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 *Project “Removing Barriers Hindering Protected Area Management Effectiveness in Viet Nam*”(PIMS #.3965)

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

Project Summary Table

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Project Title:  | *Removing Barriers Hindering Protected Area Management Effectiveness in Viet Nam (PA project)* |
| GEF Project ID: | 3603 |   | *at endorsement (US$)* | *at completion (US$)* |
| UNDP Project ID: | 3965 (UNDP PIMS#)     00074659 (UNDP Atlas ID) | GEF financing:  | 3,536,360 |  |
| Country: |      Vietnam | IA/EA own: | 7,050,000 |  |
| Region: | Asia and the Pacific      | Government: | 10,491,043 |  |
| Focal Area: | Biodiversity       | Other: | 1,000,000 |  |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): |        | Total co-financing: | 18,541,043 |  |
| Executing Agency: |      Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MONRE) | Total Project Cost: | 22,077,403 |  |
| Other Partners involved: | DoNC/MARDXuan Thuy, Cat Ba, Bidoup - Nui Ba NPs  | Pro Doc Signature (date project began):  |  22 December, 2010 |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | Proposed:December, 2014 | Actual:31 December, 2015 |

Objective and Scope

The project was designed to: secure a sustainably financed PA system, to conserve globally significant biodiversity. It has four outcomes, under which specific outcomes and outputs are expected:

* Outcome 1: A comprehensive and harmonized legal and policy framework supports sustainable PA financing
* Outcome 2: Clear and harmonized institutional mandates and processes support sustainable PA financing mechanisms
* Outcome 3: Knowledge and experience of sustainable financing options developed through demonstrations
* Outcome 4: Information on biodiversity and PA status supports PA management and builds public support for the PA system

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 purpose of the evaluation is to add to promote accountability and transparency, and to assess and disclose the extent of project accomplishments; to synthesize lessons that can help to improve the selection, design and implementation of future GEF financed UNDP activities; to provide feedback on issues that are recurrent across the UNDP portfolio and need attention, and on improvements regarding previously identified issues; to contribute to the overall assessment of results in achieving GEF strategic objectives aimed at global environmental benefit; and to gauge the extent of project convergence with other UN and UNDP priorities, including harmonization with other UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) and UNDP Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) outcomes and outputs.

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.

The scope of the evaluation covers an assessment and analysis of the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact of the project, covering areas such as project design, monitoring and evaluation, attainment of outcomes, implementation agency and executing agency execution, management arrangements, work planning, finance and co-finance, stakeholder engagement, reporting, communications, etc.

Evaluation approach and method

An overall approach and method[[1]](#footnote-2) for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects have 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 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 Xuan Thuy NP (Nam Dinh province), Bidoup - Nui Ba NP (Lam Dong province) and Cat Ba NP (Hai Phong city). Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

- PA Project Management Board at MONRE

- Biodiversity Conservation Agency, Vietnam Environment Administration

- PA Project Management Board at MARD

- Department of Natural Conservation, Vietnam Administration of Forestry

- Xuan Thuy national park, Nam Dinh province

- Cat Ba national park, Hai Phong city

- Bidoup - Nui Ba national park, Lam Dong province

The evaluator 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 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. . The full scope methods used in the evaluation are at the discretion of the evaluator(s), but a mixed method of document review, interviews, and direct observations should be employed, at a minimum. The TE inception report and TE report should explain all the evaluation methods used in detail.

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 D.

|  |
| --- |
| **Evaluation Ratings:** |
| **1. Monitoring and Evaluation** | ***rating*** | **2. IA& EA Execution** | ***rating*** |
| M&E design at entry |       | Quality of UNDP Implementation – Implementing Agency (IA) |       |
| M&E Plan Implementation |       | Quality of Execution - Executing Agency (EA) |       |
| 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 | Planned  | Actual |
| Grants  | 7,050,000 |  | 10,491,043 |  | 1,000,000 |  | 18,541,043 |  |
| Loans/Concessions  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - | - |
| * In-kind support
 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |
| * Other
 | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |
| Totals | 7,050,000 |  | 10,491,043 |  | 1,000,000 |  | 18,541,043 |  |

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-3)

Conclusions, recommendations & lessons

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

Implementation arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in *Viet Nam.* 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, and support to VISA application if requested by the Consultant. 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 over a time period of *10* weeks (30 day for IC and 27 for NC) according to the following plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Timing | Completion Date |
| **Preparation** | *3* days  | *3 days* | *25 November, 2015* |
| **Evaluation Mission** | *10* days | *10 days* | *15 December, 2015* |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | *10* days  | *8 days* | *28 December, 2015* |
| **Final Report** | *7* days | *6 days* |  *25 January, 2016* |

The evaluators is expected to conduct a field mission to Hanoi, Lam Dong, Hai Phong, and Nam Dinh provinces. The travel costs within Viet Nam (per diem) will be included in the contract as the number of days in Viet Nam for the International Consultant and number of days in the fields outside Ha Noi for the National Consultant.

The International Consultant is requested to spend 13 days in Vietnam: 3 days in Hanoi, 3 days in Hai Phong, 3 days in Nam Dinh, and 4 days in Lam Dong (days in provinces plus travel time)

Evaluation deliverables

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: *25 November, 2015* | Evaluator submits to UNDP CO  |
| **Presentation** | Initial Findings  | End of evaluation mission: *16 December, 2015* | To project management, UNDP CO |
| **Draft Evaluation Report**  | Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes | Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission: *28 December, 2015* | Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs |
| **Final Report\*** | Finalized report  | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft: *25 January, 2016* | 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 01 international consultant (team leader) for 30 days and 01 national consultant for 27 days. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. 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 *10* years of relevant professional experience
* Knowledge of UNDP and GEF
* Previous experience with results‐based monitoring and evaluation methodologies
* Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s) of biodiversity conservation, protected areas
* Experience in environmental/biodiversity strategic/biodiversity financing

International Consultant

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Se** | **Criteria** | **Score** |
|  | Minimum 10 years of relevant professional experience in programme monitoring and evaluation | 100 |
|  | Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies as a team leader | 100 |
|  | Knowledge of UNDP and GEF, as applied to biodiversity conservation | 100 |
|  | Experience working with the GEF preparation/implementation/evaluations | 200 |
|  | Experience working in Vietnam | 20  |
|  | Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s) of biodiversity conservation, protected areas | 80  |
|  | Experience in environmental/biodiversity strategic/biodiversity financing | 100  |
|  | Demonstrable analytical skills | 100  |
|  | Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset; | 100  |
|  | A Master’s degree in environmental sciences/economics, biodiversity conservation, or other closely related field | 100  |
|  |  | 1000 |

National Consultant

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Se** | **Criteria** | **Score** |
|  | Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies | 150 |
|  | Experience working with the GEF preparation/implementation/evaluations | 150 |
| 3. | Experience working in biodiversity conservation, protected areas management and protected areas financing | 200 |
| 4. | Fluent in written and verbal English | 200  |
| 5.  | Demonstrable analytical skills and communication skills | 100  |
| 6.  | Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset; | 100 |
| 7. | A Master’s degree in environmental sciences/economics, biodiversity conservation, or other closely related field | 100  |
|  |  | 1000 |

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'](http://www.unevaluation.org/ethicalguidelines)

Payment modalities and specifications

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| % | Milestone |
| *10%* | At submission and approval of inception report |
| *40%* | Following submission and approval of the 1st draft terminal evaluation report |
| *50%* | Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report  |

Application process

Applicants are requested to apply online ([www.jobs.undp.org](http://www.jobs.undp.org); [www.vn.undp.org](http://www.vn.undp.org)) 2 October 2015. 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 daily fee, per diem and travel costs).

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 final Logical Framework

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RESULT** | **INDICATOR** | **BASELINE VALUE** | **END OF PROJECT TARGET** | **MEANS OF VERIFICATION** | **RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS** |
| **Objective: To secure a sustainably financed PA system, to conserve globally significant biodiversity** | Overall PA System’s Financial scorecard scores |  67 |  By the end of the project the score is at least 85 | Scorecard assessment | * All PA management agencies responsive to new legal environment
* Governance fundamentals support capacity improvements
* Conservation remains government priority
 |
| Overall Capacity scorecard scores  | 40.9 | By the end of the project the score is at least 63.5 | Scorecard assessment |
| Average METT scores (for all sites) | 45% | By the end of the project the score is at least 73% | METT assessment |
| **Outcome 1: A comprehensive and harmonized legal and policy framework supports sustainable PA financing** | “Legal, regulatory and institutional frameworks” component of the UNDP Financial Scorecard |  33 | At the end of the project the score for has increased to at least 50 | Score card assessment | * Processing of legal documents is not delayed
* Inter-agency cooperation on legal environment is effective
 |
| “Capacity to conceptualize and formulate policies, legislations, strategies and programmes” component of the UNDP Capacity Scorecard | 5.5 | At the end of the project the score has increased to at least 7.5 | Score card assessment |
| Output 1.1: Regulations under the Law on Biodiversity that ensure consistency in protected area administration in the context of national BD planning | Approval of regulations | No regulations approved | By the end of project implementation regulations have been formally issued (these regulations incorporate specific measures related to populations living within PAs) | Project reports/ regulations | * Law on Biodiversity is not superseded by other legal instruments
* Consensus can be reached on revised regulations
 |
| Output 1.2: Emerging policy on PA financing that allows revenue generation and effective management of revenues for individual PAs and the system as a whole | Policy/regulation on financing mechanisms for PAs | No regulations approved | Draft legal document on financing mechanism | Project reports/ Decision | * Policy development processes effectively engage with project
* Issuance of new policy documents does not incur unreasonable delays
 |
| **Outcome 2: Clear and harmonized institutional mandates and processes support sustainable PA financing mechanisms** | Score for the “Business planning and tools for cost-effective management” component of the UNDP Financial Scorecard  |  21 | At the end of the project the score has increased to at least 45 | Score card assessment |  |
| Score for the “Capacity to implement policies, legislation, strategies and programmes” component of the UNDP Capacity Scorecard | 21.4 | At the end of the project the score has increased to at least 32 | Score card assessment |
| Output 2.1: Clarified and coordinated institutional management of a unified PA system | Establishment of a mechanism to promote coordination between MONRE and MARD with respect to classifying and managing PAs | No mechanism exists | By the end of year 2 of project implementation, a coordinating mechanism has been created by means of an agreement | Project reports/ decree |  |
| Mechanism is operational | As above | By the end of year 3 of the project the coordinating mechanism is promoting a coordinated approach to PA management (see also Output 4.1). | Project reports |
| Develop management and business plans for PAs  | As above | * By the end of year 2, management and business plans are developed for at least 1 PA
* By the end of year 3, management and business plans are operated
 | Management and business plans for PA |  |
| Output 2.2: PA staff at all levels with necessary skills, including business management, tourism management, monitoring and participatory management | Proportion of PA staff and related staff trained in essential skills | No PA staff trained in issues such as business planning | By the end of year 3 of project implementation, PA staff from at least 50% of PAs have been trained in key skills, such as business planning; by the end of the project this figure is 85% | Project reports/ training reports |  |
| Proportion of PA rangers trained in essential skills | Pilot programme for ranger training (CBBC) | By the end of year 3 of project implementation, rangers and other staff from at least 60% of PAs have been trained in key skills; by the end of the project this figure is 85% | Project reports/ training reports |
| Output 2.3: Revised and consistent system-wide incentive measures that promote improved performance | Existence of system-wide system of incentives | Current incentive system ineffective and disjointed | By the end of year 2 of project implementation, a revised system of incentives designed to promote improve performance among PA staff has been drafted and endorsed by PA managers | Project reports |  |
| Evidence of incentive system in operation | As above | By the end of year 4 of project implementation the revised system is in operation | Project reports |
| Level of support for revised incentive system | Little awareness of benefits of effective system | By the end of the project, at least 60% of PA managers indicate that the revised incentives have improved PA management | Survey/interviews |
| **Outcome 3: Knowledge and experience of sustainable financing options developed through demonstrations** |  Score for the “Tools for revenue generation” component of the UNDP Financial Scorecard |  13 | At the end of the project the score has increased to at least 35 |  Score card assessment | * Demonstrations are an effective way of developing new policy and procedures
* Local political support for demonstrations
 |
| Output 3.1: Models of effective collection and sharing of revenues to support sustainable PA financing |  Existence of measures to increase tourism revenues | Tourism revenue generation low | By the end of year 2 of project implementation measures to increase tourism revenue (in parallel with improved tourism services) have been identified at one or more pilot sites | Project reports | * Pilot PES policy is up-scaled to national level
* REDD is developed as a component of a post-Kyoto instrument
 |
| Measures to generate PES | Pilot revenue generation yet to be tested | By the end of year 2 of project implementation, measures are in place to generate revenues from PES at one or more pilot sites | Project reports |
| Measures to generate revenues from sustainable harvesting | No revenue generation | By the end of year 2 of project implementation, measures are in place to generate revenues from sustainable harvesting of natural resources at one or more pilot sites | Project reports |
| Capture of lessons to improve the legal environment | Sustainable financing guidelines have no lessons on which they are based | By the end of project of project implementation, lessons from increasing revenues are circulated to PAs | Project reports/ revised guidelines |
| Output 3.2: Models of operational cooperation and resource sharing among neighbouring PAs | Analysis of opportunities for cost efficiencies |  No analyses undertaken | By the end of year 2 of project implementation, opportunities for increased cost efficiencies by cross-PA cooperation and coordination have been identified at one or more pilot sites | Project reports | * Different PA management agencies are willing to cooperate
 |
| Capture of lessons to improve the legal environment | Sustainable financing guidelines have no lessons on which they are based | By the end of year 3 of project implementation, lessons from increasing cost efficiencies by cross-PA cooperation and coordination have contributed to revised guidelines under Output 1.3 and the decree/decision to create a PA authority under Output 1.2 | Project reports/ revised guidelines/draft decree |
| Output 3.3: Models of local and provincial BD planning |  Existence of a pilot provincial BD plan |  No such plans exist | By the end of year 3 of project implementation, a provincial BD plan has been developed at one or more pilot sites | Project reports | * Local planning will improve effectiveness of PA management
 |
| **Outcome 4: Information on biodiversity and PA status supports PA management and builds public support for the PA system** | Score for components 3-5 of the UNDP Capacity Scorecard (“Build consensus”, “Mobilize information”, and “Monitor, report and learn”) |  14 | At the end of the project the score has increased to at least 24 |  Score card assessment | * There is willingness to support transparent information exchange
* Staff turnover does not negate benefits of training
 |
| Output 4.1: A system-wide approach to monitoring to support PA management decisions and budgeting in line with international standards | Existence of endorsed system-wide approach | No system-wide approach in place; only site-based monitoring approach developed by VCF | By the end of year 2 of project implementation a proposal for a system-wide approach to monitoring that meet international standards has been prepared and endorsed by key stakeholders, including PA managers |  Project reports | * Framework approach to BD monitoring proves to be effective
 |
| Application of system-wide monitoring | No system-wide application | By the end of project of project implementation the system-wide monitoring programme is operational | Project reports |
| Definition of needed budgets from monitoring | Needed budgets defined | By the end of the project PA budgeting is defined to monitoring results in pilot demonstration sites | Project reports |
| Output 4.2: A system-wide approach to reporting on biodiversity status and trends in line with international standards | Existence of system-wide reporting approach |  No system in place | By the end of year 2 of project implementation a reporting process has been designed by key stakeholders, including PA managers | Project reports | * Reporting on BD contributes to effectiveness of PA management
* No delays in establishment of clearing house
* All agencies willing to cooperate
 |
| CHM operational | No CHM design | By the end of year 3 of project implementation the Clearing House is operational | Project reports |
| PA-specific BD reports | No reports produced | By the end of year 3 reports are produced by at least 1 pilot site; by the end of the project this figure is at least 2 | Project reports |
| Output 4.3: Increased public awareness of the importance of, and threats to the protected area system | Existence of public awareness campaign design |  No campaign designed | By the end of year 3 of project implementation a public awareness campaign has been designed | Project reports | * Increased public awareness translates into increased political support
 |
| Public awareness campaign implemented | As above | By the end of year 3 and throughout year 4 of project implementation the public awareness campaign is operational | Project reports |
| Increase in public awareness | Basic awareness | By the end of the project, measures of public awareness and support for PAs have increased by at least 30% of their baseline values[[3]](#footnote-4) | Survey/interviews |

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

*GEF Project Information Form (PIF), Project Document*

*MTR report*

*UNDP - GEF MTR Management Response*

*Annual Workplans of 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015*

*Annual Project Implementation (APR/PIR) Reports*

*Project budget and financial data*

*Project Tracking Tool, at the baseline and at the mid-term*

*One UN Plan II 2011-2016*

*UNDP Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP)*

*GEF focal area strategic program objectives*

*Project main reports/documents:*

1. Inter-ministerial circular No. 16 between MONRE and MOF on biodiversity financing to implement NBSAP
2. Report on reviewing of Biodiversity Law implementation
3. Training documents
4. Training report of MONRE and MARD components
5. MOU between VEA and VNFOREST
6. Draft circular on working code for PA staff
7. Report on proposing criteria of performance-based incentive for PA staffs in Vietnam
8. Develop technical guidelines on biodiversity conservation planning at provincial level
9. Decision of Cao Bang province on Biodiversity conservation planning
10. Decision of Nam Dinh PPC allowing benefit sharing implementation
11. Decision of Hai Phong PPC allowing the increase of entrance fee at Cat Ba National Park
12. Decision of Lam Dong PPC on benefit sharing from forest environmental services
13. Guidelines for management and sustainable financing plan for protected areas
14. Develop management and and sustainable financing plan at Bidoup-Nui Ba NP
15. Develop management and and sustainable financing plan at Cat Ba NP
16. 04 reports on ecosystem services valuation at demonstration
17. Guideline for report on current status of biodiversity for PAs
18. Report on biodiversity status in Xuan Thuy NP
19. Draft circular guiding on technical and economic norms for biodiversity monitoring
20. Awareness raising program on biodiversity
21. Report on financial status of protected areas in Vietnam
22. Report on sharing experiences on development and implementation of financing mechanism in Xuan Thuy NP
23. Report on sharing experiences on development and implementation of financing mechanism in Cat Ba NP
24. Report on sharing experiences on development and implementation of financing mechanism in Bidoup - Nui Ba NP
25. Report on analyzing cost- benefit on co-operating between Cat Ba and Bai Tu Long national park
26. Report on proposing fund/off-site financing mechanism for biodiversity
27. Final project report

 *List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Boards, and other partners to be consulted*

*- PA Project Board:*

* *Mr. Pham Anh Cuong, National Project Director, Phone: 0912.179.360 , Email:* pacuong@yahoo.com
* *Ms. Hoang Thi Thanh Nhan, Deputy Project Director (in-charge in technical issues), Phone: 0902.282.326, Email:* hoangnhan.bca@gmail.com
* *Mr. Nguyen Xuan Dung, Deputy Project Director, (in-charge in administrative issues) Phone: 0904.392.475, Email:* xuandungbt@gmail.com
* *Ms. Tran Huyen Trang, Project Manager, Phone: 0988.741.212, Email:* huyentrang1601@gmail.com
* *Ms. To Lan Huong, Project Accountant, Email:* tolanhuong2002@yahoo.com

*- Stakeholders:*

* *Biodiversity Conservation Agency (BCA)*
* *Department of Natural Conservation*
* *Xuan Thuy NP*
* *Bidoup - Nui Ba NP*
* *Cat Ba NP*

Annex C: Evaluation Questions

This Evaluation Criteria Matrix must be fully completed by the consultant and included as an Annex to the TE report.

| **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?  |  |
|  | * To what extent is the principle of the project in line with the national priorities
 | * Level of participation of the concerned agencies in project activities
* Consistency with national strategies and policies
 | * Project documents
* National policies and strategies
 | * Desk review
* Interviews with project team, UNDP and other partners
 |  |
|  | * To what extent is the Project aligned to the main objectives of the GEF focal area?
 | * Consistency with GEF strategic objectives
 | * Project documents
* GEF focal areas strategies and documents
 | * Desk review
* GEF website
* Interviews with project team and UNDP
 |  |
| Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? |
|  | * Has the project been effective in achieving its expected outcomes?
 | * See indicators in project document results framework
 | * Project document
* Project team and stakeholder
* Data reported in project annual and quarterly reports
 | * Desk review
* Interviews with project team and relevant stakeholders
 |
|  | * What lessons have been learned from the project regarding achievement of outcomes?
 |  | Data collected throughout evaluation | * Desk review
 |
| Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards? |
|  | * Were the accounting and financial system in place adequate for project management and producing accurate and timely financial information?
* Was the Project efficient with respect to incremental cost criteria?
* Were progress reports produced accurately, timely and responded to reporting requirements including adaptive management changes?
* Was project implementation as cost effective as originally proposed (planned vs. actual)?
* Was procurement carried out in a manner making efficient use of project resources?
 | * Availability and quality of financial and progress reports
* Timeliness and adequacy of reporting provided
* Level of discrepancy between planned and utilized financial expenditures
* Planned vs. actual funds leveraged
* Quality of results-based management reporting (progress reporting, monitoring and evaluation)
 | * Project documents and evaluations
* UNDP
* Project team
 | * Document analysis
* Key interview
 |
|  | * To what extent partnerships/linkages between institutions/organizations were encouraged and supported?
* What was the level of efficiency of cooperation and collaboration arrangements?
 | * Specific activities conducted to support the development of cooperative arrangements between partners
* Examples of supported partnerships
* Evidence that particular partnership/linkages will be sustained
* Types/quality of partnership cooperation methods utilized
 | * Project documents and evaluations
* Project partners and relevant stakeholders
 | * Document analysis
* Interviews
 |
|  Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? |
|  | * How does the project support financial mobilization for the PA implementation?
 | * Amount of national budget allocation
 | * Legal regulation
 | * Document analysis
 |
|  | * How does the project support personnel allocation for the PA implementation?
 | * Personnel allocation
 | Legal regulation | * Document analysis
 |
|  | * To what extent is biodiversity conservation consideration mainstreamed into land use planning?
 | * Government agencies aware of and committed to biodiversity conservation
* Legislation, planning documents show evidence of mainstreaming
 | * Legal regulation
* Project documents/reports
 | * Document analysis
* Interview with stakeholders
 |
|  | * Are there any political risks that may threaten the sustainability of the project outcomes?
 | * Government agencies aware of and committed to biodiversity conservation
 | * Government policies
 | * Analysis
 |
| **Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?**  |
|  | * Has the project strengthened local capacity in the PA implementation?
 | * Awareness and understanding of the PA at the provincial level
 | * Interviews
* Provincial level plans/strategies
 | * Interviews
* Document analysis
 |
|  | * Has the project made improvement for provincial biodiversity planning of two pilot provinces?
 | * Awareness and understanding of biodiversity planning at the provincial level
* Evidence of incorporation of biodiversity conservation objectives in provincial level planning documents
 | * Interviews
* Provincial level plans/strategies
 | * Interview
* Document analysis
 |
|  | * Has the project supported the revised land use planning of two pilot provinces to meet for biodiversity conservation?
 | * Evidence that biodiversity has been mainstreamed into land use planning
 | * Interviews
* Provincial level plans/strategies
 | * Interview
* Document analysis
 |

Annex D: Rating Scales

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, IA&EA Execution*** | ***Sustainability ratings:***  | ***Relevance ratings*** |
| 6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings 5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS)3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems1. 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 risks1. Unlikely (U): severe risks |  |
| *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[[4]](#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[[5]](#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) |
| **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 rated)  |
| **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* 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

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-2)
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%252520Handbook.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Measures are described in the Baseline section of the project document; specific targets for each measure will be defined before submission of the project document [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-6)