

Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference

Template 2 - formatted for the [UNDP Jobs website](#)

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

Application Deadline: 06 July 2021

Category: International Consultant/ Senior Specialist

Type of Contract: IC

Assignment Type: TE International Consultant

Languages Required: English

Starting Date: 01 August 2021

Duration of Initial Contract: 40 working days

Expected Duration of Assignment: August– October 2021 (40 working day 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 medium-sized project titled Transforming Effectiveness of Biodiversity Conservation in Priority Sumatran Landscapes (PIMS #5363) implemented through the Ministry of Environment and Forestry as the Implementing Partner. The project started on the 24th February 2016 and is in its last (6th) 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 BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT`

Indonesia has ratified the United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) on 26 November 1994, and the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification and Drought on 31 August 1998. In addition to these conventions, Indonesia

also ratified the Kyoto Protocol on 3 December 2004, thereby committing itself to stabilizing global greenhouse gas emissions for the period of 2008-2012. Moreover, to protect biodiversity from the potential risks posed by genetically modified organisms that are the product of biotechnology, Indonesia subscribed to the Cartagena Protocol on Biological Safety on 3 December 2004.

Sumatra is the sixth largest island in the world, characterized by the Bukit Barisan mountain range and globally significant tropical montane, sub montane, lowland, fresh water and peat swamp forests as well as mangroves and rivers. The island's fauna includes 201 mammal and 580 bird species, with endemic and critically endangered species such as the Sumatran orangutan and Sumatran rhinoceros, and subspecies such as the Sumatran elephant.

The Sumatran tiger *Panthera tigris sumatrae* is Indonesia's last remaining tiger subspecies with an estimated population of 400-500 adults. Its conservation areas include 13 Important Bird Areas, two Ramsar sites (Berbak and Sembilang National Parks) and the UNESCO WHC Tropical Rainforest Heritage of Sumatra sites (the National Parks of Gunung Leuser, Kerinci Seblat and Bukit Barisan Selatan).

The current project will cover all five of these globally significant sites and surrounding landscapes. Across Sumatra, the principal threat to biodiversity is habitat loss and forest degradation, with forest cover shrinking from 25.3m hectares in 1985 to 12.8m hectares in 2009, with clearance driven by commercial oil palm and timber fibre plantations, followed by subsistence agriculture, while the main driver of forest degradation has been commercial logging. In addition, the wildlife trade is a significant pressure on species, with an estimated fifty Sumatran tigers poached annually between 1998 and 2002.

The main barriers to achieving this vision are weak natural resource governance and limited protected area management capacity, poor inter-agency coordination for wildlife and forest conservation outside of the PAs, and inadequate financial planning and management for protected areas. The long-term solution offered by the project for securing Sumatra's forests, wildlife and ecosystem services lies in consolidating a network of effectively managed and adequately funded protected areas (PAs) that are supported by complementary actions in the adjacent forests and with multiple stakeholders to achieve sustainably managed landscapes. This will require both multi-agency partnerships across multiple provinces and sufficient incentives for communities to reduce forest encroachment and illegal hunting of protected species.

The objective of the project is to enhance biodiversity conservation in priority landscapes in Sumatra through adoption of good management practices in protected areas and adjacent production landscapes, using tiger recovery as a key indicator of success. This will be accomplished through supporting implementation of the National Tiger Recovery Plan, which sets out the key elements to protect forests and wildlife in Sumatra.

The project aims to address a range of institutional, governance and financial issues that prevent the project objective from being achieved. In doing so, it will create a model biodiversity management system that is operational across the target landscapes, can be scaled-up across Sumatra, and strengthen the national PA system. The Ministry of Environment and Forestry will lead project implementation in partnership with UNDP and NGOs.

As stipulated in Sumatran Tiger project document and in line with UNDP – GEF guideline on Terminal Evaluation, an International consultant will be recruited to conduct Terminal Evaluation for SUMATRAN TIGER project.

Regarding covid-19 outbreak, as of 02 April 2021, there were 1.523.179 confirmed cases of Covid-19 in Indonesia, of which 41.151 were fatalities and 1.361.017 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 pandemic has affected the implementation of the project. Based on our assessment, some activities can continue on-schedule, some activities remain the same but involve delays, some activities need to be redesigned to achieve the expected output.

Tiger project has provided equally important opportunities for the women and men in managing the activities supported by the project. Tiger project has promoted women roles for instance, through the development and management of SMART-RBM and in producing variety of non-timber forest products, and in adapting with the covid-19 pandemic by promoting health protocol for the local community.

Referring to the Covid-19 outbreak in Indonesia, the impact on the Tiger project implementation includes the following:

1. 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 Tiger Project activities are implemented.
2. During the past few months, consultations with stakeholders have not been able to take place at the project sites. Since early March 2020 several Tiger 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 been implemented using health protocol by Project Implementation Units (PIU).
3. Several Tiger Project activities in the work plan, including monitoring and facilitation that involved discussion with group of people, have been delayed in accordance with government regulation.
4. 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.
5. 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 Project Implementation Units, UNDP Indonesia, the Implementing Partner and other relevant partners

3. TE PURPOSE

The objective of the Terminal Evaluation is to enable the GEF, UNDP and the participating countries to assess the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of the Transforming Effectiveness of Biodiversity Conservation in Priority Sumatran Landscapes Project. The Terminal Evaluation will assess achievements of the project against its objectives. It will also identify factors that have facilitated or impeded the achievement of the objectives. While a thorough review of the past is in itself very important, the in-depth evaluation is expected to lead to detailed overview and lessons learned for the future and particularly provide recommendations that will contribute to sustaining the outcomes of the project to the stakeholders in the country.

The TE process must follow a collaborative and participatory approach ensuring close engagement with key participants including the Commissioning Unit (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 Biodiversity Conservation Directorate of MoEF, and other key stakeholders. Ideally, the TE should occur 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 to reach conclusions on key aspects such as project activities' sustainability.

At the Project Board Meeting on 27th of October 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 Q4. In Q3 and Q4, some activities in the field were implemented with a small group by practicing 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 report must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable, and useful.

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

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

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

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful TE. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to, 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, forest rangers, communities, women investigators, and other relevant stakeholders. 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. It includes presentation of information using sex-disaggregated data.

As part of initial deliverables of the consultant, an Inception Report will be prepared for discussion. This will outline the proposed approach to the assignment and will include, but not be limited to, a detailed work plan of activities, and methodologies of approach. It is anticipated that the Consultant will look at the entire evaluation and its activities in a holistic manner to maximize efficiencies. The Inception Report should be produced before the virtual interviews are undertaken to ensure that methods are aligned with the GEF guidelines for final evaluation.

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.

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 J**.

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

As of 11 March 2020, the World Health Organization (WHO) declared COVID-19 a global pandemic as the new coronavirus rapidly spread to all regions of the world. Travel to 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 governments 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, and it will be subject to UNDP CO Operational Manager's approval. A national consultant will also be able to support meetings virtually and in terms of language as required observing all Covid-19 stipulations.

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** (http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/GEF/TE_GuidanceforUNDP-supportedGEF-financedProjects.pdf). 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, relevance
- 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, staffing
- Institutional capacity

ii. Project Implementation

- Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
 - Responsiveness to MTR analysis
- 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
- Sustainable financing for biodiversity management
- Implementation of cross cutting / gender mainstreaming at implementation stage
- Stakeholder engagement
- M&E at implementation stage

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 and long-term sustainability

Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons Learned

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

- The section on conclusions will be written in light of the findings. Conclusions should be comprehensive and balanced statements that are well substantiated by evidence and logically connected to the TE findings. They should highlight the

strengths, weaknesses and results of the project, respond to key evaluation questions and provide insights into the identification of and/or solutions to important problems or issues pertinent to project beneficiaries, UNDP and the GEF, including issues in relation to gender equality and women's empowerment.

- Recommendations should provide concrete, practical, feasible and targeted recommendations directed to the intended users of the evaluation about what actions to take and decisions to make. The recommendations should be specifically supported by the evidence and linked to the findings and conclusions around key questions addressed by the evaluation.
- The TE report should also include lessons that can be taken from the evaluation, including best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success that can provide knowledge gained from the 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 G.

6. EXPECTED OUTPUTS AND DELIVERABLES

The TE *consultant/team* shall prepare and submit:

#	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: Approximate due date 15 August 2021	TE team submits Inception Report to Commissioning Unit and project management
2	Presentation	Initial Findings	End of TE mission: Approximate due date 13 September 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: Approximate due date 27 September 2021	TE team submits to Commissioning Unit; reviewed by BPPS-GEF RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP
4	Final TE Report* + Audit Trail	Revised final report and TE Audit trail in which the TE details	Within 1 week of receiving comments on draft	TE team submits both documents to the Commissioning Unit

		how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final TE report (See template in ToR Annex H)	report: Approximate due date 19 October 2021	
--	--	---	--	--

*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 UNDP CO Indonesia.

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

8. DURATION OF THE WORK

The total duration of the TE will be approximately 40 working days over a time period of 12 weeks starting on 1st August 2021. The tentative TE timeframe is as follows:

Timeframe	Activity
06 July 2021	Application closes
24 July 2021	Selection of TE team
25 July 2021	Preparation period for TE team (handover of documentation)
01 - 08 August 2021, 05 days	Document review and preparation of TE Inception Report
09-15 August 2021, 04 days	Finalization and Validation of TE Inception Report; latest start of TE virtual assessment
16 August – 11 September 2021, 15 days	TE virtual assessment: virtual stakeholder's interviews.

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.

13 September 2021	Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings; earliest end of TE mission
14-27 September 2021, 10 days	Preparation of draft TE report
28 September 2021	Circulation of draft TE report for comments
12- 19 October 2021; 06 days	Incorporation of comments on draft TE report into Audit Trail & finalization of TE report
24 October 2021	Preparation and Issuance of Management Response
01 November 2021	Concluding Stakeholder Workshop (optional)
15 November 2021	Expected date of full TE completion

COVID-19 travel restriction permissible, options for site visits should be provided in the TE Inception Report.

The expected date start date of contract is 1st August 2021

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.
- In case of travel, 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 upon submission of an F-10 claim form and supporting documents.

REQUIRED SKILLS AND EXPERIENCE

10. TE TEAM COMPOSITION

A team of two independent evaluators will conduct the TE – one team leader (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions) and one 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. 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 COVID-19 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.

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

International Consultant

Education

Master’s degree in the fields related to Environment, Natural resources, Biodiversity, Forestry, or other closely related field from an accredited college or university (20%)

Experience

- Relevant experience with results-based management evaluation methodologies; experience in assessing SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios; (10%)
- Experience in undertaking evaluations for UNDP or for GEF (10%)
- Experience working in the area of Biodiversity and Natural Resource Management (10%)
- Demonstrate understanding of issues related to gender and climate change adaptation/mitigations (10%);
- Experience in evaluating projects; (10%)
- Experience working in developing countries in Asia; (10%)
- Experience in relevant technical areas (biodiversity conservation) for at least 15 years; (20%)
- Excellent communication skills;
- Demonstrable analytical skills;
- 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 TE 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 PROCESS²

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](#)³ provided by UNDP;

² Engagement of evaluators should be done in line with guidelines for hiring consultants in the POPP <https://popp.undp.org/SitePages/POPPRoot.aspx>

³<https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/psa/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx>

- b) **CV** and a **Personal History Form** ([P11 form](#)⁴); Including experiences that mentioned in the Required Skills and Experiences
- 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, including approach of issues related to gender and Multi focal area of "Transforming Effectiveness of Biodiversity Conservation in Priority Sumatran Landscapes", sustainable development and/or biodiversity; (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 "Transforming Effectiveness of Biodiversity Conservation in Priority Sumatran Landscapes" or by email at the following address ONLY: bids.id@undp.org **by 23:59 PM GMT +7 on 06 July 2021**. 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. TOR ANNEXES

- 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 and TE Ratings Table
- g) Annex G: TE Report Clearance Form
- h) Annex H: TE Audit Trail Template
- i) Annex I: Main Responsibilities/Contributions to the Evaluation of the National Consultant

⁴ http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc

Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework

STRATEGIC RESULTS FRAMEWORK (SRF)

Project Title: Transforming effectiveness of biodiversity conservation in priority Sumatran landscapes

Project's Development Goal: To contribute to the conservation and sustainable use of globally significant biodiversity in Indonesia

Objective/ Component	Indicator			Baseline	EOP and Annual Project Targets	Source of Information	Risks and assumptions
Objective: To enhance biodiversity conservation in priority landscapes in Sumatra through adoption of best management practices in protected areas and adjacent production landscapes, using tiger recovery as a key indicator	Sumatran tiger density Increase in Sumatran tiger density* by >10% in core area in 4 target landscapes**:			See inset table for Density baseline metrics.	EOP: Increase in Sumatran tiger density* by >10% in core area in 4 target landscapes**: See inset table for Density target metrics. See inset table for Density target metrics.	Project reports on Density results.	<u>Risks:</u> Exploitation of tigers and forest products dramatically increase due to heightened international trade that puts the control of these drivers of change beyond the project’s intervention.
	Landscape	Density Baseline Estimate (2013)	Density Target Estimate (PY5)				
	Leuser Ecosystem	0.52 (0.27-0.99)	0.57				
	Kerinci Seblat	1.13 (0.64-2.00)	1.24				
	Bukit Barisan Selatan	n/a [1.56 (1.2-3.2) ^{\$}]	1.72				
	Berbak-Sembilang	1.02 (0.50-1.51)	1.12				
	Average score for 4 landscapes	1.06	1.17				
	*Density = number of adult individual tigers/100km ² (± 95% CIs) **4 landscapes that contain 5 NPs. Kampar is not included \$ Estimate is from 1999 (O’Brien et al. 2003 Crouching tigers, hidden						Y1: Standardized field survey design and protocol (to become <i>KSDAE</i> regulation) developed for tiger density (camera trapping); Y2: Annual camera trap surveys initiated for core tiger areas; Y3: Landscape-level

Objective/ Component	Indicator	Baseline	EOP and Annual Project Targets	Source of Information	Risks and assumptions				
of success	prey: Sumatran tiger and prey populations in a tropical forest landscape. Animal Conservation 6:131-139). Calculated using strip-width boundary method and not SECR method, which slightly lowers the density estimate. The camera trap sampling design for estimating tiger density is described in detail in Pickles et al. (2014) Running a Camera Trap Grid. Panthera Field Manual Series, PFM03. [http://www.panthera.org/tigersforeverresources]		tiger occurrence mapped and priority sites inside and outside PAs identified for targeted protection actions; Y4: Existing data monitoring systems reviewed and upgraded to establish key species monitoring database (including tiger); Y5: Final tiger density assessment indicates increase of >10% in core area per target landscape over 2013 baseline estimate;		Poaching and habitat loss are the primary threats to tigers and their prey, and the project's design enables their reduction and results in a tiger population increase.				
Component 1: Increased effectiveness of key protected area management institutions	Outputs: 1.1. Management capacity increased in target protected areas through training and technical assistance. 1.2. Enhanced management and annual plans developed, adopted and implemented. 1.3. Adaptive management law enforcement tools and standards, such as SMART, are implemented in priority RBMs in target landscapes. 1.4. Management effectiveness increase annually tracked through training results and METT* assessments. 1.5 Updated version of the National Tiger Recovery Plan and Sumatran Tiger Strategy and Action Plan developed and adopted. [*A proposed refinement of METT adapted specifically for the Indonesian PA system context and retaining consistency with METT for project M&E]								
	1.1. Capacity Development Score Improved institutional capacity of the 5 target protected area authorities for management as indicated by the Capacity Development Scorecard (see Annex 3): <table><tr><td>Protected Area</td><td>Capacity Development</td><td>Capacity Development</td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr></table>	Protected Area	Capacity Development	Capacity Development				See inset table for Capacity Development Scorecard baseline.	EOP: Improved institutional capacity of the 5 target protected area authorities for management as indicated by the Capacity Development Scorecard (see Annex 3):
Protected Area	Capacity Development	Capacity Development							

Objective/ Component	Indicator			Baseline	EOP and Annual Project Targets	Source of Information	Risks and assumptions
		Baseline Score (2014)	Target Score (PY5)				
					<p>Y1: skill gaps and management training needs identified for 5 target NPs based on professional competency standards</p> <p>Y2: Key NP personnel trained using accredited thematic skill training modules</p> <p>Y3: Mid term assessment of CD scorecards indicates at least 40% progress towards end of project targets over baseline.</p> <p>Y4: Available equipment and needs for RBM reviewed and recommendations made to KSDAE to supply/upgrade essential equipment</p> <p>Y5: End of project assessment of CD scorecards - see targets in the inset table</p>		<p>project objective.</p> <p>Failure to learn from previous experiences of biodiversity conservation in Sumatra that were not successful</p> <p><u>Assumptions:</u> The Ministry of Environment and Forestry continues to be committed to improved capacity of the PA institution through deploying a sufficient number of competent staff and having the budget to do so.</p>
	Gunung Leuser NP	69%	83%				
	Kerinci Seblat NP	72%	85%				
	Bukit Barisan Selatan NP	71%	81%				
	Berbak NP	69%	83%				
	Sembilang NP	69%	83%				

Objective/ Component	Indicator	Baseline	EOP and Annual Project Targets	Source of Information	Risks and assumptions																		
	<p>1.2. SMART-RBM Threat Encounter Reports Reduction of tiger-related threats by >10% in each of the 5 target PAs indicated by a reduction in the number of illegal activities as shown in SMART-RBM monthly patrolling reports*, and construction of tiger sanctuary in priority area is started:</p> <table><tr><th>Protected Area</th><th>SMART Baseline (2013)</th><th>SMART Target (PY5)</th></tr><tr><td>Gunung Leuser NP</td><td>43.0</td><td>39.0</td></tr><tr><td>Kerinci Seblat NP</td><td>44.0</td><td>39.0</td></tr><tr><td>Bukit Barisan Selatan NP</td><td>2.0</td><td>1.0</td></tr><tr><td>Berbak NP</td><td>0.22</td><td>0.00</td></tr><tr><td>Sembilang NP</td><td>0.00[#]</td><td>0.00</td></tr></table> <p>*Encounter rate: average number of tiger and prey snare traps removed/100km of forest patrol [#]No snare traps were encountered in 2013, and a new baseline will be explored.</p>	Protected Area	SMART Baseline (2013)	SMART Target (PY5)	Gunung Leuser NP	43.0	39.0	Kerinci Seblat NP	44.0	39.0	Bukit Barisan Selatan NP	2.0	1.0	Berbak NP	0.22	0.00	Sembilang NP	0.00 [#]	0.00	See inset table for baseline rate of number of illegal activities recorded per year per 100km patrolled in each PA and public sanctuary for tiger is not yet established	EOP: Reduction of tiger-related threats by >10% in each of the 5 target PAs indicated by a reduction in the number of illegal activities as shown in SMART-RBM monthly patrolling reports* (see inset table) Y1: RBM implementation status, current patrolling system and LE capacity in target NPs reviewed and management recommendations presented; Routine RBM-SMART forest patrols, data analysis and strategic planning initiated; tiger sanctuary plan is established and proposed Y2: Thematic RBM-SMART workshops conducted for target NPs to initiate RBM-	SMART monthly patrolling reports for each PA.	<p><u>Risks:</u> A lack of suitable ranger candidates and technical support staff results in ineffective patrolling and incomplete adaptive management systems.</p> <p><u>Assumptions:</u> Ranger candidates are selected based on merit (past record), ability and motivation and sufficiently resourced and supported to perform their duties.</p>
Protected Area	SMART Baseline (2013)	SMART Target (PY5)																					
Gunung Leuser NP	43.0	39.0																					
Kerinci Seblat NP	44.0	39.0																					
Bukit Barisan Selatan NP	2.0	1.0																					
Berbak NP	0.22	0.00																					
Sembilang NP	0.00 [#]	0.00																					

Objective/ Component	Indicator	Baseline	EOP and Annual Project Targets	Source of Information	Risks and assumptions
			<p>SMART system; Annual RBM-SMART evaluations initiated at resort, NP and national levels; feasibility study and verification for tiger sanctuary is conducted</p> <p>Y3: Annual RBM-SMART training reviews and updates conducted; tiger sanctuary plan is approved by Director General of KSDAE in the form of decree</p> <p>Y4: Lessons learned from Annual RBM-SMART evaluations at resort, NP and national levels shared and evaluated for upscaling across national PA system; preparation phase of the tiger sanctuary plan is implemented</p>		

Objective/ Component	Indicator	Baseline	EOP and Annual Project Targets	Source of Information	Risks and assumptions		
			Y5: See inset table for end of project target rate of number of illegal activities recorded per year per 100 km patrolled in each PA; and construction of tiger sanctuary in priority area is started				
	1.3. Law Enforcement Patrol Effort Increase in law enforcement patrol effort (km walked per year) by >10% in each of the 5 target PAs as shown in SMART-RBM monthly patrolling reports*:		See inset table for baseline number of forest patrol kilometres walked per year in PA and adjacent forests.	EOP: Increase in law enforcement patrol effort (km walked per year) by >10% in each of the 5 target PAs as shown in SMART-RBM monthly patrolling reports* (see inset table) Y1: RBM implementation status, current patrolling system and LE capacity in target NPs reviewed and management recommendations presented; Routine RBM-SMART forest patrols, data analysis and strategic planning initiated	SMART monthly patrolling reports for each PA.	<u>Risks:</u> A lack of suitable ranger candidates and technical support staff results in ineffective patrolling and incomplete adaptive management systems <u>Assumption:</u> Ranger candidates are selected based on merit (past record), ability and motivation and sufficiently	
	Protected Area	Forest Patrol Baseline (2013)					Forest Patrol Target (PY5)
	Gunung Leuser NP	237					261
	Kerinci Seblat NP	1722					1895
	Bukit Barisan Selatan NP	1023					1126
	Berbak NP	464					511
	Sembilang NP	320					352

Objective/ Component	Indicator	Baseline	EOP and Annual Project Targets	Source of Information	Risks and assumptions
			<p>Y2: Thematic RBM-SMART workshops conducted for target NPs to initiate RBM-SMART system; Annual RBM-SMART evaluations initiated at resort, NP and national levels</p> <p>Y3: Annual RBM-SMART training reviews and updates conducted.</p> <p>Y4: Lessons learned from Annual RBM-SMART evaluations at resort, NP and national levels shared and evaluated for upscaling across national PA system</p> <p>Y5: See inset table for end of project target number of forest patrol kilometres walked per year in PA and adjacent forests.</p>		resourced and supported to perform their duties.
	1.4. Forest Degradation Rates Forest degradation* rates in core areas in 5 target protected areas reduced to <1% by end of project [baseline to be set in	Deforestation rate baseline to be	EOP: Forest degradation* rates in core areas in 5 target	Project reports on deforestation	<u>Risks:</u> PA institutions are unwilling to

Objective/ Component	Indicator	Baseline	EOP and Annual Project Targets	Source of Information	Risks and assumptions
	<p>Project Year 1]</p> <p>*Forest degradation is defined as forest located inside a PA's core area that has completely become non-forest but retains its PA status.</p>	calculated in PY1.	<p>protected areas reduced to <1% by end of project.</p> <p>Y1: Forest cover data sets/methodologies reviewed and methodological protocol confirmed</p> <p>Y2: Forest cover assessments completed for 5 NPs with MoEF / Planology as part of routine monitoring system and encroachment hotspots identified for management action</p> <p>Y3: Targeted interventions reduce encroachment incidence at identified hotspots</p> <p>Y4: Targeted interventions</p>	n rates.	<p>tackle illegal forest conversion and lack the capacity and resources to do so.</p> <p><u>Assumptions:</u> PA regulations do not change and enable enforcement of borders from encroachment, whilst forest ranger teams are well-trained and able to address this threat.</p>

Objective/ Component	Indicator	Baseline	EOP and Annual Project Targets	Source of Information	Risks and assumptions																		
			continue to reduce encroachment at identified hotspots Y5: Final forest cover assessment completed. Deforestation rates target to be <1% by PY5.																				
	<div>1.5. Management Effectiveness (METT Score) Improved management effectiveness of 5 target protected areas* covering 3,185,359 ha, indicated by the increase in the METT assessment (see Annex 2):</div> <table><tr><th>Protected Area</th><th>METT Baseline Score (2014)</th><th>METT Target Score (PY5)</th></tr><tr><td>Gunung Leuser NP</td><td>63%</td><td>76%</td></tr><tr><td>Kerinci Seblat NP</td><td>64%</td><td>76%</td></tr><tr><td>Bukit Barisan Selatan NP</td><td>69%</td><td>77%</td></tr><tr><td>Berbak NP</td><td>53%</td><td>75%</td></tr><tr><td>Sembilang NP</td><td>59%</td><td>75%</td></tr></table> <div>*Note – this only includes the legally gazetted National Parks, not the surrounding production landscapes</div>	Protected Area	METT Baseline Score (2014)	METT Target Score (PY5)	Gunung Leuser NP	63%	76%	Kerinci Seblat NP	64%	76%	Bukit Barisan Selatan NP	69%	77%	Berbak NP	53%	75%	Sembilang NP	59%	75%	See inset table for METT Baseline scores.	<div>EOP: Improved management effectiveness of 5 target protected areas* covering 3,185,359 ha, indicated by the increase in the METT assessment (see Annex 2). See inset table.</div> <div>Y1: METT toolkit tailored for Indonesia’s PA system developed by KSDAE Working Group; review and revision of 10 year mgt plans for 5 target</div>	Project reports on METT applied at PPG, midterm and project completion.	<div>Risks:</div> <div>There is a reorientation of economic development priorities and policies leading to a change in land use plans to the detriment of the PA system.</div> <div>Assumptions:</div> <div>The Ministry of Environment and Forestry continues to be committed to improved management of the PA system despite</div>
Protected Area	METT Baseline Score (2014)	METT Target Score (PY5)																					
Gunung Leuser NP	63%	76%																					
Kerinci Seblat NP	64%	76%																					
Bukit Barisan Selatan NP	69%	77%																					
Berbak NP	53%	75%																					
Sembilang NP	59%	75%																					

Objective/ Component	Indicator	Baseline	EOP and Annual Project Targets	Source of Information	Risks and assumptions
			<p>PAs; Skill gaps and management training needs identified for 5 target NPs based on professional competency standards</p> <p>Y2: High quality annual workplans developed that support performance based incentives</p> <p>Y3: Mid term METT assessment for 5 target NPs indicates 50% progress towards targets</p> <p>Y4: High quality annual workplans developed that support performance based incentives</p> <p>Y5: See inset table for end of project METT Target scores for 5 target NPs; METT</p>		competing demands for land and resources.

Objective/ Component	Indicator	Baseline	EOP and Annual Project Targets	Source of Information	Risks and assumptions
			introduced as routine monitoring system for national PA system.		
Component 2: Intersectoral coordination systems are developed for priority landscapes	Outputs: 2.1. Landscape-level and inter-landscape partnerships developed and operationalized between relevant agencies concerned with illegal wildlife trade ¹ . 2.2. Innovative forest and wildlife management interventions in target landscapes documented and reviewed for replication and upscaling, a) Community Carbon Pool-Village Forest (<i>Hutan Desa</i>) scheme buffering Kerinci Seblat NP b) Priority wildlife habitat conserved in production area for Kampar c) Village forest restoration in Berbak NP d) 'Smart Green Infrastructure' guidelines towards roads evaluated and tailored or tiger landscapes, in cooperation with. 2.3. Management decision-making informed through wildlife and forest monitoring using a standardised scientific survey protocol. 2.4 Human-tiger conflicts effectively managed in 5 target landscapes.				
	2.1. Number of Wildlife Crime Cases Submitted for Prosecution Number of wildlife crime cases submitted for prosecution from operations conducted at island level as a result of intersectoral collaboration increases by >25%:		See inset table for 2013 baseline number of arrests in project landscapes.	EOP: Number of wildlife crime cases submitted for prosecution from operations conducted at island level as a result of intersectoral collaboration increases by >25% (see inset table). Y1: Law enforcement	Project reports on law enforcement

¹ PA authorities, SPORC, BKSDA, local government, police, prosecutors and judges, media
(COVID) TE ToR for GEF-Financed Projects – Standard Template for UNDP Jobs Site – June 2020

Objective/ Component	Indicator			Baseline	EOP and Annual Project Targets	Source of Information	Risks and assumptions
	Bukit Barisan Selatan NP	1			<p>capacity and needs reviewed and recommendations lead to action plan being developed for Sumatra</p> <p>Y2: Most effective local informant models identified and enhanced / replicated in landscape-wide initiatives, and principles developed for the adoption of informant networks into law enforcement system</p> <p>Y3: Informant networks operational and supported in 4 target landscapes</p> <p>Y4: Informant networks operational and supported in 4 target landscapes</p>		<p>cooperate at national and landscape levels; prosecutors are well-trained and competent; judiciary understands the importance of illegal wildlife trade and pertaining laws; an increased number of arrests and prosecutions is a sufficient deterrent for lowering poaching.</p>
	Berbak-Sembilang	0					
	Kampar	0					

Objective/ Component	Indicator	Baseline	EOP and Annual Project Targets	Source of Information	Risks and assumptions
			Y5: See inset table for end of project target number of arrests in project landscapes.		
	2.2. Number of Agency Staff participating in Pilot Projects At least 25 staff of the Ministry of Environment and Forestry, Provincial/District level authorities and/or regional development planning authorities (e.g. <i>Bappeda</i> and Public Works Agency) participate in the process of piloting five innovative forest/biodiversity projects.	0 people involved	EOP: At least 25 staff of the Ministry of Environment and Forestry, Provincial/District level authorities and/or regional development planning authorities (e.g. <i>Bappeda</i> and Public Works Agency) participate in the process of piloting five innovative forest/biodiversity projects. Y1: Implementation plans developed for GEF project engagement with 5 co-financed pilot innovative forest/biodiversity projects Y2: Evaluations	Project reports on forest/wildlife management interventions outside PAs.	<u>Risks:</u> Lack of support from industrial sector stakeholders Uncertainty in REDD+ development <u>Assumptions:</u> High levels of interest amongst different agencies and perception that interventions are a useful alternative for management outside PAs.

Objective/ Component	Indicator	Baseline	EOP and Annual Project Targets	Source of Information	Risks and assumptions
			<p>conducted of 5 co-financed forest / biodiversity projects outside NPs in target landscapes, including potential for replicability in other landscapes;</p> <p>Y3: Learnings from 5 pilot projects developed as a series of best management practice case studies; site exchange visits from targeted stakeholder audiences</p> <p>Y4: Continued site exchange visits / training for targeted stakeholder audiences and promotion of replication / upscaling</p> <p>Y5: Continued site exchange visits /</p>		

Objective/ Component	Indicator	Baseline	EOP and Annual Project Targets	Source of Information	Risks and assumptions
			training for targeted stakeholder audiences and promotion of replication / upscaling; total of at least 25 key stakeholders trained.		
	2.3. Tiger, Prey and Forest Habitat Monitoring System Standardised tiger, prey and forest habitat monitoring system developed and operationalized for 5 target protected areas and their surrounding landscapes.	0 systems in place	EOP: Standardised tiger, prey and forest habitat monitoring system developed and operationalized for 5 target protected areas and their surrounding landscapes. Y1: Standardized field survey design and protocols for biological monitoring developed; KSDAE accredited training modules developed; Y2: Training provided through PusDikLat to NP technical units	Project report on biological surveys.	<u>Risks:</u> Financial resources are not adequate to support surveys at a sufficient level of scientific rigor. <u>Assumptions:</u> Trained personnel stay actively involved in conducting surveys and correctly follow protocol.

Objective/ Component	Indicator	Baseline	EOP and Annual Project Targets	Source of Information	Risks and assumptions
			<p>and NGOs in biological monitoring methods (wildlife and forest)</p> <p>Y3: National and NP data management systems reviewed as a basis for developing key species monitoring data base</p> <p>Y4: Annual workplans for NPs include biological monitoring and associated data management tasks</p> <p>Y5: Biological monitoring systems in place and operational at five target NPs by end of project</p>		
	2.4. Human-Tiger Conflict Report Assessments / Responses >95% of human-tiger conflict reports are correctly assessed and/or responded in accordance with <i>KSDAE</i> mitigation protocol ² P48, by Project Year 3;	Variable response rates amongst landscapes.	EOP: >95% of human-tiger conflict reports are correctly	Project report on human-tiger	<u>Risks:</u> Personnel and agencies targeted for wildlife

² PerMen.48/2008
 (COVID) TE ToR for GEF-Financed Projects – Standard Template for UNDP Jobs Site – June 2020

Objective/ Component	Indicator	Baseline	EOP and Annual Project Targets	Source of Information	Risks and assumptions
		Problem tiger reports are not systematically logged and tracked preventing the development of accurate baselines.	<p>assessed and/or responded in accordance with <i>KSDAE</i> mitigation protocol³ P48, by Project Year 3.</p> <p>Y1: Socialisation and implementation of the human-tiger conflict mitigation protocol (P48) reviewed and next steps identified.</p> <p>Y2: One Conflict Mitigation Coordination Team established in each of the 4 NP landscapes, SOP developed and supervision provided.</p> <p>Y3-5: >95% of human-tiger conflict reports are correctly assessed and/or responded to in</p>	conflict.	<p>conflict mitigation support do not support inter-agency collaboration and lack interest in the project.</p> <p><u>Assumptions:</u> Conflict mitigation teams are adequately trained and resourced and therefore able to correctly perform core duties.</p>

³ PerMen.48/2008
(COVID) TE ToR for GEF-Financed Projects – Standard Template for UNDP Jobs Site – June 2020

Objective/ Component	Indicator	Baseline	EOP and Annual Project Targets	Source of Information	Risks and assumptions
			accordance with <i>KSDAE</i> mitigation protocol ⁴ P48.		
Component 3: Sustainable financing for biodiversity management in priority landscapes	Outputs: 3.1. Financial sustainability analysis conducted to improve cost-effectiveness, disbursement mechanisms and budget resources for UPT 3.2. Sustainable financing plans developed and implemented for selected production areas through business and biodiversity mechanisms 3.3 Institutional framework at national level adopted to support sustainable financing scheme implementation				
	3.1. Financing Plans Five new financing plans in place for selected target PAs by the project end and budgets increased by 10%.	0 financing plans in place, and 2014 budget baselines are from the NPs and partnering CSOs.	EOP: Five new financing plans in place for selected target PAs by the project end and budgets increased by 10%. Y1: - Y2: Funding road map (business plan) developed for 5 NPs using existing government funding allocations (including Env. Law No. 32 of 2009) post financial review and identification of external sources.	Project reports on financing mechanisms.	Risks: Government agencies do not view PA management as important to their own objectives; Lack of conservation funding for biodiversity-rich habitats outside protected areas Change in external donor priorities results in reduced support to Indonesia and forestry sector.

⁴ PerMen.48/2008
(COVID) TE ToR for GEF-Financed Projects – Standard Template for UNDP Jobs Site – June 2020

Objective/ Component	Indicator	Baseline	EOP and Annual Project Targets	Source of Information	Risks and assumptions
			<p>Y3: new sustainable financing mechanisms developed through exploring options with potential donors in Indonesia to specific target NPs and priority tiger conservation activities.</p> <p>Y5: Multi - donor workshop convened by KSDAE for supporting key aspects of the National Tiger Recovery Plan; New financing plans in place for the 5 target NPs by end of project and budgets increased by 10%.</p>		<p><u>Assumption:</u> Sufficient financing opportunities exist and donor are willing to consider modifications for their criteria so that it better aligns with project objectives.</p>
	<p>3.2. Sustainable Financing Plans for Production Areas involving PPPs</p> <p>Two sustainable financing plans produced for production area/s through business and biodiversity mechanisms (PES, private sector endowment and corporate social responsibility schemes and biodiversity offsetting) involving public-private partnerships (PPPs).</p>	0 plans in place.	EOP: Two sustainable financing plans produced for production area/s through business and biodiversity	Project reports on financing mechanisms.	

Objective/ Component	Indicator	Baseline	EOP and Annual Project Targets	Source of Information	Risks and assumptions
			<p>mechanisms (PES, private sector endowment and corporate social responsibility schemes and biodiversity offsetting) involving public-private partnerships (PPPs).</p> <p>Y1: -</p> <p>Y2: -</p> <p>Y3: Review of sustainable financing options for conservation activities outside the PA system completed; Two PPPs established for sustainable financing of conservation in production areas.</p> <p>Y4: Two sustainable financing plans produced for</p>		

Objective/ Component	Indicator	Baseline	EOP and Annual Project Targets	Source of Information	Risks and assumptions												
			production area/s through business and biodiversity mechanisms involving PPPs. Y5: 2 sustainable financing plans received funding and activity implementation begins.														
	3.3. Financial Sustainability Scorecard Increase by >25% for each of the three component scores in the Financial Sustainability Scorecard for the sub-system of Sumatra’s protected areas*: <table border="1"> <tr> <th>Component</th> <th colspan="2">Financial Sustainability Scorecard score (%)</th> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <th>Baseline (2014)</th> <th>Target (PY5)</th> </tr> <tr> <td>1. Legal, regulatory and institutional frameworks</td> <td>42%</td> <td>53%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2. Business planning and tools for cost- effective management</td> <td>24%</td> <td>30%</td> </tr> </table>	Component	Financial Sustainability Scorecard score (%)			Baseline (2014)	Target (PY5)	1. Legal, regulatory and institutional frameworks	42%	53%	2. Business planning and tools for cost- effective management	24%	30%	See inset table for baseline scores on financial sustainability.	EOP: Increase by >25% for each of the three component scores in the Financial Sustainability Scorecard for the sub-system of Sumatra’s protected areas* (see inset table) Y1: - Y2: - Y3: Review of existing laws, regulations and policies completed	Project reports on PA financing; financial scorecard repeat assessment in PY5	
Component	Financial Sustainability Scorecard score (%)																
	Baseline (2014)	Target (PY5)															
1. Legal, regulatory and institutional frameworks	42%	53%															
2. Business planning and tools for cost- effective management	24%	30%															

Objective/ Component	Indicator			Baseline	EOP and Annual Project Targets	Source of Information	Risks and assumptions
	3. Tools for revenue generation	35%	44%		<p>including recommendations to enable revenue flow to PAs from non-governmental sources; Mid term assessment of financial scorecard shows 40% progress towards targets</p> <p>Y4: Removal of barriers to sustainable financing of the PA system as far as possible through project support to legislation revisions.</p> <p>Y5: See inset table for end of project target scores on financial sustainability</p>		
	<p>*10 National Parks (Batang Gadis, Berbak, Bukit Barisan Selatan, Bukit Duabelas, Bukit Tiga Puluh, Gunung Leuser, Kerinci Seblat, Sembilang, Tesso Nilo and Way Kambas)</p>						

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
 - 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
 - List with page numbers
- iv. Acronyms and Abbreviations
 - List
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 rating⁶)

 - 4.1 Project Design/Formulation
 - Analysis of Results Framework: project logic and strategy, indicators

⁶ See ToR Annex F for TE rating scales.

- 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
- Progress towards objective and expected outcomes (*)
 - Relevance (*)
 - Effectiveness (*)
 - Efficiency (*)
 - Overall Outcome (*)
 - Country ownership
 - Social and Environmental Standards
 - Sustainability: financial (*), socio-economic (*), institutional framework and governance (*), environmental (*), and overall likelihood (*)
 - Gender equality and women's empowerment
 - Cross-cutting Issues
 - GEF Additionality
 - Catalytic Role / Replication Effect
 - Progress to Impact and long-term sustainability
5. Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons
- Main Findings
 - Conclusions
 - Recommendations
 - Lessons Learned
6. Annexes
- TE ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
 - TE Mission itinerary
 - List of persons interviewed

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

Annex D: Evaluation Criteria Matrix template

Relevance

- Is Tiger 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 matched the capacities needs for the institutions and individuals?
- How well does Tiger project react to changing work environment and how well has the design able to adjust to changing external circumstances?
- How did UNDP/ Tiger project contribute towards, and advance gender equality aspirations of the Government of Indonesia; UNDAF outcomes; and CPD outcomes?

Effectiveness & Results

- To what extent is Tiger project successful in achieving the expected results?
- To what extent were target institutions (MoEF primarily) engaged in the implementation of the project?
- How effective Tiger project has been in developing institutional capacity especially in preparing policy review and monitoring MoEF in gender responsive budgeting?
- To what extent are Tiger 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?
- How effective was the project was in terms of implementing sustainable finance mechanisms for biodiversity management?
- What factors contribute or influence Tiger project's ability to positively contribute to policy change from a gender perspective, women's economic empowerment, and access to justice and human rights?
- What are the impacts of the project on tiger numbers and improving conservation of endangered species in the long-term?

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 Tiger 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 Tiger project have on women's economic status in targeted provinces?
- What impact did the Tiger project have on women's access to justice in targeted provinces?

- What impact did the Tiger 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/ Tiger project design, implementation strategy/ partnership, and governance foster national ownership and capacity development?

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> <i>NOTE: Include COVID-19 specific questions, as needed.</i>			

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 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.

MTR Consultant Agreement Form

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

Name of Consultant: _____

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.

Signed at _____ (Place) on _____ (Date)

Signature: _____

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>

Annex G: Evaluation Rating Table

1. Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E)	Rating
M&E design at entry	
M&E Plan Implementation	
Overall Quality of M&E	
2. Implementing Agency (IA) Implementation & Executing Agency (EA) Execution	Rating
Quality of UNDP Implementation/Oversight	
Quality of Implementing Partner Execution	
Overall quality of Implementation/Execution	
3. Assessment of Outcomes	Rating
Relevance	
Effectiveness	
Efficiency	
Overall Project Outcome Rating	
4. Sustainability	Rating
Financial sustainability	
Socio-political sustainability	
Institutional framework and governance sustainability	
Environmental sustainability	
Overall Likelihood of Sustainability	

Annex H: 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 I: 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 Title & UNDP PIMS ID)
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 comment location	No./	Comment/Feedback the draft TE report	on	TE team response and actions taken

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

National Consultant Task	Notes	Format for Use
<p>Provide input into the Inception Report to be drafted by the IC. In particular, the NC should:</p> <p>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)</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>	
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.
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.
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) or Terminal Evaluation (TE) as this should have information as to what was produced as of the time of the MTR or TE.	Use format provided by IC
Review products as indicated by the IC & provide product assessment using the format provided by the IC		Use format provided by IC
Prepare list of all trainings conducted with project financial support	A good starting point is to review the project Mid-Term Review (MTR)	Use format provided by IC

	or Terminal Evaluation (TE) as this should have information as to what trainings were conducted as of the time of the MTR or TE.	
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 it 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	Use format provided

	our job to ensure we capture important data as we go.	
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.	

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.	
--	---	--

In the event that the National Consultant is male, and depending on the country context, 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.

Annex K : Confirmed Sources of Co-Financing for The Project by Name and Type

Please include evidence for co-financing for the project with this form (please add rows as necessary)

Sources of Co-funding	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Investment Mobilized	Amount (\$)
(select): GEF Agency Donor Agency Recipient Country Government Private Sector Civil Society Organization Beneficiaries Other		(select): Grant Loan Equity Investment Public Investment Guarantee In-kind Other	(select): Investment mobilized Recurrent expenditures	
Total Co-financing			