

Annex 1. UNDP-GEF Project: Mid-Term review Terms of Reference

Project UNDP-GEF PIMS 3938 Mozambique PA Finance

1. INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full-size projects, financed by GEF and implemented with UNDP, need to undergo a mid-term review (MTR) and a terminal evaluation (TE). This Terms of Reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for this mid-term review.

These Terms of Reference (TOR) outline the expectations to the MTR for the project in question. The essentials of the project to be reviewed are as follows:

Project Title		Sustainable Financing of the Protected Area System in Mozambique	
GEF Project ID (PMIS):	3753	PIF Approval Date	Nov 2008
UNDP GEF PIMS:	3938	CEO Endorsement Date	20-Aug-2010
ATLAS Business Unit Award # Proj. IDs:	MOZ10	PRODOC Signature Dates	
IP MITUR:	00060497 / 00076184	IP MITUR:	14-Dec-2011
IP GRP:	00062665 / 00080154	IP GRP:	03-Dec-2011
IP WWF:	00062668 / 00080157	IP WWF:	05-Dec-2011
Country(ies):	Mozambique	Date project manager hired:	01-Nov-2012
Region:	Africa	Inception Workshop date:	19-Nov 2012
Focal Area:	Biodiversity	Planned planed closing date:	Sep-2015
Trust Fund	GEF TF	If revised, proposed op. closing date:	31-Dec-2016 (as per ProDocs)
GEF Focal Area Strategic Objective	BD-SP1: Sustainable financing of protected area systems at the national level	First PIR produced	2013
		Last PIR concluded	Oct 2013
Exec. Agent / Implementing Partner:	Ministry of Tourism (MITUR) (CSO) Gorongosa Restoration Project (CSO) WWF (World Wildlife Fund)		
Other Partners:	BIOFUND Carr Foundation		

Project financing	<i>at CEO endorsement stage</i>	<i>at mid-term stage*</i>
[1] GEF financing:	\$4,850,000	\$1,061,606.82
[2] UNDP contribution:	\$200,000	\$45,392.91
[3] Government:	\$500,000	to be assessed by MTR
[4] Other partners:	\$13,168,190	to be assessed by MTR
[5] Total co-financing [2 + 3+ 4]:	\$14,118,190	to be assessed by MTR
PROJECT TOTAL COSTS [1 + 5]	\$18,968,190	to be assessed by MTR

2. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION AND OBJECTIVES

The national system of protected areas of Mozambique covers a total area of some 13,941,800 ha (>17% of the national territory), of which 360,900 ha are marine and 13,580,900 ha terrestrial.

Currently the funding baselines for protected areas, and the capacities to administer and improve protected area revenue streams, are well below the levels required to ensure that the protected area system properly serves its function as an important tool to protect biodiversity. The project will thus seek to achieve a catalytic investment in securing the long-term financial sustainability of Mozambique's protected areas.

At the PA systemic level (the first component), the project will support the Government of Mozambique in developing a financial plan to direct the long-term sustainable financing of the protected area system. It will then strengthen the institutional and individual capacities of the protected area institution/s to implement this financial plan by: (i) supporting the strategic and business planning processes in protected area institutions; and (ii) improving the financial management processes and systems in PA institutions. The project will then support the integration of the national and institutional financial sustainability plans into the business and management planning of individual protected areas. It is envisaged that the development of a generic business plan template and preparation guidelines will enable the future replication of the business planning approach across the entire system of protected areas. Since the project's inception, there were important institutional changes, in particular the establishment, in 2013, of the National Conservation Areas Administration (ANAC). The entity assumed responsibility for component 1.

A second component of the project, was slated to identify opportunities for potential cost savings in protected area management by evaluating the cost-effectiveness of different types of community-based partnership approaches in and around Gorongosa Mountain in the Gorongosa National Park. In 2008, the Government of Mozambique and the US-based Carr Foundation announced that they had signed a 20-year agreement to restore and co-manage the park, which is assigned to CSO Gorongosa Restoration Project (GRP). GRP is accessing GEF funding through the project to develop knowledge from the implementation of different community-based partnerships, so as to contribute to the global, regional and national evidence base of the cost-effectiveness of different types of community-based partnerships. Since 2012, there has been however insecurity in the Gorongosa zone, possibly threatening the Park's tourism potential. A reassessment of the way forward is needed.

Finally, the project will test and develop mechanisms for increasing income from conventional financial sources for protected areas (trust fund, user fees) and developing innovative alternatives means of revenue generation (carbon payments and biodiversity offsets. The lessons learnt from the implementation of pilot carbon and biodiversity offset initiatives will guide the future adoption and operationalisation of these revenue-generating mechanisms across the national system of protected areas). WWF has been responsible for the implementation of this third component, through which the establishment of a national conservation trust fund (BIOFUND) is a key result. BIOFUND would then assume in due course the responsibility for implementing key activities under the third component.

The project was designed to generally improve the sustainability of Mozambique's Protected Area System, by approaching the issue of costs, revenues, flow of funds and how these are to be dynamically balanced to make a more effective contribution to biodiversity conservation.

Project Objective: To strengthen the overall effectiveness and sustainability of Mozambique's protected area system, including financial sustainability, through working partnerships between private, NGO and community stakeholders.

Expected Outcomes:

- Component 1: Sustainability of the protected area system institutionalized
- Component 2: Co-management models in demonstration sites
- Component 3: Business planning and revenue generation

3. OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE OF THE MID-TERM REVIEW

The MTR will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects.

The purpose of the MTR is to gain an independent analysis of the progress made by the project so far. The MTR will identify potential problems inherent in the project design; to assess progress towards achieving its objectives; to identify and document lessons learned (including those that can improve the design and implementation of other UNDP-GEF projects); and to make recommendations for specific measures that can be taken to improve the project and/or its management.

The MTR provides an opportunity to assess early signs of success or failure of the project and propose the necessary adjustments.

The MTR should significantly assist the project in formulating useful and feasible recommendations for a more strategic, focused and results-oriented project implementation. It will also independently validate the level of achievement of key project indicators, as well as the level of co-financing realization and the project's contribution to focal area outcomes through the tracking tools.

The mid-term review process is initiated by UNDP and aims to rectify the course of the project in order for it to perform better and to achieve its objectives cost effectively.

As an integral part of the project cycle, the MTR will analyse its achievements in the light of its original goals. It will consider the effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, impact and sustainability of the project. It will also identify factors that facilitated or impeded progress towards achieving the project objectives. In order to correct the course of the project, the MTR should address issues related to performance, project design, strategy, the quality of project reports, of its intellectual production and the efficacy of its Monitoring & Evaluation system.

4. EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact**, in line with relevant policies.

A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR (see [Annex F](#)). The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. While it is important to conduct a rigorous and up to date assessment of the progress of the project implementation, the MTR should also result in a set of practical recommendations for the project's main stakeholders and lessons learned to help define the future direction of the project.

The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with the project team, beneficiaries, government counterparts (in particular the implementing partner and the GEF operational focal point), UNDP Country Office, the UNDP GEF Technical Adviser and other key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Maputo. In other circumstances, a visit to Gorongosa National Park would be envisaged, but at current stage, this needs approval from UN Department of Security. Interviews will be held with the following institutions, organizations and individuals at a minimum: Ministry of Tourism (MITUR), Ministry for Coordination of Environmental Affairs (MICOA), Ministry of Agriculture (MINAG), National Directorate for Administration of Protected Areas (ANAC), Gorongosa Restoration Project (the Carr Foundation), WWF Mozambique, Biodiversity Conservation Foundation (BioFund), and other stakeholders involved into Biodiversity/Conservation field.

The MTR team will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal/policy documents, and any other

materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A non-exhaustive list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in [Annex B](#) of this Terms of Reference.

Other specific tasks that are expected by the MTR team includes:

- (1) A critical review of the GEF focal area tracking tools for the project. The tracking tool forms which will be completed by the project team (the Financial Scorecard by the BIOFUND/WWF team and the METT by the GRP team) prior to the MTR mission. The review must include comparison with tracking tool results at the baseline stage. The role of the MTR will be to validate project achievements expressed through the GEF focal area tracking tools at mid-term and identify any issues linked to topics covered by the tools.

Validate the level of co-financing mobilization by the project. The analysis will consist of comparing, for each of the co-financiers, the amounts committed at project approval stage, to the likelihood of these commitments to materializing at project end, and to the current level of disbursement. Amounts mobilized after project approval will also be included in the analysis. Detailed and summary tables are to be completed as per [Annex D](#).

5. EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see [Annex A](#)), 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 C](#).

6. MID TERM REVIEW DELIVERABLES

Table 1.

Deliverable*	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
MTR Inception Report	Review team clarifies timing and method of review	No later than 1 week before the start of the review mission	Review team submits to UNDP Country Office (CO)
Presentation	Initial Findings	End of review mission	Project management unit and UNDP Country Office
Draft Final Report	Full report (as template in annex 5) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the review mission	Sent to UNDP CO, reviewed by RTA, Project Unit, GEF OFP and the key projects stakeholder, in particular the implementing partners, the co-financiers and project board members
Final Report	Revised report with a response matrix detailing how all received comment have (and have not) been addressed in the final	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Sent to UNDP CO.

Deliverable*	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
	review report.		

* Deliverables will be in English, with the exception of the Presentation of Initial Findings, which needs be translated into Portuguese by the MTR Team. UNDP will engage translating services for both the draft and final versions of the report.

7. TEAM COMPOSITION

The MTR team will be composed of one international consultant, to be selected from the UNDP GEF EBD approved roster. This consultant will then include in his/her proposal, the sub-contracting of a national evaluator to be part of the team.

The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage.

The international evaluator will be the team leader and will be responsible for finalizing the report. The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The Team members must present the following qualifications:

- Minimum 8 years of relevant professional experience
- Knowledge of UNDP and GEF
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
- Technical knowledge in the following technical areas:
 - Biodiversity conservation, protected area management, policies and planning
 - Finance; specific experience in conservation finance is a plus
 - Institutional development and capacity building, in particular with respect to the environment sector.
- For the international consultant: ability to read and understand Portuguese and to speak it at minimal at working level.
- For the national consultant: ability to read and speak English at working level,

8. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this review resides with the UNDP CO in Mozambique.

The UNDP CO will contract the selected team of evaluators through an individual contract issued to the international consultant. The contract will apply a lump-sum approach and should cover both the consultancy fees for the team, travel costs (tickets and per diem). It will be the responsibility of the international consultant to sub-contract the national consultant.

The CO and Project Teams will be responsible for liaising with the MTR team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange a field visit (if security permits), coordinate with the Government etc., UNDP GEF and others.

9. TIME FRAME

Although the lump-sum approach to contracting will apply, UNDP expects the number of time worked by each consultant to cover approximately 5 weeks for entire MTR. This does not include the time needed for UNDP CO to complete the translation of the Draft report, which will likely take 2-3 weeks. In this light, the total duration of the MTR will be according to the following plan:

Table 2.

Activity	Approximate timing	Preferred starting date	Target completion Date
Preparation, concluding with inception report	1 week	From contract signature	02 May 2014
Evaluation Mission	2 weeks	04 May 2014 (travel day out)	16 May 2014 (last working day in country)
Workshop on preliminary findings	(1 day during mission)	Thu 15 May 2014	
Draft Evaluation Report	5-10 working days	19 May 2014	02 Jun 2014
<i>Translation of Draft report (no working days for consultants)</i>	<i>2 weeks</i>	<i>02 Jun 2014</i>	<i>16 Jun 2014</i>
<i>Dissemination of draft report among stakeholders (no working days for consultants)</i>	<i>3-4 weeks</i>	<i>16 Jun 2014</i>	<i>07 Jul 2014</i>
Final Report	1 week	07 Jul 2014	14 Jul 2014

10. PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

%	Milestone
20%	At contract signing
50%	Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft MRT report
30%	Following submission and acceptance (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final MTR report

11. APPLICATION PROCESS

Applicants are requested to apply via email, in response to the **Invitation to Submit an Offer with respect to the MID-TERM REVIEW process for the UNDP GEF project “Sustainable Financing of the Protected Area System in Mozambique”**, following instructions contained in the invitation letter.

Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions. The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in English with indication of the e-mail and phone contact. Shortlisted candidates will be requested to submit a price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment, including total fee, per diem and travel costs.

12. EVALUATOR ETHICS

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

ANNEXES

ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

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

ANNEX C. RATING SCALE

ANNEX D. CO-FINANCING MATRIX

ANNEX E: Table of Contents for the Mid-term Review Report

ANNEX F. EVALUATION QUESTIONS

ANNEX G. EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT AND AGREEMENT FORM

TOR ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in the CPD: More efficient use of available resources to promote equitable and sustainable economic development
Country Programme Outcome Indicators: <i>Increased equitable economic opportunities to ensure sustainable livelihoods for both men and women.</i>
Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Result Area: (according to the project's objective)
Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program: SO 1 - Catalyzing the sustainability of protected areas; SP 1 Sustainable financing of protected area (PA) systems at the national level
Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes: SP 1 - PA systems secure increased revenue and diversification of revenue streams to meet total expenditures required to meet management objectives; Reduction in financing gap to meet PA management objectives
Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators: SP 1 - Total revenue and diversification in revenue streams

	Indicator	Baseline	Target/s (End of Project)	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
Project Objective Strengthen the overall effectiveness and sustainability of Mozambique's Protected Area System, including financial sustainability, through working partnerships between public, private, NGO and community stakeholders	1. Financial sustainability scorecard for national system of protected areas	21%	>45%	Review of Financial Sustainability Scorecard	Assumptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Government maintains its current financial allocations to PA institutionsDonor agencies sustain current levels of funding support to PAsCurrent levels of revenues generated from use of protected areas is maintainedModels of PA co-management with private foundations and donor agencies are continued Risks: <ul style="list-style-type: none">BIOFUND fails to attract capital investmentPolitical and institutional conflicts delay the establishment of the new National Administration of Conservation AreasThe legislation does not adequately provide for the implementation of a number of potential PA financing mechanisms
	2. Capacity development indicator score for protected area system	Systemic: 46% Institutional: 46% Individual: 35%	Systemic: 60% Institutional: 55% Individual: 50%	Review of Capacity Development Indicator Scorecard	
	3. Total budget (including operational, HR and capital budget) (US\$ per annum) for protected area management	US\$14.9 million (as at 2008/9)	US\$18.9 million ¹	Annual financial reports of MITUR, MINAG, MPescas and Protected Areas under co-management agreement. Audited reports of donor-funded projects.	
	4. Number of protected areas in which the METT is adopted as a tool to monitor effectiveness of PA management	0	>10	Annual financial reports of MITUR, MINAG, MPescas and Protected Areas under co-management agreement	
Outcome 1 Sustainability of the Protected Area System institutionalized	Outputs: 1.1 A Financial Plan for Mozambique's system of conservation areas is adopted 1.2 A Strategic Plan for the National Administration of Conservation Areas directs the piloting of business planning processes in conservation areas 1.3 Financial management processes and systems in the National Administration of Conservation Areas are strengthened				
	5. Financial plan for system of protected areas adopted by government	No	Yes	Recommendation of CONDES Annual Report of MITUR/MICOA	Assumptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Financial data for the different categories of protected areas is made available

¹ No annual adjustment for CPI

	Indicator	Baseline	Target/s (End of Project)	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	6. Achievement (%) of performance targets detailed in the PA agency's Annual Performance Plan	No plan	60%	Annual Report of PA agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none">– The PA agency regularly prepares accurate annual reports and is independently audited. Risks: <ul style="list-style-type: none">– Political and institutional conflicts delay the establishment of the new National Administration of Conservation Areas– The legislation does not adequately provide for the implementation of a number of potential PA financing mechanisms
	7. Number of protected areas with business plans that enable the sourcing of adequate funds for the implementation of PA management plan	3	8	Annual Report of PA agency	
	8. Ratio of human resource to operational costs in PA agency	PA agency still to be established	60:40 (human resource: operating costs)	Annual Report and audited Financial Report of PA agency	
	9. Number of protected area staff completing in-house specialized financial management training and skills development programmes	0	Specialized: 5 General: 40	Annual Report of PA agency	
	10. Recruitment of staff to approved posts in the organogram of new PA agency (% of posts with staff appointed)	0	75%	Annual Report of PA agency	
	11. % of audit queries adequately resolved by PA agency	N/A	>80%	Audited Financial Report of PA agency	
Outcome 2 Co-management models in demonstration sites	Outputs: 2.1 The extent of deforestation on Gorongosa Mountain is contained, and reforestation and rehabilitation activities are expanded 2.2 A joint venture tourism enterprise on the lower slopes of Gorongosa Mountain provides an alternative source of income for local communities 2.3 Improved productivity and sustainability of cultivated areas in the lowlands incentivises local farmers to abandon slash-and-burn farming practices on Gorongosa Mountain				
	12. Number of native tree species planted on the Gorongosa Mountain slopes	15,000 ²	80,000	GNP Annual Report and audited Financial Report	Assumptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">– Carr Foundation, and other donors, sustain current levels of funding and operational support to GNP– The District Administration and local communities actively support project initiatives
	13. Total area (as a % of the original extent) of evergreen forest on Gorongosa Mountain (above 700m) deforested	36% ³	<36%	Aerial photography, satellite imagery and ground truthing	

² Data from 2009 and first trimester of 2010

³ Data from 2008

	Indicator	Baseline	Target/s (End of Project)	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	14. Number of agriculture clearings (<1ha in extent) in the Gorongosa Mountain (above 700m)	8504	<100	Aerial photography, satellite imagery and ground truthing	<p>to protect evergreen forests on Gorongosa Mountain</p> <p>Risks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The legal processes for the expansion of GNP are not concluded timeously, resulting in delays to the implementation of activities in and around Gorongosa Mountain – Local communities living in the buffer areas around Gorongosa Mountain are unable to conclude and maintain co-management, partnership or Joint Venture agreements with the GRP
	15. Cost of enforcement and compliance in the proposed GNP expansion area (USD/km2/year)	185	>100	GNP Annual Report and audited Financial Report	
	16. Number of community-based rangers employed by GNP	15	30	GNP Annual Report and audited Financial Report	
	17. Number of wildfires (>1 km2) in the Gorongosa Mountain (above 700m)	63	20	Aerial photography and satellite imagery	
	18. Average monthly household income of the Canda, Sandjungira and Tambara communities (US\$)	16-75	75-150	Data from National Institute of Statistics and Gorongosa SDAE	
	19. Number of employed community members in reforestation activities and tourism ventures	59	220	GNP Annual Report and audited Financial Report. Audited Financial Report of JV	
	20. Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool scorecard: Gorongosa National Park	65%	>72% ⁴	Review of METT scorecard (every two years)	
Outcome 3 Business planning and revenue generation	<p>Outputs:</p> <p>3.1 A conservation trust fund is established, effectively administered and capitalised</p> <p>3.2 The income from user fees in national parks, national reserves and marine reserves is improved</p> <p>3.3 The development of a pilot carbon sequestration project in the mangrove forests of a coastal conservation area is catalysed</p> <p>3.4 The potential for funding conservation areas from the implementation of biodiversity offset and compensation mechanisms is assessed</p>				
	21. Capitalization of BIOFUND by donors/funders (US\$ committed)	US\$5.6m	US\$20m	BIOFUND audited Annual Financial Report	<p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The National REDD strategy is developed and adopted by government – A proportion of income from biodiversity offsets and carbon sequestration can be 'ring-fenced' for reinvestment back into protected areas
	22. Annual revenues generated from protected areas user fees (including concession income) (US\$)	US\$1,680,992 ⁵	>US\$2.5m ⁶	Annual Report and audited Financial Report of PA agency	

⁴ Includes the additional areas incorporated into the GNP

⁵ Of this amount, only 64% is however retained for re-investment in protected areas (20% is returned to the provincial state budget and 16% distributed to local communities)

⁶ No annual adjustment for CPI

	Indicator	Baseline	Target/s (End of Project)	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	23. Average annual revenue generated for protected areas from biodiversity offsets and carbon sequestration (US\$)	US\$0	>US\$100,000	Project Implementation Reports	Risks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – BIOFUND fails to attract capital investment – Political and institutional conflicts delay the establishment of the new National Administration of Conservation Areas – The legislation does not adequately provide for the implementation of a number of potential PA financing mechanisms
	24. Annual average value of grants from BIOFUND to protected areas for operational and capital development costs	US\$0	US\$500,000	BIOFUND audited Annual Financial Report	

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

- Project Document (complete with ancillary documentation)
- Inception Report
- Annual and quarterly work plans
- Quarterly progress reports
- Project implementation reports (APR/PIR's)
- Other monitoring reports prepared by the project
- Audit reports
- Focal Area Tracking Tools
- Mission reports and lessons learnt studies
- Previous evaluations
- Any studies prepared with project funds or related to the project
- Country Programme Document, UNDAF and other related documents

Public link to key documents: <https://www.dropbox.com/l/vag9DiTMZnABkEViDZA6zc?>

TOR ANNEX C. RATING SCALE

<i>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution</i>	<i>Sustainability ratings:</i>	<i>Relevance ratings</i>
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 3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks	2. Relevant (R) 1.. Not relevant (NR) <i>Impact Ratings:</i> 3. Significant (S) 2. Minimal (M) 1. Negligible (N)
<i>Additional ratings where relevant:</i> Not Applicable (N/A) Unable to Assess (U/A)		

TOR ANNEX D. CO-FINANCING MATRIX

Guidance: 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. 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.

3a. Detailed matrix

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount disbursed at midterm	Amount likely to materialize at project end
Multilat. Agency	KfW - German Development Bank	In-Kind	210,000	<i>MTR to complete</i>	<i>MTR to complete</i>
Bilat. Agencies	AFD - French Development Agency	Grant	5,600,000		
NGO	WWF Mozambique	In-Kind	272,510		
NGO	WWF US	In-Kind	245,680		
NGO	Carr Foundation / Gorongosa Restoration Project	In-Kind (actually investments)	6,840,000		
Nat'l Gov't	MITUR	In-Kind	500,000		
Impl. Agency	UNDP Mozambique	Grant	200,000		
TOTAL			13,868,190		

3b. Summary matrix

Co-financing (type/source)	UNDP's own financing (mill. US\$)		Government (mill. US\$)		Partner Agencies (mill. US\$)		Total (mill. US\$)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual
Grants or cash co-finance								
Loans/Concessions								
- In-kind support								
- Other								
Totals								

TOR Annex E: Table of Contents for the Mid-term Review Report⁷

- i. Opening page:
 - Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
 - UNDP and GEF project ID#s.
 - Review time frame and date of review report
 - Region and countries included in the project
 - GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program
 - Implementing Partner and other project partners
 - Review team members
 - Acknowledgements
- ii. Executive Summary
 - Project Summary Table
 - Project Description (brief)
 - Review Rating Table
 - Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons
- iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations
(See: UNDP Editorial Manual⁸)
1. Introduction
 - Purpose of the review
 - Scope & Methodology
 - Structure of the review report
2. Project description and development context
 - Project start and duration
 - Problems that the project sought to address
 - Immediate and development objectives of the project
 - Baseline Indicators established
 - Main stakeholders
 - Expected Results
3. Findings
(In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (*) must be rated⁹)
- 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 Progress toward Results and Capacity Building
 - Attainment of project targets (as per the project's logframe) (*)
 - Contribution to upgrading skills of the national counterparts (if applicable)
- 3.3 Implementation and Adaptive Management:
 - Work planning
 - Adaptive management approach (changes introduced to project design due to changing circumstances)
 - Innovation
 - Socio-economic benefits generated, including gender aspects
 - Approach to partnerships
 - Project finance and co-finance
 - Monitoring systems
 - Risk management
 - Reporting
 - Synergies with related projects, programmes and initiatives
- 3.4 Project Results
 - Overall results (attainment of objectives) (*)
 - Relevance(*)
 - Effectiveness & Efficiency (*)
 - Country ownership
 - Mainstreaming
 - Sustainability (*)
 - Impact
- 3.5 Management Arrangements:
 - Overall project management
 - Quality of implementation by the Implementing Partners

⁷The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

⁸ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

⁹ 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 eTABLE OF CONTENTSxplanations.

- Quality of support and supervision provided by UNDP, including UNDP-GEF
- 4. Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons
 - Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
 - Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
 - Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
 - Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success
- 5. Annexes
 - ToR
 - Itinerary
 - List of persons interviewed
 - Summary of field visits
 - List of documents reviewed
 - Questionnaire used and summary of results
 - Relevant mid-term tracking tools (METT, FSC, Capacity scorecard)
 - Co-financing table

TOR ANNEX F. 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?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•		•	•
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•

TOR ANNEX G. 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 Form¹⁰

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: _____

¹⁰www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct