BASIC CONTRACT INFORMATION

Location: Home Based (depending on travel ban, travel to Nauru may be required)

Application Deadline: July 31, 2020

Type of Contract: Consultancy

Assignment Type: International

Language Required: English

Starting Date: August 21, 2020

Duration of Initial Contract: 3 months

Expected Duration Assignment: 30 working days

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the project, *Implementing a "Ridge to Reef" approach to protect biodiversity and ecosystem functions in Nauru (PIMS # 5218).*

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

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	Implementing a Ridge to Reef approach to protect biodiversity and ecosystem functions in Nauru			
GEF Project ID:	5218		*at endorsement (Million US$)*	*at completion (Million US$)*
UNDP Project ID:	92583	GEF financing:	2,644,358	2,644,358
Country:	Nauru	IA/EA own:	40,000	40,000
Region:	Asia & Pacific	Government:	8,367,000	100,000
Focal Area:	Land Degradation, Climate Change, Biodiversity, International Waters	Other:		8,000
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):		Total co-financing:		108,000
Executing Agency:	Department of Industry, Commerce and Environment	Total Project Cost:	11,051,358	

Other Partners involved:	- Nauru Fisheries and Aquatic Resources Authority, - Department of Environment & Projects -Department of Agriculture	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		April 2015
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: March 2019	Actual: September2020

PROJECT BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

The Nauru R2R project was designed to develop, establish and implement a government and community partnership approach to increase knowledge for better management of natural resources and ecosystem services for the entire Island of Nauru (South Pacific) through innovative integrated land, water, biodiversity, coastal and marine management approaches thereby protecting and increasing livelihoods opportunities, food security, and enhancing climate resilience. These goals will be achieved by building Nauru's capacity to implement a comprehensive cross sectorial regime for sustainable land, freshwater water, solid waste, coastal and marine area management and ensuring the initiatives are mainstreamed and established into all levels of decision making including government policy, laws and regulations and community plans. The project is part of the broader Pacific Regional Program on "Pacific Islands Ridge-to-Reef National Priorities – Integrated Water, Land, and Coastal Management to Preserve Biodiversity, Ecosystem Services, Store Carbon, Improve Climate Resilience and Sustain Livelihoods". This program is designed to build stronger linkages between sustainable development and management of freshwater ecosystems (e.g. ground water systems for Nauru) and coastal/marine areas and promotes the implementation of holistic, integrated management of natural resources.

The goals of this Nauru R2R Project will be achieved through four specific project level outcomes interventions that are directly interconnected at national and site-based community (district) levels. These include (i) Improved management effectiveness of new marine conservation areas, (ii) Integrated landscape management practices adopted by local communities living within the 'bottom-side' and applicable 'ridge', and 'topside' areas not covered by mining, (iii) Biodiversity conservation and Sustainable Land Management (SLM) mainstreamed in policy and regulatory frameworks, and (iv) Knowledge Management.

To achieve integrated management of terrestrial and marine systems in Nauru the project will build upon the participatory process facilitated in the development of the R2R Program Framework Document (PFD) which included extensive stakeholder dialogues in the development, and will implement innovative and creative project activities to address critical knowledge gaps in environmental and ecosystem services. This project proposes a long-term solution by implementing a ridge-to-reef approach that combines functional, representative and sustainable national system of coastal and marine managed areas that are integrated with the adoption of appropriate SLM practices in adjoining / upstream watersheds. By also improving government capacity, the proposed project will effectively reduce land degradation and enhance protection for marine and coastal biodiversity and habitats, whilst improving coastal livelihoods and creating lasting management of Nauru's natural resources. As per UNDP SRPD 2018 - 2022, the project is expected to Outcome 1 - Climate change, disaster resilience and environmental protection and UNDAF Outcome(s).

The Nauru R2R project was designed as a 4 years project and after the mid-term review it was extended for another 18 months period from the closing date. The total project cost of the Nauru R2R Project is US$11,051,358 and consists of a GEF contribution of US$2,644,358 and Co-financing of US$ 8,407,000. The project will be implemented under the National Implementation modality (NIM). The Department of Commerce, Industry and Environment (DCIE), Division of Agriculture and the Nauru Fisheries and Marine Resource Authority (NFMRA) are the main implementing partners responsible for the achievement of the majority of the projects outcomes and outputs.

Since the pandemic of COVID-19, Nauru has not reported any cases within its borders. Entry restrictions however has been announced by the Government of Nauru for those travelling from or through China, Hong Kong, Macau, South Korea, Italy, or Iran in the 21 days prior to traveling to Nauru. Also, entry restrictions have applied for any travelers

with "direct or indirect" involvement with a vessel with a confirmed case of coronavirus, including the Diamond Princess cruise ship (docked in Japan) and the Grand Princess cruise ship (off the coast of California). In terms of the delivery of the project, the implementation of the project has been slow in meeting quarterly planned targets. The travel ban has affected the delivery of some procured items into the country and the travel of one international consultant to complete conduct a training course on the Environmental and Social Safeguard Policy and Strategy. The project outcomes however have not changed and still remains as is.

OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION

The TE report will assess the achievement of project results against what was expected to be achieved and draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming. The TE report promotes accountability and transparency and assesses the extent of project accomplishments.

Further to this, the objectives of the evaluation will be to:

- assess the achievement of project results supported by evidence (i.e. progress of project's outcome targets),
- assess the contribution and alignment of the project to relevant national development plan or environmental policies;
- assess the contribution of the project results towards the relevant outcome and output of the Sub Regional Programme Document (SRPD) & United Nation Pacific Strategy (UNPS/UNDAF)
- assess any cross cutting and gender issues
- examination on the use of funds and value for money
- 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 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.

TERMINAL EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

The TE report must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful.

The TE team will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure/SESP) the Project Document, project reports including annual PIRs, project budget revisions, lesson learned reports, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based evaluation. The TE team will review the baseline and midterm GEF focal area Core Indicators/Tracking Tools submitted to the GEF at the CEO endorsement and midterm stages and the terminal Core Indicators/Tracking Tools that must be completed before the TE field mission begins.

The TE team is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), Implementing Partners, the UNDP Country Office(s), the Regional Technical Advisor, direct beneficiaries and other stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful TE. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to (list); executing agencies, senior officials and task team/component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project

beneficiaries, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. Additionally, the TE team is expected to conduct field missions to (locations), including the following project sites (list). (Adjust text if a mission will not take place. Describe the virtual tools that will be used. See additional text suggestions below.)

The specific design and methodology for the TE should emerge from consultations between the TE team and the above-mentioned parties regarding what is appropriate and feasible for meeting the TE purpose and objectives and answering the evaluation questions, given limitations of budget, time and data. The TE team must, however, use gender-responsive methodologies and tools and ensure that gender equality and women's empowerment, as well as other cross-cutting issues and SDGs are incorporated into the TE report.

The final methodological approach including interview schedule, field visits and data to be used in the evaluation must be clearly outlined in the TE Inception Report and be fully discussed and agreed between UNDP, stakeholders and the TE team.

An overall approach and method 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

1. Interviews using standard questionnaire

 A set of standard questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR (*fill in Annex C*) The evaluator is expected to amend, -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.

2. In country Field Mission & validation

The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Nauru (but noting the current pandemic situation she/he may have to conduct this remotely until travel restrictions have been lifted), including the project sites. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

- Department of Commerce, Industry and Environment
- Division of Agriculture
- Division of Environment and Projects
- Nauru Rehabilitation Corporations
- Nauru Fisheries and Marine Resources Authority
- Nauru Community Councils (Community Leaders of Anabar, Anibare, Buada, Ijuw and Meneng)
- Nauru Environmental Coordination Committee,
- Department of Land Management and Survey
- Department of Justice
- Nauru Utilities Corporation
- Nauru Phosphate Commission
- Nauru Rehabilitation Corporation
- PAD Planning and Aid Division

3. Interviews of Concerned UNDP Staff

The evaluator is expected to conduct interviews of UNDP staff who have been involved in oversight of the project for context and information on how the project has evolved.

4. Literature/Desktop Review

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.

5. Analysis and reporting

Data collated will be analyzed and presented based on the evaluation criteria and ratings. Analysis will be provided in matric, tables to be best present findings and key recommendations; Reporting to be conducted in RBM (results-based management) approach.

6. Presentation of final draft to country office and stakeholders

The final report must describe the full TE approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the evaluation.

As of 11 March 2020, the World Health Organization (WHO) declared COVID-19 a global pandemic as the new coronavirus rapidly spread to all regions of the world. Travel to Nauru has been restricted from late March 2020 till to date (July 2020) and no changes has been announced by the government of Nauru. If it is not possible to travel to or within the country for the TE mission then the TE team should develop a methodology that takes this into account the conduct of the TE virtually and remotely, including the use of remote interview methods and extended desk reviews, data analysis, surveys and evaluation questionnaires. This should be detailed in the TE Inception Report and agreed with the Commissioning Unit.

If all or part of the TE is to be carried out virtually then consideration should be taken for stakeholder availability, ability or willingness to be interviewed remotely. In addition, their accessibility to the internet/computer may be an issue as many government and national counterparts may be working from home. These limitations must be reflected in the final TE report.

If a data collection/field mission is not possible then remote interviews may be undertaken through telephone or online (skype, zoom etc.). International consultants can work remotely with national evaluator support in the field if it is safe for them to operate and travel. No stakeholders, consultants or UNDP staff should be put in harm's way and safety is the key priority.

A short validation mission may be considered if it is confirmed to be safe for staff, consultants, stakeholders and if such a mission is possible within the TE schedule. Equally, qualified and independent national consultants can be hired to undertake the TE and interviews in country as long as it is safe to do so.

EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS

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

Evaluation Ratings:			
1. Monitoring and Evaluation	*rating*	**2. IA& EA Execution**	*rating*
M&E design at entry		Quality of UNDP Implementation	
M&E Plan Implementation		Quality of Execution - Executing Agency	
Overall quality of M&E		Overall quality of Implementation / Execution	
3. Assessment of Outcomes	**rating**	**4. Sustainability**	**rating**
Relevance		Financial resources:	
Effectiveness		Socio-political:	
Efficiency		Institutional framework and governance:	
Overall Project Outcome Rating		Environmental :	
		Overall likelihood of sustainability:	

A full outline of the TE report's content is provided in the TOR (see Annex F).

The asterisk "(*)" indicates criteria for which a rating is required.

Findings

i.   Project Design/Formulation

•   National priorities and country driven-ness

•   Theory of Change

•   Gender equality and women's empowerment

•   Social and Environmental Safeguards

•   Analysis of Results Framework: project logic and strategy, indicators

•   Assumptions and Risks

•   Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g. same focal area) incorporated into project design

•   Planned stakeholder participation

•   Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector

•   Management arrangements

ii.   Project Implementation

•   Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)

- Actual stakeholder participation and partnership arrangements

- Project Finance and Co-finance

- Monitoring & Evaluation: design at entry (*), implementation (*), and overall assessment of M&E (*)

- Implementing Agency (UNDP) (*) and Executing Agency (*), overall project oversight/implementation and execution (*)

- Risk Management, including Social and Environmental Standards

iii.   <u>Project Results</u>

- Assess the achievement of outcomes against indicators by reporting on the level of progress for each objective and outcome indicator at the time of the TE and noting final achievements

- Relevance (*), Effectiveness (*), Efficiency (*) and overall project outcome (*)

- Sustainability: financial (*), socio-political (*), institutional framework and governance (*), environmental (*), overall likelihood of sustainability (*)

- Country ownership

- Gender equality and women's empowerment

- Cross-cutting issues (poverty alleviation, improved governance, climate change mitigation and adaptation, disaster prevention and recovery, human rights, capacity development, South-South cooperation, knowledge management, volunteerism, etc., as relevant)

- GEF Additionality

- Catalytic Role / Replication Effect

- Progress to impact

Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons Learned

- The TE team will include a summary of the main findings of the TE report. Findings should be presented as statements of fact that are based on analysis of the data.

- The section on conclusions will be written in light of the findings. Conclusions should be comprehensive and balanced statements that are well substantiated by evidence and logically connected to the TE findings. They should highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project, respond to key evaluation questions and provide insights into the identification of and/or solutions to important problems or issues pertinent to project beneficiaries, UNDP and the GEF, including issues in relation to gender equality and women's empowerment.

- Recommendations should provide concrete, practical, feasible and targeted recommendations directed to the intended users of the evaluation about what actions to take and decisions to make. The recommendations should be specifically supported by the evidence and linked to the findings and conclusions around key questions addressed by the evaluation.

- The TE report should also include lessons that can be taken from the evaluation, including best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success that can provide knowledge gained from the particular circumstance (programmatic and evaluation methods used, partnerships, financial leveraging, etc.) that

are applicable to other GEF and UNDP interventions. When possible, the TE team should include examples of good practices in project design and implementation.

• It is important for the conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned of the TE report to include results related to gender equality and empowerment of women.

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								
• In-kind support	40,000	40,000	8,367,000	100,000			8,407,000	140,000
• Other				8,000				8,000
Totals	40,000	40,000	8,367,000	108,000			8,407,000	148,000

MAINSTREAMING

UNDP supported GEF financed projects are key components in UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programmes. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender.

IMPACT

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.[1]

CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions**, **recommendations** and **lessons**. Conclusions should build on findings and be based in evidence. Recommendations should be prioritized, specific,

---

[1] 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

relevant, and targeted, with suggested implementers of the recommendations. Lessons should have wider applicability to other initiatives across the region, the area of intervention, and for the future.

IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Fiji. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the evaluation will be *30* days over a time period of 3 months starting on the 21 August 2020. The tentative TE timeframe is as follow:

Timeframe	Activity
31 July 2020	Application closes
7 August 2020	Selection of TE team
21 August 2020	Preparation period for TE team (handover of documentation)
4 September – 4 days	Document review and preparation of TE Inception Report
11 September – 2 days	Finalization and Validation of TE Inception Report; latest start of TE mission
2 October 2020 – 14 days	TE mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits, etc.
5 October 2020	Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings; earliest end of TE mission
20 October 2020 – 7 days	Preparation of draft TE report
30 October 2020	Circulation of draft TE report for comments
10 November 2020- 3 days	Incorporation of comments on draft TE report into Audit Trail & finalization of TE report
15 November 2020	Preparation and Issuance of Management Response
20 November 2020	Expected date of full TE completion

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 should it happen.	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
Presentation	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission if it happens.	To project management, UNDP CO
Draft Final Report	Full report, (per annexed template F) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs
Final Report* + Audit Trail	Revised report and TE audit trail in which the TE details how all received	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft by 10 November	Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC.

comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final TE report.		

*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.

TE ARRANGEMENT

The principal responsibility for managing the TE resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's TE is UNDP Pacific Office. The Commissioning Unit and Project Team will support the implementation of a remote/visual meeting should the the travel ban to Nauru continue over the period of when TE is expected to start.

The Commissioning Unit will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the TE team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the TE team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

TEAM COMPOSITION

The evaluation will be conducted by an *International consultant*. The consultant shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The evaluator selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

Education

- Master's degree in Environmental Management/Science, Natural Resource Management or equivalent.

The Consultant must present the following qualifications:

- Relevant experience with results-based management evaluation methodologies
- Experience in applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios
- Experience in evaluating projects
- Minimum 5 years of relevant professional experience and has the technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s)
- Knowledge of UNDP and GEF evaluation process and has lead evaluation process for at least 2-3 of UNDP/GEF funded projects
- Experience working in Asia and the Pacific and has a good understanding of the biodiversity, conservation and climate change sector in the Pacific
- Experience working with communities, government sectors, NGOs and understands local protocols and customs and has excellent communication skills;
- Experience in the policy development processes associated with environment and sustainable development issues
- Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset

EVALUATOR ETHICS

The TE team will be held to the highest ethical standards and is required to sign a code of conduct upon acceptance of the assignment. This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'. The evaluator must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data. The evaluator must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses without the express authorization of UNDP and partners

PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

%	Milestone	Deadlines
10%	Submission of an inception report	4th September 2020
40%	Following submission and approval of the 1st draft terminal evaluation report	20th October 2020
50%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report	10th November 2020

In line with the UNDP's financial regulations, when determined by the Commissioning Unit and/or the consultant that a deliverable or service cannot be satisfactorily completed due to the impact of COVID-19 and limitations to the TE, that deliverable or service will not be paid.

Due to the current COVID-19 situation and its implications, a partial payment may be considered if the consultant invested time towards the deliverable but was unable to complete to circumstances beyond his/her control.

APPLICATION PROCESS

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

a) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the template[2] provided by UNDP;
b) **Detailed CV**;
c) **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price. All travel expenses to the country (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc) will be based on reimbursement. Breakdown of costs must be provided as per template attached to the Letter of Confirmation of Interest template. If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

All application materials should be submitted indicating the following reference "Consultant for Terminal Evaluation of Nauru Ride to Reef Project" by email at the following address ONLY: *(insert email address)* by *(time and date)*. Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

---

[2]https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx

Criteria for Evaluation of Proposal: Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated. Offers will be evaluated according to the Combined Scoring method – where the educational background and experience on similar assignments will be weighted at 70% and the price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring. The applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score that has also accepted UNDP's General Terms and Conditions will be awarded the contract.

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.

TOR ANNEXES

- ToR Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework
- ToR Annex B: List of Documents to be reviewed by the Evaluator
- ToR Annex C: Evaluation Questions
- ToR Annex D: TE Rating Scale
- ToR Annex E: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form
- ToR Annex F: Evaluation Report Outline
- ToR Annex G: TE Report Clearance Form
- ToR Annex H: TE Report Audit Trail

Annex A: Project Logframe

This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in UNDAF:
UNDAF Focus Area 1: Environmental Management, Climate Change and Disaster Risk Management
Regional UNDAF Outcome 1.1: Improved resilience of PICTs, with particular focus on communities, through integrated implementation of sustainable environmental manageme
climate change adaptation/mitigation, and disaster risk management.
Nauru UNDAF Outcome 1.1: National and local capacities sustainably manage environmental and water resources and ability to respond to climate change and natural disasters

UNDAF Outcome Indicators:
Outcome 1.1: % Terrestrial and marine areas protected (MDG7)

Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area (same as that on the cover page, circle one): 1. Mainstreaming environment and energy
4. Expanding access to environmental and energy services for the poor.

Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program:
BD-2: Mainstream Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use into Production Landscapes, Seascapes and Sectors
LD-3: Integrated Landscapes: Reduce pressures on natural resources from competing land uses in the wider landscape
IW-3: Support foundational capacity building, portfolio learning, and targeted research needs for joint, ecosystem- based management of trans-boundary water systems

Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes:
BD-2: Outcome 2.1: Increase in sustainably managed landscapes and seascapes that integrate biodiversity conservation.
Outcome 2.2: Measures to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity incorporated in policy and regulatory frameworks.
LD-3: Outcome 3.2: Integrated landscape management practices adopted by local communities.
IW-3: Outcome 3.1: Political commitment, shared vision, and institutional capacity demonstrated for joint ecosystem management of water bodies and local ICM principles. 3.2.
the ground modest actions implemented in water quality, quantity, fisheries and coastal habitat demonstrations for "blue forest" to protect carbon.

Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators:
BD-2: Indicator 2.1: Landscapes and seascapes certified by internationally or nationally recognized environmental standards that incorporate biodiversity considerations (e.g.
MSC) measured in hectares and recorded by GEF tracking tool
Indicator 2.2: Polices and regulations governing sectoral activities that integrate biodiversity conservation as recorded by the GEF tracking tool as a score.
LD-3: Indicator 3.2 Application of integrated natural resource management (INRM) practices in wider landscapes
IW-3: 3.1: Agreed SAPs at ministerial level with considerations for climatic variability and change; functioning national inter-ministry committees; agreed ICM plans. 3.2 Measura
results contributed at demo scale

Objectives and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
Component 1: Conservation of marine biodiversity					
OBJECTIVE: To preserve biodiversity, ecosystem services, improve climate resilence and sustain livelihoods inNauru using a ridge to reef approach.	Status of integrated land, water and coastal management in Nauru	Sectoral approach with minimal efforts towards coastal biodiversity conservation	LMMA implementation and integrated land-use management	Project reports and government and community adoption	Supportive government communities Local capacity is harnes for project implementatic

			planning and implementation		
OUTCOME 1.1 Improved management effectiveness of new marine conservation areas.	Area of coastal and marine water under active management as a Locally Managed Marine Area	Zero= LMMA will be introduced through this project	33% of coastline of Nauru (approximately 10 km) incorporated into LMMA with implementation of management plans in 4 Districts (Anabar, Anibare, Ijuw and Meneng)	Management Plan with attached budgets and implementation plans Annual reporting on progress against management plans	Communities are suppor of LMMA development Plans can be developed i timely manner
Output 1.1.1 A network of locally managed marine areas (community based (CB) or locally managed marine areas (LMMAs) established through community actions and supporting enabling government actions	Agreement between Government and DCC on LMMA establishment management .	Zero	4 agreements with 4 coastal districts	Agreement signed between DCC and Government Ecosystem health report Zoning maps for LMMA Communities / stakeholder consultation report; Government approval on Fisheries Act; LMMA network conference reports;	Surveys can be completec Committees are willing protect high va ecosystems; Proper training for NFM officers on the short-te and long-term benefits LMMAs.
	Ecosystem health survey identifying priority sites for protection and management	Limited information exists	Important marine biodiversity protected through zoning plans		
Output 1.1.2 LMMAs strengthened through development and implementation of management plans (following participatory approaches and Integrated Coastal Management to address threats, including climate change impacts; guidelines for utilizations of MMAs including closed seasons and closed areas agreed on and implemented)	Development of island level (national) based / CCA / LMMA Plan	Zero national plan developed	National LMMA plan prepared and adopted	National LMMA system report Approved plans by government Approval by communities Minutes of meetings	Loss of main source livelihoods for dist communities; lack resources implementation; conflicts between dist communities.
	Implementation of District level LMMA action Plans	Zero LMMA action plans	4 Management Plans developed and implemented for each selected Districts	Reports for 20 community/stakeholder consultations; Approval of Management Plans by Government and DCC (Anabar, Anibare, Buada, Ijuw); Annual monitoring reports	Proper advocacy for dist leaders and commu members on the short-te and long-term benefits LMMAs.

2 Sustainable land and water management

OUTCOME 2.1 Integrated landscape management practices adopted by local communities living within the 'bottom-side', and applicable 'ridge', and 'topside' areas not covered by mining.	Land-use management plans being actively implemented in all 5 districts [3]	Currently zero.	5 district land-use management plans being actively implemented	Plans Minutes of meetings Baseline surveys Monitoring and evaluation Annual technical reports Monthly monitoring reports	Lack of awareness by dist... community members re... in non-compliance... integrated agricult... practices and wa... management practices. Community management... sustainable land and wa... management and associa... scientific work is adequa... resourced and funct... effectively.
Output 2.1.1 Biophysical, demographic and socioeconomic assessments conducted and reviewed in the project districts, focusing on the bottom-side and applicable 'ridge' areas and topside not covered by mining.	2.1.1.1 Baselines for land-use plan and terrestrial environmental management established.	Rudimentary land-use maps with limited district focus terrestrial	National assessment completed with detailed 5 district terrestrial profiles	Reports for community / stakeholder consultations; Reviewed biophysical, demographic and socioeconomic assessment reports for 5 districts (Anabar, Anibare, Buada, Ijuw).	Conflict between distr... regarding land ownership... Ensuring full participation... community Information is available.
Output 2.1.2 Integrated agriculture land-use plan developed for the bottom-side and applicable 'ridge' and topside areas that are not covered by mining through review of the draft land-use plan and patterns of land ownership for the project districts/sites.	2.1.2.1 Integrated land-use plan	Land-use plan (1994).	Island-wide integrated agriculture land-use plans developed with special focus on priority districts.	Reports for community / stakeholder consultations; approved integrated land-use plan.	Lack of political will Able to ensure cooperat... of all national agencies National Environm... Coordinating Council (NE... will complete appro... process.

---

[33] Plans for management of waste from piggery and poultry included in this plan

Output 2.1.3	2.1.3.1 Number of households growing fruit-trees to contribute to soil conservation measures	Less than 5% in each of the 5 districts growing fruit trees (tbc during land-use planning)	20% of households in each of the 5 districts.	Operational MOU and LOA finalised and (R2R –GCCA-IWRM-Agriculture); Number of households with more rainwater catchment systems; SUBCONTRACTORS: In the event that the Individual Contractor requires the services of subcontractors to perform any obligations under the Contract, the Individual Contractor shall obtain the prior written approval of UNDP for any such subcontractors. UNDP may, in its sole discretion, reject any proposed subcontractor or require such subcontractor's removal without having to give any justification therefore, and such rejection shall not entitle the Individual Contractor to claim any delays in the performance, or to assert any excuses for the non-performance, of any of his or her obligations under the Contract. The Individual Contractor shall be solely responsible for all services and obligations performed by his or her subcontractors. The terms of any subcontract shall be subject to, and shall be construed in a manner that is fully in accordance with, all of the terms and conditions of the Contract. Report on safe household drinking water introduced; and	Lack of access to water result in failure intervention. Advance planning for ac to funding to ensure t water is available, supply is consistent for intervention. Households are interes to participate
Soil and water conservation measures implemented, including through rehabilitation of degraded land in 'ridge' and topside areas using economic species such as fruit trees and increase of communal water storage facilities in the five water-stressed project districts to support home gardens and household water supply.	2.1.3.2 Water storage enhanced in selected communities	Approximately 195 water harvesting / storage facilities (with 3,000m^3 capacity) in place [4]	43 additional water harvesting / storage facilities established		

---

[4] SOPAC (2007). Nauru Technical Report. Rainwater Harvesting: Asset Condition Survey of Domestic Infrastructure. http://ict.sopac.org/VirLib/ER0080.pdf

				Drought Management Strategy	
Output 2.1.4 Drought- and salt-tolerant food crops tested and practices disseminated to districts (communities and households) building on initiatives of bilateral and multilateral organizations.	2.1.4.1 Number of participating households using new crop varieties in all 5 districts	Zero households using " New" drought and salt-tolerant crops not currently available	20% of households in each of the 5 districts	Reports for community / stakeholder consultations; Nursery reports Training reports Activity monitoring report. Able to view growing crops Household surveys	Species of agricultural c not able to be identified Lack of community suppo Lack of capacity. Communication extension materials are available
Output 2.1.5 Innovative measures implemented (e.g. composting toilets) to reduce pollution loads by at least 10% on LMMAs to improve ecosystem health and sustain ecosystem services. This is based on successes of pilot demonstrations of the IWRM project and as a way of implementing the national IWRM plan.	2.1.5.1 Number of waste water treatment systems (compositing toilets) for reducing pollution established.	6 composting toilets operational in 5 districts	28 new composting toilets operational in 5 districts	Monitoring reports on implementation of new waste management systems by households and farmers. ports of number of systems being implemented. Activity monitoring reports.	Community commitme overflow of waste; lack support from stakehold and limited resources.
Component 3: Governance and institutions					
OUTCOME 3.1 Biodiversity conservation and SLM mainstreamed in policy and regulatory frameworks.	*Same as Output 3.1.1*				
Output 3.1.1 Relevant policies developed for key sectors such as environment, waste management, natural resource management, coastal fisheries, and agricultural land-use" developed.	3.1.1.1. Number of policies developed for key sectors incorporating R2R considerations.	Various old and draft plans exist, but need urgent re-validation and revision to support JNAP and NBSAP implementation	4 sectoral plans / strategies developed e.g. Fisheries, Integrated Agriculture and Land Use; NBSAP implementation; Environmental & Social Safeguards	Policy and framework documents Policy advice reports Meetings / review discussions.	Delay of approval of po and framework documer Requires revival of Natio Environment Coordinat Council (NECC)

			Policy & Guidelines		
Output 3.1.2 Capacity strengthening of national agencies associated with new policies and framework process development and formulation, including drafting of legislation, monitoring and evaluation (impacts, water quality, etc.), project implementation/ management and oversight, GIS, land-use planning; participation in relevant trainings organized through the regional R2R project.	3.1.2.1 Number of trained government personnel on integrated R2R approaches (gender disaggregated data)	Limited – Zero Training on GIS, project implementation / management and oversight in 2007 and 2008) and on Vulnerable & Adaptation assessment for JNAP.	45 staff from across ministries and fisheries authority.	Training TORs; training reports & evaluation; records of training sessions by training institutions; annual faculty reports; list of certificates awarded. .	Lack of interest participation in training; training follow-up. Advance planning advocacy for train activities as well as foll up.
Output 3.1.3 Community leaders in 5 districts capacitated towards biodiversity conservation, sustainable land management and climate change adaptation through appropriate trainings and other capacity building activities focusing on: project management, land-use planning, waste management, and marine management.	3.1.3.1. Number of district leaders trained on applying and enforcing skills in integrated R2R approaches with due consideration for gender distribution	Zero	15 community leaders (DCC, Women Reps and NGO reps) all 5 districts for each district)	Post-training surveys. Monitoring reports. Household surveys Training and workshop reports Training evaluation; Pre- and post-training surveys.	Lack of interest participation in training; training follow-up; delays in accessing funds pilot site activities. Advance planning advocacy for train activities as well as foll up; and advance plann for access to funding.
	3.1.3.2. Proportion of population (households) adopting specific actions to enhance R2R management in districts	~20% of households (All community members exposed to community outreach in Past)	Up to 80% of households adopting specific actions		
4 Knowledge management					

OUTCOME 4.1 Improved data and information systems on biodiversity and land management best practices.	*Same as 4.1.1.1 and 4.1.2.1*				
Output 4.1.1 Integrate data and information on biodiversity and sustainable land management and relevant sectors on the Environment; provide inputs to the regional R2R program on monitoring and progress reporting on the Pacific R2R program	4.1.1.1. Number of databases developed for DCIE.	Zero (one database was developed for climate change, however this needs to be expanded and integrated)	1 (integrated database)	Operational and fully functional database; Training materials for staff Databased accessible on a range computer Training TORs, reports, Pre- and post-training evaluation reports. Number of requests for data from databased	Delays in database set due to limited stock software/hardware delays in shipm irregular internet serv and loss of skills due staff turn-over. Systematic planning procurement of datab software/hardware; subscription to reg internet option; include transfer of skill part of staff hand-o notes.
	4.1.1.2. Number of training courses conducted on database setup & maintenance.	Zero	4 (1 per year)		
Output 4.1.2 Knowledge products (videos, photo stories, flyers, brochures) on all thematic areas and best practices developed and disseminated through various media (print and broadcast).	4.1.2.1. Number of community members receiving information on R2R management and taking action to enhance environment	Zero community households	500 households	Community information programs Radio and TV awareness programs Training reports R2R videos, Photo stories, Flyers, brochures; case studies; Awards Reports of global/regional/national events; Project website.	Delays in deliver products due to lim stock of knowle management mater and delays in shipm irregular internet serv non-participation global/regional eve due to unavailability required visas; and los skills due to staff tu over.
	4.1.2.2. Number of knowledge products, including best practices, produced on all thematic areas, disseminated through various media	Zero (knowledge products exist for water management, climate change, and land management only but none on integrated activities)	12 (3 per year)		Systematic planning procurement of knowle management materi subscription to reg internet option; adva planning of travel
	4.1.2.3. Participation in regional R2R activities	Not applicable	Regular participation in the regional R2R activities as may be requested by		

			national and regional stakeholders in the areas of capacity building, knowledge management, among others		associated requireme and include transfer of s as part of staff hand-c notes.
	4.1.2.4. Project website	None	Project website that is accessible and regularly updated		

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

#	Item (electronic versions preferred if available)
1	Project Identification Form (PIF)
2	UNDP Initiation Plan
3	Final UNDP-GEF Project Document with all annexes
4	CEO Endorsement Request
5	UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) and associated management plans (if any)
6	Inception Workshop Report
7	Mid-Term Review report and management response to MTR recommendations
8	All Project Implementation Reports (PIRs)
9	Progress reports (quarterly, semi-annual or annual, with associated workplans and financial reports)
10	Oversight mission reports
11	Minutes of Project Board Meetings and of other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
12	GEF Tracking Tools (from CEO Endorsement, midterm and terminal stages)
13	GEF/LDCF/SCCF Core Indicators (from PIF, CEO Endorsement, midterm and terminal stages); for GEF-6 and GEF-7 projects only
14	Financial data, including actual expenditures by project outcome, including management costs, and including documentation of any significant budget revisions
15	Co-financing data with expected and actual contributions broken down by type of co-financing, source, and whether the contribution is considered as investment mobilized or recurring expenditures
16	Audit reports

17	Electronic copies of project outputs (booklets, manuals, technical reports, articles, etc.)
18	Sample of project communications materials
19	Summary list of formal meetings, workshops, etc. held, with date, location, topic, and number of participants
20	Any relevant socio-economic monitoring data, such as average incomes / employment levels of stakeholders in the target area, change in revenue related to project activities
21	List of contracts and procurement items over ~US$5,000 (i.e. organizations or companies contracted for project outputs, etc., except in cases of confidential information)
22	List of related projects/initiatives contributing to project objectives approved/started after GEF project approval (i.e. any leveraged or "catalytic" results)
23	Data on relevant project website activity – e.g. number of unique visitors per month, number of page views, etc. over relevant time period, if available
24	UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD)
25	List/map of project sites, highlighting suggested visits
26	List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Board members, RTA, Project Team members, and other partners to be consulted
27	Project deliverables that provide documentary evidence of achievement towards project outcomes
	Add documents, as required

ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

This is a generic list, to be further detailed with more specific questions by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on the particulars of the project.

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?			
• Is the project relevant to Nauru's environmental policies & Nauru development plan?	•	•	•
• Is the project relevant to United National Pacific Strategyfor the country?	•	•	•
• Is the project relevant to UNDP Pacific's Sub Regional Programme Document?	•	•	•
• Is the project addressing the needs of the targeted beneficiaries?	•	•	•
• Is the project specifically addressing gender issues and any other	•	•	•
• • How is the project complementary to the actions of other stakeholders active in the country/region?	•	•	•
• • Is the project internally consistent in its design?	•	•	•
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
• Are the activities and outputs of the project consistent with the project's goals and objectives?	•	•	•
• To what extent has the delivered project outputs contributed to the achievement of its expected outcomes?	•	•	•
• Were the project's expected targets against the outcomes achieved?	•	•	•
• How was risk managed during the project?		•	•
• What are the lessons learnt from the project in terms of effectiveness?		•	•
• Which changes could have been made in project's design to improve its effectiveness?		•	•
• How could the project have been more effective in achieving results?		•	•

Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?			
• Was adaptive management needed and used to ensure efficient use of resources?	•	•	•
• Were the accounting and financial systems in place adequate?	•	•	•
• • Were progress reports produced in a timely manner and in compliance to project reporting requirements?	•	•	•
• Was project implementation as cost-effective as originally envisaged?	•	•	•
• Was the expected co-finance leveraged as initially expected?	•	•	•
• Were the reported lessons learnt shared among project stakeholders for subsequent improvement of project implementation?	•	•	•
• Which partnerships and networking were facilitated among stakeholders? Be specific to mention any legal agreements or memorandum of understanding signed to ascertain partnership.	•	•	•
• Was local capacity and know-how adequately mobilized?	•	•	•
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
• Were sustainability issues adequately addressed at project design?	•	•	•
• Is there evidence that some partners and stakeholders will continue their activities beyond project termination? And if such partners/stakeholders were identified, which ones were they?	•	•	•
• Which are the main risks to the continuation of policies and actions initiated by the projects? (financial, institutional, socioeconomic, environmental)	•	•	•
• Are project actions and results being scaled up or replicated elsewhere in the region?	•	•	•
• Did the project adequately address institutional and financial sustainability issues?	•	•	•
• • How is the beneficiary planning to mainstream the lessons learnt to ensure quality reporting to the global platforms?	•	•	•
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			

• How likely is the project to achieve its long-term goal?	•	•	•
• Are stakeholders more aware about the project's contribution towards setting up an EMIS and ensuring that it is operational? Which ones?	•	•	•
• What is the impact of the project for the citizens of Nauru in terms of awareness about the government's commitment to reporting its updated environmental data to the global platforms of the Rio conventions?	•	•	•
• What are the level of influence and visibility of the project in Nauru in promoting sustainable development?	•	•	•

ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

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

ANNEX E: EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT AND AGREEMENT FORM

Independence entails the ability to evaluate without undue influence or pressure by any party (including the hiring unit) and providing evaluators with free access to information on the evaluation subject. Independence provides legitimacy to and ensures an objective perspective on evaluations. An independent evaluation reduces the potential for conflicts of interest which might arise with self-reported ratings by those involved in the management of the project being evaluated. Independence is one of ten general principles for evaluations (together with internationally agreed principles, goals and targets: utility, credibility, impartiality, ethics, transparency, human rights and gender equality, national evaluation capacities, and professionalism).

Evaluators/Consultants:

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.
8. Must ensure that independence of judgement is maintained, and that evaluation findings and recommendations are independently presented.
9. Must confirm that they have not been involved in designing, executing or advising on the project being evaluated and did not carry out the project's Mid-Term Review.

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System:

Name of Evaluator: _____

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: _____

ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE

   i. Title page
      - Tile of UNDP-supported GEF-financed project
      - UNDP PIMS ID and GEF ID
      - TE timeframe and date of final TE report
      - Region and countries included in the project
      - GEF Focal Area/Strategic Program
      - Executing Agency, Implementing partner and other project partners
      - TE Team members
  ii. Acknowledgements
 iii. Table of Contents
  iv. Acronyms and Abbreviations

1. Executive Summary (3-4 pages)
   - Project Information Table
   - Project Description (brief)
   - Evaluation Ratings Table
   - Concise summary of findings, conclusions and lessons learned
   - Recommendations summary table
2. Introduction (2-3 pages)
   - Purpose and objective of the TE
   - Scope
   - Methodology
   - Data Collection & Analysis
   - Ethics
   - Limitations to the evaluation
   - Structure of the TE report
3. Project Description (3-5 pages)
   - Project start and duration, including milestones
   - Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope
   - Problems that the project sought to address: threats and barriers targeted
   - Immediate and development objectives of the project
   - Expected results
   - Main stakeholders: summary list
   - Theory of Change
4. Findings
   (in addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (*) must be given a rating[5])
   4.1 Project Design/Formulation
   - Analysis of Results Framework: project logic and strategy, indicators
   - Assumptions and Risks
   - Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g. same focal area) incorporated into project design
   - Planned stakeholder participation
   - Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
   4.1 Project Implementation
   - Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
   - Actual stakeholder participation and partnership arrangements
   - Project Finance and Co-finance
   - Monitoring & Evaluation: design at entry (*), implementation (*), and overall assessment of M&E (*)
   - UNDP implementation/oversight (*) and Implementing Partner execution (*), overall project implementation/execution (*), coordination, and operational issues
   4.2 Project Results
   - Progress towards objective and expected outcomes (*)
   - Relevance (*)
   - Effectiveness (*)

---

[5] See ToR Annex F for rating scales.

- Efficiency (*)
- Overall Outcome (*)
- Country ownership
- Gender
- Other Cross-cutting Issues
- Social and Environmental Standards
- Sustainability: financial (*), socio-economic (*), institutional framework and governance (*), environmental (*), and overall likelihood (*)
- Country Ownership
- Gender equality and women's empowerment
- Cross-cutting Issues
- GEF Additionality
- Catalytic Role / Replication Effect
- Progress to Impact

5. Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons
   - Main Findings
   - Conclusions
   - Recommendations
   - Lessons Learned

6. Annexes
   - TE ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
   - TE Mission itinerary
   - List of persons interviewed
   - List of documents reviewed
   - Summary of field visits
   - Evaluation Question Matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology)
   - Questionnaire used and summary of results
   - Co-financing tables (if not include in body of report)
   - TE Rating scales
   - Signed Evaluation Consultant Agreement form
   - Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form
   - Signed TE Report Clearance form
   - *Annexed in a separate file*: TE Audit Trail
   - *Annexed in a separate file:* relevant terminal GEF/LDCF/SCCF Core Indicators or Tracking Tools, as applicable

ANNEX G: TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT CLEARANCE FORM

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

Terminal Evaluation Report for *(Project Title & UNDP PIMS ID)* **Reviewed and Cleared By:**

Commissioning Unit (M&E Focal Point)

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Regional Technical Advisor (Nature, Climate and Energy)

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 Implementing a "Ridge to Reef" approach to protect biodiversity and ecosystem functions in Nauru (UNDP *PIMS #5218)*

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

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