

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Individual Contractor

I. Assignment Information

Assignment Title:	International Consultant to Conduct Project Terminal Evaluation
UNDP Practice Area:	Programme
Cluster/Project:	Generating, Accessing and Using Information and Knowledge Related to the Three Rio Conventions Project
Post Level:	Senior Specialist
Contract Type:	Individual Contractor (IC)
Duty Station:	Home/Phnom Penh
Expected Place of Travel:	Phnom Penh
Contract Duration:	28 days, with 10 days mission to Phnom Penh, Cambodia

II. 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: 'Generating, Accessing, and Using Information and Knowledge Related to the Three Rio Conventions', (PIMS 5222)

III. PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	Generating, Accessing, and Using Information and Knowledge Related to the Three Rio Conventions			
GEF Project ID:	5295		<i>at endorsement (Million US\$)</i>	<i>at completion (Million US\$)</i>
UNDP Project ID:	00092117 PIMS 5222	GEF financing:	0.990	0.990
Country:	Cambodia	IA/EA own Cash In kind:	0.150 1	0.274 1
Region:	RBAP	Government:	0.150	0.150
Focal Area:	MFA	Other:	n/a	n/a
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	CD2, CD4	Total co-financing:	1.300	1.424
Executing Agency:	Ministry of Environment (MOE)	Total Project Cost:	2.290	2.414
Other Partners involved:	UNDP (GEF Impl. Agency)	ProDoc Signature date:		14 January 2015
		(Operational) Closing Date:		Proposed: 31 Dec 2017 Actual: 31 Dec 2018

IV. Project Description

The Generating, Accessing and Using Information related to the 3 Rio Conventions project is in line with the GEF-5 CCCD Programme Frameworks two (2) and four (4), which calls for countries to generate, access and use information and knowledge and to strengthen capacities to implement and manage global convention guidelines. It is also aligned with the first objective of GEF6 that is to integrate global environmental needs into management information systems (MIS). It is a direct response to national priorities identified through the National Capacity Self-Assessment (NCSA) conducted in 2005-2006 and that is part of the institutional strengthening underway at MOE and MAFF. Through a learning-by-doing process, this project will harmonize existing environmental information systems, integrating internationally accepted measurement standards and methodologies, as well as develop a more consistent reporting on the global environment. Under the first outcome, the project will support the development of national capacities to effectively and efficiently standardize environment-related information that is generated on the implementation of the Rio Conventions in Cambodia, and give open-access to this information. In parallel to this, the project will support the strengthening of Cambodia's capacity to better engage stakeholders and better coordinate the implementation of the Rio Conventions in the country. Under the second outcome, project resources will be used to improve the use of environment-related information for the development of innovative tools supporting decision-making processes related to the implementation of the Rio Conventions. The project support will also include activities to develop the capacity in using this environment-related knowledge of national institutions involved in international negotiations at Conventions COPs, as well as using this knowledge to produce national reports meeting Conventions reporting obligations.

The project's objective is to improve access to environmental information related to the Rio Conventions through the harmonization of existing environmental management information systems and improving coordination of the implementation of these conventions in Cambodia. The harmonization of these existing systems will be translated into better access to information related to the implementation of the Rio Conventions in Cambodia.

The project is delineated into two main components as follows:

Component 1: Improved access and generation of information related to the three Rio Conventions

Component 2: Improved use of information and knowledge related to the Rio Conventions.

Following its approval, the project has continued to implement the agreed activities plan toward delivering its result. The project is going to end on 31 December 2018. To evaluate on the progress made by the project, the project plans to recruit an International Consultant to conduct Terminal Evaluation for the project.

V. Objective and Scope of Work

The Terminal Evaluation 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 terminal 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: Evaluation Questions](#)) 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, the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. Since the project has no field office, the Consultant is not expected to travel to the field. He/she will take lead in conducting stakeholder interview. (Find in Annex B: List of documents to be reviewed by the evaluator – list of key stakeholders).

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: list of documents to be reviewed by the evaluator](#)) of this Terms of Reference.

Evaluation Criteria & Ratings

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

Evaluation Ratings:			
1. Monitoring and Evaluation	<i>rating</i>	2. IA& EA Execution	<i>rating</i>
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	<i>rating</i>	4. Sustainability	<i>rating</i>
Relevance		Financial resources:	
Effectiveness		Socio-political:	
Efficiency		Institutional framework and governance:	
Overall Project Outcome		Environmental :	

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

Rating			
		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.

The cumulative expenditures as of 30 June 2018.

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	150,000						150,000	
Loans/Concessions								
• In-kind support	1,000,000		150,000				1,150,000	
• Other								
Totals	1,150,000		150,000				1,300,000	

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**.

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](#)

VI. Evaluation timeframe, Expected Outputs and Deliverables

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

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation	3 days	<i>3 October 2018</i>
Evaluation Mission	10 days	<i>25 October 2018</i>
Draft Evaluation Report	10 days	<i>16 November 2018</i>
Final Report	5 days	<i>30 November 2018</i>

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

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

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

While the total number of days allocated for this assignment is fixed, the tentative schedule of the each of the outputs above can be slightly adjusted once the consultant is on board based on the consultation with project team.

VII. Institutional Arrangement

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Cambodia in close coordination with the respective project Implementing Partner. 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.

Under overall direct supervision of the 3 Rio conventions project management team, ACD/Programme Team Leader, oversight of Programme analyst and direct guidance from the 3 Rio Conventions Project Coordinator, the consultant will be responsible to deliver the outputs stated above with the level of quality expected.

Role of the consultant

- The consultant is responsible to provide his/her technical expertise to produce the expected outputs;
- The consultant shall cover all the related cost for his mission to Cambodia;
- The consultant shall work under the assigned focal persons from UNDP project team and PMU;
- The consultant needs to maintain daily communication with the UNDP project focal person as and when problems emerge during the consultancy period, especially if they affect the scope of the job.
- Evaluator ethic: 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'](#)

Role of project focal team and UNDP

- The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country;
- The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, coordinate with the Government etc.
- 3 Rio Conventions PMU, and the relevant UNDP programme team will provide overall quality assurance for this consultancy;
- 3 Rio Conventions PMU and the relevant UNDP programme team will review deliverables for payment release;
- Focal points from PMU and UNDP will act as the focal persons to interact with the consultant to facilitate the assignment, facilitate the review of each output and ensure the timely generation of the comments from stakeholders on each output.

VIII. 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'](#)

IX. Payment Milestones

The consultant will be paid on a lump sum basis under the following installments.

N	Outputs/Deliveries	Payment Schedule	Payment Amount
1	1.Upon satisfactory completion of the	1 st week of October	15%

	Preparation Plan to deliver the assignment.	2018	
2	2.Upon satisfactory completion of the Evaluation Mission	4 th week of October 2018	20%
3	Choose an item. Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report	3 rd week of November 2018	25%
4	Following submission and approval (Project Management, UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report	1 st week of December 2018	40%

X. Duty Station

This assignment is home-based and requires the consultant to travel to Cambodia one time. The initial proposed mission schedule is as the following:

- Cambodia country mission: around the 2nd and 3rd week of October 2018. To have a around of stakeholder meeting to kick start the assignment. The expect duration in the country is 10 working days;

The above mission plan could be further discussed and could be adjusted based on the discussion between the consultant and the project focal persons, to be validated by the project management team and UNDP Programme Head.

Selected individual contract(s) who is expected to travel to the Country Office (CO) to undertake the assignment in the country (Cambodia) is required to undertake the Basic Security in the Field (BSIF) training prior to travelling. CD ROMs must be made available for use in environments where access to technology poses a challenge.

(<https://dss.un.org/dssweb/WelcometoUNDSS/tabid/105/Default.aspx?returnurl=%2fdssweb%2f>)

XI. Minimum Qualifications of the Individual Contractor

Education:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ An advanced University education (MS or PhD) with expertise in natural resource management, biodiversity management, agriculture, forestry, climate change, environmental management, and other related disciplines.
Experience:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Minimum of 5 years of experience in conducting evaluation for development projects and GEF funded project; ▪ Minimum of 5 years of relevant professional experience in working for similar multi-focal area capacity development projects, e.g. on the three thematic areas of the 3Rio convention namely Climate Change, Biodiversity, and Land Degradation; ▪ Experience working in Asia region, especially on capacity development and Rio Conventions;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Experience working for development projects, with multi stakeholders including government agencies, development agencies, and UN agencies. ▪ Knowledge of UNDP and GEF monitoring and evaluation policies ▪ Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
Other Competency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Time management (in managing deliverables) ▪ Team management ▪ Professionalism, courtesy, patience ▪ Outstanding inter-cultural communication, networking and coordination skills
Language Requirement:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Excellent written and oral English

Criteria for Evaluation of Level of Technical Compliance of Individual Contractor

Technical Evaluation Criteria	Obtainable Score
Minimum 5 years of experience in conducting evaluation for development projects and GEF funded project	30
Minimum of 5 years of relevant professional experience in working for similar multi-focal area capacity development projects, e.g. on the three thematic areas of the 3Rio convention namely Climate Change, Biodiversity, and Land Degradation	15
Experience working in Asia region, especially on capacity development and Rio Conventions	15
Experience working for development projects, with multi stakeholders including government agencies, development agencies, and UN agencies	10
Knowledge of UNDP and GEF monitoring and evaluation policies	15
Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies	15
Total Obtainable Score:	100

XII. Annexes:

- Annex A: Project Logframe;
- Annex B: Draft list of Documents to be reviewed by the evaluator;
- Annex C: Evaluation Question;
- Annex D: Rating Scale
- Annex E: Evaluation consultant code of conduct and agreement form
- Annex F: Sample outline of evaluation report
- Annex G: Evaluation report clearance form

Approval

Signature:

.....

Name:

Rany Pen

.....

Title/Unit/Cluster:

Programme Unit Team Leader

.....

Date:

.....

ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

<p>This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in UNDAF: UNDAF Outcome: I. Economic Growth and Sustainable Development; and V. Governance UNDAF Country Programme Outcome I.2 and V.3: (I.2) National institutions and sub-national authorities and private sector are better able to ensure the sustainable use of natural resources (fisheries, forestry, mangrove, land, and protected areas), cleaner technologies and responsiveness to climate change; and (V.3) enhanced capacities for collection, access and utilization of disaggregated information (gender, age, target populations, region) at national and sub-national levels to develop and monitor policies and plans that are responsive to the needs of the people and incorporate priority population, poverty and development linkages.</p>					
<p>UNDAF Outcome Indicators: Outcome I: Number of national and sectoral plans and strategies which explicitly refer to climate change; Outcome V: Implementation by the Government of recommendations formulated by treaty bodies in individual complaints submitted to them by Cambodian nationals; National dialogue mechanism established between Government and civil society for enhanced dialogue and cooperation including data disaggregated by province and sex; Disaggregated data and information used to monitor NSDP, CMDGs, sectoral and subnational plans; Increased coverage by the media of MDGs, extractive industries, climate change and land rights issues.</p>					
<p>Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area (same as that on the cover page, circle one):</p>					
<p>Applicable GEF Strategic Focal Area Objectives: CD-2: Generate, access and use of information and knowledge. CD-4: Strengthen capacities to implement and manage global convention guidelines.</p>					
<p>Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators: CD-2: Institutions and stakeholders trained how to use different tools available to manage information; Stakeholders are better informed via workshops and trainings about global challenges and local actions required; Ability of stakeholders to diagnose, understand and transform information and knowledge into local actions increased and retained; Knowledge platform established to share lessons learned among CBOs and CSOs. CD-4: Institutional capacities for management of environment strengthened; Standards developed and adopted; Management capacities for implementation of convention guidelines and Reporting enhanced; Capacities of CSOs and CBOs as SGP partners, strengthened; Sustainable financing mechanisms developed.</p>					
Objectives and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
Objective: To improve access to environmental information related	1. Key environmental management information	• Capacity of the main stakeholders for accessing	• Environmental knowledge related to the implementation	• Reference to the new harmonized systems in project documents;	Risk: • Political will to provide GDANCP with the necessary resources to

to the Rio Conventions through the harmonization of existing environmental management information systems and improving coordination of the implementation of these conventions in Cambodia.	systems are harmonized with open-access and covering areas related to the Rio Conventions.	environmental information from various existing systems is limited and dispersed over many organizations.	of the Rio Conventions in Cambodia is comprehensive and easily accessible.	national strategies, programmes and plans; national assessments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State of the environment reports and communications/national reports sent to Conventions • Information products such as newsletters, flyers, articles, etc. • Policies referring to this new environmental information 	sustain project achievements. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New information is not used and stays stored in computers at MOE Assumption: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MOE will support GDANCP and provide it with necessary resources • Better environmental information is readily available and actively utilized and used
	2. Quality of monitoring reports and communications to measure implementation progress of the Rio Conventions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current reports are produced by sector, with limited data, weak analysis, weak trend analysis, and there are not fully responding to international requirements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reports present adequate disaggregated data at sub-national level, are informative and present environmental trends over time. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MOE reports • Environmental reports such as the State of Environment and Communications to Conventions 	Risk: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communications and national reports are not submitted on time Assumption: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communications and national reports are submitted on time and include information from the harmonized systems.
	3. Capacity development scorecard rating	Capacity for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engagement: 4 of 9 	Capacity for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engagement: 7 of 9 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mid-term review and final evaluation reports, including an 	Risk: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project activities and resources do not translate in increasing the capacity of

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generate, access and use information and knowledge: 5 of 15 • Policy and legislation development: 4 of 9 • Management and implementation : 3 of 6 • Monitor and evaluate: 2 of 6 (Total score: 18/45) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generate, access and use information and knowledge: 10 of 15 • Policy and legislation development: 5 of 9 • Management and implementation: 5 of 6 • Monitor and evaluate: 4 of 6 (Total targeted score: 31/45) 	updated CD scorecard <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual PIRs • Capacity assessment reports 	GDANCP to provide better environmental information. Assumption: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project is effective in developing the capacity in the area of environmental information management.
OUTCOME 1: IMPROVED ACCESS AND GENERATION OF INFORMATION RELATED TO THE THREE RIO CONVENTIONS					
Output 1.1: A harmonized information management system covering the three Rio Conventions. Output 1.2: A common clearinghouse mechanism for the	4. A system and a data architectures to harmonize key environmental information systems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing systems and data architectures are not communicating efficiently and do not provide good availability to environmental knowledge 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental information systems are harmonized using internationally recognized standards. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical reports • Database(s) • PIRs • Web pages 	Risk: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of relevant expertise in local market may result in delay of required outputs and distortion of targeted deadlines Assumption: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation of project activities and recruitment of relevant national expertise is monitored and actions will be identified if the lack

three Rio Conventions.					of expertise is affecting the timely implementation of the project
Output 1.3: Existing stakeholder platforms strengthened in order to increase stakeholder engagement in Convention related dialogues.	5. A developed clearinghouse mechanism in place at MOE and covering all environmental areas related to the Rio Conventions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited mechanisms in place to access, share and exchange environmental information. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Open-access to all data, reports, research, plans and documents available on the implementation of the Rio Conventions in Cambodia. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Database(s) Reports Websites 	Risk: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government unwilling to give open-access to environmental information Assumption: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> MOE will support GDANCP and provide it with necessary resources to develop this mechanism and give public open-access
Output 1.4: Strengthened coordination between key sectors to address biodiversity, climate change and land degradation issues at systemic and institutional levels.	6. Stakeholders engagement in Rio Conventions related dialogues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Current engagement is sector-based and mostly focusing on climate change. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A platform to exchange environmental information related to the implementation of the Rio Conventions. An increase of 50% of Stakeholders engagement in related dialogues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information exchange system Meetings minutes Paper presented 	Risk: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No interest from Stakeholders to increase crosscutting dialogues on the implementation of the Rio Conventions. Assumption: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All Stakeholders involved in implementing the Rio Conventions in Cambodia are demanding for greater exchange of environmental information and to better engage in crosscutting dialogues.
	7. An operational inter-sectorial coordination mechanism that	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Few sector-based coordination mechanisms 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An operational inter-sectorial coordination mechanism in 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy paper on coordination Formal approval (ministerial 	Risks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Political</i> - delays due to ministerial reforms.

	builds on existing coordination instruments.	exist but none to coordinate across the three Rio Conventions.	place to coordinate the implementation of MEAs in Cambodia.	order?) of this new coordination mechanism.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operational - Irregular frequency of meetings for relevant bodies, unclear approval mechanism for an inter-sectorial coordination body, unwillingness to participate in the inter-sectorial coordination body. Assumption: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supporting mechanism is in-place
--	--	--	---	---	--

OUTCOME 2: IMPROVED USE OF INFORMATION AND KNOWLEDGE RELATED TO THE RIO CONVENTIONS

Output 2.1: Innovative tools piloted for decision-making using the economic valuation of the use of natural resources. Output 2.2: Strengthened capacity of existing national implementing institutions on negotiation skills and national preparatory process for COPs and other	8. Model to implement environmental economic valuation in Cambodia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental economic valuation as a policy instrument is not used in Cambodia 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A strategy on how to implement environmental economic valuation as a policy instrument in Cambodia 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government strategy • Policy paper(s) 	Risk: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No interest from decision-makers to use economic valuation as a tool to support decision-making Assumption: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The benefit of using better economic valuation will encourage decision-makers to use it.
	9. Use of environmental economic valuation in environmental decision-making	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental economic valuation is not used in decision-making in Cambodia. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3-4 policies, programmes or plans are developed using environmental economic valuation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy, programme and plan documents 	
	10. Negotiation capacity of Cambodia at COPs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited COP negotiations skills and knowledge 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Negotiations at 2-3 COPs with position papers for Cambodia 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Country position papers • Policy papers • COPs reports 	Risk: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The government does not fulfill its international

<p>related meetings for the Rio conventions.</p> <p>Output 2.3: A unified reporting process on the implementation status of the three Rio Conventions.</p>	<p>11. Quality, quantity and timeliness of reports submitted to conventions</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reports are sector-based, are not submitted on time and do not contain much primary collected data 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National communications/ reports are submitted on time and contain primary data provided by the harmonized system(s) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National communications and reports 	<p>obligations; including those from the 3 Rio Conventions</p> <p><i>Assumption:</i> The government continues to fulfill its international commitments</p>
---	---	--	--	---	---

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

1. PIF;
2. UNDP Initiation Plan;
3. Project Document;
4. Inception Report;
5. Project progress report (Quarterly and Annual);
6. Finalized GEF Capacity Development Score Cards;
7. Project Board meeting minutes;
8. Financial and administration guidelines used by PMU;
9. Project Operations Guidelines;
10. National Capacity Self-Assessment (NCSA)-2007;
11. Project Mid Term Review Report, 2017;
12. Project Implementation Report 2018
13. List of Key project stakeholders to meet:
 - Focal person of UNCBD;
 - Focal person of UNFCCC;
 - Focal person of UNCCD;
 - Project Management Team;
 - Regional Technical Advisors;

Annex C: Evaluation questions

This is a generic list, and can be amended and/or extended by a consultant and included in the TE inception report and 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?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the project contribute to the objective of bringing synergy among the 3Rio convention? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Link between the project result to the relevant indicators set for Cambodia in regard to synergy among the 3Rio conventions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project document Project Mid term review Project progress report 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk review Interview with key stakeholders of the project
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the project respond to the need of the relevant stakeholders under each of the 3Rio convention under the scope of project intervention? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Link between the project achievement and the actual respond on the need of the key stakeholders of the project as per the project design 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project document Project result resource framework Project mid term review Project progress report 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk review Interview with key stakeholders of the project
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extend does the project contribute to the expected outcomes and objectives as set in the project Result Resource Framework? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Achievement rate of the key indicators set in for the project outcomes and objectives in the project Result Resource Framework. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project document Project Mid term review Project progress report 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk review Interview with key project stakeholders
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How well are project risk and assumption are being managed? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Timeliness of the identification of risk and any change in project assumption; Quality of response identified and implemented to address the risk 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project document Project Mid term review Project progress report 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk review Interview with key project stakeholders
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Considering the time and the input (financial and human resources) under the project, to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cost in the view of outputs/result achieved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project progress report Project documents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk review Interview with key project stakeholders

what extend that the project is efficient in delivering the expected outputs/result?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extend partnership with other institution who can contribute in delivering project expected outputs/outcomes were encouraged and supported? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of particular partnership which will sustained 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project document Project Mid term review Project progress report 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk review Interview with key project stakeholders
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How effective are project human and financial resource managed? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Application of quality management and monitoring system for financial and human resources of the project; Timeliness of reporting and work planning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project progress report Project board meeting minutes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk review Interview with key project stakeholders
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extend that the knowledge/result from the project will sustain after the completion of the current 3Rio project? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extend to which the current project achievement/intervention build on existing national mechanism/system supporting the implementation of the 3Rio convention in Cambodia; Extend to which the capacity of the relevant 3Rio focal team was built to continue the work 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project document Project Mid term review Project progress report 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk review Interview with key project stakeholder
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extend does the project contribute to its expected development impact? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Degree of project contribution to impact set it the project design 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project document Mid term review Project Result Resources Framework 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review Interview with key stakeholder

ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

<i>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution</i> 6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings 5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings 4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS) 3: Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings 2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems 1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems	<i>Sustainability ratings:</i> 4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks	<i>Relevance ratings</i> 2. Relevant (R) 1.. Not relevant (NR) <i>Impact Ratings:</i> 3. Significant (S) 2. Minimal (M) 1. Negligible (N)
<i>Additional ratings where relevant:</i> Not Applicable (N/A) Unable to Assess (U/A)		

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)

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.

- 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

(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: _____