

INTERNATIONAL INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANT – TERMINAL EVALUATION OF PIMS 4490 SOUTHERN RANGELNADS KENYA.

Reference: KEN/IC/2020/053

Submission Deadline: 5.00 P.M Kenyan Time (GMT+3.00) on Friday, 13 November 2020 to consultants.ken@undp.org; reference “KEN IC 2020 053 – International Individual Consultant for Terminal Evaluation of Enhancing Wildlife Conservation in the Productive Southern Rangelands through a Landscape Approach PIMS 4490”

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 Wildlife Conservation in the Productive Southern Rangelands through a Landscape Approach PIMS 4490** implemented through the **Kenya Wildlife Service**. The project started on the **26 January 2015** and is in its **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’ ([Guidance for Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported GEF-financed Projects](#)).

2. PROJECT BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

The project was designed to mainstream biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into production lands in the Greater Amboseli landscape and improve the sustainability of Protected Area systems (PAs). It aims to provide a resource governance model that allows communities and conservationists to utilize revitalized skills, and, guided by knowledge-based landscape planning, taking advantage of modified policies and market-based incentives to balance resource use and resource conservation across the greater Amboseli, to secure a broader range of benefits for the onsite and offsite dependents, in a more equitable and sustainable manner.

The project’s goal is the biodiversity of the Greater Amboseli landscape is protected from existing and emerging threats through building an effective collaborative governance framework for multiple use management of rangelands. The project objective is to mainstream biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into production landscapes in the Greater Amboseli landscape and improve the sustainability of Protected Area systems.

The project comprises three complementary components to be implemented over a 5-year period. The interventions are cost-shared by the GEF support of USD 3,990,909 and partners co-finance of USD 24,820,000. Each component addresses a different barrier and has discrete outcomes as follows: -

- Outcome 1: Effective governance framework for multiple use and threat removal outside PAs.

- Outcome 2: Landscape based multiple use/management delivers multiple benefits to the widest range of users, reducing threats to wildlife from outside the ecosystem.
- Outcome 3: Increased benefits from tourism shared more equitably.

The project is implemented by the Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS) in partnership with UNDP, and the Maasai Wilderness Conservation Trust (MWCT), Big Life Foundation (BLF) and African Conservation Centre (ACC) as responsible parties leading the community engagement at the project site.

The partners are engaged in line with their designated roles and responsibilities; support national efforts to secure conservancy management, set up a series of conservancies across the landscape, map out and secure wildlife dispersal areas, secure connectivity corridors between the core PAs of Amboseli, Tsavo and Chyulu Hills, to offer greater protection of selected species (GEF BD SO 1).

The partners catalyzed a shift from the current sector-focused planning to a more integrated land-use planning system, thus, increasing productivity of livestock and agriculture while protecting environmental services, including the watershed services of the Chyulu Hills (GEF BD SO2).

The project contributes to the attainment of the UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD) Output 4.2: Improved institutional and community capacity to deliver pro-poor, sustainable natural resource management initiatives” through the following activities: Development of ecosystem management plan for the Amboseli landscape; Development of land use plans for community lands; Promotion of alternative wildlife; and Creation of wildlife dispersal areas.

The observed changes since the implementation of the project in 2017 include: *increased area of conservancies within the productive landscapes with streamlined management guidelines* - Securing space for wildlife dispersal and migration with the Amboseli Landscape is at the heart of the project; *Proportion of productive land in the Group Ranches under conservancies* - conservancies with a total area of 788.38 Km² are being managed as per their respective group ranch management plans; and *established wildlife compatible livelihoods* - alternative income generating activities compatible with use of the landscape as wildlife rangeland were supported by the project.

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 project has over the past years since 2017 built partnerships among the wildlife conservation agencies/stakeholders and local communities’ action within the Amboseli Landscape towards securing wildlife dispersal areas despite the changing land tenure and land use pressures.

Recommendations from TE will therefore be useful in sustaining the various results and interventions undertaken under this project.

The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming. The evaluation will also make recommendations for sustainability, replication and scaling up that will be used by the project partners to build on the gains made during the project.

4. TE APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

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

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

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

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful TE. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders.; 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: Stakeholders that must be visited for this TE are the Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS), African Conservation Centre (ACC), Big Life Foundation (BLF), Maasai Wilderness Conservation Trust (MWCT), Amboseli Ecosystem Trust (AET), Local leaders – group ranches, Local community enterprises groups, and the Kenya Wildlife Conservancies Association (KWCA).

Additionally, the national consultant is expected to conduct field missions to **the Amboseli landscape**, including the following project sites – the Amboseli National Park, Kimana Group Ranch (GR), Imbirikani GR, Kuku GR, Rombo GR and Olgulului GR.

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 use gender-responsive methodologies and tools and ensure that gender equality and women's empowerment, as well as other cross-cutting issues and SDGs are incorporated into the TE report.

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

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

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 ([Guidance for Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported GEF-financed Projects](#)). The TE is expected to be undertaken in 25 days within the period November 2020 to January 2021. It shall cover issues related to the various components of the project mentioned in Section 4 Paragraph 2 above. Overall, the objectives of the evaluation are:

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

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 (*)
- 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. Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons Learned

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

- Recommendations should provide concrete, practical, feasible and targeted recommendations directed to the intended users of the evaluation about what actions to take and decisions to make. The recommendations should be specifically supported by the evidence and linked to the findings and conclusions around key questions addressed by the evaluation.
- The TE report should also include lessons that can be taken from the evaluation, including best 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 *Enhancing Wildlife Conservation in the Productive Southern Rangelands through a Landscape Approach PIMS 4490*

Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E)	Rating¹
M&E design at entry	
M&E Plan Implementation	
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	

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)

6. TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the TE will be approximately **25 working days** over a time period of **10 weeks** starting on **30th November 2020**. The tentative TE timeframe is as follows:

Timeframe	Activity
13 th November 2020	Application closes
23 rd November 2020	Selection of TE team
30 th November 2020	Preparation period for TE team (handover of documentation)
7 th December 2020 - 4 days	Document review and preparation of TE Inception Report
14 th December 2020 - 2 days	Finalization and Validation of TE Inception Report; latest start of TE mission
17 th January 2021 - 7 days	TE mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits, etc.
18 th January 2021	Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings; earliest end of TE mission
1 st February 2021 - 8 days)	Preparation of draft TE report - conclude and share for circulation
8 th February 2021	Circulation of draft TE report for comments – conclude and feedback to consultants
15 th February 2021- 2 days	Incorporation of comments on draft TE report into Audit Trail & finalization of TE report
21 st February 2021	Preparation and Issuance of Management Response
21 st February 2021	Concluding Stakeholder Workshop - Virtual
28 th February 2021	Expected date of full TE completion

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

7. TE DELIVERABLES

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	TE Inception Report	TE team clarifies objectives, methodology and timing of the TE	No later than 2 weeks before the TE mission: 14th December 2020	TE team submits Inception Report to Commissioning Unit and project management
2	Presentation	Initial Findings	End of TE mission: 18th January 2021	TE team presents to Commissioning Unit and project management
3	Draft TE Report	Full draft report <i>(using guidelines on report content in ToR Annex C)</i> with annexes	Within 3 weeks of end of TE mission: 8th February 2021	TE team submits to Commissioning Unit; reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP

5	Final TE Report* + Audit Trail	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 1 week of receiving comments on draft report: 21st February 2021	TE team submits both documents to the Commissioning Unit
---	-----------------------------------	--	---	--

*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

8. TE ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing the TE resides with the **UNDP Kenya Office**.

A team of two independent evaluators will conduct the TE – one international (1) and one national (1) consultants.

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

The TE is expected to be **majorly a virtual evaluation**, with the consult(s) based at their home station due to COVID-19 restrictions and safety protocols. Only the national consultant will be expected to conduct a field visit to the project locations in the Amboseli Landscape. However, if travel is possible for the international consultant, Nairobi shall be the duty station of the consultant and they will participate in the field visit.

Travel:

- International travel may be required to Kenya during the TE mission;
- The BSAFE course must be successfully completed prior 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

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

9. TE TEAM COMPOSITION

A team of two independent evaluators will conduct the TE – one international (1) and one local (1) consultants. The International Consultant, the team leader, will work closely with the National Consultant. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The National Consultant will support the International Consultant who will have the overall responsibility for the conduct of the evaluation exercise as well as quality and timely submission of reports (inception, draft, final etc). The International Consultant will be accountable to UNDP for the delivery results on this assignment.

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

Team Leader- International Consultant

Education

- Master's degree in Environmental Sciences, Natural Resources Management, Water Resources Management or other closely related field (5 marks);

Experience

- At least 10 years' experience with results-based management project mid-term or terminal evaluations, preferably for GEF/Biodiversity projects (25 marks);
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios (5 marks);
- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to biodiversity (5 marks);
- Knowledge of and experience working in Kenya or East Africa or biodiversity and conservation is an asset (5 marks);
- Experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years (15 marks);
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and biodiversity; experience in gender responsive evaluation and analysis (5 marks);
- Excellent communication skills; demonstrable analytical skills; and project evaluation/review experience within United Nations system will be considered an asset (5 marks).

Language

- Fluency in written and spoken English.

10. 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.

11. 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 TE reports).
- The Audit Trail includes responses to and justification for each comment listed.

12. APPLICATION PROCESS

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

- a) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the template attached (offeror's letter to UNDP);
- b) **Updated CV**
- 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 using the attached template (IC Proposal form)
- 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 (Offeror's letter to UNDP).

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 consultants.ken@undp.org; by **5.00 P.M Kenyan Time (GMT+3.00) on 13 November 2020** reference ***“KEN IC 2020 053 – International Consultant for Terminal Evaluation of Enhancing Wildlife Conservation in the Productive Southern Rangelands through a Landscape Approach PIMS 4490”***

Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

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.

13. TOR ANNEXES

- ToR Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework
- ToR Annex B: Project Information Package to be reviewed by TE team
- ToR Annex C: Content of the TE report
- ToR Annex D: Evaluation Criteria Matrix template
- ToR Annex E: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators
- ToR Annex F: TE Rating Scales
- ToR Annex G: TE Report Clearance Form
- ToR Annex H: TE Audit Trail

ToR Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework

Objective/Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	End of Project target	Source of Information	Risks and assumptions
Objective – To mainstream biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into production landscapes in the Greater Amboseli landscape and improve the sustainability of Protected Area systems.	Increased area of conservancies within the productive landscapes with streamlined management guidelines.	Some buffer zones under biodiversity set-asides but without any systematic management regime for biodiversity conservation.	The 5,500km ² of buffer zones of the core parks under a systematic management framework.	Independent mid-term and final evaluations; Project reports	<u>Risk</u> : - Lack of cohesion amongst stakeholders <u>Assumption</u> : Continued interest and support of government and staff in the implementation of policies and programmes to mainstream biodiversity conservation and economic development in national planning
	METT scores improved in selected PAs: Amboseli NP Chyulu Hills NP	 66 52	 75 65	METT applied at PPG, Mid-term and Final Evaluation	
Component 1 – Effective governance for multiple use and threat removal outside PAs	Regional and local institutions for facilitating a more inclusive planning and conservation of the Greater Amboseli landscape established and made operational in the ecosystem: 1.1 County level rangeland management committee is emplaced and capacitated, coordinating activities amongst the conservancies at county level. 1.2 Independent, national level Kenya Wildlife Conservation Forum emplaced, with at least 10 active member organisations.			<u>Risks</u> : -Complexity in stakeholder collaboration due to differing interests and wide range of stakeholders.	

Objective/Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	End of Project target	Source of Information	Risks and assumptions
	<p>1.3 Stakeholder-led process identifies existing rangeland management organisations and engages interest in the capacitation of a system of Southern Rangelands conservancies, modelled on best practice achieved by the Northern Rangelands Trust and conservancies in southern Africa.</p> <p>1.4 Development of recommendations for wildlife conservation practices for the greater Amboseli for the longer-term harmonious co-existence of wildlife, livestock and economic development.</p>				<p>- Slow operationalisation of legislation legalising conservancies as the vehicle for co-management.</p> <p>- Delays caused by the complexities in establishing the institutions required for the southern rangelands</p> <p><u>Assumptions:</u> - governance systems will enable the necessary cohesion and pace of implementation</p>
	Financial sustainability score (%) for national systems of protected areas:	46.67%	55%	Financial sustainability scorecard	
	Component 1: Legal, Regulatory and Institutional frameworks.	52.5%	60%		
	Component 2: Business planning and tools for cost effective management.	36.62%	45%		
	Component 3: Tools for revenue generation.				

Objective/Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	End of Project target	Source of Information	Risks and assumptions
	National level institutions formalised for empowerment of local communities	1 (KWCA)	2 (CRMC and KWCA)	KWS reports; Government registration/formalisation documents	
	Number of capacity building and training programmes in place (Eco monitoring, Security & Livelihoods)	3 in each currently established conservancy (Big Life, ACC & MWCT)	At least 5 with streamlined curriculum	KWS reports; Training course curriculum	
Component 2 – Landscape based multiple use/management delivers multiple benefits to the widest range of users, reducing threats to wildlife from outside the ecosystem.	<p>An integrated land use plan for the wildlife dispersal areas formulated and implementation initiated, clearly delineating different zones of use, providing specific regulations, standards and codes of practice:</p> <p>2.1 Establishment/Formalisation of 5 conservancies ensuring key corridors of connectivity between the 2 core Parks (Amboseli and Chyulu) and the surrounding areas (group ranches) are secured through a) identification and mapping key HVBA and forest fragments in the project landscape; b) elevating the legal status of identified critical biodiversity areas outside PAs; c) rehabilitation/ eco-restoration of critically degraded areas (with co- finance).</p> <p>2.2 Creation and establishment of the proposed conservancies identified during PPG activities and consultations with local communities and key stakeholders.</p> <p>2.3 The Southern Rangelands conservancies’ project is implemented at county level, with possible alignment of Tsavo /Chyulu conservancies with the wider landscape; possibly with bordering counties of Narok, Makueni and Taita Taveta.</p>				<p><u>Risks:</u> - Threat of continued subdivision of the Group Ranches accompanied by fencing, overgrazing, extension of agriculture and unplanned human development.</p> <p>- Climate change could lead to both changed distributions</p>

Objective/Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	End of Project target	Source of Information	Risks and assumptions
	<p>2.4 Minimum utilisation levels for wildlife corridors particularly for agriculture, livestock, settlements and tourism development areas/zoned in multiple use areas.</p> <p>2.5 Protection of swamps, river systems and Chyulu hills water catchment stabilises water availability to wildlife and human use.</p> <p>2.6 Implementation of alternative sustainable livelihoods plans and biodiversity friendly farming practices that include agri-livestock activities by farmers in Kimana Ranch and Chyulu Hills resulting in stabilisation in agriculture fields, increase in volumes and duration of stream flows, no net loss of natural forest blocks in critical corridors.</p> <p>2.7 Capacitation of KWS for the protection of wildlife within and outside the NPs to cover the Greater Amboseli Ecosystem.</p>				<p>of BD components, and changes in demands on biodiversity-based resources.</p> <p>- Conservancies are slow to join the project for fear of loss of autonomy.</p> <p>-Climate change affects ecosystem resilience.</p> <p><u>Assumptions:</u> landscape approach understood and bought into by stakeholders</p>
	Movement of elephants within the greater Amboseli landscape, between the 3 core NPs.	Concentration of elephants in the Amboseli NP irrespective of season	Increased movement of elephant populations within the Amboseli landscape and between the 3 core NPs.	Biodiversity monitoring database; Monitoring reports; DRRS and ACP monitoring reports	
	Proportion of productive land in the Group Ranches under conservancies	10.8% (approximately 57,700ha)	20.7% (approximately 101,902)	KWS reports	
	Number of conservancies managed under a landscape level coordinated management programme	0	At least 5 conservancies	KWS reports; MOUs agreed upon by member conservancies	

Objective/Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	End of Project target	Source of Information	Risks and assumptions
	Number of operational wildlife conservancies managed by local communities	1 derelict (Kimana) community wildlife conservancy	At least 5 conservancies with rehabilitation of Kimana sanctuaries.	KWS reports; Independent mid-term and final evaluations	
	Threats to wildlife from unplanned tourism infrastructure development mitigated	Limited scope of procedures in place to deal with unplanned developments	Protocols for infrastructure development operationalised.	KWS reports; Approved infrastructure development guidelines	
Component 3 – Increased benefits from tourism shared more equitably.	<p>3.1 A negotiated ecosystem-wide tourism development plan formulated and implementation initiated, to support sustainable tourism development and infrastructure development outside the core PAs.</p> <p>3.2 Tourism returns to local communities enhanced through formation and operationalisation of finance management mechanisms.</p> <p>3.3 Partnerships between the private sector and group ranches on tourism outside the core PAs increased and made more equitable through development of new and innovative tourism products and other incentives (such as tax breaks), and renewed branding and marketing.</p> <p>3.4 PES for green water credits operation and earning money to land users on the Chyulu hills(co-finance);</p>				<p><u>Risks</u>: - Declining tourism revenue unable to stimulate the necessary paradigm shift from unsustainable to sustainable wildlife management.</p> <p>-Participation by women in the project is limited by lack of</p>

Objective/Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	End of Project target	Source of Information	Risks and assumptions
	Number of leasehold agreements entered into by the local communities with tourism investors for use of conservancies or wildlife zones	1 (Kuku GR)	At least 5 leasehold/management agreements	KWS reports; Independent mid-term and final evaluations	<p>awareness and cultural norms</p> <p><u>Assumptions:</u> clear and defined interest in economic engagement by appropriate stakeholders including women</p>
	Proportion of household incomes generated from wildlife-related activities	<3% as determined during PPG activities	Increase to at least 10%	KWS reports and Fiscal monitoring programmes	
	Number of alternative livelihoods engaged in by the local communities	1 (Bird shooting in Mbirikani Ranch)	At least 4 alternative livelihoods including Beekeeping, Sericulture, Aloe farming and eco-charcoal burning	Reports by ACC, ACP and KWS Independent mid-term and final evaluations	
	Number of tourists visiting conservancies	Majority of tourists visit the 3 core NPs, few venture to conservancies	Increase by up to 50% of number of visitors to conservancies.	Kenya Tourism Development Board reports KWS reports	
	Number of PES schemes established and implemented.	1 PES scheme (Tourism PES)	At least 2 additional PES schemes for watershed	KWS reports and Fiscal monitoring programmes	

Objective/Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	End of Project target	Source of Information	Risks and assumptions
			conservation and carbon trading.		

ToR 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
<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 rating³)

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

³ 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 a 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 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

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 limitations, 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: _____

professionalism).

ToR Annex F: TE Rating Scales

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

ToR Annex G: TE Report Clearance Form

<p>Terminal Evaluation Report for <i>(Project Title & UNDP PIMS ID)</i> Reviewed and Cleared By:</p>	
<p>Commissioning Unit (M&E Focal Point)</p>	
<p>Name: _____</p>	
<p>Signature: _____ _____</p>	<p>Date: _____</p>
<p>Regional Technical Advisor (Nature, Climate and Energy)</p>	
<p>Name: _____</p>	
<p>Signature: _____ _____</p>	<p>Date: _____</p>

--

ToR 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 (project name) (UNDP Project PIMS #)

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