**INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANT PROCUREMENT NOTICE** 

**Country: Jordan**

**Description of the assignment:**

**International Consultant to Conduct a Terminal Evaluation**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Post Title:** | **International Consultant to Conduct a Terminal Evaluation** |
| **Starting Date:** | March, 2015 |
| **Duration:** | 14 working days during March 2015, **out of which 7 working days in Jordan, and 7 working days home based.** |
| **Location:** | Jordan – Amman, and home based |
| **Project:** | Mainstreaming Marine Biodiversity Conservation into Coastal Zone Management |

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 theMainstreaming Marine Biodiversity Conservation into Coastal Zone Management (PIMS #4002)

The essentials of the project to be evaluated are as follows: (*fully complete the table below*).

Project Summary Table 4002

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Title: | Mainstreaming marine biodiversity conservation into coastal zone management in the Aqaba Special Economic | | | | | |
| GEF Project ID: | | 4002 |  | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | | *at completion (Million US$)* |
| UNDP Project ID: | | 00078516  00061764 | GEF financing: | 950,000 US$ | | 950,000 US$ |
| Country: | | Jordan | IA/EA own: |  | |  |
| Region: | | RBAS | Government: | Government of Jordan | |  |
| Focal Area: | | Biodiversity | Other: | UNDP 50,000 | | 50,000 |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): | |  | Total co-financing: | 7,250,000 US$ | |  |
| Executing Agency: | | ASEZA | Total Project Cost: | 8,250,000 US$ | |  |
| Other Partners involved: | | JREDS, the Marine Park, glass boat and diving operators | ProDoc Signature (date project began): | | | 8 Nov 2011 |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | | Proposed:  June 2014 | Actual:  June 2015 |

**BACKGROUND & CONTEXT**

The coral reef ecosystems of the Gulf of Aqaba are the most significant feature of the marine environment in Jordan. These coral reefs are unique in that they are the northern-most tropical reef systems worldwide, have a high diversity of marine taxa, and provide habitat for endemic and rare marine species; thus presenting a readily-available enterprise for Jordan’s tourism industry. They also have the potential to be largely isolated from the effects of climate change as a result of their seclusion within the Gulf. The Jordanian coastline is, however, subject to considerable resource pressure, particularly as this coast supports Jordan’s only seaport facilities. The high level and conflicting nature of pressure on the natural resources of Jordan’s coast poses significant challenges to effective management and conservation of this unique environment.

The marine environment of the Gulf of Aqaba is of global significance in having some of the northern-most reef systems in the Western Indo-Pacific and is designated, along with the Red Sea, as a World Wildlife Fund (WWF) global 200 ecoregion on account of its marine biodiversity value. Home to both endemic and globally threatened species, the Jordanian reefs are an important reservoir or refugium for tropical reef species. In particular, the endangered Indo-Pacific humphead wrasse, *Cheilinus undulates* has been found in the vicinity of these reefs, as well as threatened species of marine turtles. Furthermore, owing to their isolated location, these reef habitats may be largely protected from the effects of global warming and, to date, have been unaffected by bleaching and other detrimental climatic effects. This ecosystem therefore provides a natural laboratory for the study of climate change impacts on coral communities.

As the Jordanian coastline is limited to 27 km in length, the area is strategically important and the vast majority of all consumer goods and foodstuffs for the country are shipped through the Aqaba Special Economic Zone (ASEZ). There is also a small artisanal fishery in the Gulf of Aqaba. Furthermore, the current population for Aqaba City is projected to increase by more than 50% from approximately 100,000 to over 160,000 people by 2020, creating significant additional resource pressure. An initiative aimed at moving and expanding Jordan’s port facilities has recently become a higher priority, which has added urgency to this project for mainstreaming marine biodiversity conservation in the coastal management systems for the ASEZ. The development of port facilities is proposed for areas of high conservation value near the southern Jordanian border. Jordan’s coastline has become the focus of a burgeoning tourism industry. Several extensive tourist resort developments are already underway and others are proposed in the near future, adding to pressure on environmental resources.

**PROJECT GOAL, OBJECTIVES, OUTCOMES and OUTPUTS:**

The goal of this project is to mainstream biodiversity conservation in order to promote more effective and integrated management of the coastal zone in the Aqaba Special Economic Zone. The strategy to achieve this goal has four primary components: development and improvement of knowledge-management systems for coastal and marine biodiversity, promotion of biodiversity friendly investment and development, improving institutional capacity for integrated coastal zone management and biodiversity conservation and coral reef protection.

Effective stewardship is premised on having a good understanding of the nature and interactions between the living (human and non-human) and non-living components of the environment. The use of this information must be managed effectively for good stewardship. Where this information indicates that anthropogenic activities negatively impinge on environmental sustainability, appropriate guidance should be provided. The roles and responsibilities of environmental managers must therefore be transparent and grounded in the principles of long term environmental sustainability.

The project includes four components that are designed to lift the barriers identified earlier and currently preventing the required balance between biodiversity conservation and development decisions. These outcomes are the following:

***Project Component 1: Knowledge management systems for planning and investment.*** This component involves the development of a marine and coastal biodiversity database with GIS support (covering ecosystems, species, physical factors and human uses) that will permit the development of a marine spatial plan to complement the existing Land Use Plan, and provide long-term support for biodiversity-based ICZM. This component will also review national progress in ICZM, update the 2004 PERSGA national report on ICZM, produce a ‘State of the Coast’ report that covers biodiversity conservation issues, and integrate the National Coral Reef Action Plan into other ICZM planning initiatives. The methodology and indicators developed by IOC-UNESCO to assess management effectiveness and the impact of ICZM, and promoted by PERSGA, will be introduced. This component has two outcomes.

***Project Component 2: Promotion of biodiversity friendly investment and development*.** This includes an economic evaluation of Jordan’s marine biodiversity using information gathered in the previously named component, building on previous relevant studies, and demonstrating how this value can be fully realized on a sustainable basis. This component will be undertaken in collaboration with the private sector, particularly the tourism industry, and will identify mechanisms for introducing incentive measures (such as eco-certification), offsets and other schemes by which relevant industries, particularly tourism, might finance management actions aimed at maintaining healthy coral reefs. This component has three outcomes.

***Project Component 3: Institutional capacity for ICZM and biodiversity conservation.*** This component involves the development of a comprehensive ICZM process that places marine biodiversity conservation on an equal footing with economic development in recognition of the ecosystem services provided by the *former* on which the latter depends. The project’s activities will include preparation, approval and implementation of a marine spatial plan and a capacity-needs assessment for implementation of the ICZM regulatory framework. This will require a full consultation process with all sectors and stakeholders, building on the experiences garnered during the PPG.

***Project Component 4: Coral reef protection.***Relocation of the main cargo port to an undeveloped site near the international border with Saudi Arabia will result in the destruction of approximately 4 ha of high quality *coral* reefs. In recognition of the importance of coral habitat, the regulatory authority, ASEZA, has a policy of requiring project proponents provide significant financial compensation for any planned or accidental destruction of coral reefs. An opportunity has thus been provided to preserve some portions of coral reef that are currently slated for complete destruction.

**SCOPE OF WORK**

Within the context outlined above, UNDP seeks the recruitment of an international consultant to support the achievement of the following project terminal evaluation objectives:

Conduct a terminal evaluation of project in line with internal procedures of UNDP and GEF guidelines. The scope of Objective One should cover the following:

The scope of the evaluation will cover all activities undertaken in the framework of the project. The evaluators 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. It will also attempt 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 evaluation will also address the underlying causes and issues contribution to targets not adequately achieved.

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

The terminal evaluation 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.

The consultant is expected to use 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

**METHODOLOGY**

An overall approach and method[[1]](#footnote-1) for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported and GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact,** as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR (Annex C). The evaluator is expected to amend, complete 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 Ministry of Environment and other stakeholder agencies, GEF OFPs, UNDP Country Offices, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Aqaba. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: **Aqaba Special Economic Zone Authority** (**ASEZA**), The Royal Marine Conservation Society of Jordan (JERDS), glass boats and diving operators.

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, mid-term 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 and ratings**

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

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Mainstreaming**

UNDP supported GEF financed projects are key components in UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programmes. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender.

**Impact**

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.[[2]](#footnote-2)

**Conclusions, recommendations 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 Offices involved will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, coordinate with the Government etc.

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

**Evaluator ethics**

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

Evaluation timeframe

The total duration of the evaluation will be *14* days over a time period of *4*weeks in which **7 working days in Jordan, and 7 working days home based.**

**DELIVERABLES**

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Deliverable | Content | Timing | Responsibilities |
| **Inception Report** | Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method | week before the mission | Evaluator submits to UNDP CO |
| **Presentation** | Initial Findings | End of evaluation mission: | To project management, UNDP CO |
| **Draft Final Report** | Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes | Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission | Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs |
| **Final Report\*** | Revised report | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft | Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC. |

\*When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluator is required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report.

**REQUIREMENTS FOR EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS**

**A) Education:**

* Advanced university degree in Natural Resources or management or planning/strategic planning or development or project management/evaluation or environmental science and management or environmental law and policy or any other relevant major.

**B) Professional Experiences & Skills:**

* Preferably 10 years of professional experience in fields relevant to biodiversity, environment or relevant fields
* Preferably experience of marine Biodiversity.
* Minimum 5 years’ experience in conducting evaluation of similar UNDP projects and/or GEF projects
* Sound knowledge about results-based management (especially results-oriented monitoring and evaluation).
* Fluency in written and spoken English
* Full computer literacy

**C) Competencies**

* Strong interpersonal skills, communication and diplomatic skills, ability to work in a team
* 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
* Keeps abreast of available technology, understands its applicability and limitations, willingness to learn new technology
* Payment modalities and specifications

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| % | Milestone |
| *20%* | Following submission and approval of the inception report |
| *40%* | 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 (indicate the site, such as http://jobs.undp.org, etc.) by (date).

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: specify a total lump sum amount including fees, travel cost (ticket), DSA. 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.

3. Personal CV including past experience in similar projects and at least 3 references

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.

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 60 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* |

**Annex A Project Results Framework:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPAP or CPD:** | | | | | |
| **Country Programme Outcome Indicators:** | | | | | |
| **Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area 2. Catalyzing environmental finance** | | | | | |
| **Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program:** | | | | | |
| **Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes:** | | | | | |
| **Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators:** | | | | | |
|  | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Targets**  **End of Project** | **Source of verification** | **Risks and Assumptions** |
| **Project Objective[[3]](#footnote-3)**  **To mainstream marine biodiversity conservation into the coastal management framework in the Aqaba Special Economic Zone (ASEZ).** | **Coral cover**  **Proportion of soft to hard coral** | **400 Ha**  **2 : 98 – 5:95** | **400 Ha**  **2 : 98 – 5:95** | Reef checks | These indicators are retained on the assumption that (i) expanse and composition of reefs provides an indication of reef health; (ii) the project will provide ASEZA and other operators in the Gulf with sufficiently acceptable alternative such that they enable the maintenance of the existing reefs; (iii) the reef relocation effort will be successful in replacing the relocated coral and hence maintaining overall coral coverage.  Another basic assumption underlying these indicators is that Aqaba’s corals have developed significant resilience to climate change and that changes in water temperatures that may occur during the lifetime of the project will not generate a significant loss in coral cover. |
| **Component 1:**  **Knowledge management systems for planning and investment** | ASEZA annual report comprises section on status of marine and coral BD  Proportion of new developments taking into account information generated by ASEZA’s MIS | No environment section in ASEZA’s report  Less than 1% | Environment performance and indicators reported against  At least half of the 14 planned developments | ASEZA annual report – published on the ASEZA website and submitted to PM’s office   * Results of monitoring of coastal water quality and other marine environmental conditions in and around new developments * Number of complaints/issues raised by local communities and environmental NGOs operating in Aqaba | This indicator is intended to capture an institutional improvement in reporting on environmental impact parameters in the ASEZ. The current reporting does not include such reporting, and it is assumed that through the project intervention in support of knowledge management and creation, awareness raising and enhanced compliance ASEZA will start reporting on the status of the marine environment and environmental performance of investments.  Underlying this indicator is the level of compliance by development projects with regulatory policies and standards ultimately contributing to marine environmental quality and higher level impact indicators at the level of the objective. |
| ***Outcome 1:***  ***Spatial planning and sharing of benefits from marine resources informed by sound knowledge*** | Adequate, geospatially referenced information is publicly available |  |  | External access | Internet based access to the database is inferred |
| ***Output 1.1:***  *A coastal and marine database, with associated GIS, established and information available to all stakeholders*. | A GIS-based marine biodiversity database will be established  The database will be regularly updated with relevant marine biodiversity information  The database will be made publicly available via a web-based portal |  |  | * + - 1. Examination of the database is required       2. Update tracking and reporting of the database will occur regularly       3. Unrestricted access to the database is apparent | Requires adequate resourcing of the internet host by the sponsoring agency |
| ***Outcome 2:***  ***Trends in status of marine biodiversity documented and causes of changes identified*** | Baseline and monitoring information is available |  |  | Notification of information updates is provided | Information is routinely updated as it comes available |
| ***Output 2.1:***  *Monitoring of marine biodiversity strengthened and expanded* | Monitoring work plans and timetables regularly provided/updated  Monitoring activities occur regularly and are logged when complete  Monitoring information incorporated into the database |  |  | * + - 1. Work plans/timetables independently verified       2. Activity recording independently verified       3. Automatic notification of updates permits verification |  |
| **Component 2: Biodiversity friendly investment and development** | |  | | --- | | 1. Green key/Blue flag certification obtained during the lifetime of the project | | 2. Total Value Added of Corals to the Jordanian economy increases by 20% at end of project from a baseline of 3Million JD (2009 estimates) | | 3. Reduced coral damage from anchoring/cruise line density | | No certified schemes  3 million JD  N/A | At least 5 by end of the project  3.6 million JD  TBD | |  | | --- | | Survey of the number of new developments and beaches achieving certification | | Repeat of the Economic valuation of corals at the end of the project lifetime using the same methodology | | Survey of coral reefs  ASEZA data on cruise line use | | These two indicators are intended to measure the level of success of introduction of environmentally friendly activities and incentives in the Gulf. As a proxy, they also serve to measure the success of awareness raising activities and behavioural change in terms of waste disposal on the beaches, adoption of environmentally friendly practices and correlation of economic return with the status of marine biodiversity.  While it is recognized that the methodology for assessing TVA may have flaws, for the purpose of monitoring and evaluation the TVA will use the same methodology in order to avoid debates. However a business case for coral conservation may well require a finer financial and economic assessment, and this will be undertaken during the project’s lifetime. If recommended by experts and agreed upon by the project board, the results of this finer assessment may be considered as baseline and a new target set. Should these changes occur they will be reported to the GEF through the PIR. |
| **Outcome 2.1:**  **Marine biodiversity and ecosystem services accounted for within the ASEZ decision-making** | Investment decisions make reference to marine biodiversity and ecosystem services |  |  | Independent audits of investment decisions conducted | Appropriate information provided by the Investment Commission |
| **Output 2.1.1:**  Ecosystem services identified, their economic value and carrying capacity estimated, and a ‘business case’ for marine biodiversity conservation prepared | Robust valuations of ecosystem services are made  Carrying capacity/external pressure assessments of habitats are provided  Financing and incentive options implemented in ASEZA systems  Reference to ecosystems services and benefits of biodiversity conservation provided by developers in applications |  |  | Valuation and carrying capacity studies provided  Evidence of developers incorporating environmental principles into plans is provided | Developers accept that the business case for environmentally sound business practice is valid. |
| **Output 2.1.2:**  Guidelines for environmentally sound investments | Guidelines for environmentally sound investments provided to all developers.  Reference to environmentally sound investments provided by developers in applications |  |  | Guidance documents available for independent review  Evidence of developers incorporating eco-labeling/certification programs in their investments is provided | Developers accept the need environmentally sound business practice and eco-labeling. |
| **Output 2.1.3:**  Marine biodiversity and ecosystem services in ecologically sensitive areas identified managed effectively | Membership in an independent expert panel is assessed  Risk-based approaches to marine biodiversity conservation in sensitive areas are incorporated into decision making |  |  | 1. The qualifications and relevance of the expert panel membership is reviewed by an independent body 2. Evidence of developers receiving and using risk-based advice when considering development in sensitive areas | Developers accept the need/requirement for environmentally sound business practice |
| **Outcome 2.2:**  **Tourism sector contributes to marine biodiversity conservation.** | Tourists provided with facilities and activities which actively promote marine biodiversity conservation. |  |  | Independent auditing of tourism activities | Appropriate records of opportunities and actual activities are kept |
| **Output 2.2.1:**  Mechanisms to promote marine-biodiversity friendly tourism identified and implemented | Capacity needs assessment completed  Environmentally-friendly tourism initiatives are developed and promoted by facilities operators  Financial and incentive measures included in the ASEZA development framework  Environmentally friendly tourism strategy prepared and adopted by ASEZA  ‘Natural Information and Interpretation Centre’ present in Aqaba city |  |  | 1. Capacity needs assessment report audited 2. Independent auditing of the implementation of a coordinated ‘green’ tourism strategy 3. ASEZA development framework updated. 4. Presence of an expanded and revised visitor information centre | Clear guidelines on environmental incentives for tourism operators are developed. |
| **Output 2.2.2:**  Identify and implement eco-labeling/certification schemes to promote marine-biodiversity friendly tourism | 1. Aqaba Ecotourism Criteria developed 2. Guidelines for eco-labeling systems prepared 3. Eco-labeling incentives are adopted by facilities operators and developers |  |  | 1. Aqaba Ecotourism Criteria audited by an independent agency 2. Guidelines available for independent audit 3. Internationally-recognized eco-labeling certifications and activities are provided by facilities operators |  |
| **Outcome 2.3:**  Public understanding pressures political commitment for strengthened marine biodiversity conservation | Increased public participation and interest in EIA scoping and review sessions for coastal developments |  |  | Independent audits of participatory processes reveal increased public/stakeholder participation | Sufficient public notification of scoping and review sessions is provided by the regulator |
| **Output 2.3.1**  Media campaign on marine biodiversity undertaken | 1. Publicity strategy prepared and implemented 2. Variety of media used, including public meetings, newspaper advertisements, marketing brochures and one-on-one consultations with local stakeholder groups |  |  | Publicity programme provided for comment.  Records of media used provided | Appropriate records are kept; a single coordinating body is involved in the media campaign |
| **Component 3: Institutional capacity for Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICZM) and mainstreaming of marine biodiversity conservation** | Environment revenue/total revenue | 1% in 2008 | 5% at end of project lifetime | * End of project assessment using the same methodology as USAID assessment * Survey of glass boat usage * Survey of diving operations * Survey of Marine Park usage (camping ground, beach access) * Survey of marine-based resort activities undertaken by guests | Underlying this indicator is the assumption that increasing environment revenue will be correlated with additional new ventures, a higher valuation of natural assets, and that these will be translated into financial and economic benefits accruing to ASEZA. However, this indicator and its components will be closely monitored to avoid a situation where offsets are favoured as opposed to avoidance and mitigation. |
| **Outcome 3.1:**  **Negative impacts on biodiversity from coastal development minimized** | There is minimal to no degradation of coastal marine habitats associated with new coastal developments |  |  | Baseline and monitoring information | Appropriately designed baseline and monitoring studies have been conducted |
| **Output 3.1.1:**  Marine spatial plan for the ASEZ, identifying user rights allocations and regulations, developed and approved with full public consultation and participation | 1. Development of a Marine Spatial Plan is advertised 2. Full public participation (with representatives of all significant stakeholder groups) in the development of the plan occurs 3. A Marine Spatial Plan is prepared and implemented |  |  | 1. Surveys of public awareness during the participatory period 2. Marine Spatial Plan prepared 3. New, relevant Bylaws or Laws are passed relating to the regulation of coastal resource allocation according to the Marine Spatial Plan | Key players work together cooperatively to develop the Marine Spatial Plan |
| **Outcome 3.2**  **Benefits of marine biodiversity equitably shared** | Equitable public and private use of the coastline and coastal and marine resources is provided |  |  | Visitor number records from the Marine Park and coastal resorts | That all partners are committed to an equitable sharing of Jordan’s limited coastal resources |
| **Output 3.2.1**  Existing CZM plans updated and formal ICZM process established to oversee implementation of ICZM activities and ensure marine biodiversity needs are addressed | The Aqaba Master Plan, and Land Use Plan are updated  Plans governing use and protection of the Aqaba Marine Park are updated  A formal ICZM process is established and implemented  Relevant regulations for implementing the ICZM strategy are adopted |  |  | Updated plans provided  Relevant laws/bylaws/regulations passed  An ICZM strategy is publicly adopted by ASEZA | That all partners work constructively towards the principles of ICZM |
| **Outcome 3.3**  **Capacity to ensure implementation of effective ICZM strengthened (measured by changes in results of UNDP’s capacity development scorecard)** | Improved results on the UNDP capacity development scorecard |  |  | UNDP |  |
| **Output 3.3.1**  Capacity needs for implementation of ICZM identified, and training and infrastructure development undertaken | Capacity needs assessment is completed by project team  Appropriate training strategies are developed and implemented  Appropriate infrastructure development is implemented |  |  | 1. Audit of the assessment 2. ASEZA Environment Directorate prepares and implements new training strategies for staff 3. Identified ASEZA units undertake training and other professional development relevant to ICZM 4. Key Aqaba Marine Park personnel undertake training on marine spatial planning andmanagement 5. Key of the PHOSCC undertake training in marine biodiversity conservation | Appropriate resources (time and funding) is made available for staff to undertake professional development |
| **Component 4: Coral Reef Protection** | Coral reefs slated for destruction are protected through a programme of transplantation to a suitable site |  |  | Records kept by transplant team | There are sufficient resources and expertise present to successfully implement the transplantation plan |
| **Outcome 4.1**  **Southern reef translocated using globally recognized best practices, and all other natural reefs under long-term protection** | 1. Greater than 75% of all accessible corals affected by the southern port expansion are transplanted from the site 2. Survival of transplanted corals greater than 75% by project end-point. |  |  | Independent monitoring of the transplantation results is conducted | Baseline information on reef community composition is available at donor and receptor sites |
| **Output 4.1.1**  Corals translocated, and long-term monitoring programme in place | * + - 1. Expert peer review group formed       2. Coral transplantation operational work plan OWP provided       3. Public awareness plan implemented       4. Staged implementation progress reports       5. Experimental design of the monitoring program provided for review       6. Coral health checks and assessment of associated reef fauna and flora undertaken on a regular basis       7. Results of monitoring submitted for consideration on a regular basis. |  |  | 1. Coral OWP reviewed by expert peer group 2. Public awareness plan reviewed 3. Progress reports assessed by expert peer review group, Project Board 4. Assessment of biological indicators such as % coral cover, abundance of corals and associated taxa (reef fish, invertebrates) 5. Growth rates of transplanted corals equal to or greater than baseline growth rate | There is sufficient capacity to carry out monitoring in a scientifically robust manner;  Appropriate data management procedures are in place;  There is sufficient baseline information in donor and transplant communities to permit statistically robust comparisons |
| **Output 4.1.2**  Management of visitors to, and tourism developments around, Aqaba Marine Park improved | Aqaba Marine Park Management Plan Revised  Visitor management plans are prepared and implemented  Marine Park staff upskilled  Public awareness materials available and campaigns underway  Visitor numbers and activities in the Marine Park recorded.  Sustainable Tourism Liaison group formed |  |  | 1. Inquiries at Visitor’s information kiosks and at Aqaba Marine Park increased by 50% 2. Public awareness campaign 3. 50% reduction in beach litter present in the Aqaba Marine Park; 4. Additional damage to coral reef areas in Aqaba Maine Park is reduced by 50% year-on-year. | Resources for implementation of the Visitor Management Plan are provided.  Beach cleanups occur on a regular basis |

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

\_ Project initiation form (PIF)

-- Project document

-- Annual plans

-- Project Identification Forms

-- Baseline GEF focal point tracking

-- Minutes of the meetings of the board meeting

-- Quarterly progress reports

-- Audit reports

-- Training material / Proceedings / minutes for the workshops or conferences which would have been organised as a part of outreach / awareness creation / training activities for this project

- Knowledge products

-- UNDP country program for Jordan

Annex C: 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[[4]](#footnote-4) | * 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 D: Rating Scales

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

Annex E: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form

**Evaluators:**

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

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form[[5]](#footnote-5)**

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

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

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

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

Signed at *place* on *date*

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

Annex F: Evaluation Report Outline[[6]](#footnote-6)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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[[7]](#footnote-7)) |
| **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[[8]](#footnote-8)) |
| **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. For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](http://www.undp.org/evaluation/handbook), Chapter 7, pg. 163 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office:  [ROTI Handbook 2009](http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/M2_ROtI%20Handbook.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. *Objective (Atlas output) monitored quarterly ERBM and annually in APR/PIR* [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. tbd – to be determined by consultant in consultations with the project team [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. 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-8)