Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference

This is an adjusted standard terms of reference for Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported GEF/LDCF/SCCF-financed projects taking into account the impact of COVID-19 *on evaluations, including consideration for COVID-19 situation assessment within countries, impact and restrictions on evaluations, alternative approaches, methodologies and considerations to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on evaluations.*

Underlying this guidance is a principle of "do no harm", and a consideration that the safety of staff, consultants, stakeholders and communities is paramount and the primary concern of all when planning and implementing evaluations during the COVID-19 crisis.

BASIC CONTRACT INFORMATION

Location: Home based and Jakarta
Application Deadline: 19 October 2020
Category: International Consultant/Senior Specialist
Type of Contract: IC
Assignment Type: TE International Consultant
Languages Required: English and Bahasa Indonesia
Starting Date: As soon as possible
Duration of Initial Contract: 35 working days
Expected Duration of Assignment: November – December 2020 (35 working days)

BACKGROUND

1. 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 *Enhancing the Protected Area System in Sulawesi (E-PASS) for Biodiversity Conservation* (PIMS ID 4392) implemented through the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner. The project started on the 12th of March 2015 (Project Document signature date) and is in its fifth (5th) 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'.

2. Project Description

The E-PASS project is consistent with the goals of GEF Biodiversity Objective 1 "Improve Sustainability of Protected Area Systems" (BD1/GEF Focal Area Biodiversity-1) and specifically the BD1 Focal area Outcome 1.1 Improved management effectiveness of existing and new protected areas and Outcome 1.2 Increased revenue for protected area systems to meet total expenditures required for management.

The Protected Area (PA) network in Sulawesi, as in the rest of Indonesia, is characterized by low levels of management effectiveness and the PAs are not adequately distributed across the landscape to properly represent the island's key terrestrial ecosystems. The project seeks to strengthen PA management in the endemic- rich Sulawesi island group and reduce threats to biodiversity in the PAs by putting in place measures to ensure that the highly unique and globally important biodiversity of Sulawesi will be safeguarded from existing threats to its biodiversity. By strengthening the core PA management and increasing conservation outcomes in Sulawesi, the project serves to increase the overall effectiveness of the national PA system in which Sulawesi plays a key part.

Regarding covid-19 outbreak, as of 30 September 2020, there were 287,008 confirmed cases of Covid-19 in Indonesia, of which 10,740 were fatalities and 214,947 persons recovered. Covid-19 has been spread in 34 provinces and 487 regencies/cities across Indonesia. Some regions implemented large social restrictions to prevent of Covid-19 pandemics. Covid-19 pandemics have affected the implementation of the project. Based on our assessment, some works can continue on-schedule, some work remains the same but involves delays, some works need to redesign to achieve the expected output.

The activities supported by EPASS project has provided the equally important opportunities for the women and men in developing and managing the ecotourism related activities. The EPASS project has provides equal opportunities for women in managing the activities supported by seed grants. The EPASS project has promoted women roles for instance through the development and management of home industry in producing variety of non-timber forest products, producing merchandise (such as printed shirts, hats, pins), and in adapting with the covid-19 pandemic by promoting health protocol for the local community (such as making cloth mask, maintaining facilities to wash hand properly with water and soap, producing health supplements made of local herbs etc.).

Referring to the Covid-19 outbreak in Indonesia, the impact on the E-PASS project implementation include the following:
  (a) The project has to pay attention to the Presidential Decree of the Republic of Indonesia (Keppres RI no. 12/2020 dated 13 April 2020) concerning Determination of Covid-19 Outbreak as Non-natural Disaster, and Large-Scale Social Distancing measures in several provinces, cities and regencies in Indonesia, including the areas where EPASS Project activities are implemented;

  (b) During the past few months, consultations with stakeholders have not been able to take place at the project sites in Sulawesi (areas facilitated by EPASS Field Coordination Units of KPHK Tangkoko, Lore Lindu National Park, and Bogani Nani Wartabone National Park). Since early March 2020 several EPASS activities for Q1 (January to March 2020) particularly the ones related to travels (to project sites), face-to-face discussions or meetings, and personnel mobilizations for field technical activities have been postponed or have not been implemented;

  (c) Many EPASS Project activities in the work plan, including monitoring, facilitation, survey, that involved discussion with group of people, have been delayed in accordance with government regulation;

(d) To assure personnel safety and community health, the project facilitated measures in the fields by allocating project budget for the procurement of personal protective equipment, such as vitamins, mask and other relevant equipment for the community affected by Covid-19 outbreak.

(e) To cope with the Covid-19 situation, in the last few months, the project has been working through online system (virtual meetings) to conduct coordination discussions with field coordination units, UNDP Indonesia, the Implementing Partner (Directorate of Biodiversity Conservation of the Directorate General of Natural Resources and Ecosystem Conservation of the Ministry of Environment and Forestry (National Project Director)) and other relevant partners.

3. 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 process must follow a collaborative and participatory approach ensuring close engagement with key participants including the Commissioning Unit (usually the UNDP Country Office), RTAs, Regional M&E Advisors, Country Office M&E Focal Points and Programme Officers, Government counterparts including the GEF Operational Focal Point (OFP), the Nature, Climate and Energy Vertical Fund Directorate, and other key stakeholders. Ideally, the TE should occurs during the last few months of project activities, allowing the TE team to proceed while the Project Team is still in place, yet ensuring the project is close enough to completion for the evaluation team reach conclusions on key aspects such as project sustainability.

At the Project Board Meeting on 16th of June 2020, it was informed that the project team has been constrained working in the field with the project implementation because of COVID-19 pandemic since March 2020. Hence, most of the activities planned for Q2 of the year 2020 were moved to Q3, and a project extension for additional three months with no cost extension approach was proposed. In Q3, some activities in the field were implemented with a small group by practising physical distancing, and some activities that were supposed to be attended by participants from various places were adjusted through virtual options.

DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

4. TE Approach & Methodology

The TE 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 assessment begins.

The evaluation will mainly focus on assessing the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, results, impact, coordination and sustainability of EPASS project efforts and will be applied to all three components of the project. The following are guiding questions within the framework of the evaluation criterions (to be reviewed/ elaborated in the evaluation inception report).

Relevance

- Is EPASS project's theory of change clearly articulated?
- What specific methods and tools were used to assess the needs of the project beneficiaries? Have the interventions match the capacities needs for the institutions and individuals?
- How well does EPASS project react to changing work environment and how well has the design able to adjust to changing external circumstances?
- How did UNDP/ EPASS project contribute towards, and advance gender equality aspirations of the Government of Indonesia; UNDAF outcomes; and CPD outcomes?

Effectiveness & Results

- To what extent is EPASS project successful in achieving the expected results?
- To what extent were target institutions (MoEF primarily) engaged in the implementation of the project?
- How effective EPASS project has been in developing institutional capacity especially in preparing policy review and monitoring MoEF in gender responsive budgeting?
- To what extent are EPASS project interventions been implemented/ coordinated with appropriate and effective partnership and strategies? What has been the nature and added value of these partnerships
- What results are evident short-term to long term results that can be directly or indirectly attributed to the project?
- What factors contribute or influence EPASS project's ability to positively contribute to policy change from a gender perspective, women's economic empowerment, and access to justice and human rights?

Efficiency

- To what extent are funding, staff, and other resources used to achieving the expected results of the project?
- Based on cost-benefit analysis what conclusions can be drawn regarding 'value for money' and cost related efficiencies or inefficiencies in implementing EPASS project?
- Were there any unanticipated events, opportunities or constraints contributed to or hindered the delivery of the interventions on timely manner?

- Have associated risks at the national and local level been anticipated and addressed? Potential Impact
- What impact did the EPASS project have on women's economic status in targeted provinces?
- What impact did the EPASS project have on women's access to justice in targeted provinces?
- What impact did the EPASS project have in the line ministries in improving women's status?

Coordination

- To what extent the project adopted a coordinated and participatory approach in mainstreaming gender into policies and programs?
- To what extent the project used UNDP's internal expertise and adopted joint planning and programming with other UNDP projects?
- To what extent the project was effective in coordinating its activities with UN agencies, relevant development partners, donors, CSO, NGOs and academic institution?

Sustainability

- To what extent did the capacity building activities under each of the pillars produce lasting results?
- To what extent GEP-II has taken the necessary steps to transfer capacities and skills to MoEF and other institutional partners?
- How, and to what extent did UNDP/ EPASS project design, implementation strategy/ partnership, and governance foster national ownership and capacity development?

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 Advisors, 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 ; 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, however, the TE mission for the international consultant may not be possible due to the Covid-19 situation in Indonesia. For this, virtual tools will be used to conduct the interviews.

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 should be clearly outlined in the inception report and be fully discussed and agreed between UNDP, stakeholders and the TE team.

Due to ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, the Terminal Evaluation might be conducted using questionnaires, and virtual interviews, but the evaluation team should be able to revise the approach in consultation with the evaluation manager and the key stakeholders. These changes in approach should be agreed and reflected clearly in the TE Inception Report. The national expert consultant will have to play an important role in the conduct of the evaluation and will therefore, perform additional responsibilities. The main responsibilities of the national expert which will be further elaborated in the inception report is attached as **Annex I**

The final TE report should 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 the country has been restricted since March 2020 and travel in the country is also restricted. 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.

5. 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 TEs 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.   <u>Project Design/Formulation</u>

- 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.   <u>Project Implementation</u>

- 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

iv. <u>Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons Learned</u>

- 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.

The TE report will include an Evaluation Ratings Table, as shown in the ToR Annex.

6. Expected Outputs and Deliverables

The TE consultant/team shall prepare and submit:

- TE Inception Report: TE team clarifies objectives and methods of the TE no later than *2 weeks* before the TE assessment. TE team submits the Inception Report to the Commissioning Unit and project management. Approximate due date: *22 November 2020*
- Presentation: TE team presents initial findings to project management and the Commissioning Unit at the end of the TE assessment. Approximate due date: *08 December 2020*
- Draft TE Report: TE team submits full draft report with annexes *within 3 weeks* of the end of the TE mission. Approximate due date: *18 December 2020*
- Final TE Report* and Audit Trail: TE team submits revised report, with Audit Trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final TE report, to the Commissioning Unit *within 1 week* of receiving UNDP comments on draft. Approximate due date: *28 December 2020*

*The final TE report must be in English. If applicable, the Commissioning Unit may choose to arrange for a translation of the report into a language more widely shared by national stakeholders.

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.[1]

7. TE Arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing the TE resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's TE is the UNDP Indonesia.

The Commissioning Unit will contract the consultants 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.

Due to the COVID-19, the Commissioning Unit and Project Team will support the implementation of remote/ virtual meetings. An updated stakeholder list with contact details (phone and email) will be provided by the Commissioning Unit to the TE team.

8. Duration of the Work

The total duration of the TE will be approximately *35 working days* over a time period of *7 weeks* starting on *17 November 2020* and shall not exceed five months from when the TE team is hired. The tentative TE timeframe is as follows:

- *23 October 2020*: Application closes
- *11 November 2020*: Selection of TE Team
- *17 November 2020*: Preparation of the TE team (handover of project documents)
- *20 November 2020, 02 days* (recommended 2-4): Document review and preparing TE Inception Report
- *22 November 2020, 01 day*: Finalization and Validation of TE Inception Report- latest start of TE assessment
- *22 November – 06 December November 2020 14 days* (r: 7-15): TE assessment: virtual stakeholder meetings, virtual interviews
- *08 December 2020*: Assessment wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of TE assessment
- *16 December 2020) 05* days (r: 5-10): Preparation of draft TE report
- *18 December 2020*: Circulation of draft TE report for comments
- *20 December 2020): 3* days (r: 1-2): Incorporation of comments on draft TE report into Audit Trail & finalization of TE report
- *21 December 2020*: Preparation & Issue of Management Response
- *22 December 2020*: (optional) Concluding Virtual Stakeholder Workshop

---

[1] Access at: http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/section-6.shtml

Note: UNDP evaluation report template is stipulated in the UNDP Evaluation Guidelines 2019 - Annex 3 UNDP evaluation report template and quality standards. The Quality Assurance requirements is stipulated in the UNDP Evaluation Guidelines 2019 - Section 6.10.2 on Evaluation report structure, methodology and data sources; Section 6.10.3 on Cross-cutting issues; and Section 6.10.4 on Evaluation results.

- *28 December 2020:* Expected date of full TE completion

The expected date start date of contract is *17 November 2020.*

9. Duty Station

Travel:
- International travel will not be possible for the team leader given the current situation with the COVID-19 pandemic and travel restriction imposed by number of countries in the region and globally;
- The BSAFE course <u>must</u> be successfully completed <u>prior</u> to commencement of travel;
- Individual Consultants are responsible for ensuring they have vaccinations/inoculations when travelling to certain countries, as designated by the UN Medical Director.
- Consultants are required to comply with the UN security directives set forth under: https://dss.un.org/dssweb/
- All related travel expenses will be covered and will be reimbursed as per UNDP rules and regulations upon submission of an F-10 claim form and supporting documents.

REQUIRED SKILLS AND EXPERIENCE

10. TE Team Composition and Required Qualifications

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 team expert, usually from the country of the project. The team leader will be responsible for the overall design and writing of the TE report, etc. The team expert will assess emerging trends with respect to regulatory frameworks, budget allocations, capacity building, develop communication with stakeholders who will be interviewed, and work with the Project Team in developing the TE workplan.

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.

Due to the ongoing COVID19 pandemic travel restrictions, the International Consultant will work with a National Consultant and the International Consultant will operate remotely using tools to conduct virtual interviews and consultations. Please refer to **Annex I** for the main responsibilities/contribution of the national expert to the evaluation.

In the event that the National Consultant is male, it may be advisable for the Commissioning Unit for the evaluation to contract a female national consultant - preferably a gender specialist to consult with certain stakeholders such as, for example, female local community beneficiaries. Such consultations (undertaken between women) often result in more open, candid sharing of information.   An important aspect of the pursuit of gender equality is an effective monitoring and evaluation system that allows for the voices of girls and women to be heard without constraints.

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.

The selection of evaluators will be aimed at maximizing the overall "team" qualities in the following areas:

Education
- Master's degree in forestry, biodiversity studies, protected area management and other biodiversity related fields. Experience in wildlife management is an advantage or other closely related field.; (10%)

Experience
- Minimum 15 years of Relevant experience with results-based management evaluation methodologies; (10%)
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios; (10%)
- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to Sustainable Development and/or Biodiversity; (10%)
- Experience in evaluating projects; (20%)
- Experience working in developing countries in Asia; (5%)
- Experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years; (15%)
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and sustainable development and/or biodiversity, experience in gender responsive evaluation and analysis; (10%)
- Excellent communication skills;
- Demonstrable analytical skills;
- Project evaluation/review experience within United Nations system will be considered an asset; (10%)
- Experience with implementing evaluations remotely will be considered an asset.

Language
- Fluency in written and spoken English.

11.   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.

12. Payment Schedule

- 20% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final TE Inception Report and approval by the Commissioning Unit
- 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the draft TE report to the Commissioning Unit
- 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final TE report and approval by the Commissioning Unit and RTA (via signatures on the TE Report Clearance Form) and delivery of completed TE Audit Trail

    Criteria for issuing the final payment of 40%
    - The final TE report includes all requirements outlined in the TE TOR and is in accordance with the TE guidance.
    - The final TE report is clearly written, logically organized, and is specific for this project (i.e. text has not been cut & pasted from other MTR reports).
    - The Audit Trail includes responses to and justification for each comment listed.

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

13. Scope of Price Proposal and Schedule of Payments

Financial Proposal:
- Financial proposals must be "all inclusive" and expressed in a lump-sum for the total duration of the contract. The term "all inclusive" implies all cost (professional fees, travel costs, living allowances etc.);
- The lump sum is fixed regardless of changes in the cost components.

14. Recommended Presentation of Proposal

a) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the template provided by UNDP;
b) **CV** and a **Personal History Form** (P11 form);
c) **Brief description of approach to work/technical proposal** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)

d) **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc.), supported by a breakdown of costs, 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 to the address (insert mailing address) in a sealed envelope indicating the following reference "Consultant for Terminal Evaluation of "*Enhancing the Protected Area System in Sulawesi (E-PASS) for Biodiversity Conservation*" or by email at the following address ONLY: (bids.id@undp.org) by 23:59 PM GMT +7 on 23 October 2020. Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

15.   Criteria for Selection of the Best Offer

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.

16. Annexes to the TE ToR

a)   Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework
b)   Annex B: Project Information Package to be reviewed by TE team
c)   Annex C: Content of the TE report
d)   Annex D: Evaluation Criteria Matrix template
e)   Annex E: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators
f)   Annex F: TE Rating Scales
g)   Annex G: TE Report Clearance Form
h)   Annex H: TE Audit Trail
i)   Annex I: Main Responsibilities/Contributions to the Evaluation of the National Consultant

Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework

Project's Development Goal: Effectively managed system of protected areas that is well integrated into its surrounding landscape contributing to sustainable, inclusive and equitable development in Sulawesi.

Objective/ Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	Annual Project target	Source of Information
Objective: To strengthen the effectiveness and financial sustainability of Sulawesi's protected area system to respond to threats to globally significant biodiversity	Institutional capacity scores*for: - PHKA (Jakarta) - LLNP - Bogani Nani NP - North Sulawesi BKSDA *Based on UNDP Capacity Scorecard (See annex 5)	- PHKA (Jakarta): 66% - LLNP: 43% - Bogani Nani NP: 42% - North Sulawesi BKSDA: 40%	**2014**: Capacity development strategies and action plan drafted. **2015:** Capacity development strategies and action plan developed; commenced for implementation. **2016**: RPTNs (National Park Management Plan) updated. **2017**: Capacity score for PHKA :70%, LLNP :50%, Bogani Nani NP :50% and North Sulawesi BKSDA: 50%. **2018**: Draft local government regulation on buffer zone. **2019**: Capacity score for PHKA (Jakarta): 75%, LLNP: 55%, Bogani Nani NP: 55% and North Sulawesi BKSDA: 55%;	Scorecards
	Annual levels of forest degradation within Sulawesi's terrestrial PAs	Approximately 56,505 ha of forest loss within PAs from 2000-2008 or 7,603 ha/year	**2014**: - **2015:** Developed baseline forest cover in Project demonstration sites. **2016**: Annual forest degradation at project sites reduced by 5% from the baseline. **2017:** Annual forest degradation at project sites reduced by 10% from the baseline. **2018**: Annual forest degradation at project sites reduced by 15% from the baseline. **2019**: 25% reduction in annual deforestation within PAs and buffer zones in the project sites combined between baseline years (2000-2010) and last three years of project (2016-2019).	Satellite imagery, RBM/patrol report

Objective/ Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	Annual Project target	Source of Information
1. Enhanced systemic and institutional capacity for planning and management of Sulawesi PA system	Extent of implementation of RBM (Resort-based Management)	RBM has begun to be implemented at all NPs but remains incomplete throughout	**2014**: Gap analysis report on existing policies & RBM operational guidelines drafted. **2015**: Developed operational guidelines for RBM implementation; **2016**: (i) Guidelines for Community engagement & Co-Management developed and (ii) related trainings conducted; **2017**: at least 25% of resorts in all project sites achieved at least one stage above baseline; **2018**: Incentive mechanism for resort level innovation established; **2019:** Using PHKA RBM scoring system (para 60), at least 50% of resorts in the project sites achieved one stage level above the baseline.	PHKA surveys
	Effectiveness of anti-poaching efforts	Very limited implementation of anti-poaching laws across Sulawesi	**2014:** - 2015: (i) a small unit of intelligence based poaching & wildlife trade surveillance established and equipped; (ii) mechanism for monitoring, analysing and reporting developed. **2016**: The Unit was fully operational at least within Project sites and buffer zones**.** **2017:** Reporting system on wildlife trade & consumption was in place at project sites & buffer zones. **2018:** Initial replication of the intelligence based poaching & wildlife trade surveillance unit to other PAs in Sulawesi. **2019:** Intelligence-based anti-poaching has become a well-known feature of PA management, affecting incentives in measurable ways (surveys).	Surveys conducted within buffer zone communities

Objective/ Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	Annual Project target	Source of Information
	Operational island-wide biodiversity monitoring system	No integrated monitoring	**2014:** - **2015:** : Technical guidelines for biodiversity, key species and habitat condition monitoring updated & disseminated to all Sulawesi PAs system. **2016**: Platform for monitoring, reporting & knowledge sharing of the Sulawesi Biodiversity developed at provincial level. **2017**: Fully utilized the platform for island-based biodiversity monitoring, planning and budgeting. **2018**: Publication of Sulawesi biodiversity & best practices of PA management disseminated in various forms of media & discussed/reviewed at national and sub-national level. **2019**: Users across Sulawesi, Indonesia and beyond are able to upload to and access historic data on biodiversity and protected areas, generated by multiple sources, using a platform created by the project.	Project reporting on system functionality; direct experience logging on
	Representation of lowland forest (key under-represented forest ecosystem types in Sulawesi's PA system)	131,000 ha, or 4.2% of total remaining habitat type	**2014:** - **2015**: Spatial planning arrangement for Sulawesi PA system designed based on biodiversity importance & bio-geographical representatives of the PA system. **2016**: PA System Consolidation Plan and Action plan for expansion and realignment of Sulawesi PA System be vetted by relevant districts and provinces planning authorities to be eventually integrated into their spatial planning. **2017**: Implementation of the Action plan at island level in coordination with relevant directorates within the Ministry of Forestry including gazetting	Gazettement

Objective/ Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	Annual Project target	Source of Information
			preparation process of new National Park (Ganda Dewata). **2018**: Policy recommendation & exit strategy to sustain the plan implementation adopted by relevant authorities. **2019**: Representation of low land forest increased to 210,000 ha, or 6.7% of remaining habitat type (representing a 60% increase in coverage).	
2. Financial sustainability of the Sulawesi PA system	Financial sustainability score (%) for the sub-system of Sulawesi's protected areas: - Component 1 – Legal, regulatory and institutional frameworks - Component 2 – Business planning and tools for cost-effective management - Component 3 – Tools for revenue generation	Financial sustainability score (see Annex 6 - Tracking Tool, incl. METTs and Financial Sustainability Scorecard) 34 % 35 % 28 %	**2014**: - 2015: Economic valuation of Sulawesi PA system reviewed particularly for three project sites. **2016**: Communication strategy to increase public awareness on the importance of biodiversity & ecosystem services provision developed. Key target groups: decision makers, local government official and local and indigenous community. **2017**: Increased financial sustainability score for component 1 (40%), component 2 (40%) and component 3 (35%) **2018:** Increased financial investment in the Sulawesi PA system. Quantitative target will be discussed during the Inception Workshop. **2019**: Increased financial sustainability score for component 1 (50%), component 2 (50%) and component 3 (50%).	Financial scorecard
	Annual budget allocated to protected areas	Estimated $12.3 million allocated annually.	**2014: -** **2015**: Sulawesi PA system financing plan and strategies developed including proposals for broader policy reform supporting revenue generation and retention, institution arrangement, tool for cost effective management and others.	Financial scorecard in last year of project

Objective/ Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	Annual Project target	Source of Information
			2016: Business plan of the Sulawesi PA developed through participatory approach involving communities, private sector, NGOs and related government agencies. **2017**: At least one pilot financing projects operating in each project site. **2018**: Best practiced of the business plan implementation documented for replication. **2019:** Annual budget allocation to the PA system increased 25% equivalent to approx. $15 million.	
	Sustainable financing mechanisms for PAs	Government budgetary allocations / funding only	**2014**: - **2015**: Study on potential financing mechanism for Sulawesi PA management. **2016**: An enabling policy/legal environment developed through technical meetings, consultation and consensus building at local and national level **2017**: Design, negotiation, formalization and operationalization of mechanism implemented. **2018**: National mechanism of the PA system financing socialized to relevant stakeholders. **2019**: At least two new sustainable financing mechanisms for PA management developed, which can provide a minimum of US$ 3 million per year for PA management.	
3. Threat reduction and collaborative governance in the target PAs and buffer zones	METT scores for demonstration sites	LLNP - 61 BNWNP - 64 Tangkoko Batuangas NR - 55	**2014: -** **2015**: Action plan for strengthening management effectiveness of the Sulawesi PA system developed. **2016**: Participatory	METT surveys

Objective/ Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	Annual Project target	Source of Information
			Biodiversity-based boundaries realigning at project sites and buffer zone designation developed. **2017**: Increased METT scores for LLNP – 65, BNWNP – 67, TBNR Complex - 60 **2018**: Collaborative management in the targeted PAs and buffer zone integrated in Sulawesi PA system action plan. **2019**: Increased METT Score for LLNP – 70, BNWNP – 70, and Tangkoko Batuangas NR – 70	
	Threat indices at project demonstration sites	LLNP – 0.23 BNWNP – 0.28 Tangkoko Batuangas NR – 0.31	**2014**: - **2015**: Updated threats and work plan in project sites. **2016**: Developed monitoring, evaluation & reporting mechanism of the PA threats, led by Surveillance Unit. **2017**: Reduced threat indices for LLNP – 20, BNWNP – 25, and Tangkoko Batuangas NR – 25 **2018**: Best practices developed and disseminated. **2019**: Reduced threat indices for LLNP – 0.15; BNWNP – 0.20 Tangkoko Batuangas NR – 0.20	Threat indices
	Ecosystem health index at project demonstration sites	Lore Lindu NP - .68 Bogani Nani Wartabone NP - .55 Tangkoko Batuangas NR - .48	**2014**: - **2015**: Updated RBM guidelines including biodiversity and ecosystem health monitoring. **2016**: Developed monitoring, evaluation & reporting mechanism to regularly update the ecosystem health.	EHI surveys

Objective/ Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	Annual Project target	Source of Information
			2017: Increased EHI for Lore Lindu NP - 0.70, Bogani Nani Wartabone NP - 0.60, and Tangkoko Batuangas NR - 0.60 **2018:** Implemented and adopted RBM innovation incentive mechanism; published project best practices. **2019**: Increased EHI for Lore Lindu NP - .75 Bogani Nani Wartabone NP - .75 Tangkoko Batuangas NR - .75	
	Populations of selected threatened indicator species at project sites	LLNP – Mountain Anoa, Babirusa, Maleo BNWNP – Maleo, Babirusa, mountain Anoa Tangkoko Batuangas NR – Macaca nigra, Sulawesi civet, Maleo, lowland Anoa	**2014**: - **2015**: Monitored of the existing condition of selected threatened species, threats, habitat and wildlife trade. **2016**: Developed species management measures guidelines. **2017**: Maintained population of key species. **2018**: Database on key species information updated and disseminated. **2019:** Indicator population species maintained or increasing; appropriate population structure achieved.	Project field surveys
	Active encroachment areas in target PAs	- Encroachment levels as of 2011: LLNP 6,333 ha, BNWNP 3,436 h. Tangkoko baseline TBD.	**2014**: - **2015**: Fragmented and degraded ecosystem restoration conducted. **2016**: Conflict resolution to reduce forest encroachment developed. **2017**: Stopped encroachment activity in target sites. **2018**: Best practices adopted and replicated to other sites. **2019**: Zero increase in net levels of active encroachment.	Project field surveys

Objective/ Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	Annual Project target	Source of Information
	Existence and effectiveness of collaborative governance systems	Approximately 30 Community Conservation Areas (CCAs) established, currently operating at varying degrees of functionality.	**2014: -** **2015**: Existing CCAs revitalized and 5 new CCAs established. **2016**: Education programme for local communities mobilized through mobile education units and village education centers establishment. **2017**: (i) At least 40 CCAs established/revitalized at all project sites. (ii) At least 30 CCAs above operating at an agreed baseline level of functionality. (iii) At least 12 CCAs above are rated as 'highly functional'. **2018**: Agreements on collaborative management, for instance between PAs and communities, NGOs, parallel projects, local universities and local Government established. Micro-capital grants for small income generating/conservation schemes proposals established. **2019**: (i) At least 45 CCAs, including some at each project demonstration site (ii) 70% of above CCAs are operating at an agreed baseline level of functionality. (iii) 35% of above CCAs are rated as 'highly functional' (rating system to be developed and applied during inception phase).	Project reports

Annex B: Project Information Package to be reviewed by TE 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
28	Relevant COVID19 Impacts Studies and the National Recovery Strategies

Annex C: Content of the TE report

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[2])

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 (*)
- 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

---

[2] See ToR Annex F for rating scales.

- 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 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 a the local, regional and national level?			
(include evaluative questions)	*(i.e. relationships established, level of coherence between project design and implementation approach, specific activities conducted, quality of risk mitigation strategies, etc.)*	*(i.e. project documentation, national policies or strategies, websites, project staff, project partners, data collected throughout the TE mission, etc.)*	*(i.e. document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc.)*
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?			
(Expand the table to include questions for all criteria being assessed: Monitoring & Evaluation, UNDP oversight/implementation, Implementing Partner Execution, cross-cutting issues, etc.) *NOTE: Include COVID-19 specific questions, as needed.*			

Annex E: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators

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: 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: TE Report Clearance Form

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 Audit Trail

The following is a template for the TE Team to show how the received comments on the draft TE report have (or have not) been incorporated into the final TE report. This Audit Trail should be listed as an annex in the final TE report but not attached to the report file.

To the comments received on *(date)* **from the Terminal Evaluation of** *Enhancing the Protected Area System in Sulawesi (E-PASS) for Biodiversity Conservation* (PIMS ID 4392)

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

Annex I: Main Responsibilities/Contributions to the Evaluation of the National Consultant

National Consultant Task	Notes	Format for Use
Provide input into the Inception Report to be drafted by the IC. In particular, the NC should: 1) consult with the PMU to develop the draft project site visit itinerary, taking into consideration guidelines on site visits and stakeholder consultations provided by the International Consultant/Team Leader (IC) 2) prepare an evaluation question matrix to be used in conjunction with that prepared by the IC and focused specifically on those consultations that will take place during field visits.	The NC should review list of stakeholders to be met as proposed in the initial draft of the Inception Report and provide comments as to additional stakeholders to meet or, in the case that stakeholders included in the list of proposed consultations are not as important as may have appeared to the IC, indicate where these meetings may not be priority.	
Maintain the up-to-date actual itinerary of the Evaluation Team (ET) for all in-country meetings conducted	Although a tentative itinerary is provided for the ET, the actual itinerary is often significantly different. We need to include an accurate actual itinerary in the evaluation report.	Use format provided by IC. See Form A
Maintain up-to-date comprehensive list of persons met by the ET (all meetings, including those held by zoom, skype or otherwise virtually)	Actual stakeholders met by the ET usually varies from what was originally planned. We need to include the actual list of all stakeholders met in the evaluation report.	Use format provided by IC. See Form B
Prepare list of all products/outputs (technical reports, land use or management plans, curricula, etc.) produced with project financial support	A good starting point is to review the project Mid-Term Review (MTR) as this should have information as to what was produced as of the time of the MTR.	Use format provided by IC. See Form C
Review products as indicated by the IC & provide product assessment		Use format provided by IC See Form C
Prepare list of all trainings conducted with project financial support	A good starting point is to review the project Mid-Term Review (MTR) as this should have information as to what trainings were conducted as of the time of the MTR.	Use format provided by IC See Form D
At outset of assignment, brief IC on updated institutional/policy/legislative frameworks relevant to the project and on key relevant in-country initiatives (national and state government programmes/campaigns), NGO activities, and donor-supported projects).	Although the ICs will have read the PRODOC which normally describes this in some detail, several years will have passed since the time the PRODOC was written and significant changes may have taken place. It is important for the entire evaluation team to be up-	

	to-date on the institutional, policy, and legislative frameworks.	
Undertake in-country consultations	In the event that the IC is not present in country due to COVID restrictions, the NC will undertake all in-country consultations. The IC will participate remotely when feasible and when this would not be obtrusive or distracting for stakeholders being interviewed.	
Summarize each consultation undertaken ensuring that important data is recorded that allows for detailed, evidence-based observations and conclusions to be drawn.	Although all ET members involved in meetings will normally do this, during COVID restrictions that do not allow the IC to be physically present at meetings (and in some cases, not even present remotely), the primary responsibility for capture of detailed data shared during such meetings is with the NC. For example, mention may be made that 67 out of 123 farmers who underwent crab farming training provided by the project are not currently engaged in crab farming. Although is clear that crab farming was not broadly adopted by that group, the specific figures should be recorded as best as possible. Often people interviewed will cite facts and figures quickly and move on without pause. It is our job to ensure we capture important data as we go.	Use format provided See Form E
Engage with IC in review and analysis of important information gained during the day's meetings during regularly scheduled twice weekly zoom or skype calls	This is normally done at the end of each day to ensure important information is captured and that team members are able to share their perspectives and analysis for a more thorough and accurate evaluation. Due to COVID restrictions that do not allow the IC to be present in country, and given that internet access may be limited during field visits, twice weekly zoom or skype calls will be planned instead.	
Engage with IC in analysis of evaluation findings	All team members have been contracted because of their relevant expertise. All should contribute to the analysis of information obtained during the evaluation to ensure an accurate, objective, thorough	

	evaluation.	
Participate as requested by the IC in the preliminary presentation of evaluation findings	This is done on the last day of the in-country mission or, with COVID restrictions in place, shortly thereafter. Normally, UNDP, the PMU, the Government, and key involved implementing entities and NGOs are present. This is not a "Powerpoint" presentation. It is an informal presentation which provides an opportunity for the ET to share its preliminary findings for feedback from key stakeholders, to ensure accuracy, to fill in information gaps, and to better understand different perspectives on issues raised by the evaluation.	
Take photos of site visits for inclusion in the evaluation report.	This should be done in a non-intrusive way. Indeed, if the NC is comfortable asking someone else to do this, this is preferable. All photos should be labelled with brief description including location.	
Fill in information gaps as needed following drafting of Evaluation report by IC	There is sometimes a need to follow-up to obtain specific information after the in-country mission is over. The NC is best placed to do this.	