

## United Nations Development Programme – Papua New Guinea



### **TERMS OF REFERENCE**

#### **National consultant to undertake UNDP/GEF Project Terminal Evaluation**

<b>Project Title:</b>	Community-based Forest & Coastal Conservation and Resource Management in Papua New Guinea
<b>Type of Contract:</b>	Individual Contract
<b>Duration:</b>	35 days over the period of 2 months starting in October 2019
<b>Location:</b>	Home based with travel to Port Moresby, Kokopo and Kimbe in Papua New Guinea
<b>Application Deadline:</b>	1 August 2019
<b>Expected Start Date</b>	1 October 2019

***Please note that UNDP is not in the position to accept incomplete applications - please make sure that your application contains all details as specified below in this notice.***

### **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. This terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the *Community-based Forest and Coastal Conservation and Resource Management in Papua New Guinea* (PIMS #: 3936, Project 00079707).

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

### **PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE**

<b>Project Title:</b>	Community-based Forest and Coastal Conservation and Resource Management in Papua New Guinea			
GEF Project ID:	# 3954 #3936		<u>at endorsement</u> <u>(Million US\$)</u>	<u>at completion</u> <u>(Million US\$)</u>

UNDP GEF Project ID (PIMS):				
Atlas Award ID: UNDP Project ID:	00062283 00079707	GEF financing:	6,900,000	
Country:	Papua New Guinea	IA/EA own:		
Region:	Asia Pacific	Government:	5,000,000	
Focal Area:	Multi Focal	Other:	18,000,000	
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	BD-3; BD-1	Total co-financing:	23,000,000	
Executing Agency:	Conservation Environment Authority	Total Project Cost:	29,900,000	
Other Partners involved:	Bishop Museum	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		20 August 2019
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: 19 August 2019	Actual: 31 Dec 2019

## OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The project was designed to develop a government-supported approach towards creating an enabling environment to: i) establish and support of community conservation areas in Papua New Guinea and, ii) to develop effective natural resource management and financing systems. The overall objective of the project is to develop and demonstrate resource management and conservation models for landholding communities that effectively incorporate community-managed conservation areas as part of agreed national priorities with industry and government. This involves demonstration of how the development of national conservation policy framework will contribute towards the establishment of a protected area system to better support community-managed protected areas. The TE for this full-size UNDP/GEF supported project is implemented through the Conservation and Environment Protected Authority.

## Roles and Responsibilities

The National Consultant will provide support to the International Team Leader for production of the agreed products. S/he will deliver on the following:

- Assist in identifying strengths and weaknesses in the Project design and implementation, implementation arrangements and its impacts on efficiency and effectiveness of converting resources (money, time) into results and impacts;
- Assist in ascertaining achievements and impacts to date; to what extent the Project has moved towards achievement of the objectives and outputs under the three outcomes in the results framework; and the need for continued focus (achieving global environment benefits and improvement in livelihoods);

- Assist with the assessment of likelihood of sustainability of results and determine the key elements of the exit strategy that would increase the likelihood of sustaining critical results;
- Contribute to examine the significance of un-expected effects, whether beneficial or detrimental in character;
- Assist in the assessment of the extent the Project has contributed to building capacity at national, district and community levels to formulate, implement and monitor actions/activities for biodiversity conservation;
- Assess the validity of assumptions used in the development of the project;
- Contribute to the identification and assessment lessons learnt and best practices in relation to achievement of the project objectives and outputs;
- Assist assess how these activity-based projects has adapted to emerging issues and trends such as climate change, energy and other emerging issues, etc;
- Lead in mobilising stakeholders for consultations and provision of information regarding the terminal evaluation.

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 method<sup>1</sup> 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 *(fill in 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 the East and West New Britain Provinces, including the following project sites in Pomio District. Interviews will be held with the national project director from Conservation and Environment Protection Authority, the UNDP CO project management other relevant stakeholders involved the project. The key stakeholders are

---

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

East and West New Britain Provincial Administrations, Pomio District Development Authority, civil society organizations and community groups.

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 / 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
UNDP (Grants)	2,000,000	2,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000			2,000,000	2,000,000
GEF (Grants)					6,900,000	6,900,000	6,900,000	6,900,000
Loans/Concessions								
• In-kind support								
• CEPA (Grant)					5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
• Other								
◦ Bilateral (Australia)					14,000,000	14,000,000	14,000,000	14,000,000
◦ Bishop Museum					2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Totals	2,000,000	2,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	27,900,000	27,900,000	29,900,000	29,900,000

## 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.<sup>2</sup>

## CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

---

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

## IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

---

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Papua New Guinea. 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 35 days according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
<b>Preparation / Inception report</b>	4 days	10 October 2019
<b>Evaluation Mission</b>	19 days	15 <sup>th</sup> November 2019
<b>Draft Evaluation Report</b>	10 days	25 <sup>th</sup> November 2019
<b>Final Report</b>	2 days	30 <sup>th</sup> November 2019

## EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

---

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
<b>Inception Report</b>	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission.	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
<b>Presentation</b>	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission	To project management, UNDP CO

---

<sup>2</sup> 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](#)

<b>Draft Final Report</b>	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 2 weeks of the evaluation mission	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs
<b>Final Report*</b>	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC.

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

## TEAM COMPOSITION

---

The evaluation team will be composed of one international evaluator and one national evaluator. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The international consultant will be the team leader will be responsible for finalizing the report. The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The national expert (consultant) must present the following qualifications and competencies:

## REQUIRED SKILLS AND EXPERIENCE

Education:

- At least a Masters' degree in natural resource management, environmental management, agriculture, forestry or related field

Experience:

- At least 7 years' experience in natural resources management, protected area, biodiversity conservation or related fields;
- Familiarity with biodiversity conservation or protected area related projects in Papua New Guinea and particularly the national parks and wildlife management areas, either through managing or evaluating donor-funded projects;
- Substantive knowledge and skill with participatory M&E processes including actual project evaluations is essential within the context of community development processes is an advantage;

Language requirement:

- Fluent in both written and spoken English and Tok Pidgin.

## COMPETENCIES

Functional Competencies:

- Knowledge of Monitoring and Evaluation;
- Familiarity with the challenges PNG face in sustainable natural resource management and biodiversity conservation including communities;

- Excellent conceptual thinking and analytical skills;
- An independent, reliable, responsible self-motivator able to work under time pressure;
- Excellent communication, team-building and diplomatic skills to develop partnerships.
- Ability to act professionally and flexibly to engage with government officials, donor representatives, and local communities.

#### Corporate Competencies:

- Demonstrates integrity by modeling the UN's values and ethical standard;
- Promotes the vision, mission, and strategic goals of the UN;
- Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality, and age sensitivity and adaptability;
- Treats all people fairly without favoritism.

## 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

*(this payment schedule is indicative, to be filled in by the CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on their standard procurement procedures)*

%	Milestone
10%	At contract signing
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

## Evaluation

### Cumulative analysis

The proposals will be evaluated using the cumulative analysis method with a split 70% technical and 30% financial scoring. The proposal with the highest cumulative scoring will be awarded the contract. Applications will be evaluated technically, and points are attributed based on how well the proposal meets the requirements of the Terms of Reference using the guidelines detailed in the table below:

When using this weighted scoring method, the award of the contract may be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

- Responsive/compliant/acceptable, and
- Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation.

\* Technical Criteria weighting; 70%



\* Financial Criteria weighting; 30%

Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 49 points in the Technical Evaluation would be considered for the Financial Evaluation. Interviews may be conducted as part of technical assessment for shortlisted proposals.

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Points</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Qualification</b>		<b>15%</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At least a Masters' degree in natural resources, environmental management, agriculture, forestry or related field</li> </ul>	15	
<b>Experience</b>		<b>50%</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At least 7 years' experience in natural resources management, protected area, biodiversity conservation or related fields;</li> </ul>	15	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Familiarity with biodiversity conservation or protected area related projects in Papua New Guinea and particularly the national parks and wildlife management areas, either through managing or evaluating donor-funded projects</li> </ul>	15	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Substantive knowledge and skill with participatory M&amp;E processes including actual project evaluations is essential within the context of community development processes is an advantage;</li> </ul>	15	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fluent in both written and spoken English Language</li> </ul>	5	
<b>Competencies</b>		<b>5%</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Knowledge of Monitoring and Evaluation;</li> </ul>	1	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Excellent conceptual thinking and analytical skills;</li> </ul>	1	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An independent, reliable, responsible self-motivator able to work under time pressure;</li> </ul>	1	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Excellent communication and team-building skills to flexibly to engage with government officials, donor representatives, and local communities.</li> </ul>	1	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Demonstrates integrity by modeling the UN's values and ethical standard such as treating all people fairly without favoritism</li> </ul>	1	
<b>Technical Criteria</b>		<b>70%</b>
**If necessary interviews shall also be conducted as part of the technical evaluation to ascertain best value for money.		
<b>Financial Criteria – Lowest Price</b>		<b>30%</b>

### **Documents to be included when submitting Consultancy Proposals**

The following documents may be requested:

- Duly executed **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the template provided by UNDP;

- b) **CV**, indicating all past experience from similar projects, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the Candidate and at least three (3) professional references;
- c) **Brief description** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a methodology, if applicable, on how they will approach and complete the assignment. A methodology is recommended for intellectual services, but may be omitted for support services;
- d) **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price, supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template provided. If an Offeror is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the Offeror must stipulate that arrangement at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated.

### **Lump-sum contracts**

The financial proposal shall specify a total lump-sum amount, and payment terms around specific and measurable (qualitative and quantitative) deliverables (i.e. whether payments fall in instalments or upon completion of the entire contract). Payments are based upon output, i.e. upon delivery of the services specified in the TOR. To assist the requesting unit in the comparison of financial proposals, the financial proposal will include a breakdown of this lump-sum amount (including travel, living expenses, and number of anticipated working days).

### **Travel**

All envisaged travel costs must be included in the financial proposal. This includes all travel to join duty station/repatriation travel. In general, UNDP should not accept travel costs exceeding those of an economy class ticket; should the IC wish to travel on a higher class, they should do so using their own resources.

In the case of unforeseeable travel, payment of travel costs including tickets, lodging, and terminal expenses should be agreed upon, between the respective business unit and Individual Consultant, prior to travel and will be reimbursed.

### **Submission Instructions**

Incomplete proposals and failure to comply with proposal submission instruction will not be considered or will result in disqualification of proposal.

Completed proposals should be submitted via email [procurement.png@undp.org](mailto:procurement.png@undp.org) , no later than 01 August 2019.

For any clarification regarding this assignment please write to Ripana James on [procurement.pg@undp.org](mailto:procurement.pg@undp.org)

Please be guided by the instructions provided in this document above while preparing your submission.

UNDP looks forward to receiving your Proposal and thank you in advance for your interest in

UNDP procurement opportunities.

## ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPAP or CPD: UNCP Outcome 3.1 /UNDP CPD Outcome 10: <i>By 2012, rural communities in selected provinces of each region use improved sustainable livelihood practices</i>					
Country Programme Outcome Indicators:					
Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area (same as that on the cover page, circle one): 1. Mainstreaming environment and energy OR 2. Catalyzing environmental finance OR 3. Promote climate change adaptation OR 4. Expanding access to environmental and energy services for the poor.					
Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program:					
Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes:					
Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators:					
	Indicator	Baseline	Targets//End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
Project Objective <sup>3</sup> Develop effective natural resource management and financing systems for community conservation areas	National policy and regulatory framework providing comprehensive and consistent support for CCAs	No specific legislative framework for CCAs. Protected Areas are being established under a range of secondary legislation with limited and inconsistent governmental support	(1) A comprehensive and integrated policy and regulatory framework for CCAs is enacted by end of year 2, (2) supported by a coordinated whole-of-Government decision-making mechanism operational by year 3	Legislation enacted for CCAs, regulatory or operational enactments defining role and responsibilities of the decision-making mechanism, and documentation of decision-making mechanism in operation.	(Relevant to achieving Project Goal)  Financing to maintain the conservation areas will continue to receive national and international support

<sup>3</sup> Objective (Atlas output) monitored quarterly ERBM and annually in APR/PIR

	Area protected under Community Conservation Areas	None at present	1,000,000 hectares protected by end of project	Gazettement/ establishment notices and spatial monitoring.	State of Papua New Guinea continues to support PAs by all means against biodiversity threats
	Quality of biodiversity management of CCAs as measured by Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool	To be assessed for individual CCAs upon establishment	CCAs show sustained improvement in METT scores over the duration of the project, beginning from respective year of CCA establishment.	METT reports provided by CAMCs	External threats and pressures (e.g. climate change impacts, encroachment) do not adversely affect the status of biodiversity resources within CCAs.
	Landowner commitment to CCAs	Landowner commitment to existing forms of PAs (e.g. WMAs) is often limited, as demonstrated by level of contribution to WMA management.	Landowner commitment sufficient to ensure effective management and conservation of CCAs as measured at end-project.	Successful implementation of PA management plans and delivery of service agreements, level of participation in CAMCs and other consultative mechanisms.	Benefits of alternative land uses (e.g. agriculture, mining) do not drastically increase after agreement to set up CCAs is achieved.
	Funding for conservation and management of CCAs is sufficient to underwrite core activities, and is sustainable over time	To be established for each CCA during planning, using the PA Financing Scorecard	By end-project each established CCA has demonstrated access to all funding required for core management and conservation activities for at least two consecutive years.	PA Financing Scorecards to be completed during planning of each CCA, and subsequently on an annual basis.	Government commitment to provide revenue support to CCAs is sustained.

Outcome 1: National enabling environment for a community-based sustainable national system of protected areas (PAs) containing globally and nationally significant biodiversity					
Project Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	Targets//End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
1.1 Improved whole-of-Government systems and processes for making land-use decisions to avoid degradation and conversion of PAs.	Number and severity of instances in which CCAs are negatively affected by landuse or development decisions made by Government agencies	Existing PAs (e.g. WMAs) regularly suffering negative impact from agricultural conversion, mining impacts, etc.	In the final year of the project, no established CCA suffers any direct impact due to landuse/ conversion decisions, or indirect impact due to adjacent or upstream development activity.	Annual reports of CAMCs, project monitoring of supported CCAs.	Government does not make any direct and deliberate (as opposed to indirect and inadvertent) decisions to sanction development activities which degrade CCAs.
1.2. National economic development plans and sectoral plans incorporate and provide support for the objective of developing a Sustainable National System of PAs.	Explicit recognition of the role and contribution of the protected area system to national development strategies, as described in key national policy documents	No recognition of the PA system in Medium-Term Development Strategy or related planning documents. Environmentally-Sustainable Economic Growth (ESEG) Policy framework under development but not yet agreed or operationalized.	By year 3, PNG's Medium-Term Development Strategy and related planning documents explicitly recognize the development of a sustainable National PA System as a development priority, under the ESEG framework.	Audit of relevant policy documents upon publication and reported in the PIR and MTE/FE.	Inclusion of references to the National PA system on paper translate into tangible policy and financial support on the ground.
1.3. Integrated policy framework to support mainstreaming of environment conservation issues within whole-of-Government and sectoral decision-making processes	National policy framework explicitly and comprehensively addresses key conservation policy requirements, including e.g. a framework for assessing and mitigating	Comprehensive policy frameworks not yet established for EIAs, sustainable agriculture or protected area financing.	By year 3, policy frameworks for (i)SEAs, (ii)Sustainable agriculture and (iii) PA Financing have been developed, endorsed by CEPA and submitted to the Government for adoption	Audit of relevant policy frameworks upon submission, documentation of approval and reports in the PIR and MTE/FE	Existing Government commitment to adopt these policy frameworks is sustained

developed and being implemented.	environmental impacts of development, sustainability policies and criteria for agriculture and sustainable financing flows for Protected Areas.				
1.4. Integrated legal framework to ensure effective planning and regulation of development and conservation activities	Integration of the three existing Protected Areas Acts into a single legal framework for protected area establishment and management under the new Conservation and Environment Protection Act (see 3.2.1 below) with Conservation Areas providing the legal basis for establishing the Sustainable National System of PAs. The new legal arrangements for protected areas to incorporate the requirement for Benefit Sharing Agreements (BSAs).	Fragmented legislation with low power for PA management and no capacity to manage benefit sharing arrangements	A single integrated Act providing for a statutory authority with increased scope for PA management including benefit sharing arrangements	Audit of resultant legislation	Parliamentary support for legislative change

	Integration of the six Acts administered by the Department of Environment and Conservation to create a single fully integrated Conservation and Environment Protection Act for PNG.	Six separate legislative acts from different periods of history, not integrated	Integrated CEPA Act to reconcile inconsistencies in current body of law, and introduce reforms	Audit of documentation	Parliamentary support for an integrated Act
1.5. Integrated policy framework to support sustainable financing of PAs developed and evidence of success through increased funds for PA establishment and management.	Level of Government funding available for PA establishment and management.	Annual funding averages less than USD1 million at start of project.	By end-project, available funding meets minimum requirement for gazetted CAs, as measured by the PA Financing Scorecard	PA Financing Scorecard, annual DEC/CEPA reporting	Political commitment to support the national PA system is translated into sustained financial support.
1.6. Strengthened institutional and technical capacities in relevant Government agencies, linked to a framework of national core competencies to support effective conservation planning and service delivery in PAs	Level of institutional and technical capacity in CEPA (once established) and other relevant Government agencies as measured using a Capacity Scorecard or similar approach	To be established upon finalization of the Government restructuring	By end-project, CEPA institutional and technical capacity scores are rated as 'Sufficient' or 'Adequate' across all key competencies. Institutional scores for other relevant agencies (including local governments) show increases on average between project mid-term and	Institutional Capacity Scorecard to be established during creation of CEPA.	Sufficient level of cooperation obtained from other relevant agencies.



			end-project assessments		
Outcome 2: Community-managed Conservation Areas identified and established in the Owen Stanley Range and New Britain					
Project Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	Targets//End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
2.1 At least 1,000,000 hectares added to the national system of community-managed protected areas through the establishment of new financially and ecologically viable Conservation Areas and/or conversion of existing Wildlife Management Areas to Conservation Areas	Hectares of new Protected Areas established under the new community conservation area framework	None	By year 5 at least 1,000,000 hectares added	Gazettement notices or similar	Obtaining community/ landowner support for establishment of CCAs does not take significant longer than envisaged in the project strategy.
Outcome 3: Conservation Area Management Planning and Partnership Agreements with Communities					
Project Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	Targets//End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
3.1 Conservation Areas effectively managed according to the requirements of their respective Management Plans, with 20% increase in	Increase in METT scores for each established CA.	Individual METT scores to be calculated during establishment of the CAs	By end-project, METT scores for each CA increase by at least 20% over initial baseline	METT scorecards	CAs are established at least 3 years before project end, to allow sufficient time to demonstrate management improvements.

METT scores over the project lifetime.					
3.2. Service delivery, community development and economic development outcomes as specified in the Partnership Agreement being achieved.	Compliance with commitments stipulated in the Partnership Agreements	Agreements to be established during creation of CAs	Within 2 years of CA establishment or by end-project (whichever is sooner) CAMCs report satisfactory compliance with service delivery, community development and economic development outcomes as specified in the respective Partnership Agreements.	CAMC annual reports, with supplementary CAMC interviews at end-project if required	Changes in external factors, e.g. fiscal position of Provincial Governments and LLGs, does not adversely affect service delivery.
Outcome 4: Capacity development and support for implementation of CA Management Plans					
Project Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	Targets//End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
4.1 Capacity development and support for Conservation Areas stakeholders to enhance project implementation and delivery of project outputs	Institutional and individual/ technical capacities of Provincial and local level governments to ensure effective delivery of key project outputs.	Preliminary capacity assessment during PPG indicates institutional and individual/ technical capacities are low or extremely low, at 24.4% and 33.3% respectively. Detailed capacity assessments	Provincial and local level government (LLG) institutional and technical capacities to support establishment and management of CAs increases by at least 20% two years after establishment of each CA.	Capacity assessments by CEPA as part of CA establishment/ implementation.	Sufficient cooperation obtained from Provincial and local level governments for capacity development programmes

		for each participating Provincial/ local government entity to be conducted during establishment of CAs	Overall institutional capacity increases to at least 56.4%, and individual capacity increases to 50%		
4.2. Capacity development plans for landowners delivering greater capacity and improved outcomes from project activities	Capacity of landowners to manage conservation areas and associated livelihoods/ service delivery activities	Preliminary overall assessment during PPG indicated non-existent to low capacities. Specific capacity baselines to be established for each CA.	Landowner groups have sufficient capacity to implement livelihood and service delivery activities.	Proxy indicator: number of livelihood/ business development initiatives established, and progress in implementation of management and monitoring systems for CAs	Proxy indicator approach assumes other non-capacity barriers can be identified and addressed if required.
4.3. Linking of livelihood, health and population issues with CA resource management	Increased access to social services (health, sanitation, education) for landowner communities participating in CAs.	Basic social services being provided by LLGs and/or private industry (e.g. plantation and logging companies) in West New Britain. Social service provision in Kokoda being strengthened through the Kokoda Track initiative but still limited to areas around key Track sites.	All communities/ landowner groups involved in functioning community conservation areas enjoy documented improvement in at least two social service areas.	CAMC reports, final project evaluation.	Existing commitments to provide social service support from partners such as Steamships Ltd. And Digicel are maintained, and other partnerships can be established where needed.

4.4. Learned lessons from the conservation management systems developed under the project are incorporated into policy and regulations, and help improve management of the national PA system	Improvement in policy and regulatory structures for the national PA system and continued increase in management capacity.	To be established as part of CEPA structure	Project demonstrates tangible and quantifiable increase in systemic, institutional and technical capacities by end-project.	CEPA performance audit system for community conservation	<p>No external risk factors identified</p> <p>Project management to ensure commitment to participatory evaluation, and debrief to key stakeholders</p>
---	---	---	---	--	--

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

---

The project will make available the necessary documents to be reviewed by the evaluator, these include but are not limited to the following;

1. Project document,
2. Annual progress reports,
3. Annual work plans,
4. Signed CDRs
5. Budget revision documents,
6. Technical reports produced during the project implementation

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



## ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

<p><b><i>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&amp;E, I&amp;E Execution</i></b></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><b><i>Sustainability ratings:</i></b></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><b><i>Relevance ratings</i></b></p> <p>2. Relevant (R)  1.. Not relevant (NR)</p> <p><b><i>Impact Ratings:</i></b></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 Form<sup>4</sup>**

#### **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: \_\_\_\_\_

<sup>4</sup>[www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct](http://www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct)

## ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE<sup>5</sup>

---

- 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<sup>6</sup>)
- 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<sup>7</sup>)
- 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

---

<sup>5</sup>The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

<sup>6</sup> UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

<sup>7</sup> 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.

- 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**

*(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.

---

### UNDP/GEF PROJECT TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT AUDIT TRAIL

*Note:* The following is a template for the Final Evaluation Team to show how the received comments on the draft report have (or have not) been incorporated into the final report. This audit trail should be included as an annex in the final evaluation report.

**To the comments received on [Date of when comments received from UNDP and responded to by consultant] and [Name of Project, Project ID and Award ID]**

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

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

Prepared by:

Emily Fajardo, Technical Specialist, CEP/GEF/UNDP CbFCCRM Project

Approved by:

Edward Vrkic, UNDP Head of the Environment Portfolio and Senior Advisor on Climate Change