



TERMS OF REFERENCE

TERMINAL EVALUATION OF THE CONSERVING BIODIVERSITY AND ENHANCING ECOSYSTEM FUNCTION THROUGH A "RIDGE TO REEF" APPROACH IN THE COOK ISLANDS PROJECT (NATIONAL CONSULTANT/TEAM EXPERT)

A. INTRODUCTION:

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full- and medium-sized UNDP-supported GEF-financed projects are required to undergo a Terminal Evaluation (TE) at the end of the project. This Terms of Reference (ToR) sets out the expectations for the TE of the full-sized project titled ***Conserving biodiversity and Enhancing Ecosystem Function through a "Ridge to Reef" Approach in the Cook Islands*** (PIMS 5168) implemented through the Cook Islands National Environment Service. The project started on the *6th July 2015* and is in its sixth year of implementation. The TE process must follow the guidance outlined in the document ['Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects'](#).

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION OR CONTEXT AND BACKGROUND:

The project was designed to enhance Cook Islands' capacities to effectively manage its protected areas (PAs) and sustainably manage its productive landscapes at local scales while considering food security and livelihoods. This will include the operationalization of the Cook Island Marine Park (covering approximately 1.1 million km² of Cook Islands southern Exclusive Economic Zone) and the establishment and strengthening of various forms of protected and locally managed areas within the CIMP, including Protected Natural Areas, Community Conservation Areas, and Ra'ui Sites.

In so doing, the project was to support the Cook Islands in maintaining traditional resource management and conservation systems and approaches, including a leading role for traditional and local leaders and the local communities that they represent in the declaration and management of protected areas, while also integrating these traditional systems into a formal legal and institutional system of protected areas.

The project was to support the Government in tailoring policy, regulatory and institutional frameworks to suit the specific characteristics of the Cook Islands and of the new CIMP, recognizing that protection and sustainable use will need to be zoned and planned carefully, and that tenure over most land areas is vested in local communities through a traditional tenure system.

Finally, the project was designed to engineer a paradigm shift in the management of marine and terrestrial PAs from a site centric approach to a holistic "ridge to reef" land and seascape approach, whereby activities in the immediate production areas adjacent to marine and terrestrial PAs were to be managed to reduce threats to biodiversity stemming from key production activities (tourism and agriculture). The project has 2 components concerned with (1) strengthening PAs management and (2) mainstreaming biodiversity across productions land and seascapes; and 7 outputs as follows:

- Output 1.1: Strengthened Legal / Regulatory and Policy Frameworks for Protected Areas
- Output 1.2: Expanded and strengthened management systems for Protected Areas



Output 1.3: Strengthened institutional coordination and capacities at the national and local levels for the participatory management of Protected Areas
 Output 1.4: Financial sustainability framework developed for system of Protected Areas
 Output 2.1: Ridge to Reef approaches integrated into Land Use and Development Planning
 Output 2.2: Biodiversity conservation mainstreamed into agriculture sector
 Output 2.3: Biodiversity conservation mainstreamed into tourism sector

The total GEF trust funds for this project is US\$4,267,431 with in-kind co-financing of US\$14,950,000. The project document was signed in July 2015. The executing agency for this project is the National Environment Service and responsible parties are the Ministry of Marine Resources, Ministry of Agriculture, and Cook Islands Tourism Corporation. The project was granted an extension to the 6th January 2021.

Cook Islands in COVID-19

As of 5 August 2020, the Cook Islands does not have any confirmed cases of COVID-19. The country's health response to COVID-19 was initiated on 22 January 2020 and the National Health Emergency Taskforce (NHET) chaired by the Secretary of Health was activated on 27 January 2020. The health response included the opening of a coughs, colds and flu clinic on 3 February 2020 and re-organisation of health services to community settings, along with the establishment of an Isolation (COVID-19) ward at Rarotonga Hospital on 23 March 2020. The Cook Islands closed its international border to Australia, Tahiti and the US on 15 March 2020 and closed its international border to New Zealand (except for cargo) on 24 March 2020. The Cook Islands moved to Code Yellow-Alert stage and enacted the COVID-19 Act on 25 March 2020.

Due to the travel restrictions, the Team leader/lead evaluator will be home-based and will work closely with the national consultant in engaging stakeholders via virtual consultations via telephone or online meetings (Zoom, Skype, etc.). Field missions will be conducted by the national consultant with guidance from the lead evaluator and findings shared with the Team leader/lead evaluator. Furthermore, all stakeholder engagement will be strongly supported by the PMU and the UNDP MCO in Samoa. Consideration should be taken for stakeholder availability, ability and willingness to be interviewed remotely and the constraints this may place on the Terminal Evaluation. These limitations must be reflected in the final Terminal Evaluation report. No stakeholders, consultants or UNDP staff should be put in harms way and safety is the key priority.

C. TERMINAL EVALUATION (TE) PURPOSE:

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.

The TE will cover the full project and will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the [Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects](#)

D. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE TE:

The TE will assess project performance against expectations set out in the project's Logical Framework/Results Framework (see ToR Annex A). The TE will assess results according to the criteria outlined in the ['Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects'](#).

The Findings section of the TE report will cover the topics listed below. A full outline of the TE report's content is provided in ToR Annex C.

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 Standards (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 (Safeguards)

iii. Project Results

- 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 (*). Note that the TE team is expected to provide comments/recommendations to the project exit strategy and sustainability plan draft.

- 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, properly timed and targeted guidance 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. Ideally these recommendations should be linked to the project exit strategy and sustainability plan.
- The TE report should also include lessons that can be taken from the evaluation, including best 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 incorporate gender equality and empowerment of women.

The TE report will include an Evaluation Ratings Table, as shown below:

ToR Table 2: Evaluation Ratings Table for Cook Islands R2R Project

Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E)	Rating ¹
M&E design at entry	
M&E Plan Implementation	

¹ Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, Implementation/Oversight & Execution, Relevance are rated on a 6-point scale: 6=Highly Satisfactory (HS), 5=Satisfactory (S), 4=Moderately Satisfactory (MS), 3=Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), 2=Unsatisfactory (U), 1=Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). Sustainability is rated on a 4-point scale: 4=Likely (L), 3=Moderately Likely (ML), 2=Moderately Unlikely (MU), 1=Unlikely (U)

Overall Quality of M&E	
Implementation & Execution	Rating
Quality of UNDP Implementation/Oversight	
Quality of Implementing Partner Execution	
Overall quality of Implementation/Execution	
Assessment of Outcomes	Rating
Relevance	
Effectiveness	
Efficiency	
Overall Project Outcome Rating	
Sustainability	Rating
Financial resources	
Socio-political/economic	
Institutional framework and governance	
Environmental	
Overall Likelihood of Sustainability	

E. TIMEFRAME:

The total duration of the TE will be approximately *26 working days* over a time period of *8 weeks* starting on *4 September 2020*. The tentative TE timeframe is as follows:

Timeframe	Activity
<i>31 August 2020</i>	Application closes
<i>4 September 2020</i>	Selection of TE team
<i>7 September 2020</i>	Preparation period for TE team (handover of documentation)
<i>9 September 2020</i>	Document review and preparation of TE Inception Report
<i>11 September 2020</i>	Finalization and Validation of TE Inception Report; latest start of TE field work
<i>14 – 25 September 2020 (10 days)</i>	TE field work: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits, etc.
<i>24 September 2020</i>	TE field work wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings; earliest end of TE field work
<i>25 – 30 September 2020</i>	Preparation of draft TE report
<i>30 September 2020</i>	Circulation of draft TE report for comments
<i>20 October 2020</i>	Incorporation of comments on draft TE report into Audit Trail & finalization of TE report
<i>28 October 2020</i>	Preparation and Issuance of Management Response
<i>31 October 2020</i>	Expected date of full TE completion

Options for site visits should be provided in the TE Inception Report.

F. EXPECTED DELIVERABLES:

#	Deliverable	Description	Estimated Timing	Responsibilities
1	Terminal Evaluation Inception Report	TE team clarifies objectives, methodology and timing of the TE; Options for site visits by the national consultant should be provided in the Inception Report.	Target date for signing contract & commencement of work is 4th September 2020. Inception report due no later than one week after contract signing 11 September 2020	Evaluation team submits to the Commissioning Unit and Project Management Unit
2	Presentation	Initial Findings (this includes a PPT that summarizes Initial findings and preliminary recommendations)	24 September 2020	Evaluation team presents to the Commissioning Unit and the Project Management Unit. Sent for information only to Commissioning Unit, RTA, Project Management Unit, GEF OFP
3	Draft Final Evaluation Report	Full report <i>(using guidelines on report content in ToR Annex C)</i> with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the TE field work. 30 September 2020	Sent for review to the Commissioning Unit, RTA, Project Management Unit, GEF OFP
4	Final Evaluation Report	Revised final report and TE Audit trail in which the TE details how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final TE report <i>(See template in ToR Annex H)</i>	Within 2 weeks of receiving UNDP comments on draft: 31 October 2020	Sent to the Commissioning Unit, RTA, Project Management Unit, GEF OFP

*All final TE reports will be quality assessed by the UNDP Independent Evaluation Office (IEO). Details of the IEO's quality assessment of decentralized evaluations can be found in Section 6 of the UNDP Evaluation Guidelines.²

² Access at: <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/section-6.shtml>

G. TE TEAM COMPOSITION:

A team of two independent evaluators will conduct the TE – one team leader (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions) and one **National Team Expert**, usually from the country of the project.

The team leader will be responsible for;

- Completion of the inception report in coordination with the National Team Expert
- Conduct TE interviews with coordination with the National Team expert and PMU
- The overall design, writing and completion of the TE report inclusive of audit trail and including all comments from project partners and stakeholders
- Overall TE report quality assurance and adherence to the [*'Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects'*](#).

The **national team expert** will be responsible for;

- Work closely with the Team Leader and the PMU;
- Contribute to the inception report including a detailed plan for interview and project site visits
- Develop and confirm TE interview schedule in coordination with the PMU and the Team Leader
- Translate questionnaires if needed and share list of questions with interviewees in preparation for the TE interviews
- Facilitate virtual (and translate if needed) interviews for the TE and conduct interviews where virtual means are unavailable
- Conduct data collection for the TE
- Conduct field visits to verify impact of project interventions at project sites in coordination with the Team Leader and PMU
- Work with PMU to confirm co-financing for the project
- Contribute to the TE report
- Conduct and confirm any follow up data/information requirements to complete the Terminal evaluation report including audit trail.

The evaluator(s) cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation and/or implementation (including the writing of the project document), must not have conducted this project's Mid-Term Review and should not have a conflict of interest with the project's related activities.

The selection of **National Team Expert** will be aimed at maximizing the overall "team" qualities in the following areas:



Education:

- Minimum A bachelor's degree in Environmental Management, Biodiversity and ecosystems management or other closely related field **(10 points)**;

Experience:

- Minimum of 5 years of relevant professional experience in providing management or consultancy services to the multi focal area projects; in developing national and regional capacities and enabling conditions for global environmental protection and sustainable development **(20 points)**;
- Extensive demonstrated experience in the Cook Islands environment and protected areas sectors, with well-established knowledge of and networks amongst government, tourism, NGO and community organisations **(25 points)**.
- 3 years' experience in project evaluations, results-based management, and/or evaluation methodologies **(10 points)**;
- Technical knowledge in the targeted GEF focal areas: Biodiversity and International Waters **(20 points)**
- Experience working in biodiversity conservation and protected areas elsewhere in the Pacific region or SIDS **(5 points)**
- Fluency in English (oral and written) is a requirement, with excellent written and presentation skills **(10 points)**

H. 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.

I. DUTY STATION:

Home-based in the Cook Islands. It is expected that the consultant will be coordinating/supporting stakeholder interviews via virtual means (Zoom, skype etc.). The site visit is also required.

**J. SCOPE OF BID PRICE & SCHEDULE OF PAYMENTS:**

The payment shall be paid after certification by UNDP of satisfactory performance of deliverables per milestone listed below;

DELIVERABLES	DUE DATE (%)	AMOUNT IN USD / WST	% PAYMENT
Upon approval and certification by the Commissioning Unit of the TE Inception Report	11 September 2020 (6 days after contract signing)	\$xxx	20%
Upon approval and certification by the Commissioning Unit of the draft Terminal Evaluation report	30 September 2020	\$xxx	40%
Upon approval and certification by the Commissioning Unit and UNDP-GEF RTA of the final Terminal Evaluation report and completed Audit Trail	31 October 2020	\$xxx	40%
TOTAL	26 working days	\$xxx	100%

NOTE:

Criteria for issuing the final payment of 40%³:

³ The Commissioning Unit is obligated to issue payments to the TE team as soon as the terms under the ToR are fulfilled. If there is an ongoing discussion regarding the quality and completeness of the final deliverables that cannot be resolved between the Commissioning Unit and the TE team, the Regional M&E Advisor and Vertical Fund Directorate will be consulted. If needed, the Commissioning Unit's senior management, Procurement Services Unit and Legal Support Office will be notified as well so that a decision can be made about whether or not to withhold payment of any amounts that may be due to the evaluator(s), suspend or terminate the contract and/or remove the individual contractor from any applicable rosters. See the UNDP Individual Contract Policy for further details:

https://popp.undp.org/_layouts/15/WopiFrame.aspx?sourcedoc=/UNDP_POPP_DOCUMENT_LIBRARY/Public/PSU_Individual%20Contract_Individual%20Contract%20Policy.docx&action=default



K. APPLICATION PROCESS⁴

Complete proposals must be submitted by **14 September 2020** electronically via email: procurement.ws@undp.org. Incomplete applications will not be considered and only candidates for whom there is further interest will be contacted. Proposals must include:

- [Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability](#) using template⁵ provided by UNDP;
- **CV or P11 Form**⁶ indicating all past experience from similar projects, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) and at least three (3) professional references (most recent)
- **Statement of capabilities addressing the evaluation criteria** of why the you consider yourself the most suitable for the assignment,
- **A brief methodology** on how you will approach and conduct the work (2 pages maximum),
- **Financial Proposal** specifying the daily rate in US Dollars and other expenses, if any (Annex II)

Queries about the consultancy can be directed to the UNDP Procurement Unit
procurement.ws@undp.org

L. CRITERIA FOR SELECTION AND AWARDING

- Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated. Incomplete applications will not be considered;
- Offers will be evaluated according to the Combined Scoring method – where the technical criteria (section H.) will be weighted at 70% and the financial offer will be weighted at 30%;
- Only the top 3 candidates that have achieved a minimum of 70 points (70% of 100 points) from the review of education, experience and language will be deemed technically compliant and considered for the financial evaluation;
- The financial proposal shall specify an all-inclusive lump sum fee. In order to assist the requesting unit in the comparison of financial proposals, the financial proposal must additionally include a breakdown of this daily fee (including all foreseeable expenses to carry out the assignment);
- Applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score and has accepted UNDP's General Terms and Conditions will be awarded the contract.

⁴ Engagement of evaluators should be done in line with guidelines for hiring consultants in the POPP
<https://popp.undp.org/SitePages/POPPRoot.aspx>

⁵<https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/psa/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx>

⁶ http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc



M. Annexes to the TOR

TOR Annex A: Project Logical Framework

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets	Sources of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
Project Objective: To build national and local capacities and actions to ensure effective conservation of biodiversity, food security and livelihoods and the enhancement of ecosystem functions within the Cook Islands Marine Park	<p>Overall framework in place for conservation in the Southern Group of the Cook Islands</p> <p>Area of inhabited Outer Islands in Southern Group managed for BD conservation through Island Development Plans</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Terrestrial • Marine <p>Tracking Tool IW1: Innovative solutions implemented for reduced pollution, improved water use efficiency, sustainable fisheries with rights-based management, IWRM, water supply protection in SIDS, and aquifer and catchment protection</p>	<p>Cook Islands Marine Park (CIMP) declared as protected, but with no legal designation or active management</p> <p>0</p> <p>0</p> <p>Limited local capacity exists for overseeing and monitoring of water quality in lagoons</p>	<p>1.1 million sq. km. of CIMP legally designated and actively managed, with dedicated staff implementing planning and coordination of the entire CIMP by end of year 2</p> <p>By end of project: 6 islands totalling 15,110 ha. 6 islands totalling 16,174 ha.</p> <p>Water quality improved through small demonstrations and monitoring mechanisms in place for project related indicators</p>	<p>Legal documents and annual reports of Marae Moana office</p> <p>Published Island Development Plans</p> <p>Completed IW1 Tracking Tools</p>	<p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government agencies, landowners, traditional and local leaders constructively engage in management of protected areas <p>Risks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential impacts of climate change on marine and terrestrial ecosystems
Component 1: Strengthening Protected	Outputs <p>1.1: Strengthened Legal / Regulatory and Policy Frameworks for Protected Areas</p> <p>1.2: Expanded and strengthened management systems for Protected Areas</p> <p>1.3: Strengthened institutional coordination and capacities at the national and local levels for the participatory management of Protected Areas</p>				



Areas Management	1.4: Financial sustainability framework developed for system of Protected Areas				
	Improved management effectiveness of Cook Islands Marine Park, as measured by GEF BD 1 Tracking Tool (METT)	METT score = 30	METT score > 60 by end of project	METT updated at mid-term and end of project	Assumptions
	<p>National agencies responsible for PA management are effectively delivering PA management functions (as measured by the Capacity development⁷ indicator score for protected area system):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Systemic • Institutional • Individual <p>Updated and consolidated legal framework for management of the Cook Islands Marine Park (CIMP) and all other protected areas in the country</p> <p>Consolidated management authority for protected areas in the Cook Islands</p> <p>Management of protected area sites on islands in the Southern Group</p>	<p>50%</p> <p>47%</p> <p>52%</p> <p>Existing legislation for PAs is out-dated and incomplete: CIMP and Ra'ui systems have no legal standing; detailed regulations are not in place</p> <p>Institutional authority for protected areas is spread among various agencies</p> <p>1 existing protected area site (Takitumu Conservation Area) is actively managed</p>	<p>By end of project:</p> <p>70%</p> <p>70%</p> <p>70%</p> <p>Protected and Managed Areas Act drafted and enacted by end of year 2; detailed regulations for resource restrictions and PA management enacted by end of project</p> <p>Marae Moana Office undertaking coordinated management of protected areas by end of project</p> <p>Management plans for at least 15 protected area sites under</p>	<p>Capacity Development Scorecard updated at end of project</p> <p>Enacted legislation and regulations</p> <p>Annual reports of Marae Moana Office</p> <p>Management plans approved</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacity for technical delivery of management regimes and enforcement is in place • Legal gazetting of new Protected Areas is not held up in the executive or legislative branches • Legal enactment and enforcement authority is granted to traditional leaders & local communities • Climate impacts (cyclones, storm

⁷ Project will work to ensure that gender equality is promoted in the selection of persons to participate in capacity development activities



	<p>% Area of Southern Group islands managed as Protected Areas (protected natural areas, community conservation areas, ra'ui sites)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Terrestrial • Marine (to the outer reef) <p>Improved management effectiveness of priority conservation zones, as measured by the GEF BD 1 Tracking Tool (METT):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Takitumu Conservation Area (Rarotonga) • Cloud Forest Nature Reserve (Rarotonga) • Manuae Wildlife Sanctuary / Marine Reserve (Manuae) • Moko Ero Nui Leeward Forest Reserve (Atiu) • Takutea Wildlife Sanctuary / Marine Reserve (Takutea) <p>Lagoon ecosystems are managed in a coordinated manner and with clear ecological conservation objectives</p> <p>Funds available for management of Protected Areas, as reported in the GEF BD1 Tracking Tool – Financial Scorecard:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-governmental financing mechanisms 	<p>2.8%</p> <p>9.7%</p> <p>64</p> <p>26</p> <p>12</p> <p>26</p> <p>29</p> <p>Lagoons in the Cook Islands are not actively managed for conservation</p>	<p>implementation by end of project</p> <p>By end of project: 6.7% 12.3%</p> <p>By end of project: METT score >70 METT score >50 METT score >40</p> <p>METT score >50</p> <p>METT score >50</p> <p>Aitutaki Lagoon Master Plan in place, with conservation zoning, goals and targets</p>	<p>by relevant authorities</p> <p>Legal gazetting documents for each area</p> <p>METTs updated at mid-term and end of project</p> <p>Approved Lagoon Master Plan & annual workplans</p> <p>Financial Scorecard updated at end of project;</p>	<p>surges, drought, extreme rainfall) do not significantly impact terrestrial and inshore marine ecosystem functioning</p> <p>Risks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholders, particularly local communities, are not able to perceive benefits from conservation during programme duration • Poor accessibility to the Outer Islands from Rarotonga will make it difficult to generate equitable benefits to the
--	---	--	---	---	---



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government budget allocations <p>Conservation of critical coral reef habitat within the CIMP, as measured by finfish populations at coral reefs around Rarotonga and Aitutaki</p> <p>Conservation of priority species at selected sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Green Turtle (Takutea and Manuae) Hawksbill turtle (Takutea and Manuae) Loggerhead Turtle (Palmerston) Napoleon (Humphead) Wrasse (Rarotonga & Aitutaki) Atiu Swiftlet (Atiu) Mangaian Kingfisher (Mangaia) Rarotongan Monarch (Rarotonga & Atiu) Mitiaro Tree Palm (Mitiaro) 	<p>US\$23,800⁸ US\$63,750⁹</p> <p>Baseline TBD in year 1 of project¹⁰</p> <p>Baseline TBD in year 1 of project¹¹ Baseline TBD in year 1 of project Baseline TBD in year 1 of project</p>	<p>By end of project: US\$523,800¹² US\$148,750¹³</p> <p>No decrease in finfish populations by end of project</p> <p>By end of project: No net decline in population¹⁴ No net decline in population No net decline in population No net decline in population</p>	<p>Govt. Budget Reports</p> <p>Project monitoring survey reports</p> <p>Project monitoring survey reports</p>	<p>Outer Islands from the project</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Financial resources are not sufficient to support effective protected area planning and operations over the long-term
--	---	--	--	---	---

⁸ Current funding from non-governmental mechanisms includes \$17,000/year in recurrent funding for the Takitumu Conservation Area and an additional US\$6,800 in entrance fees for the TCA; other funding sources are extraordinary and non-recurring, including approx. US\$550,000/year for 2014-2016 from the Oceans 5 Foundation

⁹ Current Govt. funding for PAs includes \$63,750/year in recurrent spending for Suvarrow National Park; the Govt. is spending an additional \$93,500 in the current year on PA activities through non-recurring funds from the GEF-UNEP project "Conservation Management of Island Biodiversity".

¹⁰ The Living Oceans Foundation carried out extensive reef surveys in 2013, including assessments of fish abundance and size for over 200 fish species around Rarotonga and Aitutaki. This data, once it is made available, will be used to establish baseline populations for selected finfish species.

¹¹ No baseline data exists for turtle populations in the southern group. The project will establish a turtle monitoring program, and determine baseline populations during year 1 of the project

¹² PA financing mechanisms are expected to provide approximately US\$0.5 million / year for PA financing by the end of the project, primarily through mechanisms such as an airport departure tax, import levies on environmentally damaging goods, and entrance / user fees for PA sites (see Output 1.4 for details)

¹³ The Office of the Prime Minister will provide at least NZ\$100,000 (US\$85,000) per year in ongoing operating costs for the Marae Moana Office

¹⁴ Population trends for Green, Hawksbill and Loggerhead turtles will be measured by no net decline in the # of turtle nests beyond normal annual fluctuations



		Baseline TBD in year 1 of project	No net decline in population No net decline in population No net decline in population		
		420 individuals 1,000 individuals 428 individuals (Rarotonga); 125 individuals (Atiu)	No net decline in forested area ¹⁵		
		375 mature trees			
Component 2: Outputs Effective mainstreaming of biodiversity in key sectors to mitigate threats within production landscapes					
	2.1 Ridge to Reef approaches integrated into Land Use and Development Planning 2.2 Biodiversity conservation mainstreamed into agriculture sector 2.3 Biodiversity conservation mainstreamed into tourism sector				
	Landscape/seascape area covered by the project (ha), as measured by GEF BD 2 Tracking Tool <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Directly covered Indirectly covered Pressures from resources uses in the land- and seascape are reduced through Ridge to Reef management approaches, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduced use of agricultural chemicals, based on value of annual imports¹⁶ 	0 0 • NZ\$339,554	1.1 million sq. km. (CIMP) 0.83 million sq. km. (Northern Group) • At least 15% reduction in value of imports of agricultural	BD 2 Tracking Tool updated at mid-term and end of project Reports of Cook Islands Customs	Assumptions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Climate impacts (cyclones, drought, extreme rainfall) do not significantly impact agricultural production

¹⁵ The number of Mitiaro Tree Palms is being measured using the number of mature trees (each mature tree typically has a "clump" of 5-30 small trees around it)

¹⁶ Because annual import levels vary substantially, the baseline values are based on 5-year average (2008-2012) spending on imported fertilizers and pesticides (including insecticides, fungicides, herbicides and rodenticides), and the end of project targets will be based on 4-year average (2015-2018) of the project implementation period



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fertilizers Pesticides <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planning approval process for infrastructure and other development <p>Forest cover on the 9 islands within the Cook Islands Marine Park</p> <p>Sedimentation and pollution of aquatic and marine habitats</p> <p>Reduced impacts of human activities on land on the health of inshore marine ecosystems, as measured by algal levels (coralline algae, turf algae, and macro-algae) on coral reefs around Rarotonga and Aitutaki</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NZ\$406,701 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process depends on self-reporting by developers <p>13,245 hectares of natural forested area¹⁷</p> <p>Sedimentation and pollution (pesticides, herbicides, fertilizers, waste) have significant negative impacts on streams and lagoons in the country</p> <p>Baseline TBD during year 1 of project</p>	<p>chemicals by the end of the project</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> EIAs for infrastructure development in or around PAs are subject to independent review, and development plans are adapted as necessary to conserve biodiversity <p>No decline in forest cover by the end of the project</p> <p>At least 10 sites within CIMP where water quality will be improved through measures to control water pollution and sedimentation (from agriculture or other sources)</p> <p>No increase in algal levels on coral reefs by end of project</p>	<p>Revised published EIA regulations</p> <p>Satellite / aerial survey imagery</p> <p>Reports from MMR water quality monitoring stations / laboratory</p> <p>Reports from MMR Algal surveys</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The government allocates adequate resources (staff and budget) to fulfil its leading role in directing Ridge to Reef approaches for conservation and sustainable resource use <p>Risks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poor accessibility to the Outer Islands from Rarotonga will make it difficult to generate equitable benefits to the Outer Islands from the project
--	--	---	--	--	--

¹⁷ Estimated forest cover (to be confirmed at project inception, including confirmation of natural forest as opposed to plantations or invasive dominated areas): Mangaia (4,500 ha.); Rarotonga (4,000 ha.); Aitutaki (1,600 ha.); Manuae (350 ha.); Atiu (1,140 ha.); Takutea (94 ha.); Mauke (1,046 ha.); Mitiaro (335 ha.); Palmerston (180 ha.)



	<p>Impact of tourism businesses on biodiversity and ecosystem functioning in targeted KBAs</p> <p># of projects by tourism operators that support biodiversity conservation (e.g. creating Ra'ui sites / CCAs; coral gardens; beach clean-up; sponsored species conservation)</p>	<p>Less than 5 tourism businesses in the Cook Islands actively implement environmental management programs</p> <p>6 on-going projects in the Southern Group¹⁸</p>	<p>At least 20 tourism businesses are implementing BD management programs that comply with conservation guidelines developed through the project and included in national accreditation system</p> <p>At least 15 projects operating by the end of the project</p>	<p>Reports of CIT Corp accreditation / green endorsement system</p> <p>Project reports on tourism operations</p>	
--	---	--	--	--	--

¹⁸ Projects to support monitoring / protection of Ra'ui sites (Rarotonga and Edgewater hotels); ocean clean up programs (Big Fish Divers and Pacific Divers); ecotourism projects (Takitumu Conservation Area); accommodation discounts for research staff for bird conservation work (Atiu Villas)

ToR ANNEX B: Information Package to be reviewed by the Terminal Evaluation Team

#	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
<i>Additional documents, as required</i>	

ToR ANNEX C: Content of the TE Report

- i. Title page
 - Title 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 rating¹⁹)

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
- Risk Management, including Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)

4.2 Project Results and Impacts

- Progress towards objective and expected outcomes (*)
- Relevance (*)
- Effectiveness (*)
- Efficiency (*)
- Overall Outcome (*)
- 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/Replication Effect
- Progress to Impact

5. Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons

- Main Findings
- Conclusions
- Recommendations

¹⁹ See ToR Annex F for rating scales.

- Lessons Learned

6. Annexes

- TE ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
- TE Mission itinerary, including summary of field visits
- List of persons interviewed
- List of documents reviewed
- 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

ToR ANNEX D: Evaluation Criteria Matrix template

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 level?			
<i>(include evaluative questions)</i>	<i>(i.e. relationships established, level of coherence between project design and implementation approach, specific activities conducted, quality of risk mitigation strategies, etc.)</i>	<i>(i.e. project documentation, national policies or strategies, websites, project staff, project partners, data collected throughout the TE mission, etc.)</i>	<i>(i.e. document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc.)</i>
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in line with international and national norms and standards?			

Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-political, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
Gender equality and women's empowerment: How did the project contribute to gender equality and women's empowerment?			
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
<i>(Expand the table to include questions for all criteria being assessed: Monitoring & Evaluation, UNDP oversight/implementation, Implementing Partner Execution, cross-cutting issues, etc.)</i>			

ToR ANNEX F: TE Rating Scales

Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, Implementation/Oversight, Execution, Relevance	Sustainability ratings:
6 = Highly Satisfactory (HS): exceeds expectations and/or no shortcomings 5 = Satisfactory (S): meets expectations and/or no or minor shortcomings 4 = Moderately Satisfactory (MS): more or less meets expectations and/or some shortcomings 3 = Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): somewhat below expectations and/or significant shortcomings 2 = Unsatisfactory (U): substantially below expectations and/or major shortcomings 1 = Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe shortcomings Unable to Assess (U/A): available information does not allow an assessment	4 = Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3 = Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks to sustainability 2 = Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks to sustainability 1 = Unlikely (U): severe risks to sustainability Unable to Assess (U/A): Unable to assess the expected incidence and magnitude of risks to sustainability

ToR ANNEX G: Terminal Evaluation Report Clearance Form

(to be completed by the Commissioning Unit and UNDP-GEF RTA and included in the final document)

Evaluation Report for Conserving biodiversity and Enhancing Ecosystem Function through a "Ridge to Reef" Approach in the Cook Islands Project (PIMS 5168) Reviewed and Cleared By:

**UNDP Country Office (M&E Focal Point)**

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Regional Technical Advisor (Nature, Climate and Energy)

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

ToR Annex H: TE Audit Trail

To the comments received on (date) from the Terminal Evaluation of Enhancing Ecosystem Function through a "Ridge to Reef" Approach in the Cook Islands Project (PIMS 5168)

The following comments were provided to the draft TE report; they are referenced by institution/organization (do not include the commentator's name) and track change comment number ("#" column):

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

N. Approval

This TOR is approved by : *[indicate name of Approving Manager]*

Signature _____

Name and Designation _____

Date of Signing _____