flyway are effectively maintained** |

|  | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Target**  **(Tranche I)** | **Target**  **(Tranche II)** | **Sources of verification** | **Risks and Assumptions** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **GEF Project Objective:** Conservation management objectives and actions for MSBs are mainstreamed effectively into the hunting, energy, agriculture, waste management and tourism sectors along the Rift Valley/Red Sea flyway, making this a safer route for soaring birds | Number of new and revised country sector policies (hunting, energy, agriculture, waste management and tourism) incorporating MSB issues approved by national governments | 0 policies at start of year 1 | A total of at least 6 sector policies approved by end of year 5 | A total of at least 20 sector policies approved from the 11 countries by end of year 10 | - Government sector policy documents | Stable political and socio-economic environment in region  External pressures on MSBs remain within projected threat analysis |
|  | Number of new private sector projects and schemes incorporating MSB concerns in each target sector | 0 projects at start of year 1 | At least 4 among participating countries by end of year 5 | At least one in each participating country by end of year 10 | - Government agency reports  - Private sector company annual reports |  |
|  | Annual application of GEF BD2 tracking tool shows increased scores throughout life of project | Score at beginning of year 1 | Increased score at each yearly review of project up to end of year 5 | Increased score at each yearly review of project up to end of year 10 | Annual Project Evaluation Reports, Mid-term Evaluation Report |  |
|  | Land managed for hunting, energy, agriculture and waste management under ‘flyway sensitive’[[1]](#footnote-1) practices at selected sites[[2]](#footnote-2) along flyway | 0 ha at beginning of year 1 | 15% by end of year 5 compared to project start baseline | 40% by end of year 10 compared to year 1 baseline | - Field assessment reports  - Government statistics |
|  | Number of sites with ‘flyway sensitive’ practices along flyway | 0 at start of year 1 | At least 10 bottleneck[[3]](#footnote-3) sites by end of year 5 | At least 23 bottlenecks by end of year 10 | Project progress reports |  |
| **Outcome 1**  Raised awareness of the flyway and altered social and cultural behaviours among target groups that threaten MSBs in the key sectors, decision-makers and the general public (Tranche I) | Increase in number of articles in national newspapers highlighting MSBs and flyway importance in Jordan, Lebanon, Palestine, Egypt and Ethiopia | Jordan – 0 articles; Lebanon – 3 articles; Palestine – 4 articles; Egypt – 0 articles; Ethiopia – 1 articles in 2004-2005 | At least 10 articles/year at end of year 5in each country | At least 15 articles/year at end of year 10 in each country | Copies of national newspaper articles  Project progress reports  Documentation (letters, emails, etc.) on requests for information | Awareness campaigns are able to alter behaviour and choices of general public, influencing the political and decision-making process  Level of public and government interest in the project is maintained throughout and beyond the project period |
|  | Increase in number of hunters and tour guides able to identify specific soaring birds and name activities that threaten them operating at selected bottleneck sites | Number of hunters and tour guides aware of MSB issues at start of year 1  Lebanon (2005 data): 3 hunting groups aware of bird conservation issues, 2 eco-tour companies trained in bird identification  Syria: 0% hunters; 0% of tour companies | 50% increase in numbers of hunters and tour guides aware at end of year 5 compared to year 1 baseline figures | 80% increase in numbers of hunters and tour guides aware at end of year 10 compared to year 1 baseline figures | - Reports from professional surveys and polls of hunters and tour guides commissioned by the project  - Reports from awareness raising campaigns  - Tour company annual reports  - Project progress reports |  |
|  | Number of government and private sector requests to project for ‘flyway sensitive’ guidelines, best practice, and related materials | 0 requests for information at start of year 1 | At least 20 requests by end of year 5 | At least 100 requests by end of year 10 | - Documentation (letters, emails, etc) on requests for information  - Project progress reports |  |
|  | Number of requests for ‘flyway sensitive ’ branding scheme from hunting, energy, agricultural and waste management sector institutions | Year 6 will be baseline (when branding schemes established) | Not applicable during Tranche I | Annual increase of 10% from year 6 to year 10 | - Project progress reports  - Sector agency reports |  |
|  | Increase in membership of national bird conservation NGOs in selected target countries | Lebanon (SPNL) – 38; Jordan (RSCN) – 500; Palestine (PWLS) – 120; Ethiopia (EWLS) – 400 (at 2002) | 25% at end of year 5 on 2002 figures | 25% increase at end of year 10 on year 5 figures | - NGO Annual reports |  |
| **Output 1.1**  Concept of MSB Flyway established and promoted (Tranche I)  **Output 1.2**  Regional ‘Flyway Facility’ established to promote mainstreaming of MSB considerations (Tranche I)  **Output 1.3**  Targeted awareness campaigns on MSB flyway issues designed and carried out (Tranche I) | | | | | | |
| **Outcome 2**  Increased national and regional capacity to effect double mainstreaming and application of Flyway concept (Tranche I and II) | Capacity of national Birdlife International partners to apply double-mainstreaming as indicated by BirdLife-UNDP capacity assessment scores [[4]](#footnote-4) | Partner capacity assessment scores at end of PDF-B phase | At least 7 partners with capacity assessment scores of over 18 | At least 10 partners with capacity assessment scores of over 18 | - Capacity assessment score reports at years 1 and 5  - Project reports | Government contributions (finances, counterpart staff) and co-financing contributions are forthcoming in a timely manner |
|  | Increase in number of joint national project partner-government and project partner-private sector partnerships established in key sectors during project period to achieve mainstreaming of MSB concerns | Jordan – 1 relevant partnership; Palestine – 4; Lebanon – 4; Ethiopia – 0; Egypt – no data; at 2005 | 2005 figure + 3 by end of year 5 for each national partner | 2005 figure + minimum of 10 by end of year 10 for each national partner | - NGO evaluation reports from  BirdLife Secretariat  - Government and private sector company report  - Project progress reports |  |
| **Output 2.1**  Capacity of national partners strengthened to develop and promote concept of Flyway, respond to new opportunities and monitor content standards (Tranche I)  **Output 2.2**  Capacity of national government and private sector institutions strengthened to promote “flyway friendly” practices (Tranche I and II) | | | | | | |
| **Outcome 3**  Content and tools to enhance flyway friendly practice developed, delivered and mainstreamed effectively into sector processes and programmes (Trenches I and II) | Number of existing and planned mainstreaming “vehicles” into which flyway content and tools are mainstreamed in each country[[5]](#footnote-5) | 0 programmes at start of year 1 | At least 4 programmes with MSB issues integrated into project activities by end of year 5 (trigger for entry into Tranche II) | At least 15 programmes with MSB issues integrated into project activities by end of year 10 | - Project progress reports  - ‘vehicle’ project reports  - Reports of national UNDP and other involved multinational, bilateral and national donor programmes | Existing suitable donor-funded mainstreaming projects welcome added value provided by project  Stable political, civil and socio-economic environment in region continues allowing donor- and country-driven development projects in target sectors to continue and be developed  The market for ‘flyway sensitive’ alternatives and services is created and maintained, even if economic instability occurs  Approval and entry of agreed ‘flyway sensitive’ policy and sector regulations and practices occurs without significant delays  Adopting ‘flyway sensitive’ designs and practices bring an economic or social benefit or have minimal cost  Political instability (including changes in government administration) does not cause major changes in policy priorities  Recipients of flyway content accept technical standard or added value of content provided by project despite project testing a new approach (double mainstreaming)  Amendments to legislation and regulations modifications are officially approved and enacted in a timely fashion.  Sufficient data are available to produce reliable sensitivity maps for soaring birds  Best practice from outside region is applicable to situation in Red Sea/Rift Valley region (e.g. given concentrations & numbers using flyway)  National agencies and private sector companies open to joint monitoring activities |
| **Indicators and targets per sector with mainstreaming projects**  **Hunting** | Number of hunted MSBs recorded for sale (live and dead) at specific markets in Beirut including Sunday flea market, and Jordan | Number birds recorded at each market during year 1  Jordan: 40 birds recorded in markets in 2004  Lebanon: 350 soaring birds sold in known markets in 2004 (real total much higher) | 10% reduction in number birds traded by year 5 compared to year 1 | 25% reduction in number birds traded in year 10 compared to year 1 | - Field assessment reports |
|  | Number of hunting groups along the flyway endorsing responsible hunting practices | 0 hunting groups endorsing responsible hunting practices at start of year 1 | At least 3 groups endorsing responsible hunting practices at end of year 5 compared to baseline | At least 10 groups endorsing responsible hunting practices at end of year 10 compared to baseline | Signed endorsements of Responsible Hunting Guidelines and Codes of Practice by hunting groups/associations; hunting group/ association records and annual reports; law enforcement and licensing agency statistics; survey reports |
|  | Number of ammunition and gun suppliers in Lebanon, endorsing responsible hunting | 0 national suppliers endorse responsible hunting at start of year 1 | At least 10% of suppliers endorse responsible hunting by end of year 5 | At least 25% of suppliers endorse responsible hunting by end of year 10 | Signed endorsements of Responsible Hunting Guidelines and Code of Practice by ammunition and gun suppliers |
| **Energy** | Planners take account of bottlenecks in national and local energy planning | 0 countries | In at least 2 countries by end of year 5 | In at least 5 countries by end of year 10 | National energy strategies and national and local plans in comparison with MSB sensitivity maps |
|  | New energy projects adopt best practice in avoidance and mitigation of MSB risks | 0 projects | For at least 5 projects by end of year 5 | For at least 10 projects by end of year 10 | Project plans & EIA assessments and mitigation plans, in comparison with best practice guidelines |
|  | Collaborative monitoring schemes in place at existing and new energy projects to assess mortality rate | 0 monitoring schemes | Monitoring protocols designed and tested for at least 2 projects by end of year 5 with stakeholder participation/endorsement | Monitoring schemes in place for at least 10 projects by end of year 10 with full stakeholder participation/endorsement | Multi-stakeholder monitoring reports; annual reports from private energy companies and government energy agencies |
|  | Mitigation of any high-levels of mortality at existing sites that may be identified during the project | 0 projects | High risk sites with significant mortality identified by end of year 5 | Feasible mitigation measures adopted at high risk sites by end of year 10 | As above |
| **Tourism** | Number of locations with demonstration of benefits to tourism sector from MSB activities | 0 tourist location at start of year 1 | At least 5 tourist locations at end of year 5 | 15 tourist locations at end of year 10 | - Interviews with tourism companies  - site visits by project team  - Tour company and guide records  - Project progress reports |
|  | Number of tourism companies branded ‘flyway sensitive ’ in target countries | 0 tour operators at start of year 1 | At least 3 tour company in one pilot country by end of year 5 | At least 2 tour companies in each participating country with focus on sector by end of year 10 | - Interviews with tourism companies  - site visits by project team  - Tour company and guide records  - Project progress reports |
| **Waste Management** | No of EIAs for new waste management projects that address MSB concerns in project area | 0 EIAs that address MSBs in 2004-2005 | At least 3 new EIAs address MSBs by end of year 5 | At least 5 new EIAs address MSBs by end of year 10 in areas receiving double-mainstreaming support | - Copies of EIA reports  - Reports from government agencies responsible for EIAs  - site monitoring reports |
|  |
|  | No of existing waste management sites where ‘flyway sensitive ’ best practice measures have been adopted | 0 sites in 2005 | At least 2 pilot sites by end of year 5 | At least 5 sites in countries prioritizing the waste management sector for Tranche II interventions | - “vehicle” project reports  - Field survey reports |
| **Agriculture** | No of agriculture development plans incorporating MSB conservation considerations | 0 agriculture development plans | At least two agriculture development plan by end year 5 | At least five agriculture development plans by end year 10 | - Agricultural plans reports  - Field surveys reports |
| No of agricultural projects incorporating MSB conservation considerations | 0 projects | At least one project by end year 5 | At least three projects by end year 10 | - “vehicle” project reports  - Field survey reports |  |
| **Output 3.1.**  Technical content developed and integrated into appropriate reform “vehicles” **(Tranche I and II)** | | | | | | |
| **Outcome 4**  Learning, evaluation and adaptive management increased (Tranche I and II) | Lessons learned from demonstration activities applied to other sites along the flyway | 0 demonstration sites at start of year 1 | Lessons learned applied to at least 5 other sites along flyway by end of year 5 | Lessons learned applied to at least 12 other sites along flyway by end of year 10 | - Project progress reports  - References to project activities in reports, press releases, documents from additional bottleneck areas | Qualified, experienced and affordable project and technical staff are available in the region  Countries are able to deliver on project activities on a large complex regional project with many partners |
|  | Positive monitoring and evaluation reports, both internal and external | First evaluation report (first 6-monthly BirdLife report) | BirdLife and GEF-UNDP Mid-term Evaluations and reports at end of Tranche I show positive reports | BirdLife and GEF-UNDP Mid-term Evaluations and reports at end of Tranche II show positive reports | - Project progress reports  - Monitoring and Evaluation reports by UNDP-GEF  - Minutes of PSC, and other advisory meetings |
|  | Targets for project and partner entry into Tranche II verified | 1. Baseline of 0 at start of year 1  2. Baseline of 0 at start of year 1  3. Baseline values at end of year 5  4. Baseline of 0 at start of year 1  5. Baseline of 0 at start of year 1 (existing information poor or non-existent) | 1. At least 4 double mainstreaming pilots in Tranche I successful  2. 1:3 GEF: co-financing ratio secured for Tranche II  3. Minimum score of 2 for each of 9 capacity measures identified by BirdLife capacity Assessment during PDFB stage  4. Agreement with at least one new reform vehicle for Tranche II  5. Establishment of material links between sector activity and bird mortality along the flyway and the establishment of baseline data against which impact indicators can be measured verified by UNDP-GEF, in accordance with GEF criteria | Not applicable | - M&E reports  - Project progress reports  - written statements from project “vehicles”  - Written guarantees to required co-financing levels  - Project partner capacity assessment report  - written agreements between project and potential vehicles  - Independent peer-reviewed research reports  - UNDP-GEF review reports |
| **Output 4.1**  Project management structure established and operational (Tranche I and II)  **Output 4.2**  Project monitoring, evaluation, reporting and dissemination systems and structures established and operational (Tranche I and II)  **Output 4.3**  Establishment of appropriate monitoring schemes at selected sites to assess impact of mainstreaming interventions, strengthen impact indicators and assess other potential target sectors (Tranche I and II) | | | | | | |

Annex B: Evaluation Questions

| **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? | | | | |
|  | * How and why have project outcomes and strategies contributed to the achievement of the expected results? Have the project outcomes contributed to national development priorities and plans? | * tbd[[6]](#footnote-6) | * tbd | * tbd |
|  | * Are the project’s objectives and components clear, practicable and feasible within the project’s timeframe? | * tbd | * tbd | * tbd |
|  | * Were the capacities of executing institutions and counterparts properly considered when the project was designed? | * tbd | * tbd | * tbd |
|  | * Were counterpart resources (funding, staff, and facilities), enabling legislation, and adequate project management arrangements in place at project entry? | * tbd | * tbd | * tbd |
|  | * What are the underlying factors beyond the project’s immediate control and to what extent they have influenced outcomes and results? How appropriate and effective were the project’s management strategies for these factors. | * tbd | * tbd | * tbd |
| Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? | | | | | |
|  | * To what extent have the project objectives and outcomes, as set out in the Project Document, project’s Logical Framework and other related documents, have been achieved? | * tbd | * tbd | * tbd | |
|  | * Review planned strategies and plans for achieving the overall objective of the project within the timeframe. | * tbd | * tbd | * tbd | |
|  | * Were the assumptions made by the project right and what new assumptions that should be made could be identified? | * tbd | * tbd | * tbd | |
|  | * Were the project budget and duration planned in a cost-effective way? | * tbd | * tbd | * tbd | |
|  | * How and to what extent have implementing agencies contributed and national counterparts (public, private) assisted the project? | * tbd | * tbd | * tbd | |
| Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards? | | | | | |
|  | * How useful was the logical framework as a management tool during implementation and any changes made to it? | * tbd | * tbd | * tbd | |
|  | * Were the risks identified in the project document and PIRs the most important and the risk ratings applied appropriately? | * tbd | * tbd | * tbd | |
|  | * How and to what extent have project implementation process, coordination with participating stakeholders and important aspects affected the timely project start-up, implementation and closure? | * tbd | * tbd | * tbd | |
|  | * Do the outcomes developed during the project formulation still represent the best project strategy for achieving the project objectives? | * tbd | * tbd | * tbd | |
|  | * How have local stakeholders participated in project management and decision-making? What are the strengths and weaknesses of the approach adopted by the project? What could be improved? | * tbd | * tbd | * tbd | |
|  | * Does the project consult and make use of skills, experience and knowledge of the appropriate government entities, NGOs, community groups, private sector, local governments and academic institutions in the implementation and evaluation of project activities? | * tbd | * tbd | * tbd | |
| Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? | | | | | |
|  | * Was project sustainability strategy developed during the project design? | * tbd | * tbd | * tbd | |
|  | * How relevant was the project sustainability strategy? | * tbd | * tbd | * tbd | |
|  | * Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes? What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GEF assistance ends (resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and trends that may indicate that it is likely that in future there will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project’s outcomes)? | * tbd | * tbd | * tbd | |
|  | * Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there a sufficient public/ stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project? | * tbd | * tbd | * tbd | |
| **Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?** | | | | | |
|  | * How has the project contributed to the reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status? | * tbd | * tbd | * tbd | |
|  | * Are the project outcomes contributing to national development priorities and plans? | * tbd | * tbd | * tbd | |

Annex C: 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 D: 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[[7]](#footnote-7)**

**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 E: Evaluation Report Outline[[8]](#footnote-8)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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[[9]](#footnote-9)) |
| **1.** | **Introduction (4-5 pages)**   * Purpose of the evaluation * Scope & Methodology * Structure of the evaluation report |
| **2.** | **Project description and development context (2-3 pages)**   * 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 (20 pages)**  (In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) must be rated[[10]](#footnote-10)) |
| **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 (3-5 pages)**   * 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 * List of persons interviewed * 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: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. In the revision of the project document, “flyway friendly” practices has been replaced by “flyway sensitive” practices, because some sectors cannot be considered friendly, but can be developed in a sensitive and responsible manner. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The various ‘selected…sites’ indicated in this logframe (largely referring to bottleneck sites) will be agreed at the inception phase based on the feasibility of data collection, local social and environmental conditions, existing baseline data, whether included within area of operation of project “vehicles” and other criteria. The exact boundaries and area of these sites will also be defined at inception. However, the baseline area will comprise that of the flyway covered by the project “vehicles” in Tranche I. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. The source of information for these bottleneck sites is Richard Porter’s technical report available in annex 2 of the project document. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. BirdLife International and the project partners, with guidance and input from UNDP-GEF, undertook an assessment of the capacity of the partners to undertake mainstreaming activities (see Annex 13 of Project Document). Nine key areas for mainstreaming were identified, and a target score of at least 2 (scores range from 0-3) for each of the 9 key areas has been set for partners to allow entry into Tranche II. The self-assessment will be verified by UNDP and set as the baseline before CEO endorsement. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. See Annex 11 of Project Document for details of the 6 initial reform “vehicles” and the integration of the Soaring Birds Project into these projects [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. tbd – to be determined by consultant in consultations with the project team [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)