

TERMINAL EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE (NATIONAL CONSULTANT)

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 Sustainable Management of Biodiversity in Thailand's Production Landscape (PIMS #3642). The essentials of the project to be evaluated are as follows:

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	Sustainable Management of Biodiversity in Thailand's Production Landscape			
GEF Project ID:	3940 (GEF PMIS#)		<i>at endorsement</i> <i>(Million US\$)</i>	<i>at completion</i> <i>(Million US\$)</i>
UNDP Project ID:	3642 (UNDP PIMS#) 00077720 (UNDP Atlas ID)	GEF financing:	1,940,000	
Country:	Thailand	IA/EA own:	5,518,000	
Region:	Asia-Pacific	Government:		
Focal Area:	Biodiversity	Other:		
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	Mountain ecosystems (OP: Operational Programme); Mainstreaming biodiversity in production (SP: Strategic Priority)	Total co-financing:	5,518,000	
Executing Agency:	The Biodiversity-based Economy Development Office (BEDO)	Total Project Cost:	7,458,000	
Other Partners involved:		ProDoc Signature (date project began):		29 December 2011
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: 31 December 2015	Actual:

PURPOSE, OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE:

The Biodiversity-based Economy Development Office (BEDO) as a public organization was given the mandate of promoting conservation of biodiversity in production landscapes, improving local community knowledge of best practice for sustainable production and enhancing biodiversity-based economic development. The long-term challenges for BEDO is to ensure that Biodiversity conservation is mainstreamed into production and marketing of agricultural, forestry and fishery business, to create community incentives to conserve and enhance biodiversity in Thailand's land- and seascapes while maintaining appropriate incomes to satisfy family needs for livelihood and wellbeing.

There are three main barriers to achieve this: (i) At the national level, the institutional framework is not sufficiently capacitated to address the needs of an emerging biodiversity-based business sector, based on sustainable harvesting and production principles, (ii) At the community-level, sustainable production approaches and biodiversity conservation efforts are inadequate due to low incomes from present product categories, and (iii) Community revenues are limited due to low prices in the commodity market, as well as to high transaction costs in the supply chains.

The project aims to directly address these barriers through the three major outcomes of this project:

1. Building national capacity for support of Biodiversity Business
2. Piloting Community-based Social Enterprises (CbSE) in valuable Eco-regions
3. Mainstreaming Biodiversity Business into the supply chains of high-value consumer markets

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects.

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

The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

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

EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

An overall approach and 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

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

included with this TOR ([Annex C](#)). The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Thailand including the project sites in Prachinburi, Kanchanaburi, Ranong, Pang Nga Province.

Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

- Project Director
- Project Manager
- Representative of Responsible Parties, including Raks Thai Foundation and Thailand Environment Institute
- Field Officers
- Representatives from pilot communities
- Project Administrative Officer
- Project Financial Officer
- Members of Project Steering Committee
- UNDP Country Office in Bangkok in-charge of the ‘Sustainable Management of Biodiversity in Thailand’s Production Landscape’ Project.

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

EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see [Annex A](#)), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact**. Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in [Annex D](#).

Evaluation Ratings:			
1. Monitoring and Evaluation	rating	2. IA & EA Execution	rating
M&E design at entry		Quality of UNDP Implementation – Implementing Agency (IA)	

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

PROJECT FINANCE / COFINANCE

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

Co-financing (type/source)	UNDP own financing (mill. US\$)		Government (mill. US\$)		Partner Agency (mill. US\$)		Total (mill. US\$)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual
Grants								
Loans/Concessions								
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In-kind support 								
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other 								
Totals								

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](#)

IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Thailand. 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 25 days over a time period of 11 weeks according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Tentative Period
Preparation	4 days	5-8 October 2015
Evaluation Mission	12 days	1-12 November 2015
Draft Evaluation Report	7 days	17-23 November 2015
Final Report	2 days	17 -18 December 2015

EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
Inception Report	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission: 8 October 2015.	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
Presentation	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission: 12 November 2015.	To project management, UNDP CO
Draft Final Report	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 1.5 weeks of the evaluation mission: 23 November 2015.	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs
Final Report*	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft: 18 December 2015	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. See [Annex H](#) for an audit trail template.

TEAM COMPOSITION

The evaluation team will be composed of *an international and a national evaluator*. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The international evaluator will be designated as the team leader and 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.

A. INTERNATIONAL LEAD CONSULTANT

PROFILE

- Post-Graduate in environmental studies, development studies, social sciences and/ or other related fields.
- Minimum of ten years accumulated and recognized experience in biodiversity conservation and sustainable utilisation areas, and sustainable livelihoods
- Minimum of five years of project evaluation and/or implementation experience in the result-based management framework, adaptive management and UNDP or GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy
- Familiarity in similar country or regional situations relevant to that of ‘Sustainable Management of Biodiversity in Thailand’s Production Landscape’ Project
- Experience with multilateral and bilateral supported biodiversity conservation and sustainable utilisation projects
- Comprehensive knowledge of international biodiversity conservation and sustainable utilisation best practices
- Very good report writing skills in English

RESPONSIBILITIES

- Documentation review
- Leading the TE Team in planning, conducting and reporting on the evaluation
- Deciding on division of labor within the Team and ensuring timeliness of reports
- Use of best practice evaluation methodologies in conducting the evaluation
- Leading the drafting and finalization of the Inception Report for the Terminal Evaluation
- Leading presentation of the draft evaluation findings and recommendations in-country
- Conducting the de-briefing for the UNDP Country Office in Thailand and Core Project Management Team
- Leading the drafting and finalization of the Terminal Evaluation Report

B. NATIONAL CONSULTANT

PROFILE

- Post-graduate in environmental studies, development studies, social sciences and/ or other related fields
- At least ten years of project development and implementation
- Minimum of five years of project evaluation and/or implementation experience in the result-based management framework, adaptive management and UNDP or GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy
- Multilateral and bilateral funded project development and implementation
- Familiarity with Thailand national development policies, programs and projects

RESPONSIBILITIES

- Documentation review and data gathering
- Contributing to the development of the review plan and methodology
- Conducting those elements of the evaluation determined jointly with the international consultant and UNDP

- Contributing to presentation of the review findings and recommendations at the wrap-up meeting
- Contributing to the drafting and finalization of the review report

EVALUATOR ETHICS

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex E) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the [UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'](#).

PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

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

APPLICATION PROCESS

How to apply: Please access <http://jobs.undp.org> (By location>Asia and the Pacific> Environment and Energy for vacancy notification and apply through the website.

http://jobs.undp.org/cj_view_jobs.cfm?is_consult=1

UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators	Baseline	Target	Source of verification	Risks and assumptions
<p>Objective:</p> <p>To strengthen national and local capacity for mainstreaming biodiversity into the management of ecologically important production landscapes by transforming the supply and market chain of biodiversity based products.</p>	<p>1. The national governance system provides positive incentives and effective business facilitation and marketing support for biodiversity business development through BEDO and its partner network, demonstrated by:</p> <p>a. No. of enterprises for community-based biodiversity business assisted</p> <p>b. No and turnover from of commercial supply chain actors from project sites involved in marketing of sustainable biodiversity-based products in target markets</p>	<p>a. National framework for establishment of community enterprises based on local products in place via OTOP program</p> <p>b. BEDO has provided targeted support approx. 35 community enterprises, but with limited focus on mainstreaming</p> <p>c. Very few cases of systematic and comprehensive mainstreaming of biodiversity</p> <p>d. Limited focus on export markets for biodiversity business</p>	<p>At least 10 pilot products of community-based social enterprises (CbSE) supported in making high-value a) bamboo and other NTFP products, b) agricultural and horticultural products, c) marine products, d)</p> <p>tourism and recreation services successfully mainstreamed into the commercial markets</p> <p>- at least 5 of the pilot products successfully selling into national and export markets</p>	<p>Surveys of target sites</p>	<p>The private sector will see commercial advantages in supporting biodiversity business</p> <p>The producers will be able to produce high quality products in sufficient amount to attract interest from major actors in the market</p>

	<p>2. Community-based social enterprises and commercial supply chains for biodiversity-based products increases family income, biodiversity conservation incentives and market share of certified sustainable production in target areas, demonstrated by</p> <p>a. Percentage of certified sustainable bamboo, marine- and other biodiversity-based products produced from project sites (percentage of total product output)</p> <p>b. Percentage of CbSE revenue allocated for biodiversity conservation and rehabilitation</p>	<p>a. No certification schemes are currently in use in target sites.</p> <p>b. Interviews at target sites indicate Bt 5,000-10,000 per household/month derived from existing biodiversity-based products.</p> <p>c. No systematic community funding specifically allocated for biodiversity conservation.</p>	<p>a) At end-project at least 30% of total product output from target sites is certified sustainable.</p> <p>b) At end-project, percentage of household incomes derived from certified products averages at least 25%.</p> <p>c) At end-project at least 10% of net annual CbSE revenue allocated to conservation and rehabilitation activities.</p>	<p>Surveys of target sites</p>	<p>Success of the CbSE model does not result in purely commercial competitors attempting to hijack the markets created. (Free-rider risk)</p> <p>CbSEs are able to generate net profits within the project period.</p>
	<p>3. Increase in percentage of target landscapes and seascapes under community-based</p>	<p>Less than 2.5% land- and sea-scapes managed by target communities is under sustainable management.</p>	<p>By end-project at least 5% of land and sea-scape managed by target communities is under sustainable management.</p>	<p>Community-based monitoring reports from their production landscapes</p>	<p>External economic forces do not alter significantly to induce communities</p>

	sustainable management or co-management.				to convert or sell their land.
--	--	--	--	--	--------------------------------

Component 1: Building National Capacity for Support of Biodiversity Business

<p>Outcome 1.1 Institutional capacity and staff competences for national support to biodiversity business established.</p>	<p>1. Enabling national policies, laws and regulations introduced by appropriate government departments with respect to:</p> <p>a) land use rights for biodiversity business</p> <p>b) Community based Social Enterprise establishment and operation</p> <p>c) incentives for community-based biodiversity conservation</p>	<p>a. Overall policies, laws and regulations for biodiversity conservation and for mainstreaming of biodiversity business largely in place</p> <p>b. several unsolved conflicts about community land use rights not settled</p> <p>c. No regulation directly targeted to promote and facilitate CbSEs.</p>	<p>A comprehensive policy and regulatory framework for CbSEs is developed, and submitted to the relevant Government authorities.</p>	<p>Documentation of submissions to relevant Government authorities.</p>	<p>Departments and – subsequently – the parliament will agree to pass the proposed policy and regulatory framework.</p>
--	---	--	--	---	---

	2. BEDO has the institutional capacities, organizational structure and resources required to act as national biodiversity business facility to facilitate development of CbSEs, as measured by the Capacity Scorecard.	BEDO has been mandated in law and established, however institutional capacities for business facilitation are at the average level, as indicated in the Capacity Scorecard assessment.	The institutional capacity scores for business facilitation are raised 50% relation to baseline at end of project	Survey reports From evaluations	BEDO board is strongly motivated to create a biodiversity business facility.
	3. BEDO staff have the technical capacities (skills, technical qualifications and experience) needed by a biodiversity business facility, as measured by the Capacity Scorecard	Baseline technical capacities assessed as low to medium, as indicated in the Capacity Scorecard.	The staff Capacity Scores are raised 50% relation to baseline at end of project	Survey reports From evaluations	BEDO staff is both motivated and professional equipped to perform the tasks of a biodiversity business facility
Outcome 1.2: Collaboration with and capacities in Partner Networks of the Biodiversity Business Facility are strengthened	1. Through the Partner Network, BEDO has the capacity to assess market needs and demands, and to develop targeted solutions to issues such as sustainable harvesting, waste minimization and reuse,	Individual and ad-hoc analysis of various aspects of biodiversity business have been undertaken by partners, however no systematic and comprehensive analytical capacity.	By project mid-point, the Partner Network clearly demonstrates the capacity and willingness to partner with BEDO in identifying, analyzing and resolving sustainable production and market development	Mid-term evaluation assessment	Research institutions and other partners are willing to support BEDO and CbSE needs and to cooperate constructively in multi-disciplinary studies.

	low-impact packaging, etc.		issues identified in the development of CbSEs.		
	<p>2. Through the Partner Network, local communities and CbSEs have increased access to extension and business development services, as measured by:</p> <p>a. Number of community enterprises receiving support on sustainable harvesting and production</p> <p>b. Number of community enterprises receiving support for biodiversity business development and management</p> <p>c. Number of communities receiving support on biodiversity conservation and rehabilitation</p>	Limited collaboration mechanism among BEDO partners for providing extension services of biodiversity business development for CbSE	<p>Comprehensive and systematic collaboration mechanism with BEDO partners established to provide the extension services of biodiversity business development for CbSE</p>	Collaboration guidelines and minutes of meetings	Commitment of BEDO partners to strengthen collaboration on extension services

Component 2: Piloting Community-based Social Enterprises in Valuable Eco-regions					
Outcome 2.1: Community-based sustainable production and <i>in-situ</i> biodiversity conservation and rehabilitation is strengthened.	1. Appropriate methods for community-based monitoring of biodiversity status for data collection.	Inadequate system of biodiversity status collection of data conducted by community.	Appropriate system developed for community monitoring of biodiversity status by the end of second year. At least, 4 communities actively applied by the end of year 3.	Mid-term Review	Community engages in the development and implement of monitoring system.
	2. Number of biodiversity conservation and rehabilitation projects planned and implemented by communities using revenues derived from CbSEs.	No community-initiated conservation projects financed by CbSEs.	At end-project at least four conservation and/ or rehabilitation projects under way, financed by revenues from CbSEs.	Project monitoring reports.	CbSEs generate sufficient profits to finance conservation/ rehabilitation projects during project lifetime.
Outcome 2.2 : Pilot Models for Community-based Social Enterprises (CbSE) with Combined	1.a.CbSEs are using maximum sustainable yield as a benchmark to set production levels.	1. Existing community enterprises do not have capacity to assess maximum sustainable yield.	1. CbSE business plans incorporate maximum sustainable yield as a variable in setting production levels.	Business plans and reports of CbSEs.	Maximum sustainable yield levels can be easily approximated for all major products.

Objectives of Income generation, Sustainable Production and Biodiversity conservation are established.	1.b.Change in marginal revenue per unit of resource use.	2. Marginal revenue per unit of resource use varies depending on product.	2. Marginal revenue per unit of resource use increases by at least 10% on average across all product lines.		
	2. CbSE business plans and management strategies include explicit objectives to allocate net revenues for conservation and rehabilitation.	Existing community enterprises do not have specific objectives to allocate revenues for conservation or rehabilitation.	Every CbSE supported by the project has explicit objectives to allocate net revenues for conservation and rehabilitation.	CbSE business plans and marketing strategies.	CbSEs have transparent governance and accountability mechanisms.
Outcome 2.3: Human and technological capacities in producer communities are strengthened	1. CbSEs have the necessary skills and tools to produce products which meet the requirement for certification.	Community has basic skill in product development and productions.	CbSE in 4 communities are producing products which meet relevant certification standard	Data collected by BEDO (e.g. technical reports)	Community members have motivation and willingness to develop sufficient skill.
	2. CbSEs have a transparent and participatory governance mechanism.	Community enterprises have basic rule and regulation for governance.	Set governance mechanism which clearly includes participation, inclusiveness and gender parity.	CbSE rule and regulation.	Communities are aware of governance issue and willing to participate in the development of CbSE governance.
Component 3: Mainstreaming Biodiversity Business into the Supply Chains of High-value Consumer Markets					

<p>Outcome 3.1: Demand-driven design and branding of high-value products</p>	<p>1. Mainstreaming of high-value products from biodiversity businesses is increased through development of appropriate products designs, focused on niche-markets of lifestyle consumers in Thailand and selected export markets, as demonstrated by number of CbSE products successfully designed, branded for introduction into target markets</p>	<p>Present community-based products are designed for local markets with little coherence with high-value consumer demand</p>	<p>a. At least 50% of CbSE products are designed for high-value consumer markets</p> <p>b. 25% of the products from pilot communities are successfully introduced into high-value markets</p>	<p>Data collected by BEDO (e.g. technical reports)</p>	<p>The CbSE products' design are protected by Intellectual Property (Copy Right) to prevent plagiarism.</p>
	<p>2. Quality and value of CbSE products have been increased and meet BEDO certification standard for selected markets</p>	<p>No certified CbSE products in the pilot sites</p>	<p>80% of BEDO certified products recognised by and 20% endorsed by other relevant certifications e.g. FDA, Community Product Industrial standard (ชุมชน)</p>	<p>Data collected by BEDO (e.g. technical reports)</p>	<p>Risks of pollution and contamination can be monitored and mitigated.</p>

<p>Outcome 3.2: Reduction of transaction costs through transformation in the supply chains</p>	<p>Transformation of supply chains have been demonstrated in relation to products from the target regions, as demonstrated by optimum of alternative supply chains provided.</p>	<p>No data on optimum alternative supply chains available for project sites</p> <p>The wholesale and retail actors keep the majority of value added</p>	<p>a. At least 50% of the pilot cases have introduced optimum alternative supply chains to increase gate revenue;</p> <p>b. Transaction costs are reduced in comparison to the existing transaction costs</p>	<p>Reports from project evaluations</p>	<p>Private Sector is positive to collaborate to provide optimum alternative supply chains</p>
<p>Outcome 3.3: Increased investment and subsidy options for Community-based Social Enterprises</p>	<p>1. Appropriate investment options for pilot CbSE's have been identified, as demonstrated by</p> <p>a) No. of dedicated investment windows in public and private sector</p> <p>b) No. of non-profit social and environmental investment funds</p>	<p>Numerous public and private investment facilities available but not dedicated to small-scaled investment for CbSE's</p>	<p>80% of finance needs for pilot CbSE's are being met</p>	<p>Data collected by BEDO (e.g. technical reports)</p>	<p>Sufficient community capacity for investment management</p> <p>Communities are willing to make investment for CbSE</p>

	<p>1.Amount of Subsidies raised for pilot CbSE's in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Government subsidies; • Local Government Organisations; • Private Sector (CSR); • Not-for-Profit organisations/ Foundations <p>2.No. Of projects from increased CSR collaborations on CbSE and biodiversity conservation in the target areas</p>	<p>There are several national and local subsidy schemes provided by government and not-for-profit organisations</p> <p>There is limited collaboration with CSR on CbSE and biodiversity conservation and rehabilitation in the target areas</p>	<p>10% of costs for biodiversity conservation activities are supported via Government and NGO subsidy programs</p> <p>At least 4 projects from CSR collaboration in the target areas</p>	<p>Data collected by BEDO (e.g. technical reports)</p>	<p>Sources of fund from different agencies are available and accessible</p> <p>Private Sector is willing to engage CbSE and biodiversity conservation into their CSR agenda</p>
<p>Outcome 3.4: Strengthened awareness about commercial potentials in biodiversity business.</p>	<p>Types of IEC³ Materials on the potential of CbSE for biodiversity business for general public</p>	<p>There is limited awareness, campaigns, advocacy, on the potential of CbSE for biodiversity business</p>	<p>IEC Materials developed in the form of print, audio-visual, internet</p> <p>At least 0.5% of the total communities across the country have contacted BEDO</p>	<p>IEC Materials</p>	<p>Project partners and stakeholders are willing to disseminate IEC Materials.</p>

³ IEC = Information, Education, and Communication

			for support for possible replication		
--	--	--	---	--	--

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

GEF Project Information Form (PIF), Project Document, and Log Frame Analysis (LFA)

Project Implementation Plan

Implementing/Executing partner arrangements

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

Project sites, highlighting suggested visits

Mid Term Review (MTR) Report

Annual Project Implementation (APR/PIR) Reports

Project budget and financial data

Project Tracking Tool, at baseline, at mid-term, and at terminal points

UNDP Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF)

UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD)

UNDP Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP)

GEF focal area strategic program objectives

ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

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

For the sample evaluation criterial matrix, please refer to Annex 4 of the TE Guidance <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/UNDP-GEF-TE-Guide.pdf>

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"> • Is the project relevant to UNCBD and other international convention objectives? 	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the project relevant the GEF biodiversity focal area? 	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the project relevant to Thailand’s environment and sustainable development objectives? 	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the project addressing the needs of target beneficiaries at the local and regional levels? 	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the project internally coherent in its design? 	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How is the project relevant with respect to other donor-supported activities? 	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the project provide relevant lessons and experiences for other similar projects in the future? 	•	•	•
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the project been effective in achieving the expected outcomes and objectives? 	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How is risk and risk mitigation being managed? 	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What lessons can be drawn regarding effectiveness for other similar projects in the future? 		•	•

Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?			
• Was project support provided in an efficient way?	•	•	•
• How efficient are partnership arrangements for the project	•	•	•
• Did the project efficiently utilize local capacity in implementation?	•	•	•
• What lessons can be drawn regarding efficiency for other similar projects in the future?	•	•	•
• Effectiveness: To what extent have/ will the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been/be achieved?	•	•	•
• Has the project been effective in achieving the expected outcomes and objectives?	•	•	•
• How is risk and risk mitigation being managed?	•	•	•
• What lessons can be drawn regarding effectiveness for other similar projects in the future?	•	•	•
• Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?	•	•	•
• Was project support provided in an efficient way?	•	•	•
• How efficient are partnership arrangements for the project?	•	•	•
• Did the project efficiently utilize local capacity in implementation	•	•	•
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
• Were interventions designed to have sustainable results given the identifiable risks?	•	•	•
• What issues emerged during implementation as a threat to sustainability?	•	•	•
• Are there social or political risks that may threaten the sustainability of project outcomes?	•	•	•

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there ongoing activities that pose an environmental threat to the sustainability of project outcomes? 	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have the entities/people that will carry on the project been identified and prepared? 	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there evidence financial resources are committed to support project results after the project has closed? 	•	•	•
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"> • Has the project made verifiable environmental improvements? 	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the project made verifiable reductions in stress on environmental systems? 	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the project demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements? 	•	•	•

ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

<p><i>Ratings for Effectiveness, Efficiency, Overall Project Outcome Rating, M&E, IA & EA Execution</i></p> <p>6. Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings 5. Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings 4. Moderately Satisfactory (MS): moderate shortcomings 3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings 2. Unsatisfactory (U): major shortcomings 1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe shortcomings</p>	<p><i>Sustainability ratings:</i></p> <p>4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks</p>	<p><i>Relevance ratings</i></p> <p>2. Relevant (R) 1. Not relevant (NR)</p>
<p><i>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 Form⁴

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: _____

⁴www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE⁵

- 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 Manual⁶)
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 rated⁷)
- 3.1 Project Design / Formulation
 - Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)
 - Assumptions and Risks
 - Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design
 - Planned stakeholder participation
 - Replication approach
 - UNDP comparative advantage
 - Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
 - Management arrangements
- 3.2 Project Implementation
 - Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
 - Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)
 - Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management

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

⁶ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

⁷ See Annex D for rating scales.

- Project Finance
- Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry (*), implementation (*), and overall assessment (*)
- Implementing Agency (UNDP) execution (*) and Executing Agency execution (*), overall project implementation/ execution (*), coordination, and operational issues

3.3 Project Results

- Overall results (attainment of objectives) (*)
- Relevance (*)
- Effectiveness (*)
- Efficiency (*)
- Country ownership
- Mainstreaming
- Sustainability: financial resources (*), socio-economic (*), institutional framework and governance (*), environmental (*), and overall likelihood (*)
- Impact

4. Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons

- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
- Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
- Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
- Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success

5. Annexes

- ToR
- Itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- Summary of field visits
- List of documents reviewed
- Evaluation Question Matrix
- Questionnaire used and summary of results
- Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form
- Report Clearance Form
- *Annexed in a separate file:* TE audit trail
- *Annexed in a separate file:* Terminal GEF Tracking Tool

ANNEX G: EVALUATION REPORT CLEARANCE FORM

(to be completed by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and included in the final document)

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

UNDP GEF RTA

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

ANNEX H: TE REPORT AUDIT TRAIL

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

To the comments received on (date) from the Terminal Evaluation of (project name) (UNDP PIMS #)

The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft Terminal Evaluation 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