

## TERMINAL EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

### PROJECT TERMINAL EVALUATION INDEPENDENT EVALUATOR (NATIONAL)

#### INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These Terms of Reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the *Strengthening Marine Protected Areas to Conserve Marine Key Biodiversity Areas in the Philippines* (PIMS# 4389)

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

#### PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	Strengthening Marine Protected Areas to Conserve Marine Key Biodiversity Areas in the Philippines			
Atlas Award ID / Project ID:	00076994		<u>at endorsement</u> <u>(Million US\$)</u>	<u>at completion</u> <u>(Million US\$)</u>
PIMS ID:	4389			
Output ID:	00088065	GEF financing:	8,000,000.00	8,000,000.00
Country:	Philippines	IA/EA own:	1,500,000.00	1,500,000.00
Region:	Asia	Government:	16,853,171.00	16,853,171.00
Focal Area:	Biodiversity	Other:	7,480,319.00	7,480,319.00
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	BD-1-1 Mainstreaming biodiversity across sectors as well as landscapes and seascapes through biodiversity mainstreaming in priority sectors  UNDP Strategic Plan Output 1.4.1 Solutions scaled up for sustainable management of natural resources, including	Total co-financing:	25,833,490.00	25,833,490.00

	sustainable commodities and green and inclusive value chains			
Executing Agency:	UNDP	Total Project Cost:	33,833,490.00	33,833,490.00
Other Partners involved:	Department of Environment and Natural Resources - Biodiveristy Management Bureau (DENR-BMB), Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources (BFAR), Conservation International Philippines (CIP), Fishbase Information Network (FIN), HARIBON Foundation, Kabang Kalikasan ng Pilipinas (WWF Philippines), RARE Philippines, UP Marine Science Institute, and local government units	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		August 2014 (NEDA) April 2014 (UNDP)
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: August 2019	Actual: July 2020

## OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

---

The project was designed to accelerate the establishment of Marine Protected Areas (MPA) and MPA Networks to include more marine key biodiversity areas (KBAs) in order to reduce and arrest the rapid degradation of marine and coastal habitats.

In this regard, the project directly addresses these barriers through an integrated approach aimed at strengthening the conservation, protection and management of key marine biodiversity areas in the Philippines. This will be achieved through partnerships with key national government agencies, national and local conservation NGOs and LGUs. Three major outcomes are derived from this approach:

**Outcome 1:** Conservation effectiveness of existing and new MPAs/MPANs is enhanced through improvements in spatial coverage and representativeness (particularly coverage of under-represented KBAs), strengthening of the national system for MPA identification, designation and management under the NIPAS legislative framework, and quantifiable improvements in management of at least 10% of identified Marine KBAs nationwide, with concomitant increases in local stakeholder participation and support.

**Outcome 2:** Financial resources available for the management of MPAs and MPANs are sufficient to meet all critical management needs and are growing in line with the expansion of the MPA system. Sources of revenue for MPA management are being progressively diversified, with the percentage of revenue being derived from Government fiscal sources declining to less than 50% by end- project.

**Outcome 3:** A comprehensive policy framework in place and effectively implemented for the conservation, protection and management of the country’s marine ecosystems and fishery resources, that harmonizes mandates, plans and activities amongst all key MPA stakeholders including BMB, BFAR and relevant Local Government Units.

The Project is being managed by the Biodiversity Management Bureau (BMB, formerly PAWB) which has established a Project Management Unit (PMU) to implement certain outputs and coordinate the work of partners in pilot sites. Below is the project summary.

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 ([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 counterpart and Project partners, including non-government organizations (NGOs), People’s Organizations (POs), provincial and municipal Local Government Units (LGUs) and private sector. Table 1 below lists down specific offices and organizations which are to provide feedback on Project implementation through Key Informant Interviews and/or Focus Group Discussions (FGDs).

Table 1. SMARTSEAS PH Project Partners

---

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

Agency Categories	Specific Agencies
National Government Agencies (NGAs)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Office of the Undersecretary for Mining Concerns and Climate Change, GEF Operational Focal Point</li> <li>2. DENR Central Office – Policy and Planning Service</li> <li>3. DENR Central Office – Foreign Assisted and Special Projects Service</li> <li>4. Biodiversity Management Bureau (BMB) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Offices of the Director and Assistant Director</li> <li>- Biodiversity Policy and Knowledge Management Division</li> <li>- Coastal and Marine Division</li> </ul> </li> <li>5. Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources</li> <li>6. National Economic and Development Authority – Agriculture and Natural Resources Staff (NEDA-ANRES)</li> <li>7. Department of the Interior and Local Government (DILG)</li> </ol>
Local NGA Offices	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. DENR Regional Offices (regions IV-A, IV-B, VII, XI and CARAGA)</li> <li>2. Provincial Environment and Natural Resource Office (PENRO)</li> <li>3. Community Environment and Natural Resource Office (CENRO)</li> <li>4. BFAR Regional Office</li> <li>5. BFAR Provincial Fishery Office</li> </ol>
Provincial and municipal LGUs <sup>2</sup>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Batangas Province and LGUs (Balayan, Batangas City, Lobo, Mabini, Nasugbu, San Juan)</li> <li>2. Oriental Mindoro and LGUs (Calapan City, Gloria, Naujan, Pinamalayan, Pola, Puerto Galera)</li> <li>3. Occidental Mindoro and LGUs (Lubang, Looc, Abra de Ilog, Paluan)</li> <li>4. Palawan Province and LGUs (Aborlan, Narra, Sofronio Espanola, Brooke’s Point , Bataraza)</li> <li>5. Negros Oriental and LGUs (San Carlos City, Tayasan, Bindoy, Manjuyod, Ayungon, Amlan, Bais City, Guihulngan City, La Libertad, San Jose)</li> <li>6. Negros Occidental and LGUs (Calatrava, Toboso)</li> </ol>

<sup>2</sup> The identification of local government units to be visited will be finalized during the inception meeting

Agency Categories	Specific Agencies
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7. Cebu Province and LGUs (Alegria, Aloguinsan, Badian, Bantayan, Ginatilan, Moalboal, Samboan, Sta. Fe, Santander, San Remegio</li> <li>8. Davao City</li> <li>9. Davao de Sur Province and LGUs (Sta. Cruz)</li> <li>10. Davao del Norte Province and LGUs (Island Garden City of Samal, City of Panabo, Tagum City)</li> <li>11. Compostela Valley Province and LGUs (Mabini, Maco)</li> <li>12. Davao Oriental Province and LGUs (Lupon, San Isidro)</li> <li>13. Surigao del Sur Province and LGUs (Carrascal, Cantilan, Lanuza, Cortes, Tandag City)</li> </ol>
Local Responsible Partners	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Conservation International Philippines (CIP)</li> <li>2. National Fisheries Research and Development Institute (NFRDI)</li> <li>3. Fishbase Information Network (FIN)</li> <li>4. HARIBON Foundation</li> <li>5. Kabang Kalikasan ng Pilipinas (WWF Philippines)</li> <li>6. RARE Philippines</li> <li>7. UP Marine Science Institute</li> </ol>
Other Local Partners	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. VIP MPAN and LEN Technical Working Group</li> <li>2. Palawan Council for Sustainable Development</li> <li>3. TSPS Protected Area Office</li> <li>4. Davao Integrated Development Program (DIDP)</li> <li>5. Lanuza Bay Development Alliance</li> </ol>
Partner People's Organizations <sup>3</sup>	

List of Stakeholders to be presented of the result of evaluation by the consultant

1. Project Management Unit
2. Biodiversity Management Bureau
3. United Nations Development Programme
4. Evaluation Review Group (i.e. NEDA-ANRES, DENR Policy and Planning, DENR FASPO, BMB - CMD, BFAR, PEMSEA, PCSD, DILG)
5. DENR-SMARTSeas Project Board

<sup>3</sup> The identification of people's organization to be interviewed will be finalized during the inception meeting

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](#).

<b>Evaluation Ratings:</b>			
<b>1. Monitoring and Evaluation</b>	<i>rating</i>	<b>2. IA&amp; EA Execution</b>	<i>rating</i>
M&E design at entry		Quality of UNDP Implementation	
M&E Plan Implementation		Quality of Execution - Executing Agency	
Overall quality of M&E		Overall quality of Implementation / Execution	
<b>3. Assessment of Outcomes</b>	<i>rating</i>	<b>4. Sustainability</b>	<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	Actual	Actual
Grants								
Loans/Concessions								

• In-kind support	1,500,000.00		16,853,171.00		7,480,319.00		25,833,490.00	
• Other								
Totals	1,500,000.00		16,853,171.00		7,480,319.00		25,833,490.00	

## 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>4</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 the Philippines. 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 38 days spread over 4 months according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparations for the TE Team (handover of Project Documents)	1 day	March 3, 2020
Document review and preparing TE Inception Report	3 days	March 6-8, 2020
Finalization and Validation of TE Inception Report- latest start of TE mission		

<sup>4</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](#)

TE mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits	21 days	March 3 - 28, 2020
Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of TE mission - Presentation of initial findings to PMU, UNDP CO, DENR Policy and Planning, Foreign Assisted and Special Projects Services (FASPS) and BMB representatives	1 day	April 12, 2020
Preparing draft TE report (incorporate feedbacks during audit trail into draft report)  Produce a final draft of the TE; Presentation of initial findings to PMU, UNDP CO, DENR Policy and Planning, Foreign Assisted and Special Projects Services (FASPS) and BMB representatives	10 days	April 17-28, 2020
Presentation of the final draft report to PMU, UNDP CO and DENR BMB representatives	1 day	May 4, 2020
Presentation of the final TE Report to the Project Board	1 day	May 22, 2020

## 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.	Inception Report presented to PMU, UNDP CO and BMB representatives
<b>1<sup>st</sup> Presentation</b>	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission	Initial findings presented to PMU, UNDP CO PMU, DENR Policy and Planning, Foreign Assisted and Special Projects Services (FASPS) BMB representatives, and ERG members.
<b>Draft Final Report</b>	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission	Draft Final Report presented to PMU, UNDP CO, DENR Policy and Planning, Foreign Assisted and Special Projects Services (FASPS) and BMB



			representatives and other Evaluation Reference Group (ERG) members  Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs
<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Presentation</b>	<b>Draft Final Report</b>	1 week after the preparation of the draft final report	Draft Final Report presented to DENR-PPS, DENR-FASPS, DENR-BMB, UNDP, and ERG members
<b>Final Report*</b>	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Final Report presented to the Project Board; signed-off by PMU, BMB, CO and RTA  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**

A team of two independent consultants will conduct the TE - one team leader (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions globally) and one team expert, from the Philippines. The consultants must not have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project's related activities.

The team expert who will be the national consultant will have the following qualities:

<b>Qualifications</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<i>Education</i> Advanced degree in Environment and Natural Resources Management (ENRM), Environmental Planning or Resource Economics, or other closely related field	10
<i>Experience</i> At least 10 years of experience in natural resource economics or accounting preferably in marine protected areas or fisheries management;	20
At least 10 years of experience in the implementation of protected area management, MPA financing sustainability, MPA system wide planning and monitoring, and capacity building for MPA management.	20
Demonstrated experience in conducting international development evaluations; prior experience in GEF Project evaluations would be an advantage;	15
Demonstrated strong knowledge of Monitoring and Evaluation methods for development projects; knowledge of UNDP's results-based management orientation and practices;	15

Familiarity with biodiversity conservation issues in the Philippines;	10
<i>Language</i> Fluency in the English language and excellent oral and written communication skills.	10
TOTAL	100

The National Consultant will primarily support the International Consultant, the Team Leader, in the conduct of the evaluation mission. S/he is expected to do the tasks but not limited to the following:

1. Assist the team leader and provide inputs in the preparation of the TE Inception Report and Mid-term Evaluation Report;
2. Assist in the conduct of the evaluation mission especially in the gathering and analysis of data and information;
3. Provide the national context in the analysis of SMARTSeas’ results and accomplishments; and
4. Provide recommendations for improvement considering the national context where SMARTSeas operates.

The Evaluation Team is expected to discuss among themselves their detailed division of work and should be clearly articulated in the TE Inception Report.

The National Consultant will coordinate with the Team Leader (International Consultant). The UNDP CO and PMU will provide support to the development of the evaluation work plan in consultation with key project partners. The project team (PMU) will serve as the reference group for the evaluation and ensure the monitoring of satisfactory completion of evaluation deliverables.

SMARTSeas PH PMU will provide office space and access to office services such as, Internet and printing. Evaluator/s should provide their own computer and communications equipment.

In consultation with the Evaluation Team and as requested, the PMU personnel will make available all relevant documentation and provide contact information to key project partners and stakeholders, and facilitate contact where needed. The team will also assist in organizing any briefing de-briefing meetings including coordination of stakeholders’ input in the evaluation draft 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**

Consultants will be contracted by UNDP and remunerated according to the reviewed and accepted financial proposal. The contract will be output-based and payment issued only upon delivery of satisfactory outputs/milestones.

%	Milestone
10%	Upon submission and approval of the TE Mission Inception Report
40%	Upon submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report
50%	Upon submission and approval of (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report and audit trail.

**APPLICATION PROCESS**

---

Applicants are requested to apply online (<http://www.undp.org.ph.jobs>) . Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions.

The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in English with indication of the e-mail and phone contact. Shortlisted candidates will be requested to submit a price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs).

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

## ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

INDICATOR	BASELINE	END OF PROJECT TARGETS (2020)	SOURCE OF INFORMATION	OF RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS	
<p><b>Project Objective<sup>5</sup></b></p> <p>Strengthening the Conservation, Protection and Management of Key Marine Biodiversity Areas in the Philippines</p>	<p>Number of Marine Key Biodiversity Areas in the Philippines included in the PA System (IUCN Categories I – VI)</p>	<p>53/123 MKBAs</p>	<p>At least 66 out of the 123 MKBAs in Philippines are included in the PA System (IUCN Categories I – VI)</p>	<p>BMB report and database</p> <p>MSN report/database</p> <p>NBSAP</p> <p>Country (Philippines) report to CBD</p>	<p><b>Risks</b></p> <p>Shift in national and local priorities will not be supportive of MPA/MPANs</p> <p>Extreme climate and geological events</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <p>Proposed budget allocation for SCREMP is released every year until 2020</p> <p>Partner agencies and institutions cooperate and coordinate well their interventions and activities.</p>
<p>Areas in the Philippines</p>	<p>Percent increase in Fish biomass of commercially important species</p>	<p>Siganidae, Acanthuridae and Serranidae.</p> <p>Acanthuridae -2.58 kg 500m-2 (±0.33)</p> <p>Serranidae – 0.35 kg 500m-2 (±0.05)</p> <p>Siganidae -0.56 kg 500m-2 (±0.10)</p> <p>For TSPS,</p> <p>Acanthuridae -3.77 kg 500m-2 (±0.68)</p> <p>Serranidae – 0.59 kg 500m-2 (±0.11)</p> <p>Siganidae -0.44 kg 500m-2 (±0.10)</p> <p>For VIP</p> <p>Acanthuridae -0.56 kg 500m-2 (±0.08)</p>	<p>5% increase in fish biomass of at least 3 commercially important species.</p>	<p>MSN report and database</p> <p>Site resource monitoring reports</p> <p>FIN data on fish diversity</p>	<p>Partner agencies and institutions cooperate and coordinate well their interventions and activities.</p>

<sup>5</sup> Objective (Atlas output) monitored quarterly ERBM and annually in APR/PIR

INDICATOR	BASELINE	END OF PROJECT TARGETS (2020)	SOURCE INFORMATION	OF RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS
	<p>Serranidae – 0.09 kg 500m-2 (±0.02) Siganiidae -0.19 kg 500m-2 (±0.06)</p> <p>For Southern Palawan</p> <p>Acanthuridae -1.66 kg 500m-2 (±0.74) Serranidae – 0.23 kg 500m-2 (±0.08) Siganiidae -0.49 kg 500m-2 (±0.07)</p> <p>For Lanuza Bay</p> <p>Acanthuridae -2.06 kg 500m-2 (±0.65) Serranidae – 0.55 kg 500m-2 (±0.15) Siganiidae -0.22 kg 500m-2 (±0.11)</p> <p>For Davao Gulf</p> <p>Acanthuridae -1.96 kg 500m-2 (±0.45) Serranidae – 0.18 kg 500m-2 (±0.03) Siganiidae -0.81kg 500m-2 (±0.23)</p>			
Level of water pollution levels in Verde Island Passage, Lanuza Bay, Davao Gulf, Southern Palawan and Tanon Strait	Baselines to be established in Year 1 <sup>69</sup>	Reduction in pollution level against the baseline levels. Targets to be agreed in Year 1.	Project reports Community-based water monitoring records.	

INDICATOR	BASELINE	END OF PROJECT TARGETS (2020)	SOURCE OF INFORMATION	RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS
Protected Seascape.				
Presence of large marine vertebrates (e.g. Marine mammals, reptiles, sharks)	<p>Lanuza Bay:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Green sea turtle (Chelonia mydas)</li> <li>2. Hawksbill turtle (Eretmochelys imbricata)</li> <li>3. Whale shark (Rhincodon typus)</li> </ol> <p>Davao Gulf:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Green sea turtle (Chelonia mydas)</li> <li>2. Hawksbill turtle (Eretmochelys imbricata)</li> <li>3. Dugong dugon</li> <li>4. Spinner dolphin (Stenella longirostris)</li> <li>5. Gray's spinner dolphin (S.I. longirostris)</li> <li>6. Short-finned pilot whales (Globicephala macrorhynchus)</li> </ol> <p>TSPS</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Dwarf Sperm whale (Kogia sima)</li> <li>2. Bottlenose dolphin (Tursiops truncatus)</li> </ol>	No net decrease in sightings of large marine vertebrates.	Project reports Community-based dolphin monitoring records	

INDICATOR	BASELINE	END OF PROJECT TARGETS (2020)	SOURCE INFORMATION	OF RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS
	3. Short-finned pilot whales (Globicephala macrorhynchus) VIP 1. Green sea turtle (Chelonia mydas) 2. Hawksbill turtle (Eretmochelys imbricata) 3. Dwarf Sperm whale (Kogia sima) 4. Bottlenose dolphin (Tursiops truncatus) 5. Spinner dolphin (Stenella longirostris)			
<b>Outcome 1<sup>6</sup></b> Increased Management Effectiveness of Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) and MPA Networks (MPANs)	<b>Outputs:</b> 1.1 New MPA Networks (NPANs) established in designated priority areas. 1.2 Management improved at least 95 existing MPAs through the development and effective implementation of local government or community-based MPA management plans. 1.3 MPA and MPAN management structures institutionalized in Southern Palawan, Verde Island Passage, Lanuza Bay, Davao Gulf. 1.4 Increased capacity in Marine Protected Area Management with Capacity Development Scorecards incorporated into management planning and monitor processes for MPAs/MPANs at all five target sites. 1.5 At least 20% increase in LGUs or local partners support in each target site in terms of funding or other tangible support for capacity building on marine conservation, MPA management, ecological monitoring or related activities at site level.			
	Coverage of IUCN Category V Protected Landscape PAs in the 5 target sites	518,221 ha (Tanon Strait Protected Seascape)	At least 959,489.2 hectares more will be placed under PA or IUCN Category	BMB report and database  MSN report/database  NBSAP  Country (Philippines) report to CBD

<sup>6</sup> All outcomes monitored annually in the APR/PIR. It is highly recommended not to have more than 4 outcomes.

INDICATOR	BASELINE	END OF PROJECT TARGETS (2020)	SOURCE OF INFORMATION	RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS
METT Scores in each of Lanuza Bay, Tanon Strait Protected Seascape, Southern Palawan, VIP and Davao Gulf target sites	Lanuza Bay– 48% TSPS – 40% Southern Palawan – 40% VIP 29% Davao Bay – 48%	Lanuza Bay– 58% TSPS – 50% Southern Palawan – 50% VIP 39% Davao Bay - 58%	METT PA assessment scorecards	
METT Scores in each of the selected 95 MPAs targeted by Management Plan development and implementation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Batangas Carerahan Fish Sanctuary and Reserve 38</li> <li>2. Batangas Nalayag Point Fish Refuge and Sanctuary 68</li> <li>3. Batangas Pulong Bato Fishery Refuge and Sanctuary 68</li> <li>4. Batangas Sinisian Marine Protected Area 38</li> <li>5. Batangas Sawang/Olo-Olo Fish Sanctuary 64</li> <li>6. Batangas Malabrigo Fishery Refuge and Sanctuary 62</li> <li>7. Batangas Biga Fishery Sanctuary 43</li> </ol>	At least 25% increase in management effectiveness scores using METT of 95 MPAs	METT PA assessment scorecards	



INDICATOR	BASELINE	END OF PROJECT TARGETS (2020)	SOURCE INFORMATION	OF RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS
		8. Batangas Punta Fuego Sanctuary 37 9. Batangas Hugom Marine Sanctuary 63 10. Oriental Mindoro Ranzo Fish Sanctuary 54 11. Romblon Yabawon Fish Sanctuary 60 12. Palawan Sto. Niño Fish Sanctuary 14 13. Palawan Gosong Fish Sanctuary 13 14. Palawan Sapah and Sarimburawan Fish Sanctuary 22 15. Palawan Maasin Fish Sanctuary 24 16. Negros Oriental Bolisong Marine Protected Area 32 17. Negros Oriental Bala-as Marine Protected Area 32 18. Negros Oriental Campuyo Marine Protected Area 33		

INDICATOR	BASELINE	END OF PROJECT TARGETS (2020)	SOURCE INFORMATION	OF RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS
		19. Negros Occidental Sagahan Marine Protected Area 28		
		20. Cebu Ginatilan Marine Sanctuary 59		
		21. Cebu Colase Fish Sanctuary 54		
		22. Davao City Punta Dumalag Marine Protected Area 45		
		23. Davao City Agdao Centro Fish Sanctuary (Davao City) 33		
		24. Davao City Lasang-Bunawan Marine Protected Area (Davao City) 34		
		25. Davao City Vicente Hizon Sr. Marine Protected Area (Davao City) 61		
		26. Davao de Sur Bato Marine Protected Area 57		
27. Davao del Norte Cogon				

INDICATOR	BASELINE	END OF PROJECT TARGETS (2020)	SOURCE INFORMATION	OF RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS
		Fish Sanctuary 60 28. Davao del Norte Dapia Marine Sanctuary 58 29. Davao del Norte Linosutan Coral Garden Marine Protected Area 60 30. Davao del Norte Dadatan and Mansud Coral Garden Marine Protected Area 60 31. Davao del Norte Camudmud Marine Protected Area 60 32. Davao del Norte Cagangohan Fish Santuary 35 33. Davao del Norte Liboganon Fish Sanctuary (Tagum City) 40 34. Compostela Valley Mabini Protected Landscape and Sescap (NIPAS) 50		

INDICATOR	BASELINE	END OF PROJECT TARGETS (2020)	SOURCE INFORMATION	OF RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS
		35. Davao Oriental Lupon Fish Sanctuary 62 36. Surigao del Sur Adlay Marine Protected Area 59 37. Surigao del Sur Carrascal Marine Protected Area 59 38. Surigao del Sur General Island Marine Protected Area 55 39. Surigao del Sur Ayoke Marine Protected Area 54 40. Surigao del Sur San Pedro Marine Protected Area 12 41. Surigao del Sur Poblacion Fish Sanctuary 63 42. Surigao del Sur Tag-anongan Fish Sanctuary 63 43. Surigao del Sur Mabahin Fish Sanctuary 65 44. Surigao del Sur Tigao Fish Sanctuary 65		

INDICATOR	BASELINE	END OF PROJECT TARGETS (2020)	SOURCE OF INFORMATION	OF RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS
	45. Surigao del Sur Balibadon Fish Sanctuary 65 46. Surigao del Sur Buenavista Marine Protected Area 47 47. Surigao del Sur Mabua Marine Protected Area 48			
	Number of gender and IP sensitive MPA/MPAN management plan formulated and implemented	0. There are draft management plans that have not been approved and implemented in 4 of the proposed project sites (VIP, Tanon, Davao Gulf and Lanuza Bay)	At least four MPA networks with gender and IP sensitive management plans developed and jointly implemented	Project site reports
	Average increase in technical and management capacity scores in the 5 target MPA networks	Capacity scorecard – Tanon and Lanuza: 18 out 45; VIP: 19; Southern Palawan: 14, Average of 17.5 out of 45	20% average increase in capacity score cards of the 5 target MPA networks by 2016 and 35% average increase by 2018	Project reports & UNDP Capacity Scorecard applied at Mid-Term and Final Evaluation
<b>Outcome 2</b> Improved Financial Sustainability of MPAs and MPANs	<b>Outputs:</b> 2.1 Benchmark management costs established for MPAs of varying size (<5 ha, < 50ha, <250ha, >250 ha) and potential cost savings or cost efficiencies on average per site identified through consolidation of management functions in MPANs. 2.2 At least two MPANS (Verde Island Passage and Davao Gulf) implementing financing and business plans targeting increases in revenue generation from the tourism and fisheries sectors. 2.3 At least 5 of locally managed MPA in each of five sites have revenue generation schemes in operation, including market-based visitor and service fees for tourism operators, pilot ecological service payments from the fisheries sector and local taxes for conservation and management of key tourism draws. (Field level activity). 2.4 MPA financing plans developed and piloted in at least 30% of MPAs in each of five sites, incorporating governance mechanisms to ensure participatory management of revenues and resources involving local communities, local government and national government agencies as appropriate. (Field level activity).			

INDICATOR	BASELINE	END OF PROJECT TARGETS (2020)	SOURCE OF INFORMATION	OF RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS
Financial resources for conservation and management of MPAs in five project sites	Funding Gap present. <sup>7</sup> Baseline to be established in Year 2 <sup>8</sup>	At least 25 MPAs (5 MPAs in each site) have income from various sources that covers the recurrent costs as defined by financing plans	Financial and business plans; Receipts and other proof of payment (landing fees, auxiliary invoice, user fees, entry fees); Approved regulations or business procedures; MOAs etc.	RISKS : Major calamity or disaster impacting on local economies; change in priority development projects in sites; political climate and peace and order condition prevents co-management and collaboration ASSUMPTIONS: sustained interest in MPAs and MPANs as management interventions from national and local governments
Percentage of MPA funding coming from sources other than government budgets	All funding disaggregated into local government, central government	50% of income from sources other than government budgets by 2018		
Number of MPAs with participatory multi-stakeholder systems in place to oversee utilization of MPA funds and revenues include women and IPs where appropriate	0	At least 30 participating MPAs have participatory multi stakeholder systems including women and IPs where appropriate with oversight functions on disbursement / resource allocation by 2018	Minutes of the multi-stakeholder meetings  Project Reports	Basis for MPANs is well understood There is enough local expertise to undergo training in SF

<sup>7</sup> Data gathered from various technical reports plus two data sets provided by the site partners for this PPG indicate a huge funding gap between current management costs and the ideal conservation scenario. Rosales (2008)<sup>48</sup> estimated the ideal enforcement scenario (a significant component of MPA costs) to be at least six times than the current expenditure levels while Anda and Atienza<sup>7</sup>, using 79 PA samples including both marine and terrestrial PAs, estimated an increase of 9.7 times in operating expenditures. The study by Mazars Starling (2012) evaluated funding gaps for five MPAs, three of which are NIPAS sites, while the two others are LGU-managed. Of the three NIPAS sites, only Tubbataha Reef appears to be generating enough revenues to defray all costs. Gilutongan MPA also resulted in a zero funding gap given its collaboration with the Hei Yang Sports Management Corporation, the arrangement of which generates Php 6 million annually. Financing gaps ranged from 38.66% for Apo Reef (a large flagship national MPA) to 66.3% for the Palm Reef Marine Reserve, a small LGU-managed MPA in the Visayas.

<sup>8</sup> Collecting financial data for locally-managed MPAs needs detailed analysis as many agencies/partners are involved. During the financial planning exercise of to-be-selected 25 MPAs the baseline financial information and the required operational costs will be estimated against which progress will be measured.

INDICATOR	BASELINE	END OF PROJECT TARGETS (2020)	SOURCE OF INFORMATION	OF RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS
	Number of sustainable financing plans implemented in participating MPAs	0	At least 25 MPAs in five sites have sustainable financing plans being implemented as part of their management plans	Management plans with financial plans incorporated
<b>Outcome 3</b> Established Enabling Policy Framework for Marine Biodiversity Conservation.	<b>Outputs:</b> 3.1 A set of policy recommendations under implementation to strengthening laws, policies and regulations governing major facets of marine resource management (including fisheries, tourism, coastal resource management, shipping, etc.), to reduce external threats and pressures on MPAs. 3.2 Effective policy and regulatory frameworks in place for the designation and management of MPA Networks (MPANs) encompassing subsets of the national MPA system according to ecological connectivity and/or management effectiveness criteria. 3.3 Existing mechanisms and resources for fisheries and marine PA policy implemented at BFAR and DENR assessed, improved and institutionalized. 3.4 Tools, guidance and best-practice examples available to support LGUs in implementing effective regulations and policies for MPA establishment, management and financing within their local government regulatory frameworks.			
	Presence of a gender- and IP-sensitive, inclusive and comprehensive MPA and MPAN Policy Framework	Policy & regulatory review to be conducted in Y1 of among other the following documents: Fisheries Code, NIPAS Act <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wildlife Act, LGC, Other relevant statutes, EO 578, MOA Lanuza Bay, EO 1234, Davao Gulf Management Council</li> </ul>	A comprehensive MPA and MPAN Policy Framework in place incorporating gender equality and IP rights developed and effectively implemented addressing at least 50% of the policy recommendations identified through the policy review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy review study</li> <li>Policy issuances</li> <li>Line up of relevant policy recommendations</li> </ul>
	Number of policies for MPAs and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Close seasons during breeding season of particular fish</li> </ul>	All policies for MPAs and MPANs management	Revised policies  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conflicting positions of stakeholders</li> <li>Change in political leadership and shift in development priorities of national and local governments that conflict with MPA and MPAN interests, especially with the synchronized national and local elections taking place in 2016 (consider in this respect)</li> <li>Policy harmonization and</li> </ul>

INDICATOR	BASELINE	END OF PROJECT TARGETS (2020)	SOURCE OF INFORMATION	RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS
MPANs management that incorporate scientifically-based ecological conservation criteria (species abundance and distribution, threats and pressures, larval transmission and dispersal, climate change stresses, etc	species • Lubang Island declared as climate resilient MPA after a thorough multi disciplinary climate change vulnerability assessment • Unified fishery ordinance in Lanuza Bay	incorporate scientifically-based ecological conservation criteria (species abundance and distribution, threats and pressures, larval transmission and dispersal, climate change stresses, etc		complementation may go beyond project life  Assumption • Presence of stakeholders that will champion policy recommendations at the national and local levels

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

1. PIF <sup>[[L]]</sup><sub>[[SEP]]</sub>
2. UNDP Initiation Plan <sup>[[L]]</sup><sub>[[SEP]]</sub>
3. UNDP Project Document <sup>[[L]]</sup><sub>[[SEP]]</sub>
4. UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results <sup>[[L]]</sup><sub>[[SEP]]</sub>
5. Project Inception Report <sup>[[L]]</sup><sub>[[SEP]]</sub>
6. All Project Implementation Reports (PIR's) <sup>[[L]]</sup><sub>[[SEP]]</sub>
7. Annual and Quarterly Progress Reports (2015-2019) and annual work plans (AWPs) from 2015-2019 of the various implementation task teams <sup>[[L]]</sup><sub>[[SEP]]</sub>
8. Audit reports <sup>[[L]]</sup><sub>[[SEP]]</sub>
9. Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools at CEO endorsement and midterm (fillin specific TTs for this project's <sup>[[L]]</sup><sub>[[SEP]]</sub> focal area) <sup>[[L]]</sup><sub>[[SEP]]</sub>



10. *Oversight mission reports* <sup>[[L]]</sup><sub>ISEP</sub>
11. *All monitoring reports prepared by the project* <sup>[[L]]</sup><sub>ISEP</sub>
12. *Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team* <sup>[[L]]</sup><sub>ISEP</sub>

*The following documents will also be available:*

13. *Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems* <sup>[[L]]</sup><sub>ISEP</sub>
14. *UNDP country/countries programme document(s)* <sup>[[L]]</sup><sub>ISEP</sub>
15. *Minutes of the SMARTSeas PH Project Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)* <sup>[[L]]</sup><sub>ISEP</sub>
16. *Project site location maps* <sup>[[L]]</sup><sub>ISEP</sub>
17. *Mid-Term Review Evaluation Report*

## 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>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has the SMARTSeas developed good practices in MPA Network planning, establishment and implementation, financing and capacity building suitable and appropriate to local conditions?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent has SMARTSEAS achieved mainstreaming of good practices in MPA Network planning and implementation, financing and capacity-building in the Biodiversity Management Bureau's Coastal and Marine Environment Management Program (CMEMP)?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did the project design address the needs of target beneficiaries, i.e., DENR-BMB, local government units (LGUs) and communities?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent did the project adapt to changes un contexts over time? Were there changes which need to made to respond to potential new needs and/or priorities?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
<b>Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What outcomes have the Project achieved, expected and unexpected, positive and negative?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has the Project reached its intended beneficiaries, DENR-BMB, local government units (LGUs) and communities?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent has the Project been effective in building the capacities of key national and local decision-makers, including</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>

the communities, in ensuring improved Coastal Resources Management (CRM)?			
<b>Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Was the project implemented on budget? Were the variances between planned and actual expenditure justified versus the extent of achievement of outcomes?</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has the partnership modality, which was used for project implementation, resulted in efficient use of partner capacities and sufficiently utilized the comparative advantage of the partners involved, including key National Government Agencies (NGAs), local NGA Offices, LGUs, Local Responsible Partners (LRPs), academic institutions, non-government organizations (NGOs) and Peoples' Organizations (POs) and their ongoing activities?</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Did the Project build effective synergies with other existing initiatives?</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<b>Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To what extent are the outcomes replicable and have the potential for scaling-up by DENR-BMB, LGUs and local partners, including local key NGA Offices LGUs, academic institutions and NGOs?</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Was there adequate ownership of the project by end-users/beneficiaries and were there tangible commitments from these user/beneficiaries?</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To what extent has the programme built in resilience to future risks?</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<b>Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?</b>			

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent has the Project contributed to achieving results at the impact level?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are the results that are directly attributable to the interventions of the Project?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>

## ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

---

<p><b>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&amp;E, I&amp;E Execution</b></p> <p>6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings</p> <p>5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings</p> <p>4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</p> <p>3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings</p> <p>2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems</p> <p>1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems</p>	<p><b>Sustainability ratings:</b></p> <p>4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability</p> <p>3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks</p> <p>2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks</p> <p>1. Unlikely (U): severe risks</p>	<p><b>Relevance ratings</b></p> <p>2. Relevant (R)</p> <p>1.. Not relevant (NR)</p> <p><b>Impact Ratings:</b></p> <p>3. Significant (S)</p> <p>2. Minimal (M)</p> <p>1. Negligible (N)</p>
<p><i>Additional ratings where relevant:</i></p> <p>Not Applicable (N/A)</p> <p>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>9</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>9</sup>[www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct](http://www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct)

## ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE<sup>10</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>11</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>12</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
  - Management arrangements

---

<sup>10</sup>The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

<sup>11</sup> UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

<sup>12</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.



- 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. Co-Financing Form**

See attached separate form.

**ANNEX H: EVALUATION REPORT CLEARANCE FORM**

---

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

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

UNDP GEF RTA

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

ANNEX I:

UNDP-GEF TE REPORT AUDIT TRAIL **TEMPLATE**

*Note:* The following is a template for the TE Team 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 Project ID-**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 comment location	No./ Comment/Feedback on the draft TE report	TE team response and actions taken