TERMS OF REFERENCE

Reference	PN/FJI/076/21
Location	Resilience Sustainable Development (RSD) Regional Ridge to Reef Project , UNDP Pacific Office, Suva, Fiji
Type of Contract	Individual Contractor
Post Level	National Consultant (6 National Consultants each to be based in country i.e. Palau, FSM, Vanuatu, Fiji, Tuvalu and Samoa)
Consultancy Title	Terminal Evaluation of Regional Ridge to Reef Project
Languages required:	English
Duration of Initial Contract:	1 September 2021 – 10 January 2022

BACKGROUND

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 Ridge to Reef - Testing the Integration of Water, Land, Forest & Coastal Management to Preserve Ecosystem Services, Store Carbon, Improve Climate Resilience and Sustain Livelihoods**.** It is commonly referred to as the Regional Ridge to Reef (R2R) project.

The TE process must follow the guidance outlined in the document 'Guidance For Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects'

To support the ongoing development of 'Ridge to Reef' and 'Community to Cabinet' approaches in Pacific PICS through the abovementioned multi-focal area R2R program, the GEF Council approved the development of an International Waters project entitled "Ridge to Reef: Testing the Integration of Water, Land, Forest and Coastal Management to Preserve Ecosystem Services, Store Carbon, Improve Climate Resilience and Sustain Livelihoods in Pacific Island Countries". This regional project was implemented by the United Nations Development Program through the Applied Geoscience and Technology Division of the Secretariat of the Pacific Community in partnership with the 14 Pacific Island Countries to improve the integration of water, land, forest, and coastal management required to fashion sustainable futures for island communities. The project aimed to address the recent high-level recognition and calls for results-based approaches to the management of development assistance programmes and projects, with support provided in areas of coordination, capacity building, technical assistance, and monitoring and evaluation for the operation of the broader Pacific R2R program.

Importantly, the project was built on nascent national processes from the previous GEF IWRM project to foster sustainability and resilience for each participating island nation through reforms in policy, institutions, and coordination; building capacity of local institutions to integrate land, water and coastal management; establishing evidence-based approaches to ICM planning; and improved consolidation of information and data required to inform cross-sector R2R planning approaches. These processes are being sustained. It is envisaged that this project focused much attention on harnessing support of traditional community leadership and governance structures with improving the relevance of investment in integrated land, water, forest, and coastal management. This project also provided coordination functions and linkages with the national GEF STAR multifocal projects and LDCF project and facilitated dialogue and action planning through national Inter-Ministry Committees on responses to emerging issues and threats in environment and natural resource management. Similarly, it will facilitate coordinated exchanges of experience and results of the GEF portfolio of investments in a broader regional R2R programme for PICs. Linkages with co-financed activities on water resource and wastewater management, coastal systems and climate adaptation and disaster risk management will ensure more targeted capital investment in coastal infrastructure within an integrated management framework. Similarly, the project had fostered solidarity among the PICs, particularly with respect to

the political will required in supporting more integrated approaches to R2R in natural resource management.

The purpose of the project was to test the mainstreaming of 'ridge-to-reef' (R2R), climate resilient approaches to integrated land, water, forest, and coastal management in the PICs through strategic planning, capacity building and piloted local actions to sustain livelihoods and preserve ecosystem services. This regional project provided the primary coordination vehicle for the national R2R STAR Projects that are part of the Pacific R2R Program, by building on nascent national processes from the previous GEF IWRM project to foster sustainability and resilience for each island through: reforms in policy, institutions, and coordination; building capacity of local institutions to integrate land, water and coastal management through on-site demonstrations; establishing evidence-based approaches to ICM planning; improved consolidation of results monitoring and information and data required to inform cross-sector R2R planning approaches. This project will also focus attention on harnessing support of traditional community leadership and governance structures to improve the relevance of investment in ICM, including MPAs, from 'community to cabinet'.

To achieve its objective, the project focusses on five components:

- Component 1. National Demonstrations to Support R2R ICM/IWRM Approaches for Island Resilience and Sustainability

- Component 2. Island-based Investments in Human Capital and Knowledge to Strengthen National and Local Capacities for Ridge to Reef ICM/IWRM approaches, incorporating CC adaptation

- Component 3. Mainstreaming of Ridge to Reef ICM/IWRM Approaches into National Development Frameworks

- Component 4. Regional and National 'Ridge to Reef' Indicators for Reporting, Monitoring, Adaptive Management and Knowledge Management

- Component 5. Ridge-to-Reef Regional and National Coordination

Fourteen countries participate in the Regional R2R project. They include the Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji Islands, Kiribati, Nauru, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Marshall Islands, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu, and Vanuatu. Through this project there are regionally implemented activities as well demonstration activities in each country which are led by respective national executing agencies.

The Regional R2R *(PIMS #5221)* is implemented through th*e Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC).* A mid Term Review was conducted in March 2019. A first extension was granted until September 1, 2021 and recently, a second extension until March 1, 2022. The project started on the *1 September 2015* and is in its *6th* year of implementation.

Through a grant of Global Environment Facility (GEF) of USD 10,317,454, the project was initially implemented over a period of 5 years. The total co-financing commitment from partners amounting to USD87,708,160.

Since the global Covid-19 pandemic has escalated into a global humanitarian and socio-economic crisis in the first quarter of 2020, the Pacific region was amongst those affected and currently national governments of the 14 participating countries have travel restrictions ongoing as a necessary measure to mitigate the spread of the virus. Both international and local travels are limited to only necessary

travel and those entering the country must have in possession a Quarantine Certificate and a mandatory negative COVID-19 test result. Travelers entering countries are expected to undergo a 14-day quarantine period (in isolation) before they are allowed to move freely. In 2020, there were lockdown periods, with national government priorities focused on a Corvid 19 response strategic plans. Covid-19 severely affected the project implementation from 2020 until to-date.

DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

1. TE PURPOSE

The TE will focus on the delivery of the project's results as initially planned (and as corrected after the mid-term evaluation, if any such correction took place). It will look at impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental benefits/goals, regional and national goals including recommendations for follow-up activities.

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, assesses the extent of project accomplishments.
Further to this, the objectives of the evaluation will be to:

- assess the achievement of project results supported by evidence (i.e., progress of project's outcome targets as per the approved project document and corresponding updated logframe),
- assess the contribution and alignment of the project to relevant national development plan or environmental policies;
- assess the contribution of the project results towards the relevant outcome and output of the Sub Regional Programme Document (SRPD) & United Nation Pacific Strategy (UNPS). The SRPD is a UNDP specific strategy which supports 14 Pacific Island countries achieve national priorities and sustainable development. It is linked to regional and international frameworks. The UNPS represent a collective efforts of UN agencies to.
- assess the positive and negative effects of the project on local populations (e.g. income generation/job creation, improved natural resource management arrangements with local groups, improvement in policy framework for resource allocation and distribution, regeneration of natural resource for long term sustainability);
- Assess the extent which the project outcomes have contributed to better preparations to cope with disasters or mitigate risk, and or addressed climate change mitigation and adaptation as relevant
- Assess the extent to which poor, indigenous, persons with disabilities and other disadvantaged or marginalised groups benefitted from this project;
- Assess the effectiveness and quality of gender related results contributed by the project using the Gender Results Effectiveness Scale (GRES)
-
- examination on the use of funds and value for money

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

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects.

Scope of Work

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

The Findings section of the TE report will cover the topics listed below.

A full outline of the TE report's content is provided in ToR Annex C.

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

Findings

i. Project Design/Formulation

- National priorities and country driven-ness
- Theory of Change
- Gender equality and women's empowerment
- Social and Environmental Safeguards
- Analysis of Results Framework: project logic and strategy, indicators
- Assumptions and Risks
- Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design

Planned stakeholder participation

- Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
- Management arrangements

ii. Project Implementation

- Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
- Actual stakeholder participation and partnership arrangements
- Project Finance and Co-finance
- Monitoring & Evaluation: design at entry (*), implementation (*), and overall assessment of M&E (*)
- Implementing Agency (UNDP) (*) and Executing Agency (*), overall project oversight/implementation and execution (*)
- Risk Management, including Social and Environmental Standards

iii. 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

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 include results related to 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 Regional R2R Project

Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E)	Rating[1]
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

---

[1] Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution, Relevance are rated on a 6-point rating 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)

		Rating
Relevance		
Effectiveness		
Efficiency		
Overall Project Outcome Rating		
Sustainability		Rating
Financial resources		
Socio-political/economic		
Institutional framework and governance		
Environmental		
Overall Likelihood of Sustainability		

Expected Outputs and Deliverables.

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	TE Detailed evaluation and logistics schedule and confirmation on schedule of interview, foreseen limitations informing inception report	TE team clarifies objectives, methodology and timing of the TE	By 16 October	TE team submits Inception Report to Commissioning Unit and project management
2	Presentation	Initial Findings from the field visit and validation are incorporated into the presentation	End of TE mission: 30 October	TE team presents to Commissioning Unit and project management
3	Field visits report with supporting evidences informing draft Terminal Evaluation	Full draft report *(using guidelines on report content in ToR Annex C)* with annexes	Within 3 weeks of end of TE mission: 10 November	TE team submits to Commissioning Unit; reviewed by BPPS-GEF RTA, Project Coordinating Unit and Regional Program Coordination Group
5	Final TE Report* + Audit Trail	*Actively participate in the review and addressing of comments on the TE report from stakeholders.*	Within 1 week of receiving comments on draft report: 05 January 2022	TE team submits both documents to the Commissioning Unit

COMPETENCIES

- Professionalism: Ability to perform a "broad range of administrative functions e.g budget/work programme, human resources, data base management, etc. Ability to apply knowledge of various United Nations administrative, financial and human resources rules and regulations in work situations. Experience and knowledge in technical cooperation programme implementation.
- Strong interpersonal and communication skills;
- Openness to change and ability to receive/integrate feedback;
- Ability to plan, organize, implement and report on work;
- Ability to work under pressure and tight deadlines;
- Demonstrates integrity and ethical standards;
- Positive, constructive attitude to work;
- Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability.

REQUIRED SKILLS AND EXPERIENCE

Educational Qualifications:

Degree in Environmental Management/Science, Natural Resource Management and/or 5 years relevant work experience;

Experience & skills

Experience in supporting implementation of community-based projects and experience with participatory processes
Good understanding of biodiversity, land degradation and international water issues in country.
Strong networks with Government Departments, Non- Governmental Organizations,
Competence in adaptive management, as applied to Biodiversity, Land Degradation and International Waters;
Previous experience with evaluating is advantageous
Experience in relevant technical areas at least 5 years;
Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and International Waters; experience in gender responsive evaluation and analysis;
Excellent communication skills;
Demonstrable analytical skills;
Project evaluation/review experience within United Nations system will be considered an is essential
Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations methodology, preferred;

Experience with implementing evaluations remotely will be considered an asset

Other Competencies

Corporate Competencies:

- Demonstrates integrity by modeling the UN's values and ethical standards
- Promotes the vision, mission, and strategic goals of UNDP
- Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability
- Treats all people fairly without favoritism

Functional Competencies:
Knowledge Management and Learning

- Promotes a knowledge sharing and learning culture in the office
- In-depth knowledge on development issues

Development and Operational Effectiveness

- Strong IT skills

Management and Leadership
- Focuses on impact and result for the client and responds positively to feedback
- Consistently approaches work with energy and a positive, constructive attitude
- Demonstrates strong oral and written communication skills
- Builds strong relationships with clients and external actors
- Remains calm, in control and good humored even under pressure
- Demonstrates openness to change and ability to manage complexities

Language requirements and Computer skills

- Fluency of English language
- Proven experience in the use of office IT applications, incl. MS Office packages;

Price Proposal and Schedule of Payments

Consultant must send a financial proposal based on the **Lump Sum Amount**. The total amount quoted shall be all-inclusive and include all costs components required to perform the deliverables identified in the TOR, including professional fee, travel costs, living allowance (if any work is to be done outside the IC´s duty station) and any other applicable cost to be incurred by the IC in completing the assignment. The contract price will be fixed output-based price regardless of extension of the herein specified duration. Payments will be done according to deliverables/outputs and as per below:

- 20% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final TE Inception Report and approval of the Commissioning Unit by 30 october
- 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the draft TE report to the Commissioning Unit by 30 November
- 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 by 05 January 2022

    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.

Evaluation Method and Criteria

Individual consultants will be evaluated based on the Cumulative **analysis**
The award of the contract shall be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as a) responsive/compliant/acceptable; and b) having received the highest score out of set of weighted technical criteria (70%). and financial criteria (30%). Financial score shall be computed as a ratio of the proposal being evaluated and the lowest priced proposal received by UNDP for the assignment.

Technical Criteria for Evaluation (Maximum 70 points)
- Degree in Environmental Management/Science, Natural Resource Management or relevant field - 15%

Experience & skills

- Minimum of 5 years of progressively administrative responsible work, finance and logistics and programme work 20%
- Project support within the development sector 5%
- Experience with international /regional organization 10%
- Experience in providing a streamlined financial service role to a project management team, including experience in developing and delivering financial reports 10%
- Experience and ability to operate standard office equipment, usage of computers and office software packages (MS Word, Excel etc) and advance knowledge of spreadsheet and database packages, experience in handling of web-based management systems.5%
- Fluency in English Language 5%

Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 49 points (70% of the total technical points) would be considered for the Financial Evaluation.

Shortlisted candidates shall be called for an interview which will be used to confirm and/or adjust the technical scores awarded based on documentation submitted.

Documentation required
Interested individual consultants must submit the following documents/information to demonstrate their qualifications. Please group them into **one (1) single PDF document** as the application only allows to upload maximum one document:
- **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the template provided in Annex II.
- **Personal CV**, indicating all past experience from similar projects, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the Candidate and at least three (3) professional references.
- **Technical proposal**, including a) a brief description of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment; and b) a methodology, on how they will approach and complete the assignment.
- **Financial proposal**, as per template provided in Annex II. Note: National consultants must quote prices in United States Dollars (USD).

Note: Successful individual will be required to provide proof of medical insurance coverage before commencement of contract for the duration of the assignment.

Incomplete and joint proposals may not be considered. Consultants with whom there is further interest will be contacted. The successful consultant shall opt to sign an Individual Contract or a Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA) through its company/employer with UNDP.

Annexes
- Annex I - Individual IC General Terms and Conditions
- Annex II – Offeror's Letter to UNDP Confirming Interest and Availability for the Individual IC, including Financial Proposal Template

For any clarification regarding this assignment please write to elena.wakolo@undp.org

All applications must be clearly marked with the title of consultancy and submitted by 5:00pm, 24th August 2021, 5pm (Fiji Time) online via UN Jobs website https://jobs.undp.org/

Annex A

---

1   PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

Project Title: Testing the Integration of Water, Land, Forest and Coastal Management to Preserve Ecosystem Services, Store Carbon, Improve Climate Resilience and Sustain Livelihoods in Pacific Island Countries

UNDP Strategic Plan Environment and Sustainable Development Primary Outcome:

Outcome 2; Output 2.5 – Legal and regulatory frameworks, policies and institutions enabled to ensure the conservation, sustainable use and access and benefit sharing of natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystems in line with international conventions and national legislation; Output 2.5.2

UNDP Strategic Plan Secondary Outcome:

Outcome 1: Output 1.4 – Scaled up action on climate change adaptation and mitigation across sectors which is funded and implemented: Ouput 1.4.2.

Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program: International Waters Strategic Objective 1; and Strategic Objective 3

Project Objective: To test the mainstreaming of 'ridge-to-reef' (R2R), climate resilient approaches to integrated land, water, forest and coastal management in the PICs through strategic planning, capacity building and piloted local actions to sustain livelihoods and preserve ecosystem services

Objective Indicator: Extent of harmonization of sectoral governance frameworks for integrated 'ridge to reef' approaches achieved through national sustainable development planning

Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes:

Component 1. National Demonstrations to Support R2R ICM/IWRM Approaches for Island Resilience and Sustainability

Outcomes:

1.1 Successful pilot projects testing innovative solutions involving linking ICM, IWRM and climate change adaptation [linked to national STAR projects via larger Pacific R2R network]

1.2 National diagnostic analyses for ICM conducted for prioritizing and scaling-up key ICM/IWRM reforms and investments

1.3 Community leader roundtable networks established for strengthened 'community to cabinet' ICM/IWRM

Component 2. Island-based Investments in Human Capital and Knowledge to Strengthen National and Local Capacities for Ridge to Reef ICM/IWRM approaches, incorporating CC adaptation

Outcomes:

2.1 National and local capacity for ICM and IWRM implementation built to enable best practice in integrated land, water, forest and coastal management and CC adaptation

2.2 PIC knowledge on climate variability, coastal area planning in DRM, integrating 'blue forest' and coastal livelihoods consolidated and shared to support evidence-based coastal and marine spatial planning

2.3 Incentive structures for retention of local 'Ridge to Reef' expertise and inter-governmental dialogue on human resource needs for ICM/IWRM initiated

Component 3. Mainstreaming of Ridge to Reef ICM/IWRM Approaches into National Development Planning

Outcomes:

3.1 National and regional strategic action frameworks for ICM/IWRM endorsed nationally and regionally

3.2 Coordinated approaches for R2R integrated land, water, forest and coastal management and CC adaptation achieved in 14 PICs

3.3 Physical, natural, human and social capital built to strengthen island resilience to current and emerging anthropogenic threats and climate extremes

Component 4. Regional and National 'Ridge to Reef' Indicators for Reporting, Monitoring, Adaptive Management and Knowledge Management

Outcomes:

4.1 National and regional formulation and adoption of integrated and simplified results frameworks for integrated multi-focal projects

4.2 National and regional platforms for managing information and sharing of best practices and lessons learned in R2R established

Component 5. Ridge-to-Reef Regional and National Coordination

Outcomes:

5.1 Effective program coordination of national and regional R2R projects

Gender specific indicators.

Component 1	National Demonstrations to Support R2R ICM/IWRM Approaches for Island Resilience and Sustainability
Outcome 1.1	Successful pilot projects testing innovative solutions involving linking ICM, IWRM and climate change adaptation [linked to national STAR projects via larger Pacific R2R network]

Components	Outcomes	Indicator(s)	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
1. National Demonstrations to Support R2R ICM/IWRM Approaches for Island Resilience and Sustainability	1.1 Successful pilot projects testing innovative solutions involving linking ICM, IWRM and climate change adaptation [linked to national STAR projects via larger Pacific R2R network]	1.1.1 Number and quality of baseline environmental state and socio-cultural information incorporated in project area diagnostics	1.1.1 Baseline environmental and social data is unconsolidated	1.1.1 14 national pilot project area diagnostics based on R2R approach including: baseline environmental state and social data incorporating CC vulnerabilities; and local governance of water, land, forests and coasts reviewed	1.1.1 Pilot area diagnostic reports published online	1.1.1 Data and information required to conduct diagnostic analyses may not be shared by local government agencies
		1.1.2 Stress reduction and water, environmental and socioeconomic status indicators • Municipal waste pollution reduction (N kg/yr) • Pollution reduction to aquifers (kg/ha/yr) • Area of restored habitat (ha) • Area of conserved/protected wetland • Area of catchment under improved management (ha) • Number of people engaged in alternative livelihoods • Status of mechanisms for PM&E • Number and quality of demonstration projects that have incorporated	1.1.2 Limited community and cross-sectoral participation in the planning of coordinated investments and stress reduction efforts in land, forest, water and coastal management in PICs. *(Baseline for water, environmental and social economic status indicators for municipal waste pollution, pollution to aquifers, areas of restored habitat, area of conserved/protect*	1.1.2 14 national pilot projects test methods for catalyzing local community action, utilizing and providing best practice examples, and building institutional linkages for integrated land, forest, water and coastal management, and resulting in: • Municipal waste pollution reduction of 5,775 kg N/yr (6 sites) • Pollution reduction to aquifer of 23 kg N/ha/yr (2 sites) • 6,838 ha of restored habitat (4 sites) • 290 ha of conserved/protected wetland (2 sites)	1.1.2 Reports of community and sectoral participation in the planning, execution, and monitoring and evaluation of pilot activities, including annual reports on effectiveness of stress reduction measures Project Implementation Reports, Mid-term and Terminal Evaluation Reports	1.1.2(a) Development pressures may result in adoption or revision of land-use policies by national or local governments which are incompatible with activities at pilot sites 1.1.2 (b) Challenges and costs associated with demonstrating environmental stress reduction benefits of

Components	Outcomes	Indicator(s)	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
		gender analysis as part of the community engagement plans	ed wetland, area of catchment under improved management, and number of people engaged in alternative livelihoods, will be obtained at project start.)	• 25,860 ha of catchment under improved management (7 sites) • 30 charcoal producers (40 % of total) engaged in alternative charcoal production activities • Participatory monitoring and evaluation of environmental and socioeconomic status of coastal areas (9 sites) • 14 national pilot projects demonstrate gender responsive implementation and results • Direct national pilot project beneficiaries equitably shared		technologies and management measures may constrain replication and upscaling 1.1.2 (c) Sufficient commitment from Pacific leaders to address gender issues and promote mainstreaming.

Outcome 1.2 National diagnostic analyses for ICM conducted for prioritizing and scaling-up key ICM/IWRM reforms and investments

Components	Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
1. National Demonstrations to Support R2R ICM/IWRM Approaches for Island Resilience and Sustainability (*cont.*)	1.2 National diagnostic analyses for ICM conducted for prioritizing and scaling-up key ICM/IWRM reforms and investments	1.2.1 By end of the project, number of diagnostic analyses conducted for priority coastal areas	1.2.1 Choice of sites for GEF and other donor investment in natural resource and environmental management does not adequately represent the range of biological, environmental and socio-economic	1.2.1 14 diagnostic analysis for ICM/IWRM and CCA investments conducted to inform priority areas for scaling-up in each of 14 participating PICs	1.2.1 Diagnostic reports for priority coastal areas published	1.2.1 Data and information required to conduct site characterizations of coastal areas may not be shared by relevant sectoral agencies or other institutions

Components	Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
			conditions in PICs			
		1.2.2 Number and quality of ICM-IWRM investments incorporating baseline environmental state and socio-cultural information for the prioritization of investment sites	1.2.2 Lack of a scientifically sound and objective procedure for the selection of locations for investment in integrated natural resource and environmental management in PICs	1.2.2 Up to 14 ICM-IWRM investments utilizing methodology and procedures for characterizing island coastal areas for ICM investment developed by the project	1.2.2 Regional guidelines for characterizing and prioritizing coastal areas for ICM investment prepared	1.2.2 Engaging appropriate expertise to facilitate consensus on the selection of physical, biological and social variables to be used in characterization of PIC coastal areas

Outcome 1.3 Multi-stakeholder leader roundtable networks established for strengthened 'community to cabinet' ICM/IWRM

Components	Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
1. National Demonstrations to Support R2R ICM/IWRM Approaches for Island Resilience and Sustainability (*cont.*)	1.3 Multi-stakeholder leader roundtable networks established for strengthened 'community to cabinet' ICM/IWRM	1.3.1 Number of local leaders and local governments engagement/ participating in multi-stakeholder leader roundtable networks	1.3.1 Limited engagement of community-based governance mechanisms in national policy and planning	1.3.1 Institutional relationships between national and community-based governance structures strengthened and formalized through national "Ridge to Reef" Inter-Ministry Committees in 14 Pacific SIDS	1.3.1 Reports of multi-stakeholder leader network activities	1.3.1 Existing tensions between land-owners and government agencies may limit community leader participation
		1.3.2 Number of forums held to discuss opportunities for	1.3.2 Low level mobilization of the private sector in environmental	1.3.2 Up to 14 new national private-sector and donor partnership	1.3.2 Reports of private sector and donor	1.3.2 Limited private sector presence, or alignment of donor

Components	Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
		agreements on private sector and donor participation in PIC sustainable development	investment and planning in PICs	forums for investment planning in priority community-based ICM/IWRM actions	partnership forums	investment strategies with proposed actions, at priority R2R locations

Component 2	Island-based Investments in Human Capital and Knowledge to Strengthen National and Local Capacities for Ridge to Reef ICM/IWRM approaches, incorporating CC adaptation

Outcome 2.1	National and local capacity for ICM and IWRM implementation built to enable best practice in integrated land, water, forest and coastal management and CC adaptation

Components	Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
2. Island-based Investments in Human Capital and Knowledge to Strengthen National and Local Capacities for Ridge to Reef ICM/IWRM approaches, incorporating CC adaptation	2.1 National and local capacity for ICM and IWRM implementation built to enable best practice in integrated land, water, forest and coastal management and CC adaptation	2.1.1 Number of PIC-based personnel with post-graduate training in R2R management. *Data will be gender disaggregated	2.1.1 Zero R2R post-graduate training courses available specific to the Pacific Region.	2.1.1 At least 10 people with post-graduate training in R2R management. *At least 5 people will be women At least 3 innovative post-graduate training programs for the Pacific Region in ICM/IWRM and related CC adaptation delivered for project managers and participating stakeholders through partnership of internationally recognized educational institutes and technical	2.1.1 Agreed curricula and materials for post-graduate training program published	2.1.1 Internationally recognized institute (or consortium) able to deliver a cost-effective post-graduate training course which is both accredited and regionally appropriate

Components	Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
				support and mentoring program with results documented		
		2.1.2 Number of community stakeholders (i.e. catchment management committees, CSOs, etc) engaged in R2R planning and CC adaptation activities	2.1.2 Limited national and local capacity for ICM and IWRM implementation constrains achievement of best practice in integrated management in PICs	2.1.2 At least 14 community stakeholder groups (ie. Catchment management committees, CSOs, etc) engaged in R2R planning and CC adaptation activities. *Number of trainings (including training on integrating gender into community level R2R and CC planning and implementation) conducted to build capacity for civil society and community organization participating in ICM/IWRM and CC adaptation strengthened through direct involvement in implementation of demo activities with results documented	2.1.2 Community training materials compiled and published online	2.1.2 Adequate resourcing from national STAR projects available to support STAR project stakeholder participation in training and capacity building activities

Outcome 2.2   Incentive structures for retention of local 'Ridge to Reef' expertise and inter-governmental dialogue on human resource needs for ICM/IWRM initiated

Components	Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
2. Island-based Investments in Human Capital and Knowledge to Strengthen National and Local Capacities for Ridge to Reef ICM/IWRM approaches, incorporating CC adaptation (*cont.*)	2.2 Incentive structures for retention of local 'Ridge to Reef' expertise and inter-governmental dialogue on human resource needs for ICM/IWRM initiated	2.2.1 Number of R2R personnel for which functional competencies are benchmarked, tracked and analyzed Number of studies completed identifying the national human capacity needs for R2R (ICM/IWRM) implementation and benchmarking/ tracking competencies of national and local government units for R2R implementation Number of capacity building support secured with results documented	2.2.1 Required functional competencies of national and local personnel for environment and natural resource management in PIC contexts undefined and untracked	2.2.1 Up to 14 R2R personnel identified, with functional competencies are benchmarked, tracked and analysed. At least one study completed identifying national human capacity needs for R2R (ICM/IWRM) implementation and benchmarking/ tracking competencies of national and local government units for R2R implementation. Based on the study, at least 14 capacity building support provided with results documented.	2.2.1 Assessment of national and local government competencies and capacity development needs published	2.2.1 Securing advice and support from human resource specialist familiar with systems of government and barriers to sustainable development in PIC contexts
		2.2.2 Number of recommendations on practitioner retention internalized at national and local government levels	2.2.2 Retention of skilled and experienced practitioners in environment and natural resource management low, particularly in project-based investments, including	2.2.2 At least 1 regional report with recommendations for R2R practitioner retention at national and local government levels completed. The report will analyse existing Public Service Commission salary scales and	2.2.2 Report of Public Service Commission employment conditions, ICM/IWRM human capacity needs, and recommended incentive structures published	2.2.2 Sufficient commitment from Pacific leaders to address human resourcing issues for natural resource and environmental management

Components	Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
			limited dialogue on human capacity needs for cross-sectoral	required functional competencies of key R2R (ICM/IWRM) personnel; appropriate guidelines and incentive structures for retention of local R2R expertise proposed.		

Component 3   Mainstreaming of Ridge to Reef ICM/IWRM Approaches into National Development Frameworks

Outcome 3.1   National and regional strategic action frameworks for ICM/IWRM endorsed nationally and regionally

Components	Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
3. Mainstreaming of Ridge to Reef ICM/IWRM Approaches into National Development Frameworks	3.1 National and regional strategic action framework for ICM/IWRM endorsed nationally and regionally	3.1.1 Number of sectoral governance framework harmonised and strengthened through national and regional development frameworks	3.1.1 Constrained and inadequate sectoral planning and investment of natural and social systems in PICs	3.1.1 National recommendations for 14 PICs for coastal policy, legal and budgetary reforms for ICM/IWRM for integration of land, water, forest, coastal management and CC adaptation compiled and documented with options for harmonization of governance frameworks	3.1.1 14 national reviews of existing policies, laws, Executive Orders, Presidential Decrees, and departmental strategic plans relating to land, forest, water, and coastal management, including recommendations for the harmonization of governance frameworks published	3.1.1 Government agencies may be unwilling to participate in processes for the harmonization of policy and legislation
		3.1.2 Inter-ministerial agreements and strategic action framework	3.1.2 Lack of r national and regional policy and plans to support the mainstreaming	3.1.2 Agreements and strategic action frameworks for the 14 PICs	3.1.2 Endorsed National and Regional Strategic Action	3.1.2 Consultative processes will not elicit adequate stakeholder

Components	Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
		for 14 PICs developed and submitted for endorsement on integration of land, water, forest and coastal management and capacity building in development of national ICM/IWRM reforms and investment plans	of R2R approaches in development planning	endorsed by leaders	Frameworks published	input and commitment of support from national networks to proposed priority strategic actions
		3.1.3 Number of demonstrable use of national 'State of the Coasts' or 'State of the Islands' reports in national and regional action planning for R2R investment	3.1.3 Limited application of evidence-based approaches in PICs national development planning in the areas of: freshwater use and sanitation; wastewater treatment and pollution control; land use and forestry practices; balancing coastal livelihoods and biodiversity conservation; hazard risk reduction; and climate variability and change	3.1.3 National 'State of the Coasts' or 'State of the Islands' reports for 14 PICs completed and launched to Pacific Leaders during National Coastal Summits (Yr 3) in coordination with national R2R projects and demonstrated as national development planning tool, including guidelines for diagnostic analyses of coastal areas	3.1.3 Published 'State of the Coasts' reports	3.1.3 Strong and high-level government commitment is generated, sustained and willing to use 'State of Islands' reporting as an instrument for change

Outcome 3.2 Coordinated approaches for R2R integrated land, water, forest and coastal management and CC adaptation achieved in 14 PICs

Components	Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
3. Mainstreaming of Ridge to Reef ICM/IWRM Approaches into National Development Planning (*cont.*)	3.2 Coordinated approaches for R2R integrated land, water, forest and coastal management and CC adaptation achieved in 14 PICs	3.2.1 Number of networks of national R2R pilot project inter-ministerial committees formed and linked to existing national IWRM committees	3.2.1 National IWRM task forces and local coordinating committees in 12 countries and a need exists for strengthened coordination of IWRM plan implementation within broader R2R frameworks	3.2.1 Up to 14 national networks of R2R (ICM/IWRM) national pilot project inter-ministry committees formed by building on existing IWRM committees and contributing to a common results framework at the project and program levels	3.2.1 Meeting reports of pilot project committees (joint management/planning decisions and participant lists)	3.2.1 Provincial and local governments may perceive IMC approach as being driven by central government
		3.2.2 Number of people participating in inter-ministry committee (IMC) meetings conducted including scope and uptake of joint management and planning decisions *Participation data to be disaggregated by gender	3.2.2 Limited number and variety of stakeholders participating in national coordinating bodies to ensure community to Cabinet planning of investment in sustainable development of PICs	3.2.2 The number and variety of stakeholders participating in periodic IMC meetings in 14 PICS are doubled, with meeting results documented, participation data assembled and reported to national decision-makers and regional forums	3.2.2 Meeting reports of periodic national IMC meetings (joint management/planning decisions and participant lists), including annual IMC 'results' report to national leaders in 14 PICs and regional fora	3.2.2 Appropriately qualified national staff available to provide adequate Secretariat support to IMC work

Components	Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
				*50% of participants will be women, youth, and/or from vulnerable groups		
		3.2.3 Number of networks established between community leaders and local government from pilot projects	3.2.3 Limited exchange between communities on best practices in environment and natural resource management	3.2.3 Community leaders and local government create at least 14 networks via national and regional round-table meetings complemented by community tech exchange visits	3.2.3 Reports of national and regional round-table meetings	3.2.3 Adequate cooperation is fostered among IW pilot project and national STAR project staff to build stakeholder confidence in benefits of integration
		3.2.4 Number of inter-ministry committee members meeting within the 4 pilot PICs that is engaged in learning and change in perception through participatory techniques *Participation data to be disaggregated by gender	3.3.4 Limited learning on effectiveness of investments in country-driven approaches to development assistance in PICs	3.2.4 At least 20 ICM members total from the 4 pilot PICs (sub-regional, mix of high island, atoll settings) gauge in learning, leading to change in perception through participatory techniques. *50% of participants will be women,	3.2.4 Report of the application of participatory techniques to gauge learning and change in perception among IMC members in 4 pilot PICs	3.2.4 R2R is accepted at the national level as a legitimate framework for a multi focal area approach to GEF investment for PIC sustainable development

Components	Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
				youth, and/or from vulnerable groups		

Outcome 4.1   National and regional formulation and adoption of integrated and simplified results frameworks for integrated multi-focal projects

Components	Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
4. Regional and National 'Ridge to Reef' Indicators for Reporting, Monitoring, Adaptive Management and Knowledge Management	4.1 National and regional formulation and adoption of integrated and simplified results frameworks for integrated multi-focal projects	4.1.1 Number and quality of national and regional indicator set with the proposed targets and outcomes of the R2R program	4.1.1 Calls from Pacific leaders for strengthened emphasis on results in the planning and financing of development in PICs	4.1.1 1 simple and integrated national and regional reporting templates developed based on national indicator sets and regional framework to facilitate annual results reporting and monitoring from 14 PICs	4.1.1 Agreed national and regional reporting templates published online	4.1.1 (a) Design of national STAR projects include targets and related indicators aimed at achievement of R2R program goals and outcomes; (b) legal agreements between national lead agencies and GEF implementing agencies for STAR projects include explicit requirement for project management units to meet R2R program reporting requirements
		4.1.2 Level of acceptance of the	4.1.2 Lack of results tracking and	4.1.2 1 unified/harmonized multi-focal area	4.1.2 Regional results	4.1.2 Sustained commitment of senior

23

Components	Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
		harmonized results tracking approach by the GEF, its agencies and participating countries	reporting approach tested via GEF Pac IWRM project, including training of a cadre of national WatSan sector staff	results tracking approach and analytical tool developed, endorsed, and proposed to the GEF, its agencies and participating countries	framework and analytical tool developed and accessible online for review and testing	government officials with oversight of IW and STAR projects to develop and test a harmonized results approach for GEF investment in PICs
		4.1.3 Number of National planning exercises in 14 Pac SIDS conducted with participants from relevant ministries with a mandate to embedding R2R results frameworks into national systems for reporting, monitoring and budgeting	4.1.3 An increasingly large myriad of national level reporting requirements for natural resource and environment agencies constrains the timely and accurate reporting of results of development assistance in PICs	4.1.3 Up to 14 national planning exercises in 14 Pac SIDS conducted with participants from relevant ministries with a mandate to embed R2R results frameworks into national systems for reporting, monitoring and budgeting	4.1.3 Reports of national planning exercises in 4 PICs on embedding R2R results frameworks into national systems	4.1.3 National planning and finance ministry staff are sufficiently well engaged in national planning exercises

Outcome 4.2   National and regional platforms for managing information and sharing of best practices and lessons learned in R2R established

Components	Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
4. Regional and National 'Ridge to Reef' Indicators for	4.2 National and regional platforms for	4.2.1 Regional communications strategy developed and number of partnership	4.2.1 Absence of public-private partnership in support of communicating	4.2.1 Regional 'ridge to reef' communications strategy developed and implemented	4.2.1 Approved communications strategy published	4.2.1 (a) Willingness of regional and national media outlets prepared to

Components	Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
Reporting, Monitoring, Adaptive Management and Knowledge Management (*cont.*)	managing information and sharing of best practices and lessons learned in R2R established	with media and educational organizations	benefits of IWRM initiated via GEF Pac IWRM project	and assistance provided to national R2R project including at least 10 partnerships with national and regional media and educational organizations		partner with R2R program implementation; and (b) adequate resourcing from national STAR projects to the development of media products required to effectively communicate the benefit of integrated R2R approaches
		4.2.2 Number of IW:LEARN experience notes published	4.2.2 Limited regional and global sharing of information on best practice and lessons learned from the GEF Pacific Alliance for Sustainability	4.2.2 Participation in IW:LEARN activities: conferences; preparation of at least 10 experience notes and inter-linked websites with combined allocation of 1% of GEF grant	4.2.2 Published experience notes	4.2.2 Retention of national and regional level staff required to resource the documentation of experiences and lessons learned as IW:LEARN experience notes
		4.2.3 Number of users, volume of content accessed, and online visibility of the 'Pacific R2R Network'	4.2.3 Need for media platforms and targeted communications in support of efforts to harness support for inter-ministerial coordination and policy and planning elements of the R2R program	4.2.3 Pacific R2R Network established with at least 100 users registered, online regional and national portals containing among others, databases, rosters of national and regional experts and practitioners on R2R, register of national and	4.2.3 Regional and national project portals, GIS and meta-databases, roster of national and regional experts and practitioners on R2R, register of national projects, repository for best practice R2R technologies, lessons learned, and results	4.2.3 Inter-connectivity in national and regional project offices is adequate to support the efficient online compilation and sharing of information and data

Components	Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
				regional projects, repository for best practice R2R technologies, lessons learned etc.	portal accessible online via 'Pacific R2R Network'	

Component 5   Ridge-to-Reef Regional and National Coordination

Outcome 5.1   Effective program coordination of national and regional R2R projects

Components	Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
5. Ridge-to-Reef Regional and National Coordination	5.1 Effective program coordination of national and regional R2R projects	5.1.1 Program coordination unit recruited and staff retained	5.1.1 No coordination unit and full time personnel established	5.1.1 Functioning overall R2R program coordination unit with alignment of development worker positions contributing to coordinated effort among national R2R projects (Year 1)	5.1.1 Terms of Reference and contracts for program coordination unit staff	5.1.1 Regional executing agency ability to recruit and retain appropriately qualified staff for program coordination unit
		5.1.2 Number of requests for regional-level support to national project delivery and management met by program coordination unit	5.1.2 Limited national level experience and capacity in delivery of large integrated natural resource and environment projects and programs	5.1.2 Technical, operational, reporting and monitoring Unit is operational to provide support to national R2R projects, as may be requested by PICs, to facilitate timely delivery of overall program goals. At least 14 requests per year are met effectively.	5.1.2 Outputs of in-country technical support missions Annual client (country) survey on regional R2R support quality	5.1.2 Adequate resourcing available to program coordination unit to meet support requests of national STAR projects

Components	Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
		5.1.3 Number of R2R staff trained resulting in effective results reporting and online information sharing	5.1.3 Low-level familiarity with GEF minimum standards for results-based management, monitoring and evaluation, and financial and progress reporting requirements of GEF and its implementing agencies	5.1.3 At least 14 R2R staff are trained (in harmonized reporting and monitoring and other regional and national and capacity building modules, among others) resulting in effective results reporting and online information sharing.	5.1.3 Training modules for results reporting and online information sharing published online R2R Staff annual performance evaluation	5.1.3 IW pilot and STAR project are retained to enable the longer-term development and local exchange of national project management and reporting capacity
		5.1.4 Volume and quality of information and data contributed by program stakeholders to online repositories	5.1.4 Existing GEF IWRM interactive website with a cadre of national project stakeholders trained in its operation	5.1.4 At least 4 quality information and/or data contributed/ updated per year (total of at last 16 throughout the project) to the online repository, as a result of support provided to PICs for the development and operation of the Pacific R2R Network and regional with national R2R web pages as a repository of information, documentation and for sharing best practices	5.1.4 Program stakeholder contributions of information and data published online	5.1.4 Internet connectivity in national and regional offices of program/project stakeholders adequate to support use of online training tools
		5.1.5 Number of planning and coordination	5.1.5 Limited sub-regional and regional coordination	5.1.5 At least 4 (1 per year) planning and coordination	5.1.5 Agenda, list of participants and minutes	5.1.5 National and regional organisations assign sufficient

Components	Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
		workshops conducted for national projects teams to ensure timeliness and cost-effectiveness of IW pilot project and STAR project coordination, delivery and reporting	and planning workshops conducted in association with inter-governmental meetings for cost efficiency purposes	workshops conducted for national project teams in the Pacific R2R network	of planning and coordination workshops	importance to engagement with planning and coordination initiatives of the project

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 Regional Steering Committee Meetings (Project Board Meetings) and of other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings, RSTC, RPCG)
12	GEF Tracking Tools (from CEO Endorsement, midterm and terminal stages)
13	GEF/LDCF/SCCF Core Indicators (from PIF, CEO Endorsement, midterm and terminal stages); for GEF-6 and GEF-7 projects only
14	Financial data, including actual expenditures by project outcome, including management costs, and including documentation of any significant budget revisions
15	Co-financing data with expected and actual contributions broken down by type of co-financing, source, and whether the contribution is considered as investment mobilized or recurring expenditures
16	Audit reports
17	Electronic copies of project outputs (booklets, manuals, technical reports, articles, etc.)
18	Sample of project communications materials
19	Summary list of formal meetings, workshops, etc. held, with date, location, topic, and number of participants
20	Any relevant socio-economic monitoring data, such as average incomes / employment levels of stakeholders in the target area, change in revenue related to project activities
21	List of contracts and procurement items over ~US$5,000 (i.e. organizations or companies contracted for project outputs, etc., except in cases of confidential information)
22	List of related projects/initiatives contributing to project objectives approved/started after GEF project approval (i.e. any leveraged or "catalytic" results)
23	Data on relevant project website activity – e.g. number of unique visitors per month, number of page views, etc. over relevant time period, if available
24	UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD)

25	List/map of project sites, highlighting suggested visits
26	List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Board members, RTA, Project Team members, and other partners to be consulted
27	Project deliverables that provide documentary evidence of achievement towards project outcomes
	Add documents, as required

ToR Annex C: Content of the TE report

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

ii. Acknowledgements
iii. Table of Contents
iv. Acronyms and Abbreviations

1.   Executive Summary (3-4 pages)
- Project Information Table
- Project Description (brief)
- Evaluation Ratings Table
- Concise summary of findings, conclusions and lessons learned
- Recommendations summary table

2.   Introduction (2-3 pages)
- Purpose and objective of the TE
- Scope
- Methodology
- Data Collection & Analysis
- Ethics
- Limitations to the evaluation
- Structure of the TE report

3.   Project Description (3-5 pages)
- Project start and duration, including milestones
- Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope
- Problems that the project sought to address: threats and barriers targeted
- Immediate and development objectives of the project
- Expected results
- Main stakeholders: summary list
- Theory of Change

4.   Findings

(in addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (*) must be given a rating[2])

4.1 Project Design/Formulation
- Analysis of Results Framework: project logic and strategy, indicators
- Assumptions and Risks
- Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g. same focal area) incorporated into project design
- Planned stakeholder participation
- Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector

4.1 Project Implementation
- Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
- Actual stakeholder participation and partnership arrangements
- Project Finance and Co-finance
- Monitoring & Evaluation: design at entry (*), implementation (*), and overall assessment of M&E (*)
- UNDP implementation/oversight (*) and Implementing Partner execution (*), overall project implementation/execution (*), coordination, and operational issues

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

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

6. Annexes
- TE ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
- TE Mission itinerary
- List of persons interviewed

---

[2] See ToR Annex F for rating scales.

- 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

ToR Annex D: Evaluation Criteria Matrix template

2   Annex 6. Sample Evaluation Criteria Matrix

Below is a sample Evaluation Criteria Matrix for a biodiversity project.

Evaluation Questions	Indicators	Sources	Data Collection Method
Evaluation Criteria: Relevance			
• Does the project's objective align with the priorities of the local government and local communities?	• Level of coherence between project objective and stated priorities of local stakeholders	Local stakeholders Document review of local development strategies, environmental policies, etc.	Local level field visit interviews Desk review
• Does the project's objective fit within the national environment and development priorities?	• Level of coherence between project objective and national policy priorities and strategies, as stated in official documents	• National policy documents, such as National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan, National Capacity Self-Assessment, etc.	Desk review National level interviews

• Did the project concept originate from local or national stakeholders, and/or were relevant stakeholders sufficiently involved in project development?	• Level of involvement of local and national stakeholders in project origination and development (number of meetings held, project development processes incorporating stakeholder input, etc.)	Project staff Local and national stakeholders Project documents	Field visit interviews Desk review
• Does the project objective fit GEF strategic priorities?	• Level of coherence between project objective and GEF strategic priorities (including alignment of relevant focal area indicators)	• GEF strategic priority documents for period when project was approved • Current GEF strategic priority documents	• Desk review

Evaluation Questions	Indicators	Sources	Data Collection Method
• Was the project linked with and inline with UNDP priorities and strategies for the country?	• Level of coherence between project objective and design with UNDAF, CPD	• UNDP strategic priority documents	• Desk review
• Does the project's objective support implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity? Other relevant MEAs?	• Linkages between project objective and elements of the CBD, such as key articles and programs of work	• CBD website • National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan	• Desk review
Evaluation Criteria: Efficiency			

• Is the project costeffective?	• Quality and adequacy of financial management procedures (in line with UNDP, UNOPS, and national policies, legislation, and procedures) • Financial delivery rate vs. expected rate • Management costs as a percentage of total costs	• Project documents • Project staff	• Desk review • Interviews with project staff
• Are expenditures in line with international standards and norms?	• Cost of project inputs and outputs relative to norms and standards for donor projects in the country or region	• Project documents • Project staff	• Desk review • Interviews with project staff
• Is the project implementation approach efficient for delivering the planned project results?	• Adequacy of implementation structure and mechanisms for coordination and communication • Planned and actual level of human resources available • Extent and quality of engagement with	• Project documents • National and local stakeholders • Project staff	• Desk review • Interviews with project staff • Interviews with national and local stakeholders

Evaluation Questions	Indicators	Sources	Data Collection Method
	• relevant partners / partnerships • Quality and adequacy of project monitoring mechanisms (oversight bodies' input, quality and timeliness of reporting, etc.)		

Evaluation Questions	Indicators	Sources	Data Collection Method
• Is the project implementation delayed? If so, has that affected costeffectiveness?	• Project milestones in time • Planned results affected by delays • Required project adaptive management measures related to delays	• Project documents • Project staff	• Desk review • Interviews with project staff
• What is the contribution of cash and in-kind cofinancing to project implementation?	• Level of cash and inkind co-financing relative to expected level	• Project documents • Project staff	• Desk review • Interviews with project staff
• To what extent is the project leveraging additional resources?	• Amount of resources leveraged relative to project budget	• Project documents • Project staff	• Desk review • Interviews with project staff
Evaluation Criteria: Effectiveness			
• Are the project objectives likely to be met? To what extent are they likely to be met?	• Level of progress toward project indicator targets relative to expected level at current point of implementation	• Project documents • Project staff • Project stakeholders	• Field visit interviews • Desk review
• What are the key factors contributing to project success or underachievement?	• Level of documentation of and preparation for project risks, assumptions and impact drivers	• Project documents • Project staff • Project stakeholders	• Field visit interviews • Desk review
• What are the key risks and barriers that remain to achieve the project objective and generate Global	• Presence, assessment of, and preparation for expected risks, assumptions and impact drivers	• Project documents • Project staff • Project stakeholders	• Field visit interviews • Desk review

Evaluation Questions	Indicators	Sources	Data Collection Method
Environmental Benefits?			

• Are the key assumptions and impact drivers relevant to the achievement of Global Environmental Benefits likely to be met?	• Actions undertaken to address key assumptions and target impact drivers	• Project documents • Project staff • Project stakeholders	• Field visit interviews • Desk review
Evaluation Criteria: Results			
• Have the planned outputs been produced? Have they contributed to the project outcomes and objectives?	• Level of project implementation progress relative to expected level at current stage of implementation • Existence of logical linkages between project outputs and outcomes/impacts	• Project documents • Project staff • Project stakeholders	• Field visit interviews • Desk review
• Are the anticipated outcomes likely to be achieved? Are the outcomes likely to contribute to the achievement of the project objective?	• Existence of logical linkages between project outcomes and impacts	• Project documents • Project staff • Project stakeholders	• Field visit interviews • Desk review
• Are impact level results likely to be achieved? Are the likely to be at the scale sufficient to be considered Global Environmental Benefits?	• Environmental indicators • Level of progress through the project's Theory of Change	• Project documents • Project staff • Project stakeholders	• Field visit interviews • Desk review
Evaluation Criteria: Sustainability			
• To what extent are project results likely to be dependent on continued financial support? What is the likelihood that any	• Financial requirements for maintenance of project benefits • Level of expected financial resources available to support	• Project documents • Project staff • Project stakeholders	• Field visit interviews • Desk review

Evaluation Questions	Indicators	Sources	Data Collection Method
required financial resources will be available to sustain the project results once the GEF assistance ends?	maintenance of project benefits • Potential for additional financial resources to support maintenance of project benefits		
• Do relevant stakeholders have or are likely to achieve an adequate level of "ownership" of results, to have the interest in ensuring that project benefits are maintained?	• Level of initiative and engagement of relevant stakeholders in project activities and results	• Project documents • Project staff • Project stakeholders	• Field visit interviews • Desk review
• Do relevant stakeholders have the necessary technical capacity to ensure that project benefits are maintained?	• Level of technical capacity of relevant stakeholders relative to level required to sustain project benefits	• Project documents • Project staff • Project stakeholders	• Field visit interviews • Desk review
• To what extent are the project results dependent on sociopolitical factors?	• Existence of sociopolitical risks to project benefits	• Project documents • Project staff • Project stakeholders	• Field visit interviews • Desk review
• To what extent are the project results dependent on issues relating to institutional frameworks and governance?	• Existence of institutional and governance risks to project benefits	• Project documents • Project staff • Project stakeholders	• Field visit interviews • Desk review
• Are there any environmental risks that can undermine the future flow of project impacts and Global Environmental Benefits?	• Existence of environmental risks to project benefits	• Project documents • Project staff • Project stakeholders	• Field visit interviews • Desk review

Gender equality and women's empowerment			
Evaluation Questions	**Indicators**	**Sources**	**Data Collection Method**
• How did the project contribute to gender equality and women's empowerment? •	• Level of progress of gender action plan and gender indicators in results framework	• Project documents • Project staff • Project stakeholders	• Desk review, interviews, field visits
• In what ways did the project's gender results advance or contribute to the project's biodiversity outcomes?	• Existence of logical linkages between gender results and project outcomes and impacts	• Project documents • Project staff • Project stakeholders	• Desk review, interviews, field visits
Indicate whether the gender results achieved are short term or long term	• • Existence of logical linkages between gender results and project outcomes and impacts	• Project documents • Project staff • Project stakeholders	• Desk review, interviews, field visits
Is there any potential negative impact on gender equality and women's empowerment? If so, what can be done do to mitigate this?	• • Existence of logical linkages between gender results and project outcomes and impacts	• Project documents • Project staff • Project stakeholders	• Desk review, interviews, field visits
Indicate which of the following results areas the project contributed to (indicate as many results areas as applicable and describe the specific results that were attributed to the project): ○ Contributing to closing gender gaps in access to and control over resources; ○ Improving the participation and decision-making of	• • Level of progress of gender action plan and gender indicators in results framework	• Project documents • Project staff • Project stakeholders	• Desk review, interviews, field visits

women in natural resource governance; o Targeting socio-economic benefits and services for women			
Discuss any further points on the project's gender results in terms of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, country ownership, sustainability and impact.	• • Level of progress of gender action plan and gender indicators in results framework	• Project documents • Project staff • Project stakeholders	• Desk review, interviews, field visits
Cross-cutting and UNDP Mainstreaming Issues			
• How were effects on local populations considered in project design and implementation?	• Positive or negative effects of the project on local populations.	• Project document, progress reports, monitoring reports	• Desk review, interviews, field visits
• Discuss how the project results have contributed to disasters or mitigation risks and or climate change mitigation and adaptation measures	• Level of contribution to disasters, mitigation risks and or climate change mitiation and adaptation	• Project document, progress reports, monitoring reports	• Desk review, interviews, field visits
• Discuss scale of project's benefitting poor, indigenous persons with dasbialities, and marginalized groups	• Level of beneficiaries such as poor, indigenous, persons living with disabilities and marginalized groups from the project	• Project document, progress reports, monitoring reports	• Desk review, interviews, field visits

Describe how the environmental conservation activities of te project contributed to poverty reduction and sustaining livelihoods	• Level of contribution of environmental conservation activities towards poverty reduction and sustaining livelihoods	• Project document, progress reports, monitoring reports	• Desk review, interviews, field visits
Describe how the project contributed to a human rights based approach	-level of contribution of project to a human rights based approach	• Project document, progress reports, monitoring reports	• Desk review, interviews, field visits
GEF Additionality			
Describe if there are quality quantitative and verifiable data demonstrating the incremental environmental benefits	Level of existence of verifiable data and quality/quantative data demonstrating the incremental environmental benefits	• Project document, progress reports, monitoring reports	• Desk review, interviews, field visits
Describe if the outcomes be attributed to the GEF contribution as originally anticipated	Level of linkages between the outcomes in attributioin to the GEF contribution	• Project document, progress reports, monitoring reports	• Desk review, interviews, field visits
Explain if monitoring and evaluation documents provided evidence of the causality between the rationale for GEF involvement and the incremental environmental and other benefits	Level of M&E evidently demonstrating causality between the rationale for GEF involvement and the incremental environmental and other benefits directly associated with the GEF	• Project document, progress reports, monitoring reports	• Desk review, interviews, field visits

directly associated with the GEF supported project			

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 professionalism).

Evaluators/Consultants:

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.
8. Must ensure that independence of judgement is maintained, and that evaluation findings and recommendations are independently presented.
9. Must confirm that they have not been involved in designing, executing or advising on the project being evaluated and did not carry out the project's Mid-Term Review.

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

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

Name of Evaluator: _____

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____

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

Signed at _____ (Place) on _____ (Date)

Signature: _____

ToR Annex F: TE Rating Scales

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

ToR Annex G: 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: _____

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** Regional R2R project (UNDP Project PIMS # 5220)

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