



Empowered lives.  
Resilient nations.

## TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR TERMINAL EVALUATION

<b>Project Title</b>	SGP/ COMPACT Re-granting of OAK Funds
<b>Project Number</b>	(Atlas No.00087293)
<b>Implementing Agency</b>	UNDP / SGP
<b>Project Scope</b>	6 Districts of Belize
<b>Project Duration</b>	July 2013 to December 2015
<b>Project Budget (USD)</b>	USD \$326,000.00

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Portfolio Project # 00087293 (SGP/COMPACT Re-granting of OAK FUNDS) was implemented between the period June 2013 to December 2015 with the financial support of the OAK Foundation; and was designed with an objective of protecting and conserving the Belize Barrier Reef Reserve System World Heritage Site. Small Grants targeted Coastal Community Based Organizations, Associations and Local Non-Governmental Organizations and promoted:

- a. Increased capacities of CBO's and emerging groups
- b. Improved Marine Protected Areas management
- c. Biodiversity and Conservation education
- d. Enhanced community livelihood benefits
- e. Enhanced stakeholder communication, consultation and consensus building
- f. Dissemination of lessons learnt

The above stated objective was achieved through the administration and implementation of the 10 project grants. As a condition of UNDP/ SGP re-granting of OAK Foundation funds, it is prescribed that a terminal evaluation of OAK Funded initiatives be undertaken. The Terminal Evaluation is intended to be a systematic learning exercise for project partners. The exercise is therefore structured so as to generate and share experiences and practical knowledge. The proposed portfolio evaluation of the OAK Supported SGP will focus on:

- ❖ Portfolio/ Outcome analysis
  - Detailing how those initiatives funded have contributed to the overall progress of Objective realization (including contributing factors and constraints);
- ❖ Output analysis
  - Focusing on the relevance of and progress made in terms of the individual project outputs within the UNDP/ OAK Portfolio (including analysis of project activities, sustainability factors, non- intentional results and cascading/ ripple effect of investment );

## **2. SCOPE OF WORK**

The portfolio review will provide an overall picture of the Performance of the OAK portfolio and will address impact, effectiveness and efficiency issues that can be dealt with at the portfolio level. The results of the portfolio evaluation will be used for designing and implementation of UNDP's Small Grant Programming interventions during the current UNDP Country and is crucial in informing the design of the new UNDP CPD cycle (2017- 2021). More specifically, the scope of the outcome evaluation is as follows:

### **1. *Outcome analysis***

- Review the business case and assess whether or not stated objective, indicators and targets appropriately responded to national circumstances and to the state of the Belize Barrier Reef Complex.
- Assess the timeliness of intervention and determine the likelihood for achieving the portfolio impact within the planned timeframe
- Assess the main factors (positive and negative) within and beyond UNDP/SGP interventions that affected portfolio delivery; stating clearly how these factors limited or facilitated progress towards attainment of the portfolio objective.
- Assess whether or not proposed contributions to the achievement of the portfolio objective were appropriate, sufficient, effective and sustainable
- Determine portfolio's contribution to the realization of Gender equity in portfolio programming (Examine the intended/unintended impacts for women, men and youths)
- Assess the extent to which the capacity developed under the programme can continue to function without continued external support from UNDP/ SGP

### **2. *Output analysis***

- What is the effectiveness of the SGP for successfully achieving environmental conservation and sustainable management while addressing livelihoods in communities?
- What are the key outputs that have been or that will most likely be produced and to what extent can results been up-scaled, replicated or mainstreamed and what are the factors favoring or hindering this? (Identify possibilities for detailed case studies as a means to contribute to knowledge building)
- Were the outputs (Projects) relevant to the stated portfolio objective?
- Are the monitoring and evaluation indicators appropriate to link these outputs to the portfolio objective, or is there is a need to improve these indicators?
- What are the factors (positive and negative) that affected the accomplishment of the outputs (Projects)?
- Assess whether capacity development activities in support of sustainable management of the Belize Barrier Reef Reserve System World Heritage Site have resulted in enhanced civil society capacities.
- Assess whether or not outputs (Projects) served to create an enabling environment for the effective management of Belize's MPA and the utilization of biological diversity within the Belize Barrier Reef Reserve System World Heritage Site.
- Assess whether or not the outputs (projects) utilized innovative approaches contributing to the realization of Programme Objective.
- Assess whether UNDP/ SGP management and oversight structures and working methods were appropriate and supportive of the effective delivery of the portfolio initiative?

- Based on the above analysis, provide with practical recommendation how should UNDP/ SGP adjust its programming, partnership arrangements, working methods and/or management structures to ensure the efficiency of future UNDP small grant programming?

### **3. *Other Areas to be evaluated***

Besides putting primary focus on the above areas, the evaluator will be expected to consider the following drivers of development effectiveness throughout the portfolio evaluation process:

- Developing national capacities
- Enhancing national ownership
- Advocating and fostering an enabling policy environment
- Promoting gender equality
- Forging partnerships for results

These drivers of development effectiveness, when taken together, help to connect UNDP's substantive results to larger intended national development outcomes.

Projects to be evaluated:

Output 1: Building Community Resilience as a Tool to Minimizing Impact on the Belize Barrier Reef System through Improved Educational Opportunities and Land-use within the Rio Grande River Watershed.

Output 2: Strengthen the Institutional Capacity of the Belize Fishermen Cooperative Association (BFCA).

Output 3: Building the Capacity of Local tour guides for Responsible Tourism in Punta Gorda, a Coastal Community of the Belize Barrier Reef Reserve System World Heritage Site.

Output 4: Promoting Conservation and Sustainable Use of fisheries resources by Building Capacity and Seeking Alternatives for Fishers.

Output 5: Capacity Building and Empowerment of the Chunox Fishers for Improved Management of the Marine Resource through Education and Participation in Fisheries Management.

Output 6: Enhancing Mangrove and Coral Ecosystems via Active Reforestation/Restoration Efforts and Structured Training Activities in the Stann Creek District.

Output 7: Sustainable Financing of Conservation and Development in the Maya Mountain Marine Corridor.

Output 8: Enhancing the Conservation and Sustainability of Light House Reef Atoll-Promoting Income Diversification Opportunities.

Output 9: Strengthening System Level Management of Marine Protected Areas in the Northern Belize Coastal Complex.

Output 10: Strengthening Capacities in Seascape Conservation and Management within the Belize Federation of Fishers.

### 3. KEY DELIVERABLES/PRODUCTS

Following key deliverables/products are expected from this portfolio and project evaluations:

1. ***Comprehensive Evaluation Report*** that includes, but is not limited to:

- Executive summary
- Introduction
- Description of the evaluation methodology
- Analysis of the situation with regard to outcome, outputs, resources, partnerships, management and working methods
- Key findings/ Project Specific Learning
- Conclusions and recommendations for the future program implementation

In addition, the final report should contain the following annexes:

- Terms of Reference for the evaluation
- List of meetings attended
- List of persons interviewed
- List of documents reviewed
- Any other relevant material

The evaluation will be conducted in a participatory manner working on the basis that the primary purpose of the evaluation is to assess the results (outcomes), impacts, performance (on the basis of the indicators identified in the Results matrix) and sustainability of the project. For this to happen, the mission will start with a review of the key project documents, notably Minutes of the Project Steering Committee, Annual Reports, Donor Reports and any other reports and correspondence that seems relevant.

An overall guidance on outcome/ portfolio evaluation methodology can be found in the UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Results and the UNDP Guidelines for Outcome Evaluators. The evaluator(s) should develop detailed methodologies for the outcome and output evaluations during the preparatory phase of the evaluation. Evaluation tools and techniques may include, but not limited to:

- i. desk review of existing documents and materials
- ii. interviews with partners, beneficiary groups and stakeholders
- iii. field visits to projects as a means to verify the produced outputs and the impact of the outputs
- iv. participatory techniques and other approaches for data gathering and analysis
- v. briefing and debriefing sessions with UNDP, SGP NSC and key government representatives

The evaluator has certain flexibility to adapt the evaluation methodology to better suit the purpose of the evaluation exercise.

Each aspect/dimension will be rated as: Highly Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Marginally Satisfactory, Moderately Unsatisfactory, Unsatisfactory, and N/A.

- Highly Satisfactory (HS): The project has no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives.
- Satisfactory (S): The project has minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives.
- Marginally Satisfactory (MS): The project has moderate shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives.

- Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): The project has significant shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives.
- Unsatisfactory (U): The project has major/ severe shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives.

The portfolio and achievements will be tested against following evaluation criteria:

- Relevance** – the extent to which the activity is suited to local and national development priorities, organizational priorities (OAK, UNDP).
- Effectiveness** – the extent to which an objective has been achieved or how likely it is to be achieved.
- Efficiency** – the extent to which results have been delivered with the least costly resources possible.
- Results/impacts** – the positive and negative, and foreseen and unforeseen, changes to and effects produced by a development intervention.
- Sustainability** – the likely ability of an intervention to continue to deliver benefits for an extended period of time after completion.

<b>Deliverable</b>	<b>Estimated Duration to Complete</b>	<b>Target Due dates</b>	<b>Review and Approvals Required</b>
<b>Deliverable 1:</b> Work plan	2 days	June 6, 2016	UNDP (Not tied to payment)
<b>Deliverable 2:</b> Preliminary findings Draft version of the evaluation report	15 days	June 24, 2016	UNDP
<b>Deliverable 3:</b> De-briefing and presentation	1 day	June 29, 2016	N/a
<b>Deliverable 4:</b> The final project evaluation report	12 days	July 11, 2016	UNDP
<b>Total number of working days:</b>	30 days		

#### **4. DAYS OF WORK AND SCHEDULE OF PAYMENT**

The evaluator is expected to display competencies and capacities in the results based monitoring approach. The consultant will be hired for a period of 30 days under a standard UNDP Individual Contract. This includes the visits to project sites and interaction with the implementing agencies and other stakeholders.

Fee payments will be made based on following milestones:

50% - First draft of Outcome evaluation report;

15% - Debriefing report which summarizes stakeholder input

35%- Final Evaluation report

#### **5. QUALIFICATIONS OF THE SUCCESSFUL INDIVIDUAL CONTRACTOR**

- Master's degree in energy, natural resource management, environmental economics or other related fields;

- 5 years of experience in project development, result based management and portfolio evaluation will be considered an asset;
- Demonstrated skills and knowledge in participatory monitoring and evaluation processes
- Good understanding and knowledge of the Belizean context with regard to coastal zone management, community management of natural resources
- Experience in monitoring and evaluation of development portfolios and projects
- Strong analytical skills;
- Strong oral, communications and writing skills;
- Fluency in English and Spanish

## **6. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS**

The terminal evaluation will be carried out by an Outcome Evaluation Consultant. The evaluation will be a joint effort by the OAK Foundation and the UNDP Country Office. An evaluation 'Management Team', formed by two task managers (Representatives of UNDP and OAK), will be responsible for oversight of the evaluation process. Where necessary, logistical support and venue to the evaluator will be provided by the UNDP Belize Country Office. It is the responsibility of the consultant to liaise directly with project teams, and to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the all project stakeholders.

## **7. DOCUMENTS FOR STUDY BY THE EVALUATORS**

1. UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluation for results;
2. UNDP Guidelines for Outcome Evaluators;
3. UNDP Result-Based Management: Technical Note;
4. Project Grant Agreement OCA – 12-577
5. Memorandum of Agreements:
  - a. BZE/COMPACT/OP5/Y3/CORE/BD/13/03
  - b. BZE/COMPACT/OP5/Y3/CORE/BD/13/04
  - c. BZE/COMPACT/OP5/Y3/CORE/IW/14/01
  - d. BZE/COMPACT/OP5/Y3/CORE/BD/14/02
  - e. BZE/COMPACT/OP5/Y4/CORE/BD/14/03
  - f. BZE/COMPACT/OP5/Y4/CORE/BD/14/04
  - g. BZE/COMPACT/OP6/Y1/CORE/2015/01
  - h. BZE/COMPACT/OP6/Y1/CORE/2015/02
  - i. BZE/COMPACT/OP6/Y1/CORE/2015/03
  - j. BZE/COMPACT/OP6/Y1/CORE/2015/04

## **8. RECOMMENDED PRESENTATION OF OFFER**

Interested persons are requested to submit the following documents:

### **Technical Proposal**

1. Proposed methodology and work plan (maximum five pages).
2. Detailed profile of expertise (CV's) of the consultant including references

### **Financial Proposal**

3. Detailed budget for the work plan- that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price, supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template provided.

**9. CRITERIA FOR SELECTION OF THE BEST OFFER**

Lowest price method – where the award will be made to the qualified/responsive individual who offered the lowest price.