



INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANT PROCUREMENT NOTICE

Date: 24 April 2015

Country: Suriname

Description of the assignment: International Consultant – Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the Suriname Coastal Protected Area Management (PIMS 4370)

Project name: Suriname Coastal Protected Area Management

Period of assignment/services (if applicable): 25 working days - in the period 08 May – 30 June 2015 (non-consecutive), with at least 13 working days in Suriname.

The applicant is requested to submit a financial proposal (quotation) accompanied by a resume (CV) and P11 history form to the following email address registry.sr@undp.org no later than **5 May 2015**.

Any request for clarification must be sent in writing, or by standard electronic communication to the address or e-mail indicated above. The Procurement unit will respond in writing or by standard electronic mail and will send written copies of the response, including an explanation of the query without identifying the source of inquiry, to all consultants.

TERMINAL EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the *Suriname Coastal Protected Area Management* (PIMS 4370)

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

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	Suriname Coastal Protected Area Management
----------------	--

GEF Project ID:	4180		<u>at endorsement</u> <u>(Million US\$)</u>	<u>at completion</u> <u>(Million US\$)</u>
UNDP Project ID:	4370	GEF financing:	965,556	965,556
Country:	Suriname	IA/EA own:	100,000	100,000
Region:	LAC	Government:	450,000	250,000
Focal Area:	Biodiversity	Other:	1,055,045	1,255,045
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	BD-2;BD-1	Total co-financing:	1,605,045	1,605,045
Executing Agency:	UNDP	Total Project Cost:	2,570,601	2,570,601
Other Partners involved:		ProDoc Signature (date project began):		28 July 2011
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: August 2014	Actual: 30 June 2015

OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The project was designed to: *Safeguard Suriname's globally significant coastal biodiversity. The project objective is to promote the conservation of biodiversity through improved management of protected areas along the nation's western coast. The objective will be achieved through two components: (1) improving the management effectiveness and efficiency of coastal protected areas; and (2) increasing and diversifying coastal protected area funding.*

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

The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

An overall approach and method¹ for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact**, as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR ([Annex C](#)). The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government

¹ For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](#), Chapter 7, pg. 163

counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Suriname, including the following project sites *Bigi Pan, North Coronie and North Saramacca Multiple Use Management Area's (MUMA's)*. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: *Ministry of Physical, Planning and Forest Management, Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Husbandry and Fisheries, Districts Commissioners of Coronie, Nw. Nickerie and Saramacca,*.

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in [Annex B](#) of this Terms of Reference.

EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework ([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 / COFINANCE

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

Co-financing (type/source)	UNDP own financing (mill. US\$)		Government (mill. US\$)		Partner Agency (mill. US\$)		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

CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

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

IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

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

EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the evaluation will be 25 days according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation	4 days	13 May 2015
Evaluation Mission	13 days	10 June 2015
Draft Evaluation Report	6 days	22 June 2015
Final Report	2 days	06 July 2015

EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

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](#)

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

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

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

TEAM COMPOSITION

The evaluation team will be composed of *(1 international evaluators)*. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. *(If the team has more than 1 evaluator, one will be designated as 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:

- Master's degree or higher in Natural Resource Management, environmental management, socio-economics field or other related field
- Minimum 7 years of relevant professional experience
- Substantial knowledge in the targeted focal area
- At least 5 years of recent experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies
- At least 5 years' experience applying participatory monitoring approaches
- At least 3 years' experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios
- Recent knowledge of UNDP's results-based evaluation policies and procedures
- Recent knowledge of the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy
- Good command of the English language (oral and written)
- Knowledgeable of the Suriname context and national circumstances is an advantage
- Good command of the Dutch language is an advantage

EVALUATOR ETHICS

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

PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

%	Milestone
20%	Upon submission and acceptance of inception report including work plan
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 email to registry.sr@undp.org by 5th May 2015. Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV, P11 history form and price offer (quotation) indicating the total costs of the assignment (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs) for this position. The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in English with indication of the e-mail and phone contact.

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

ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Objective and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
Project Objective: To promote the conservation of biodiversity through improved management of protected areas along the western coast of Suriname	Increase in coastal protected area operational sustainability measured by average METT score for all coastal PA's based on the following definitions: High (70-100), Medium (50-69), Low (<50).	METT for coastal PA's High (70-100): 0 Medium (50-69): 3 Low (<50): 7	METT for coastal PA's High (70-100): 3 Medium (50-69): 3 Low (<50): 4	METT scorecard applied at project start, MTE and FE	Changes in political circumstances and economic priorities affect Government or other stakeholders (including NGO PA managers) commitment to NSPA and regulatory, financial and management improvements
	Increase in coastal protected areas financial capacity measured by Financial Sustainability Scorecard	Financial Score (Part 2): 13% Legal, regulatory and institutional frameworks: 18% Business planning & other tools for cost-effective management: 13% Tools and systems for revenue generation & mobilization: 1%	Financial Score (Part 2): 38% (The highest score possible is 196) Legal, regulatory and institutional frameworks: 49% Business planning & other tools for cost-effective management: 34% Tools and systems for revenue generation & mobilization: 32%	Financial Sustainability Scorecard applied at project start, MTE and FE	Climate change, natural disasters, and other environmental impacts beyond national do not exceed current expectations affecting the viability of management options and distract attention from PA issues.
	Total mangrove forest cover remains constant and/or increases within coastal protected areas No negative change in population number of 3 key indicator species within coastal protected	200,000 hectares of mangrove forest in coastal protected areas Number of individuals of three indicator species within coastal protected areas: Scarlet ibis (Eudocimus ruber), Jaguar (Panthera onca), Tarpon (Tarpon	200,000 hectares of mangrove forest in coastal protected areas Number of individuals of three indicator species within coastal protected areas: Scarlet ibis (Eudocimus ruber), Jaguar (Panthera onca), Tarpon (Tarpon	PA reports, monitoring results, management plans, and project reports	

	areas Water quality improves and/or remains consistent at five monitoring stations located within coastal protected areas	atlanticus) (Exact figures to be determined at project inception) 3 Water quality at five monitoring stations within coastal protected areas measured by: Chlorine, Mercury, PH and salinity, E-coli, COB and BOD, and Dissolved oxygen. (Exact figures to be determined at project inception.)	atlanticus) (Exact figures to be determined at project inception) Water quality at five monitoring stations within coastal protected areas measured by levels of: Chlorine, Mercury, PH and salinity, E-coli, COB and BOD, and Dissolved oxygen. (Exact figures to be determined at project inception.)		
Outcome 1: Improved effectiveness and efficiency of the management of coastal protected areas	Number of coastal protected areas with clearly designated PA management authority	0 coastal protected areas within NSPA with legal agreement designating PA management authority	3 coastal protected areas within NSPA with legal agreements designating PA management authority (100% of PA's)	Legal agreement reviewed, PA reports, management plans, and project reports	Decision-makers (national and local) will support and approve various legal agreements, including making required institutional reforms.
	Number of coastal PA's implementing contemporary management plans that reflect NSPA standards and integrate landscape/seascape wide approaches to addressing PA threats	0 coastal protected areas implementing contemporary management plans that reflect NSPA standards and integrate landscape/seascape wide approaches to addressing PA threats	3 coastal protected areas implementing contemporary management plans that reflect NSPA standards and integrate landscape/seascape wide approaches to addressing PA threats	PA reports, management plans, and project reports	NSPA is developed and effectuated. Authorities will follow coordinated MUMA management relationship.
	Number of coastal protected areas with comprehensive biodiversity conservation monitoring systems informing	0 coastal protected areas with comprehensive biodiversity conservation monitoring systems informing management decision-	3 coastal protected areas with comprehensive biodiversity conservation monitoring systems informing management decision-	PA reports, management plans, and project reports	Continued GoS support for MUMA management improvement. Institutions and

3 Mangrove surveys will be conducted by the University of Suriname. Scarlet ibis surveys will be conducted by NCD with the support of Stinasu. Tarpon surveys will be conducted with the support of Fisheries Department. The University of Suriname will work with NCD to conduct three jaguar surveys during project implementation. The National Hydraulic Service will work with PA management to generate water quality information.

	management decision-making	making	making		individuals successfully apply new skills.
	Increase in coastal and terrestrial protected area management effectiveness measured by METT scores	<p>METT Scores for 16 PA's:</p> <p>Coastal PA's:</p> <p>Bigi Pan: 56 Hertenrits: 42 North Coronie: 37 North Saramacca: 56 North Commewijne/Marowijne: 34 Coppename Monding: 56 Wia Wia: 20 Galibi: 45 Peruvia: 43 Wanekreek: 22</p> <p>Terrestrial PA's:</p> <p>Boven Coesewijne: 54 Copi: 24 Brinckheuvel: 22 Brownsberg: 33 Central Suriname: 40 Sipaliwini: 25</p>	<p>METT Scores for 16 PA's:</p> <p>Coastal PA's: (25% increase)</p> <p>Bigi Pan: 70 Hertenrits: 53 North Coronie: 47 North Saramacca: 70 North Commewijne/Marowijne: 43 Coppename Monding: 70 Wia Wia: 25 Galibi: 56 Peruvia: 54 Wanekreek: 27.5</p> <p>Terrestrial PA's: (10% increase)</p> <p>Boven Coesewijne: 59 Copi: 26 Brinckheuvel: 24 Brownsberg: 36 Central Suriname: 44 Sipaliwini: 28</p>	<p>PA reports, management plans, and project reports</p> <p>METT scores at inception, MTE, and FE</p>	<p>Inadequate management and technical support undermines project outcomes</p> <p>Institutional Reform of RGB departments is finalized</p>
<p>Outputs:</p> <p>Cooperative management agreements for MUMAs developed, specifying roles of key Ministries and stakeholders, financial responsibilities, and conflict resolution mechanisms.</p> <p>Consultation Commissions established (with representation of GoS agencies and MUMA users) to resolve MUMA-related conflicts</p> <p>Three updated management plans in place for the MUMAs, which describe measures to maintain ecosystems, and how management can be adapted, based on information available.</p> <p>A monitoring and evaluation system in place for each MUMA.</p> <p>Selected staff from the MUMAs are trained in management plan development, implementation, administration, and financial planning (number of staff will be determined during the PPG phase).</p>					
Outcome 2: Increased and diversified coastal protected areas funding	Increase in section 3 of financial scorecard part II: Tools and systems for revenue generation & mobilization from 1% to 32%	Baseline: 1%	Final: 32%	UNDP Financial Scorecard	<p>Government, NGO's, private sector and other donors maintain and/or improve investment and support for NSPA.</p> <p>PA management will complete and implement management and business plans.</p>
	Increase in annual government funding for coastal protected areas conservation	Baseline: US\$ 833,000	Final: US\$ 1,150,000 (25% increase.)	GoS financial reports, coastal protected areas financial reports, PA	State Oil Company maintains high

				reports, management plans, and project reports	level of engagement and support for biodiversity off-set programming
	Increase in annual private sector (e.g., oil, tourism, fisheries, agriculture) monetary investments in coastal protected areas conservation	Baseline: US\$ 592,0004	Final: US\$ 740,0005 (25% increase)	Coastal protected areas financial reports, PA reports, management plans, and project reports	
	Percentage of coastal protected areas implementing business plans that reflect NSPA standards	0 coastal protected areas implementing business plans that reflect NSPA standards	3 coastal protected areas with implementing business plans that reflect NSPA standards (25% increase)	Review of business plans, PA reports, management plans, and project reports	
	Decrease in coastal protected areas funding gap between existing and ideal scenario	Coastal PA's funding gap: Bigi Pan: 29% Hertenrits: 29% North Coronie: 27% North Saramacca: 37% North Commewijne/Marowijne: 17% Coppename Monding: 37% Wia Wia: 17% Galibi: 46% Peruvia: 27% Wanekreek: 86%	Coastal PA's funding gap: Bigi Pan: 9% Hertenrits: 9% North Coronie: 7% North Saramacca: 17% North Commewijne/Marowijne: +3% Coppename Monding: 17% Wia Wia: +3% Galibi: 26% Peruvia: 7% Wanekreek: 66% (20% decrease)		
<p>Outputs:</p> <p>Three business plans for MUMAs, which aim at financial sustainability of MUMA management.</p> <p>Three MUMA economic valuations undertaken and used to increase public and private-budget allocations.</p> <p>Agreement with the State Oil Company for a biodiversity offset scheme in at least one MUMA</p> <p>Proposal to earmark MUMA related line items in the annual budgets of key GoS agencies.</p> <p>Mechanism to manage and administer MUMA-derived income / funds.</p>					

4 This figure from 2009 includes: 75,000 private investment in Warappa Kreek in 2009, 500,000 on coastal MUMA research spent by State Oil Company, and 17,000 spent by State Oil Company on turtle monitoring.

5 This will include the State Oil Company (Staatsolie), permits/fees from tourism, etc.

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

Non limitative

- 1 *UNDAF 2008 – 2011;*
- 2 *CPD 2008 – 2010;*
- 3 *Project Document;*
- 4 *Annual work plans.*
- 5 *APRs/PIR reports;*
- 6 *Project Progress Reports;*
- 7 *Minutes from relevant meetings UNDP – ROGB;*
- 8 *ToRs for Consultancies;*
- 9 *Workshop reports;*
- 10 *Multi Annual Development Plan 2006 – 2010;*
- 11 *Risk Logs;*
- 12 *UNDP's Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluation for Results;*
- 13 *North Coronie MUMA documents*
- 14 *North Saramacca MUMA documents*
- 15 *Biodiversity offset documents*
- 16 *Audit reports*

ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

This is a generic list, to be further detailed with more specific questions by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on the particulars of the project.

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 realistic were the project's intended outcomes?	• Degree to which the project supports national environmental Objectives	• Project documents and evaluations •	• Document analysis
• Were the project's objectives and components relevant, according to the social and political context?	• Degree of coherence between the project and national priorities, policies and strategies	• ROGB, Project team, UNDP	• Interviews
• Were counterpart resources (funding, staff, and facilities), enabling legislation, and adequate project management arrangements in place at project entry?	• Appreciation from national stakeholders with respect to adequacy of project design and implementation to national realities and existing capacities	• Project partners and relevant stakeholders	• Interviews
• Are the stated assumptions and risks logical and robust? And did they help to determine activities and planned outputs?	• Coherence between needs expressed by national stakeholders and UNDP-GEF criteria	• Extent to which the project is actually implemented in line with incremental cost argument	• Document analysis
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
• To what extent were project results achieved?	• See indicators in the project document results framework and log frame	• Project documents and evaluations	• Document analysis
• In what ways are long-term emerging effects to the project foreseen?	• Level of coherence between project expected results and project design internal logic	• ROGB, Project team, UNDP	• Interviews
• Were the relevant representatives from government and civil society involved in project implementation, including as part of the project	• Level of coherence between project design and project implementation approach	• Project partners and relevant stakeholders	• Document analysis

steering committee?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Was an intergovernmental committee given responsibility to liaise with the project team, recognizing that more than one ministry should be involved? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Level of coherence between project design and project implementation approach 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents and evaluations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document analysis
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Was adaptive management used and if so, how did these modifications to the project contribute to obtaining the objectives? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quality of existing information systems in place to identify emerging risks and other issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents and evaluations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document analysis
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How did institutional arrangements influence the project's achievement of results? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quality of risk mitigations strategies developed and followed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ROGB, Project team, UNDP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interviews
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Were the indicators provided in the Project Document effectively used for measuring progress and performance? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Occurrence of change in project design/ implementation approach (i.e. restructuring) when needed to improve project efficiency 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents and evaluations ROGB, Project team, UNDP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interviews
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Were baseline conditions, methodology and roles and responsibilities well-articulated at project start-up? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Occurrence of change in project design/ implementation approach (i.e. restructuring) when needed to improve project efficiency 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents and evaluations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interviews
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In what way may the benefits from the project be maintained or increased in the future? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See indicators in project document results framework and log frame 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents and reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document analysis
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is there sufficient public/stakeholder awareness in support of the project's long-term objectives? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that particular partnerships/linkages will be sustained 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ROGB, Project team, UNDP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interviews
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Which of the project's aspects deserve to be replicated in future initiatives? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that particular practices will be sustained 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ROGB, Project team, UNDP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interviews
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do the legal frameworks, policies, and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that Mainstreaming has taken place and SLM concepts are integrated in 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document analysis

jeopardize sustainability of project benefits?	multiple sectors' policies.	reports	
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are there verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See indicators in project document results framework and log frame 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents and evaluations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document analysis
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is there demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NBSAP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project team Project partners and relevant stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interviews

ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

<p><i>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution</i></p> <p>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</p>	<p><i>Sustainability ratings:</i></p> <p>4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks</p>	<p><i>Relevance ratings</i></p> <p>2. Relevant (R) 1.. Not relevant (NR)</p> <p><i>Impact Ratings:</i></p> <p>3. Significant (S) 2. Minimal (M) 1. Negligible (N)</p>
<p><i>Additional ratings where relevant:</i> Not Applicable (N/A) Unable to Assess (U/A)</p>		

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 Form⁶

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: _____

⁶www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE⁷

- 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 Manual⁸)
- 1. Introduction
 - Purpose of the evaluation
 - Scope & Methodology
 - Structure of the evaluation report
- 2. Project description and development context
 - Project start and duration
 - Problems that the project sought to address
 - Immediate and development objectives of the project
 - Baseline Indicators established
 - Main stakeholders
 - Expected Results
- 3. Findings
(In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (*) must be 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 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

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 explanations.

- Project Finance:
- Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (*)
- UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (*) coordination, and operational issues

3.3 Project Results

- Overall results (attainment of objectives) (*)
- Relevance(*)
- Effectiveness & Efficiency (*)
- Country ownership
- Mainstreaming
- Sustainability (*)
- Impact

4. Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons

- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
- Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
- Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
- Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success

5. Annexes

- ToR
- Itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- Summary of field visits
- List of documents reviewed
- Evaluation Question Matrix
- Questionnaire used and summary of results
- Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

ANNEX G: EVALUATION REPORT CLEARANCE FORM

(to be completed by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and included in the final document)

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

UNDP GEF RTA

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____