

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 **Strengthening the Protected Area Network in Southern Tanzania: Improving the Effectiveness of National Parks in Addressing Threats to Biodiversity** (PIMS 3253)

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

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	Strengthening the Protected Area Network in Southern Tanzania: Improving the Effectiveness of National Parks in Addressing Threats to Biodiversity			
GEF Project ID:	3965		<i>at endorsement</i> <i>(Million US\$)</i>	<i>at completion (Million US\$)</i>
UNDP Project ID:	3253	GEF financing:	5.3	5.3
Country:	Tanzania	IA/EA own:	1.0	TBD
Region:	Africa	Government:	11.1	7.2 TBC
Focal Area:	Biodiversity	Other:	0.3	0.4
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	SP3	Total co-financing:	12.1	TBD
Executing Agency:	Tanzania National Parks Authority (TANAPA)	Total Project Cost:	17.4	TBD
Other Partners involved:	Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		June 2011
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: December 2016	Actual: December 2017

OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The project was designed to increase the effectiveness of the National Parks in protecting biodiversity and provide for the long-term ecological, social and financial sustainability of that system. The focus was on the new and developing Southern Circuit of Tanzania's National Parks, reflecting the fact that with some exceptions, the management effectiveness of NPs in this region remained sub-optimal, relative to the Government's desired levels and tourism numbers remained low. The project aims to increase the effectiveness of the National Parks in protecting biodiversity and provide for the long-term ecological, social and financial sustainability of that system that are able to reduce anthropogenic pressures on the sites and secure biodiversity status within them. The project has been designed to address PA management barriers of (a) a lack of proper connectivity between isolated PAs, for larger mammal movements and to buffer against climate change impacts and (b) lack of management capacity and

financial planning to bring people to the area and to prevent the various threats to the area through two complementary components namely:

1. **Integrating Management of NPs and Broader Landscapes:** This first component entailed the creation of active and functioning inter-sectoral District land management coordination mechanism between TANAPA, district authorities and the Wildlife Division (WD) and involved planning, implementation, and monitoring by key state and civil society partners on biodiversity management measures for the Greater Ruaha Landscape (37,000km²) and Greater Kitulo-Kipengele Landscape (2,150k m²). This approach would secure PAs, wildlife corridors and dispersal areas.
2. **Strengthening NP Operations:** This second component will engineer the delivery of an integrated package of PA management functions., The project will initiate financial and business planning on both landscape and individual PAs and will provide funding for basic infrastructure and field equipment across the Southern Circuit Sites

PROJECT GOAL, OBJECTIVE, OUTCOME, COMPONENTS AND OUTPUTS

The Project Goal is to ensure the Southern Tanzania's biodiversity and ecosystem values are conserved and provide sustainable benefit flows at local, national and global levels through the establishment of landscape planning mechanisms and enhanced operational capacity.

The project is responsible for achieving the following project objective: The biodiversity of Southern Tanzania is better represented and buffered from threat within National Parks. The project is designed to lift the barriers to establishment of a landscape approach to the management of biodiversity. The project objective will be achieved through the implementation of two complementary components namely:

Component 1: Integrating Management of National Parks and Broader Landscapes in Southern Tanzania. This first component entails the creations of an inter-sectoral district land management coordination mechanism between TANAPA, district authorities and the Wildlife Division (WD) and will also involve planning, implement, and monitoring by key state and civil society partners on biodiversity management measures for the Greater Ruaha and Greater Kitulo Kipengere landscapes. The project will set up inter-sectoral district land administration mechanisms and develop land use plans; to ensure that land in ecologically sensitive areas is allocated to conservation compatible land uses through an integrated landscape management planning process. Development impact assessments will be undertaken, to define acceptable land uses and management practices. Support will be rendered to strengthen the enforcement framework, to ensure compliance and guard against chaotic; unplanned economic development, which is leading to habitat degradation and loss elsewhere in Tanzania. This component will also ensure that TANAPA has the competence and staff skills to lead land use planning, management and monitoring in landscapes and have improved, staffed community extension services to ensure effective engagement between communities and park authorities.

Specific outcomes of the first component are expected to be:

- A working model for integrating management of NPs and wider productive landscapes is piloted and adapted in 7 Districts in Southern Tanzania and secures wildlife corridors and dispersal areas covering over 39,000 km² in the Greater Ruaha and Greater Kitulo-Kipengere ecological landscapes
- Integrated landscape management approach is replicated by TANAPA in at least one additional ecological landscape in southern Tanzania.
- No net loss of natural habitat in major habitat blocks identified as critical for wildlife dispersal and at least 40% reduction in hunting pressures in these blocks.

- PAs expanded to encompass two ecologically sensitive wildlife corridor areas linking Kitulo NP to Mt Rungwe and to Mpanga Kipengere Game Reserve), creating a linked 'Greater Kitulo-Kipengere landscape' totaling over 2,000 km².

Component 2: Operations Support for National Park Management in Southern Tanzania. This second component focuses at addressing threats within the NP boundaries by engineering the delivery of an integrated package of PA management functions. Based on needs assessment commissioned at the start of the project, funding will be provided for basic infrastructure and field equipment across the Southern Circuit Sites. An emphasis will be placed on building operations capacity at PA sites that have not previously benefitted from such investment (i.e. Ruaha expansion and Kitulo NPs). This support will be accompanied by the development of business plans for the sites, to define the optimum operations support needed to address threats in a cost effective and sustainable manner.

Specific outcomes of the second component include the following:

- Core NP operations strengthened in Southern Tanzania covering over 22,000 km² leading to the effective detection and deterrence of poaching and fire risks. This is evidenced in a reduction in poaching activity, retaliatory wildfires set by poachers, and grazing of cattle where proscribed.
- Management Effectiveness Score for NPs in Southern Tanzania increased over the baseline score by at least 40%.

Specifically, the project will deliver 12 Outputs, organized within the two components and summarized in the Project Logical Framework (Annex A)

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 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 **Dar es Salaam, Iringa, Mbeya and possibly Arusha & Dodoma**, including the following project sites (**Ruaha, Mpanga Kipengele and Kitulo**). Interviews will be held with the following organizations (see table below) and individuals at a minimum.

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

List of stakeholders to be consulted (look at this)

Category	Stakeholder	location
Government stakeholders (National)	Dar: UNDP, MOF, MNRT, DW, VPO Arusha: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TANAPA Dodoma: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> PO-RALG 	Dar Arusha Dodoma
Local governments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional government District Councils 	Iringa Njombe Mbeya Mbarali
NGOs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS) World Wildlife Fund (WWF) African Wildlife Foundation (AWF) World Elephant Centre (WEC) 	Dar/ Mbeya DAR Arusha Arusha/Ruaha
Development Partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> USAID World Bank 	Dar
Private Sector	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tour operators Lodge owners Film and media producers, local artists 	Iringa, Ruaha and Kitulo

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 (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	
M&E Plan Implementation		Quality of Execution - Executing Agency	
Overall quality of M&E		Overall quality of Implementation / Execution	
3. Assessment of Outcomes	rating	4. Sustainability	rating
Relevance		Financial resources:	
Effectiveness		Socio-political:	
Efficiency		Institutional framework and governance:	
Overall Project Outcome Rating		Environmental:	
		Overall likelihood of sustainability:	

PROJECT FINANCE / CO-FINANCE

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table 03 below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

Table 03: Project co-financing (in US\$)

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at approval	Actual Amount Materialized at MTR June 2016	Amount Materialized at TE August 2017	Amount % of Expenditure
Donor	GEF	Grant	5,304,500	2,930,240	5,285,397	99.64%
Donor	UNDP	Grant	1,000,000	422,802	611,197	61.12%
National Government	TANAPA	Cash	10,700,000	7,180,112	TBD	67.1%
National Government	Wildlife Division	In-kind	150,000	423,818	TBD	282.5%
National Government	PO-RALG	In-kind	210,000	Not available	TBD	TBD
Total Project funds			17,364,500	10,956,973		
Total Co-finance funds			12,060,000			
Ratio Co-finance: GEF funds			2.27			

Source: data supplied by UNDP CO and PCU

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**. Conclusions should build on findings and be based in evidence. Recommendations should be prioritized, specific, relevant, and targeted, with suggested implementers of the recommendations. Lessons should have wider applicability to other initiatives across the region, the area of intervention, and for the future.

IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Tanzania. 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 30 days over the time period of about 8 weeks according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation	3 days	15 - 17 August
Presentation of Inception Report	1	18 August
Evaluation Mission	14 days	19 – 1 September
Draft Evaluation Report	8 days	2 – 9 September
Presentation of Initial Findings	1 day	11 September
Allow 2 weeks for draft circulation to obtain comments from Partners	-	12-22 Sept 17.
Consultant respond & incorporates comments	3 days	23-25 Sept 17
Submission of the Final Report	-	26 September

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](#)

EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
Inception Report	TE clarifies objectives, methodology and timing for the TE	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission. (by 18 Aug 2017)	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
Presentation	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission by 01 Sept 2017)	To project management, UNDP CO
Draft Final Report	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission (by 09 Sept 2017)	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs
Final Report*	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft (by 11 Sept 2017)	Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC.

*When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluator is required also to provide an 'audit trail' (Annex H), 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 and 1 national evaluators. The international consultant will be designated team leader and will be responsible for the quality of the final report submitted to UNDP. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. The evaluators will be recruited separately however, the two consultants will form a team making a joint presentation to a project Steering Committee that shall be planned to take at the end of the in-country mission. The selected consultants should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities. The International consultant must present the following qualifications:

- Master's degree or higher in relevant area such as Biodiversity Management, Wildlife Conservation & Natural Resources Management or Environmental sciences with minimum of 7 years of relevant professional experience at the international level **(25%)**
- Knowledge and experience in developing projects, specific experience in UNDP and GEF project Evaluation (25%)
- Experience in evaluating similar projects with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies in the recent past engagement; **(25%)**
- Knowledge on Wildlife Conservation and Management & tourism in Tanzania and its related policies **(25%)**

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
10%	No later than 2 weeks following contract signature
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. 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 an e-mail address and a phone number for contact.

UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will consider 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

PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

Results Framework for Southern Tanzania PA Project: Outcomes and Indicators

Project Goal:	Southern Tanzania's biodiversity and ecosystem values are conserved and provide sustainable benefit flows at local, national and global levels through the establishment of landscape planning mechanisms and enhanced operational capacity.
	Objectively Verifiable Indicators

Project Components	Indicator	Baseline	Target by EOP	Sources of verification	Assumptions
Objective: The biodiversity of Southern Tanzania is better represented and buffered from threat within National Parks. GEF 5.3 mill USD)	Two landscape level coordination mechanisms are formalised to improve biodiversity conservation in GRL and GKKL; two wildlife corridors are created in GKKL (Bujingijila and Numbe); two WMAs are consolidated in GRL.	Within the GRL, TANAPA have management plans for RUNAPA; WCS and local government supporting development of Mbomipa and Umemaruwa WMAs. In GKKL, KINAPA, MKGR and MRNR have management plans.	A working model for integrating management of NPs and wider productive landscapes is piloted and adapted; secures wildlife corridors and dispersal areas covering over 39,000 km2 in the GRL and GKKL ecological landscapes.	Partnership agreements and constitutions of coordination mechanisms, monitoring and evaluation of related activities; creation of two wildlife corridors in the GKKL landscape and documented support to WMA establishment in the GRL.	All stakeholders remain interested in the concept of landscape level conservation during the lifespan of the project and support the formalisation of coordination initiatives and the promotion of wildlife corridors to enhance ecological sustainability.

Project Components	Indicator	Baseline	Target by EOP	Sources of verification	Assumptions
	Two national parks (RUNAPA and KINAPA) and one game reserve (MKGR) have increased operational capacity to manage themselves sustainably.	RUNAPA and KINAPA lack operational capacity to manage park operations and poaching is common; MKGR is in a vulnerable state of management and all three PAs open to risks of fire and poaching; tourism is nascent and complaints about service levels are common.	Core NP operations strengthened in Southern Tanzania covering over 22,000 km2 leading to the effective detection and deterrence of poaching and fire risks.	Documented reduction in poaching activity, retaliatory wildfires set by poachers, and grazing of cattle where proscribed, good reports from tourist industry and tourists on customer care; tourism options enhanced through the addition of walking safaris; films promote the southern circuit.	TANAPA management and staff will be open minded to developing their capacity in new and ongoing areas; relationships can be built successfully to allow greater TANAPA - WD operational coordination.
	Landscapes maintain global biodiversity values; METT scores are improved in the 4 target PAs, especially RUNAPA, KINAPA and MKGR.	Landscape level management remains uncoordinated and biodiversity is lost over time within PAs and buffer areas. Current METT scores as follows: RUNAPA (53), KINAPA (52), MKGR (21), MRNR (40): average: 42	An increase in METT scores in four PAs across the two landscapes by 40% on average; monitoring indicates species diversity either unaffected or increased; Integrated landscape management approach is replicated by TANAPA elsewhere in southern Tanzania.	Fauna and Flora Monitoring procedures, Biodiversity resources assessments, Ministry and landscape level Reports, and Project Docs, PA and Landscape plans, maps and GIS files, MTE and Terminal Evaluation (TE)	Government and their community, civil society and private sector partners in GRL and GKKL are effectively supported in training and management to ensure ongoing support and engagement in the process

Project Components	Indicator	Baseline	Target by EOP	Sources of verification	Assumptions
Component 1: Integrating management of NPs and broader landscapes in Southern Tanzania (GEF 0.77 million USD)	Biodiversity management in NPs, GRs, NRs, wildlife migration corridors and dispersal areas is factored into decision-making governing land use management.	Management activities are carried out on WMA, district, regional government and TANAPA level but with a lack of a landscape level coordination mechanism	Inter-sectoral District land management coordination mechanism is emplaced in the GRL and GKKL in Southern Tanzania.	Existence of landscape level management plans and institutional mechanisms, minutes of meetings and subsequent actions. Ministerial consent and ratification of plans at MNRT and PMORALG	TANAPA, PMORALG, WD, FBD and other related government institutions support a landscape approach to biodiversity management, ratified at national and local government level.
	Development impacts in sensitive areas have been mitigated, monitoring and reporting systems are in place, and enforcement measures are operational in GRL and GKKL landscapes.	Monitoring of species and habitats is managed on an individual PA level; understanding of wildlife corridor functions, species movements and dispersal areas limited.	TANAPA, WD, 7 pilot District Authorities and civil society partners plan, implement, and monitor biodiversity management measures for these landscapes	A systematic conservation plan for both landscapes that defines wildlife corridors and dispersal areas, with EIA and M&E systems has been ratified and is in use by GRL and GKKL.	TANAPA and MNRT are willing to engage a specialist assessment of ecological situation for both GRL and GKKL PAs, buffer areas and their connectivity.
	Two specialist units are developed by TANAPA with partners; a land use planning unit and an ecological monitoring unit	TANAPA has community conservation service and ecology departments in RUNAPA and KINAPA; however lacking adequate coordination functions with external parties.	TANAPA has the competence and staff skills to lead land use planning, management and monitoring in landscapes	Land Use Planning and Ecological Monitoring Units set up on a landscape level; decisions and actions documented	TANAPA, PMORALG, WD, FBD and communities work together in these units.

Project Components	Indicator	Baseline	Target by EOP	Sources of verification	Assumptions
	Relations with neighbouring communities to PAs considerably improved: lower instances of human wildlife conflict, fires and poaching	TANAPA has community conservation service departments in RUNAPA and KINAPA; however, park-community relations remain strained in some crucial border areas.	TANAPA has a staffed community extension services to ensure effective engagement between communities and park authorities and dispute resolution.	Community Conservation Unit set up and running, decisions and actions documented.	TANAPA, PMORALG, WD, FBD and communities work together in these units.
	Public consultations are completed in an open and fair manner; beacons mark PA boundaries clearly	Recent developments in PA status, especially in western Kitulo area, Mpanga Kipengere and Usangu mean boundaries are not clear; conflicts are a result.	Agreed boundary beacons are in place around three PAs: RUNAPA, KINAPA and MKGR, including newly gazetted areas such as Usangu.	Equitable public consultations are completed and management plans are completed, taking into account the outcomes for both.	Consultation process is managed with due care and process; community and intra-ministry cooperation is secured.
	Mpanga Kipengere GR is upgraded to NP through consultative process, tourism improves as do wildlife numbers as a result	Mpanga Kipengere GR is managed on a meagre budget, fires and poaching are rife; tourism is minimal	Mpanga Kipengere Game Reserve is raised to higher protected area status as a national park	Gazettement notice of MKGR as a NP; rise in wildlife numbers, rise in tourism revenues	WD and TANAPA, with MNRT, communities and other stakeholders agree that upgrading MKGR the right step
	Bujingijila and Numbe valley corridors gazetted, the Kitulo-Kipengere NP is agreed and gazetted as a NP.	Wildlife are not able to move from GRL to GKKL, linkages are weak within GKKL PAs	Mpanga Kipengere linked through Numbe valley corridor to Kitulo NP to enable merging the two parks. Bujingijila also allows linkages to Mount Rungwe Nature Reserve	Gazettement notice of MKGR as a NP; agreement to merge KINAPA and MGR; gazettement notice of merged parks, if agreed.	WD and TANAPA, with MNRT, communities and agreement on a merger of MKGR with KINAPA.

Project Components	Indicator	Baseline	Target by EOP	Sources of verification	Assumptions
Component 2: Operations Support for National Park Management in Southern Tanzania (GEF 4 million USD)	Ranger and staff training in g programme in existence in RUNAPA and KINAPA; MKGR has joint TANAPA-WD programme; guide training and documentary programmes in existence.	Rangers have insufficient capacity in RUNAPA, KINAPA and MKGR to gather intelligence on poaching and fires; relations with tour operators and tourists often strained because of lack of customer care capacity; lack of value-add services.	Systematic staff training programme covering all aspects of PA operations ensures 300 rangers, guides and other field staff meet necessary competencies.	Staff training programmes are in place across spectrum of operations in RUNAPA, KINAPA and MKGR, covering necessary competencies for planning, administration, marketing, customer care, conflict resolution, policing and enforcement.	TANAPA, WD and partners are willing to take lessons learned from other countries and from NGOs, tour operators and other private sector partners on best practices for PA staff in core and new competencies.
	Finance and business planning has established management costs for different PAs and WMAs, and provides accurate revenue forecasts for each PA and the wider landscape (GRL/GKKL) and matches revenue to priority management needs.	Business planning in southern Tanzania's PAs lacks local context and full understanding of the international dimension of financial and business planning requirements; business planning is limited a s result.	A sustainable finance plan is developed approved and implemented for the PA system in both GRL and GKKL landscapes. Business Planning is mandated for four PAs as well as for two adjacent WMAs, along approved best practice guidelines.	Business and financial plans for each landscape, with a focus on each PA; a full and comprehensive understanding of the revenue generating options for each PA and WMA in the context of each landscape.	TANAPA, WD, FBD and other government and community partners willing to support the development of an objective planning process for the sustainable financing of PAs in GRL and GKKL and support implementation.

Project Components	Indicator	Baseline	Target by EOP	Sources of verification	Assumptions
	The input of increased HR capacity and funds for equipment following a business planning approach has led to greater efficiency and effectiveness of park operations in RUNAPA and KINAPA.	RUNAPA and KINAPA lack operational capacity to manage park operations in a sustainable manner, gaps exist in HR across park operations, lack of equipment means difficulty to manage fires, poaching and monitoring the ecosystem.	Funds, human resources and equipment are provided and deployed to address threats to RUNAPA and KINAPA in a cost-effective manner, utilising business planning.	Business plans exist for both parks in operational management. New staff recruited. Surveillance equipment – radios, repeaters, GPS, cameras, night vision and firefighting equipment purchased, trained on, logged and in use.	Business plans set cost co-efficients for all prescribed PA functions and rolling operations plans define site management priorities.
	Stakeholder groups in both GRL and GKKL landscapes are engaging positively and constructively on biodiversity, land use and management and social and economic growth issues, such as tourism planning.	There is a marked lack of communication largely due to insufficient funding between different PA authorities, local government, communities, civil society and the private sector, causing inefficiencies, misunderstanding and occasional conflict.	A joint (TANAPA-Community-District-Private Sector) stakeholder group formed to address overall management issues in both RUNAPA and KINAPA, MKGR, MRNR, wildlife corridors and adjacent WMAs is established for each landscape.	Stakeholder committee formed, joint management plan developed, and joint enforcement systems emplaced using the Management Orientated Management System (MOMS) in and around Ruaha and Kitulo NPs (covering a total area of at least 23,000 km ²).	TANAPA and partners are willing to work together, both between different PA authorities, but also between civil society actors, communities and the private sector (especially tourism).

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

1. PIF
2. UNDP Initiation Plan
3. UNDP Project Document
4. UNDP Environmental and Social Screening Results
5. Project Inception Report
6. Annual Project Reports (APR) and Project Implementation Review (API/PIR), 2013-2017
7. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
8. Audit reports
9. Finalized GEF biodiversity Tracking Tools at CEO endorsement and midterm (METT and (FSC) Financial Sustainability Scorecard)
10. Oversight mission reports
11. M&E Operational Guidelines, UNDP Monitoring and Frameworks, all monitoring reports prepared by the project
12. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team
13. Project Technical Reports;
14. Annual work plans including budgets;
15. Project board meetings/Project board meeting minutes, 2012-2017
16. Mid-term Review report for SPANEST (June 2015)
17. Management response to MTR
18. Project site location maps

(to be added

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

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 Form³

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: _____

³www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE⁴

- 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 Manual⁵)
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 rated⁶)
- 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

⁴The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

⁵ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

⁶ 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
 - Report Clearance Form
 - *Annexed in a separate file:* TE Audit Trail
 - *Annexed in a separate file:* Terminal GEF Tracking Tool

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: _____	
--	--

ANNEX H: TE REPORT AUDIT TRAIL

The following is a template for the evaluator to show how the received comments on the draft TE report have (or have not) been incorporated into the final TE report. This audit trail should be included as an annex in the final TE report.

To the comments received on 22 September 2017 from the Terminal Evaluation of (Strengthening the Protected Area Network in Southern Tanzania: Improving the Effectiveness of National Parks in Addressing Threats to Biodiversity) (UNDP PIMS 3253)

The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft Terminal Evaluation report; they are referenced by institution ("Author" column) and by comment number ("#" column):

Author	#	Para No./ comment location	Comment/Feedback on the draft TE report	Evaluator response and actions taken

Strengthening the Protected Area Network in Southern Tanzania: Improving the Effectiveness of National Parks in Addressing Threats to Biodiversity