

## NATIONAL CONSULTANT'S TERMINAL EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

### INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the [Mainstreaming Coastal and Marine Biodiversity into production Sectors in Sindhudurg Coast, Maharashtra \(PIMS: 4242\)](#)

The essentials of the project to be evaluated are as follows:

### PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	Sindhudurg Coastal and Marine Ecosystem (SCME)			
GEF Project ID:	00072738		<i>at endorsement (Million US\$)</i>	<i>at completion (Million US\$)</i>
UNDP Project ID:	00058538	GEF financing:	3.438	3.438
Country:	India	IA/EA own:	0.00	0.00
Region:	South Asia	Government:	12.00	9.92 (received) + 2.08 (likely by project end)
Focal Area:	Biodiversity	Other:	0.00	0.00
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	Mainstreaming Coastal and Marine Biodiversity into production Sectors	Total co-financing:	12.00	12.00
Executing Agency:	UNDP	Total Project Cost:	15.438	15.438
Other Partners involved:	Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change Department of Revenue and Forests, Government of Maharashtra	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		May 2012
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: December 2016	Actual: December 2017

## OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

---

The Sindhudurg Coastal and Marine Ecosystem (SCME), located on the west coast of India (Maharashtra) is one of the 11 ecologically and economically critical habitats identified along the Indian coast. The area is rich in mangroves, coral reefs, apart from varied marine flora and fauna including globally significant species like Whale shark, Indo-pacific humpback dolphins, Olive Ridley, Green and Leatherback turtles. Due to its high ecological importance, 29.12 sq. km of SCME was designated as the Malvan Marine Sanctuary (MMS) in 1987. SCME has enormous economic significance as well, being one of the major fish landing centers, and as a rapidly emerging tourism destination. The primary drivers of ecosystem degradation in the SCME include unsustainable fishing by trawlers, an expanding tourism sector, and pollution from fishing vessels and other maritime traffic. The existing institutional arrangement in the SCME being inadequate in addressing these issues from a landscape perspective, the UNDP-GEF intervention aimed to address this through the following outcomes: (1) Cross-sectoral planning framework that mainstreams biodiversity conservation; (2) Enhanced capacity of sector institutions for implementing biodiversity-friendly fisheries management plan, ecotourism management plan and MMS management plan; and (3) Sustainable community livelihoods and natural resource use. By the project end, it has been envisioned that production activities in at least 6,327 sq. km of SCME mainstream biodiversity conservation objectives, in turn improving the conservation prospects of critical species and ecosystems, apart from contributing to the sustainable development of the region.

### Project Strategy:

a. The first outcome viz, '**Cross-sectoral planning framework that mainstreams biodiversity conservation considerations**' suggests strategies for ensuring more effective cross-sectoral planning for the SCME, wherein the interests of conservation, livelihood and production sectors are effectively integrated for long term sustainable environmental management of the SCME. These were planned to be achieved through the following Outputs:

- **Output 1.1: Developing a landscape level zoning plan-** Sindhudurg Coast requires an integrated approach for the conservation of coastal and marine biological diversity, cultural attributes, and wise use of natural resources for sustainable livelihoods. The objective is to make the optimal allocation of coastal and marine areas to different uses based on ecological carrying capacity and socio-economic needs over the long-term. The project will undertake several diagnostic studies like comprehensive biodiversity profiling and mapping of SCME; economic assessment of ecosystem goods and services of the SCME; etc in order to support development of the zoning plan. The preparation of the zoning plan will be based on a consultative process involving private sector stakeholder representatives from the fisheries sector (traditional fisher-folk, commercial operators), tourism sector, agriculture/ horticulture, and mining and other industrial activities.
- **Output 1.2. Establishing Cross Sectoral Stakeholder Consultation Committee-** Cross-sectoral dialogue will be critical for the development and implementation of the zoning plan. The project will, therefore, support the establishment of a cross-sectoral stakeholder consultation committee under the chairmanship of the Conservator of Forests in charge of the MMS. The Committee shall also have representation from private sector, local communities and other key stakeholders in the SCME. The committee will be supported by the Project Management Unit.
- **Output 1.3. Recommendations for strengthening relevant legislations-** There are two areas where legislation can be strengthened to better reflect the needs of coastal and marine biodiversity conservation, viz, the Wildlife Protection Act and the MFRA. The project will support

this legislative reform process by developing specific recommendations based on the experience in the SCME on legal provisions that need to be made to ensure that fishing activity in the EEZ is also sustainable.

b. The Second outcome, viz, **‘Enhanced capacity of sector institutions for implementing biodiversity-friendly fisheries management plan, ecotourism management plan and MMS management plan’** focuses on translating the elements of the zoning plan into implement-able actions on the ground, by developing institutional capacities for sustainable fisheries management, sustainable ecotourism management and effective management of the marine sanctuary. This outcome has been proposed to be achieved through:

- **Output 2.1. Developing and implementing sustainable fisheries management based on an Ecosystem Approach-** The major threats to biodiversity come from large scale commercial fishing trawlers. Therefore, priority will be given to the development of a sustainable Fisheries Management Plan (FMP) that is based on the Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries (EAF). The development of the EAF-based Fisheries Management Plan will be based on FAO guidelines. Several studies will be undertaken like impact of trawlers using purse-seine nets; assessment of fisheries potential/ carrying capacity in the SCME; etc. The findings of these assessments will inform development of the Fisheries Management Plan. If found appropriate, the project will support the Fisheries Department in pursuing certification in collaboration with MPEDA (Marine Products Exports Development Authority), SEAI (Sea foods Exports Association of India), as well as WWF-India which is supporting certification for small-scale fisheries. Development of the FMP will, therefore, be based on extensive consultation and participation. Research agencies will also be involved to assist in the initiation of EAF-based fisheries management, such as the Wildlife Institute of India, Science & Technology Park of Pune University, and Central Marine Fisheries Research Institute. Training will be provided to staff from the Fisheries Department and Forest Department, as well as to local representatives of the Maharashtra Maritime Board that oversees maritime traffic and ports, and the Coast Guards as part of capacity building for aiding implementation of Fisheries Management Plan.
- **Output 2.2. Developing and implementing sustainable tourism management** - Tourism is a rapidly growing sector in the SCME. The rapid growth of recreational, cultural and eco-tourism present the coastal communities of the SCME with opportunities and challenges. However, the Local communities have started benefiting from the economic potential of sustainable and responsible tourism. The project will therefore support the development of planned, low-impact, less intrusive, community-driven tourism that can significantly reduce negative dependency on bio-resources, boost the local economy and help in developing a strong constituency for marine and coastal biodiversity conservation. the project will support development of a Sustainable Tourism Management Plan for the SCME. The plan will also establish appropriate norms and standards for development of both types of tourism in the SCME given the ecological significance of the area. Consultations with key stakeholders and capacity building would be part of the project.
- **Output 2.3. Strengthened Management Effectiveness of the Malvan Marine Sanctuary-** Several provisions under the Wildlife (Protection) Act, 1972 are yet to be completed in the Malvan Sanctuary. With greater involvement of communities in the decision-making process, better outcomes can be expected vis-à-vis compliance with conservation measures. The project will also implement capacity building exercise for Forest Department staff.

c. Under the third outcome of the project '**Sustainable community livelihoods and natural resource use**', the project will work with fishing communities in all 3 target talukas of Deogad, Malvan and Vengurla and has been proposed to be realized through:

- **Output 3.1. Supporting traditional fishing practices and capacity building on conservation management-** The project will provide technical and financial support to traditional fishing communities to reinforce their low-impact practices and manage their fishing effort in line with the EAF-based Fisheries Management Plan. In addition, fishing communities will be trained in conservation management practices so that they can become effective partners in conservation actions initiated by the Forestry and Fisheries Departments.
- **Output 3.2. Implementing livelihood diversification strategy and related socio-economic interventions-** The project envisages developing micro plans to identify opportunities for income generation during the lean period, and opportunities for alternate livelihoods.

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.

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

## EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

---

An overall approach and method<sup>1</sup> for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact**, as defined and explained in the [UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects](#). A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR (*fill in Annex C*) The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Sindhudurg, including the following project sites *Mumbai and Delhi*. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: (i) Senior officers of MoEFCC; (ii) UNDP Management; (iii) Officers of Mangrove Cell, Maharashtra; (iv) Senior Officers of Maharashtra State Forest Department; (v) Officials of State Departments of Fisheries, Tourism and Agriculture; (vi) Officials of Sindhudurg District Administration; (vii) PMU/LPU Officials; (viii)

---

<sup>1</sup> For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](#), Chapter 7, pg. 163

representatives of various Institutions/Organizations involved in the Project implementation; (ix) Local community representatives.

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document,

- Project reports – including Annual APR/PIR,
- Project budget revisions, midterm review,
- Progress reports,
- GEF focal area tracking tools,
- Project files,
- National strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment.

A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in [Annex B](#) of this Terms of Reference.

### EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see [Annex A](#)), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact**. Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in [Annex D](#).

<b>Evaluation Ratings:</b>			
<b>1. Monitoring and Evaluation</b>	<i>rating</i>	<b>2. IA&amp; EA Execution</b>	<i>rating</i>
M&E design at entry		Quality of UNDP Implementation	
M&E Plan Implementation		Quality of Execution - Executing Agency	
Overall quality of M&E		Overall quality of Implementation / Execution	
<b>3. Assessment of Outcomes</b>	<i>rating</i>	<b>4. Sustainability</b>	<i>rating</i>
Relevance		Financial resources:	
Effectiveness		Socio-political:	
Efficiency		Institutional framework and governance:	
Overall Project Outcome Rating		Environmental:	
		Overall likelihood of sustainability:	

## PROJECT FINANCE / COFINANCE

---

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

Co-financing (type/source)	UNDP own financing (mill. US\$)		Government (mill. US\$)		Partner Agency (mill. US\$)		Total (mill. US\$)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Actual	Actual
Grants								
Loans/Concessions								
• In-kind support								
• Other								
Totals								

## MAINSTREAMING

---

UNDP supported GEF financed projects are key components in UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programmes. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender.

## IMPACT

---

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.<sup>2</sup>

## CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

---

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions, recommendations and lessons**.

---

<sup>2</sup> A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office: [ROtI Handbook 2009](#)

## IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

---

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in [India](#). The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

## EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

---

The total duration of the evaluation will be thirty working days spread over three months according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing
Preparation of TE team, document review etc.	2 days
Preparation of TE inception report	3 days
TE review Mission	12 days
Draft TE Report	7 days
Final Report	4 days
A stakeholder workshop to share the findings of the TE	2 days

## EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

---

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
<b>Inception Report</b>	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission.	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
<b>Presentation</b>	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission	To project management, UNDP CO
<b>Draft Final Report</b>	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs
<b>Final Report*</b>	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC.
<b>Stakeholder workshop</b>	Stakeholder workshop to share the findings of the TE	Within 29 days of submitting final report	

\*When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluator is required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report.

## TEAM COMPOSITION

---

The evaluation team will be composed of 2 consultants – **international and national evaluators**. The international consultant will be designated as the Team Leader and will be responsible for finalizing the report. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities. The Team members must present the following qualifications:

### **National consultant**

#### **Academic Qualifications:**

- Master's degree in natural resources management/marine biodiversity conservation, and related fields.

#### **Professional Qualification:**

- A minimum of 8 years of work experience in the relevant field is required;
- Knowledge of UNDP and GEF processes.

#### **Cumulative analysis:**

The award of the contract shall be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

Responsive;

Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation.

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

- Technical Criteria weight - 70%;
- Financial Criteria weight - 30%.

#### **Technical Criteria:**

- Experience specific to mainstreaming of marine and coastal biodiversity conservation into production sectors and related projects is advantageous; (Credibility of completion/on-going support documents to be included) (20%)
- Knowledgeable and familiarity on conservation institutions and projects in the country, conservation issues and priorities, and related policies and legislations particularly in relation to coastal and marine biodiversity conservation, including inter-departmental coordination issues at the national and local levels is necessary. (20%)
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies (10%)
- Proposed work methodology with timelines (20%)

**Responsibilities:**

- Documentation review and data gathering
- Contributing to the development of the review plan and methodology
- Conducting those elements of the evaluation determined jointly with the international consultant and UNDP
- Contributing to presentation of the review findings and recommendations at the wrap-up meeting
- Contributing to the drafting and finalization of the review report

The consultant should be fluent in English with excellent writing skills. In addition, they should possess excellent computing skills, including MS Word, Excel, Power Point and other related programmes. The consultant must bring his/ her own computing equipment.

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex E) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the [UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'](#)

**PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS**

%	Milestone
10%	On submission of agreed work plan.
50%	Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report
40%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report

**APPLICATION PROCESS**

Applicants are requested to apply online. The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in English with indication of the e-mail and phone contact.

UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

## ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

**Objective:** The long-term goal to which the project will contribute is the sustainable management of the globally significant coastal and marine biodiversity of India by mainstreaming biodiversity conservation considerations into production activities in the coastal and marine zones, while also taking into account development imperatives, need for sustaining livelihoods and addressing retrogressive factors such as the anticipated impacts of climate change.

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline	Targets	Means of verification	Risks and Assumptions
Project objective: To mainstream biodiversity conservation considerations into those production sectors that impact coastal and marine ecosystems of the SCME.	Landscape/seascape area in the SCME where production activities mainstream biodiversity conservation	0 ha	About 6,327 sq. km. (2,327 sq km as area of direct influence and 4,000 sq km as area of indirect influence)	Project Reports; Independent mid-term and final evaluations	Project approach is not internalized by state government departments responsible for tourism, fisheries, ports, conservation, agriculture, mining and other industrial activity in the SCME  Government departments do not provide co-financing in a timely manner to support implementation of the project strategy  Government Representatives of the different sectors do not work in a collaborative manner
	Extent of coral reefs in the project area	360 sq.km and this will be verified in first 6 months of the project	The extent of coral cover remains at least stable or increasing.	Monitoring reports	
	Population status of following critical species: Olive Ridley turtle and Indo-pacific hunch back dolphin	40-50 nesting sites of Olive Ridley Turtles reported and 100-150 Indo-pacific hunch back dolphins frequent the region. This will be verified in first 6 months of the project	Population status remain at least stable/ increasing	Monitoring reports	
	Population status of birds (including migratory):	This will be verified in first one year of the project	Population status remains at least stable or increases.	Annual bird count	

<b>Project Strategy</b>	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Targets</b>	<b>Means of verification</b>	<b>Risks and Assumptions</b>
Outcome 1: Cross-sectoral planning framework that mainstreams biodiversity conservation considerations	Landscape level zoning plan (LP) that zones resource use by taking into account conservation needs of the SCME	0	1 Landscape Plan that prepared and integrated with the District level planning process	Approved Landscape Plan document	Stakeholder institutions may not provide high-level representation in the cross-sectoral Stakeholder consultation committee
	Establishing a functional cross-sectoral Stakeholder Committee for the management of SCME involving District Planning Dept, Forest Dept, the Maritime Board, Dept. of Industries, Fisheries, Agriculture, Tourism, Private Sector & NGOs	0	1	Notification/ Constitution/ memorandum of the Stakeholder Committee for SCME	Stakeholder institutions are unwilling to share information that is required for developing LP that mainstreams coastal and marine biodiversity conservation concerns
	Recommendations on reform of Wildlife (Protection) Act	WPA has a terrestrial focus that is not suited to marine PAs	Amendments that give explicit recognition to marine PAs are approved or under consideration by the MoEFCC	Government notification/ order/ records	Recommendations on legislative amendments for addressing biodiversity conservation in sector practices may not receive government and political support
	Recommendations on reform of MFRA	MFRA does not adequately incorporate the integration of the conservation of coastal and marine biodiversity	Amendments to MFRA incorporating provisions for the conservation of coastal and marine biodiversity approved or under consideration by State Department of Agriculture/ Fisheries	Government notification/ order/ records	LP is not integrated in

<b>Project Strategy</b>	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Targets</b>	<b>Means of verification</b>	<b>Risks and Assumptions</b>
	Compliance of new developments related to tourism, fisheries, ports, mining and agricultural activity in the target landscape with the LP	There is no comprehensive zoning plan for production activities in the SCME that takes into account conservation needs	By project end any new developments related to tourism, fisheries, ports, mining and agricultural activity conform with the LP	Final Evaluation	<p>the District development planning process</p> <p>Local communities do not support the LP</p>
	Compliance of existing activities related to tourism, fisheries, ports, mining and agricultural activity in the target landscape with the LP	There is no comprehensive zoning plan for production activities in the SCME that takes into account conservation needs	By project end an action plan for bringing existing activities related to tourism, fisheries, ports, mining and agricultural activity in line with the LP is developed and approved by sectoral departments	Final Evaluation	
	Zoning of MMS in line with LP	Current MMS boundaries do not capture key biodiversity rich areas and there is conflict with local fishermen on resource use issues	MMS boundaries and zoning are rationalized to accord protection to biodiversity rich areas and to guarantee occupational interests and innocent passage of local fishers	Approved new MMS Management Plan	
	Financial sustainability strategy for continued implementation of landscape-level management of SCME	0	1	Strategy document	

<b>Project Strategy</b>	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Targets</b>	<b>Means of verification</b>	<b>Risks and Assumptions</b>
Outcome 2: Enhanced capacity of sector institutions for implementing biodiversity-friendly fisheries management plan, ecotourism management plan and MMS management plan	Number of representatives from the key sectors (government and private) trained in mainstreaming and integration of environmental management considerations and safeguards into policies, plans and activities of key sectors	0	Production sector: 1 000 Conservation sector: 100 Livelihood sector: 5 000	Training records; training evaluations	Institutions are unwilling to commit the expected number of personnel for training and capacity building  Trained staff may not continue in current roles  Fisheries and Tourism sector representatives may not be committed to implementing the EAF-based Fisheries Management Plan and the Sustainable Tourism Plan
	Mesh size laws are followed by the trawlers	To be collected in the first year	50% of trawlers follow the mesh size norms set up by Mesh Regulation Committee, 1983	Survey reports of Fisheries Department	
	Incidence of encroachment of intensive fishing operations into traditional fishing grounds	Encroachment is taking place	By project end, all fishing activity complies with zoning specified in LP and there are no reports of encroachment	Records of Forests and Fisheries Department	
	Reduction/ elimination of trawlers from outside SCME i.e., from Ratnagiri (Maharashtra), Goa and Karnataka	Baseline to be collected in Year 1	50% reduction of trawlers from outside SCME	Monthly Fishing Reports	
	Community based ecotourism	25%	50% by project end	Final Evaluation	

<b>Project Strategy</b>	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Targets</b>	<b>Means of verification</b>	<b>Risks and Assumptions</b>
	operations as a % of all tourism operations in project area				
	Number of violations of MMS Management Plan, compared with year of initial patrolling	Baseline violations to be measured in 1 <sup>st</sup> 3 months of project	Declines by 50% by year 5	Survey reports	
Outcome 3: Sustainable community livelihoods and natural resource use in the SCME	Traditional fishing communities continue to practice sustainable, low-impact, traditional fishing activity as measured by extent of rampani fishing and related cooperatives	98 rampani fishing cooperatives	50% increase	Records of Fisheries Department	Local communities may not be willing to participate in the conservation and protection of coastal and marine ecosystems unless the project addresses their livelihood needs  The livelihood activities supported under the project may not add significantly to income opportunities of local people so that the dependency on natural resources is reduced.
	Number of EDCs active in the SCME	0	15	Records of the Forest Department	
	Number of skills-development activities carried out for VLIs and other local institutions for alternative livelihoods or sustainable ecosystem-based livelihoods that reduce pressures on biodiversity	0	Target to be defined after design of the micro-plans	Administrative reports and records	

<b>Project Strategy</b>	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Targets</b>	<b>Means of verification</b>	<b>Risks and Assumptions</b>
	Amount of resources flowing to local communities annually from community based ecotourism activities	USD 2.5 million	USD 5 million (this is estimated as a reasonable trajectory by local experts based on local conditions and the anticipated impact of project interventions in this regard; target value to be re-confirmed and modified as appropriate once micro-plans are developed)	Records of VLIs, administrative records, etc	
	Number of people shifting to alternative livelihood options that reduce pressure on biodiversity	0	Target to be defined after design of the micro-plans	Records of VLIs, administrative records, etc	

\*\*\*

## **ANNEX B: LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE EVALUATORS**

---

- Project Document
- Inception Workshop Report
- Annual Work and Financial Plans
- Annual Project Report/Project Implementation Review (APR/PIR) for 2013;
- Review the tracking tool. If it is not available, review the required information to complete the tracking tool as required for climate change mitigation projects.
- Quarterly Reports
- Minutes of Project Technical Committee/Project Steering Committee meetings
- Back-to-Office Reports of UNDP staff (if any)
- Study reports/Conference proceedings/government guidelines, etc.
- Midterm review Report
- Other evaluation Reports, if any.

## ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

*This is a generic list, to be further detailed with more specific questions by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on the particulars of the project.*

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
<b>Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is the project relevant to UNCBD and other international convention objectives?</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is the project relevant the GEF biodiversity and climate change focal area?</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is the project relevant to India's environment and sustainable development objectives?</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is the project addressing the needs of target beneficiaries at the local and regional levels?</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is the project internally coherent in its design?</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How is the project relevant with respect to other donor-supported activities?</li> </ul>	•	•	•

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the project provide relevant lessons and experiences for other similar projects in the future?</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<b>Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has the project been effective in achieving the expected outcomes and objectives?</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How is risk and risk mitigation being managed?</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What lessons can be drawn regarding effectiveness for other similar projects in the future?</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<b>Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Was project support provided in an efficient way?</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How efficient are partnership arrangements for the project?</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Did the project efficiently utilize local capacity in implementation?</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What lessons can be drawn regarding efficiency for other similar projects in the future?</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effectiveness: To what extent have/ will the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been/be achieved?</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has the project been effective in achieving the expected outcomes and objectives?</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How is risk and risk mitigation being managed?</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What lessons can be drawn regarding effectiveness for other</li> </ul>	•	•	•

similar projects in the future?			
• Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?	•	•	•
• Was project support provided in an efficient way	•	•	•
• How efficient are partnership arrangements for the project?	•	•	•
• Did the project efficiently utilize local capacity in implementation?	•	•	•
<b>Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?</b>			
• Were interventions designed to have sustainable results given the identifiable risks?	•	•	•
• What issues emerged during implementation as a threat to sustainability?	•	•	•
• Are there social or political risks that may threaten the sustainability of project outcomes?	•	•	•
• Are there ongoing activities that pose an environmental threat to the sustainability of project outcomes?	•	•	•
• Have the entities/people that will carry on the project been identified and prepared?	•	•	•
• Is there evidence financial resources are committed to support project results after the project has closed	•	•	•
<b>Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?</b>			
• Has the project made verifiable environmental improvements?	•	•	•

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has the project made verifiable reductions in stress on environmental systems?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has the project demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>

**ANNEX D: RATING SCALES**

---

<p><b><i>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&amp;E, I&amp;E Execution</i></b></p> <p>6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings          5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings          4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS)          3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings          2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems          1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems</p>	<p><b><i>Sustainability ratings:</i></b></p> <p>4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability          3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks          2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks          1. Unlikely (U): severe risks</p>	<p><b><i>Relevance ratings</i></b></p> <p>2. Relevant (R)</p> <p>1.. Not relevant (NR)</p> <p><b><i>Impact Ratings:</i></b></p> <p>3. Significant (S)          2. Minimal (M)          1. Negligible (N)</p>
<p><b><i>Additional ratings where relevant:</i></b>          Not Applicable (N/A)          Unable to Assess (U/A)</p>		

## ANNEX E: EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT AND AGREEMENT FORM

---

### Evaluators:

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.

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form<sup>3</sup>**

**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: \_\_\_\_\_

---

<sup>3</sup>[www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct](http://www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct)

## ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE<sup>4</sup>

---

- i.** Opening page:
  - Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
  - UNDP and GEF project ID#s.
  - Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report
  - Countries included in the project
  - GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program
  - Implementing Partner and other project partners
  - Evaluation team members
  - Acknowledgements
- ii.** Executive Summary
  - Project Summary Table
  - Project Description (brief)
  - Evaluation Rating Table
  - Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons
- iii.** Acronyms and Abbreviations  
(See: UNDP Editorial Manual<sup>5</sup>)
- 1.** Introduction
  - Purpose of the evaluation
  - Scope & Methodology
  - Structure of the evaluation report
- 2.** Project description and development context
  - Project start and duration
  - Problems that the project sought to address
  - Immediate and development objectives of the project
  - Baseline Indicators established
  - Main stakeholders
  - Expected Results
- 3.** Findings  
(In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) must be rated<sup>6</sup>)
- 3.1** Project Design / Formulation
  - Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)
  - Assumptions and Risks
  - Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design
  - Planned stakeholder participation
  - Replication approach
  - UNDP comparative advantage
  - Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
  - Management arrangements

---

<sup>4</sup>The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

<sup>5</sup> UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

<sup>6</sup> Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations.

- 3.2 Project Implementation
  - Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
  - Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)
  - Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management
  - Project Finance:
  - Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (\*)
  - UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (\*) coordination, and operational issues
- 3.3 Project Results
  - Overall results (attainment of objectives) (\*)
  - Relevance (\*)
  - Effectiveness & Efficiency (\*)
  - Country ownership
  - Mainstreaming
  - Sustainability (\*)
  - Impact
  -
- 4. Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons
  - Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
  - Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
  - Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
  - Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success
- 5. Annexes
  - ToR
  - Itinerary
  - List of persons interviewed
  - Summary of field visits
  - List of documents reviewed
  - Evaluation Question Matrix
  - Questionnaire used and summary of results
  - Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

**ANNEX G: EVALUATION REPORT CLEARANCE FORM**

---

*(to be completed by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and included in the final report)*

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

UNDP GEF RTA

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_