

APPENDIX 3

RESULTS FRAMEWORK

**Project Logical Framework and Objectively Verifiable Impact Indicators:
Project Title: Support to the Preparation of the Third National Biosafety Reports**

Objectives and Outcomes/Outputs	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Important Assumptions
<p>Objective To assist GEF-Eligible Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety to prepare and make timely submission of their Third National Reports on measures that each Party has taken to implement the Protocol in line with Article 33</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholders in each of the participating countries exhibit enhanced understanding of the protocol and its provisions. • Each of the participating countries has in place a mechanism that will expedite the reporting process for the protocol. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 90% of the GEF eligible Parties have by the 31st December 2015 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholders have a sustained interest in Biosafety • Political will exists to effectively complete and submit the national report in a timely manner
Component 1 : Development of the Second National Reports			
<p>Outcome 1: Enhanced Understanding by key stakeholders of their obligations under the Protocol and the implications for government and other stakeholders</p>	<p>Existing Biosafety-related capacity, policy basis and main stakeholders are identified;</p>	<p>Documentation on stakeholder analysis; Workshop/seminars reports; National reporting documents</p>	<p>Stakeholders have sustained interest in issues of biosafety and related obligations to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety</p>
<p>Output: A national report from at least 90% of eligible Parties on the measures that each Party has taken to implement the CPB</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Main stakeholders are identified • Stakeholder-specific information is produced and disseminated • Increased levels of in country dialogue on the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A register of Biosafety stakeholders developed for each country. • Number of Third National Reports uploaded on the BCH. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholders are willing to engage in discussions that will enrich the preparation and finalization of National Reports
Component 2 Technical Advisory support, review of reports and assistance to countries in the management of the reports			
<p>Outcome 1: Increased quality of national reports submitted to the SCBD by Parties</p>	<p>Increased number of reporting countries to the CPB</p> <p>Higher quality of reports received by the SCBD</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A greater number of 3rd National Reports received at the SCBD compared to the 2nd National Report 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advisory services, technical support and renewed formats will contribute sufficiently to raise quality of national reports
<p>Output: Inventory of country requests for technical assistance received at UNEP</p>	<p>As least 50% of participating countries send requests for technical support to UNEP</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emails or letters from countries requesting for support. • Emails responding to countries from UNEP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Countries will be open to their reports being analyzed by UNEP

APPENDIX 4

WORK PLAN AND TIME TABLE

Activity	Months								GEF	Co-Financing (In-Kind)	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8			
Development and Internalisation of Project											
Development of SSFAs and Payments to Countries											
Data collection by countries											
Stakeholder consultations and data verification											
Completion of the on-line form/ template											
Review by UNEP and uploading by National Focal Point											
Progress and expenditure reports											
Evaluation and Closure											

**APPENDIX 5
KEY DELIVERABLES AND BENCHMARKS**

Component	Activities	Deliverables/Outcomes	Benchmarks
1. Development of the National Reports	1 Identification and review of existing biosafety information	Baseline data organised and made accessible to project partners/stakeholders. Enhanced Understanding by key stakeholders of their obligations under the Protocol and the implications for government and other stakeholders	Existing baseline data compiled with new data collected in-country.
	2 Data collection and analysis including field Research		
	3 Stakeholder consultations and meetings		
	4 Preparation and finalization of draft report		
	5 National consultation workshop		
	6 UNEP Review of Report		
	7 National Focal Point Endorsement and upload to BCH		
		A national report from each of the eligible Parties on the measures that each Party has taken to implement the CPB	Assessment and or compliance reports for each country compiled at the CPB
2. Increased quality of reports submitted to the SCBD by Parties	1 Reviewing Country Reports on Demand.	Monitoring framework developed	Improved information uploaded to CPB BCH for analysis
	2 Fund and Administrative Management via ANUBIS tool		
3. Monitoring and Evaluation	1 Country Inception Meetings		
	2 Technical Review of National Reports by IA		
	3 Terminal evaluation		

APPENDIX 6
SUMMARY OF REPORTING REQUIREMENTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Reporting requirements	Due date	Format appended to legal instrument as	Responsibility of:
Individual Country Expenditure report accompanied by explanatory notes	At end of project duration	Annex	National Executing Agencies
Cash Advance request and details of anticipated disbursements	On counter signature of Small Scale Funding Agreement	Annex	National Executing Agencies
Progress report	August 2015	Annex	National Executing Agencies
Co-financing report	August 2015	Annex	National Executing Agencies
Final report	December 2015	Annex	National Executing Agencies
Final expenditure statement	December 2015	Annex	National Executing Agencies
Final audited report for expenditures of project	March 2016	N/A	National Executing Agencies
Independent terminal evaluation report	April 2016	Annex	Evaluation Office

APPENDIX 7

STANDARD TERMINAL EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

Terminal Evaluation of the UNEP GEF project {Title}

1. PROJECT BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW

Project rationale

The objective was stated as:

The indicators given in the project document for this stated objective were:

Relevance to GEF Programmes

The project is in line with:.

Executing Arrangements

The implementing agency(ies) for this project was (were) UNEP and { }; and the executing agencies were:

The lead national agencies in the focal countries were:

Project Activities

The project comprised activities grouped in {number} components.

Budget

At project inception the following budget prepared:

	<u>GEF</u>	<u>Co-funding</u>
Project preparation funds:		
GEF {Medium/Full} Size Grant		

TOTAL (including project preparation funds)

Co-funding sources:

Anticipated:

APPENDIX 7

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE EVALUATION

1. Objective and Scope of the Evaluation

The objective of this terminal evaluation is to examine the extent and magnitude of any project impacts to date and determine the likelihood of future impacts. The evaluation will also assess project performance and the implementation of planned project activities and planned outputs against actual results. The evaluation will focus on the following main questions:

1. Did the project help to { } among key target audiences (international conventions and initiatives, national level policy-makers, regional and local policy-makers, resource managers and practitioners).
2. Did the outputs of the project articulate options and recommendations for { }? Were these options and recommendations used? If so by whom?
3. To what extent did the project outputs produced have the weight of scientific authority and credibility necessary to influence policy makers and other key audiences?

Methods

This terminal evaluation will be conducted as an in-depth evaluation using a participatory approach whereby the UNEP/DGEF Task Manager, key representatives of the executing agencies and other relevant staff are kept informed and consulted throughout the evaluation. The consultant will liaise with the UNEP/EOU and the UNEP/DGEF Task Manager on any logistic and/or methodological issues to properly conduct the review in as independent a way as possible, given the circumstances and resources offered. The draft report will be circulated to UNEP/DGEF Task Manager, key representatives of the executing agencies and the UNEP/EOU. Any comments or responses to the draft report will be sent to UNEP / EOU for collation and the consultant will be advised of any necessary or suggested revisions.

The findings of the evaluation will be based on the following:

1. A desk review of project documents including, but not limited to:
 - (a) The project documents, outputs, monitoring reports (such as progress and financial reports to UNEP and GEF annual Project Implementation Review reports) and relevant correspondence.
 - (b) Notes from the Steering Group meetings.
 - (c) Other project-related material produced by the project staff or partners.
 - (d) Relevant material published on the project web-site: { }.
2. Interviews with project management and technical support including {NEED INPUT FROM TM HERE}
3. Interviews and Telephone interviews with intended users for the project outputs and other stakeholders involved with this project, including in the participating countries and international bodies. The Consultant shall determine whether to seek additional information and opinions from representatives of donor agencies and other organizations. As appropriate, these interviews could be combined with an email questionnaire.

4. Interviews with the UNEP/DGEF project task manager and Fund Management Officer, and other relevant staff in UNEP dealing with {relevant GEF focal area(s)}-related activities as necessary. The Consultant shall also gain broader perspectives from discussions with relevant GEF Secretariat staff.
5. Field visits¹ to project staff

Key Evaluation principles.

In attempting to evaluate any outcomes and impacts that the project may have achieved, evaluators should remember that the project's performance should be assessed by considering the difference between the answers to two simple questions “*what happened?*” and “*what would have happened anyway?*”. These questions imply that there should be consideration of the baseline conditions and trends in relation to the intended project outcomes and impacts. In addition it implies that there should be plausible evidence to **attribute** such outcomes and impacts **to the actions of the project**.

Sometimes, adequate information on baseline conditions and trends is lacking. In such cases this should be clearly highlighted by the evaluator, along with any simplifying assumptions that were taken to enable the evaluator to make informed judgements about project performance.

2. Project Ratings

The success of project implementation will be rated on a scale from ‘highly unsatisfactory’ to ‘highly satisfactory’. In particular the evaluation shall **assess and rate** the project with respect to the eleven categories defined below:²

A. Attainment of objectives and planned results:

The evaluation should assess the extent to which the project's major relevant objectives were effectively and efficiently achieved or are expected to be achieved and their relevance.

- *Effectiveness*: Evaluate how, and to what extent, the stated project objectives have been met, taking into account the “achievement indicators”. The analysis of outcomes achieved should include, *inter alia*, an assessment of the extent to which the project has directly or indirectly assisted policy and decision-makers to apply information supplied by biodiversity indicators in their national planning and decision-making. In particular:
 - Evaluate the immediate impact of the project on {relevant focal area} monitoring and in national planning and decision-making and international understanding and use of biodiversity indicators.
 - As far as possible, also assess the potential longer-term impacts considering that the evaluation is taking place upon completion of the project and that longer term impact is expected to be seen in a few years time. Frame recommendations to enhance future project impact in this context. Which will be the major ‘channels’ for longer term impact from the project at the national and international scales?
 - *Relevance*: In retrospect, were the project's outcomes consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies? Ascertain the nature and

¹ Evaluators should make a brief courtesy call to GEF Country Focal points during field visits if at all possible.

² However, the views and comments expressed by the evaluator need not be restricted to these items.

significance of the contribution of the project outcomes to the {relevant Convention(s)} and the wider portfolio of the GEF.

- *Efficiency*: Was the project cost effective? Was the project the least cost option? Was the project implementation delayed and if it was, then did that affect cost-effectiveness? Assess the contribution of cash and in-kind co-financing to project implementation and to what extent the project leveraged additional resources. Did the project build on earlier initiatives, did it make effective use of available scientific and / or technical information. Wherever possible, the evaluator should also compare the cost-time vs. outcomes relationship of the project with that of other similar projects.

B. Sustainability:

Sustainability is understood as the probability of continued long-term project-derived outcomes and impacts after the GEF project funding ends. The evaluation will identify and assess the key conditions or factors that are likely to contribute or undermine the persistence of benefits after the project ends. Some of these factors might be outcomes of the project, e.g. stronger institutional capacities or better informed decision-making. Other factors will include contextual circumstances or developments that are not outcomes of the project but that are relevant to the sustainability of outcomes. The evaluation should ascertain to what extent follow-up work has been initiated and how project outcomes will be sustained and enhanced over time.

Five aspects of sustainability should be addressed: financial, socio-political, institutional frameworks and governance, environmental (if applicable). The following questions provide guidance on the assessment of these aspects:

- *Financial resources*. Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes? What is the likelihood that financial and economic resources will not be available once the GEF assistance ends (resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and trends that may indicate that it is likely that in future there will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project's outcomes)? To what extent are the outcomes of the project dependent on continued financial support?
- *Socio-political*: Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project?
- *Institutional framework and governance*. To what extent is the sustenance of the outcomes of the project dependent on issues relating to institutional frameworks and governance? What is the likelihood that institutional and technical achievements, legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes will allow for, the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? While responding to these questions consider if the required systems for accountability and transparency and the required technical know-how are in place.
- *Environmental*. Are there any environmental risks that can undermine the future flow of project environmental benefits? The TE should assess whether certain activities in the project area will pose a threat to the sustainability of the project outcomes. For example; construction of dam in a protected area could inundate a sizable area and thereby neutralize the biodiversity-related gains made by the

project; or, a newly established pulp mill might jeopardise the viability of nearby protected forest areas by increasing logging pressures; or a vector control intervention may be made less effective by changes in climate and consequent alterations to the incidence and distribution of malarial mosquitoes.

C. Achievement of outputs and activities:

- Delivered outputs: Assessment of the project's success in producing each of the programmed outputs, both in quantity and quality as well as usefulness and timeliness.
- Assess the soundness and effectiveness of the methodologies used for developing the technical documents and related management options in the participating countries
- Assess to what extent the project outputs produced have the weight of scientific authority / credibility, necessary to influence policy and decision-makers, particularly at the national level.

D. Catalytic Role

Replication and catalysis. What examples are there of replication and catalytic outcomes? Replication approach, in the context of GEF projects, is defined as lessons and experiences coming out of the project that are replicated or scaled up in the design and implementation of other projects. Replication can have two aspects, replication proper (lessons and experiences are replicated in different geographic area) or scaling up (lessons and experiences are replicated within the same geographic area but funded by other sources). Specifically:

- Do the recommendations for management of {project} coming from the country studies have the potential for application in other countries and locations?

If no effects are identified, the evaluation will describe the catalytic or replication actions that the project carried out.

E. Assessment monitoring and evaluation systems.

The evaluation shall include an assessment of the quality, application and effectiveness of project monitoring and evaluation plans and tools, including an assessment of risk management based on the assumptions and risks identified in the project document. The Terminal Evaluation will assess whether the project met the minimum requirements for 'project design of M&E' and 'the application of the Project M&E plan' (see minimum requirements 1&2 in *Annex 4* to this Appendix). GEF projects must budget adequately for execution of the M&E plan, and provide adequate resources during implementation of the M&E plan. Project managers are also expected to use the information generated by the M&E system during project implementation to adapt and improve the project.

M&E during project implementation

- *M&E design.* Projects should have sound M&E plans to monitor results and track progress towards achieving project objectives. An M&E plan should include a baseline (including data, methodology, etc.), SMART indicators (see Annex 4) and data analysis systems, and evaluation studies at specific times to assess results. The time frame for various M&E activities and standards for outputs should have been specified.
- *M&E plan implementation.* A Terminal Evaluation should verify that: an M&E system was in place and facilitated timely tracking of results and progress towards projects objectives throughout the project implementation period

(perhaps through use of a log frame or similar); annual project reports and Progress Implementation Review (PIR) reports were complete, accurate and with well justified ratings; that the information provided by the M&E system was used during the project to improve project performance and to adapt to changing needs; and that projects had an M&E system in place with proper training for parties responsible for M&E activities.

- *Budgeting and Funding for M&E activities.* The terminal evaluation should determine whether support for M&E was budgeted adequately and was funded in a timely fashion during implementation.

F. Preparation and Readiness

Were the project's objectives and components clear, practicable and feasible within its timeframe? Were the capacities of executing institution and counterparts properly considered when the project was designed? Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated in the project design? Were the partnership arrangements properly identified and the roles and responsibilities negotiated prior to project implementation? Were counterpart resources (funding, staff, and facilities), enabling legislation, and adequate project management arrangements in place?

G. Country ownership / drivenness:

This is the relevance of the project to national development and environmental agendas, recipient country commitment, and regional and international agreements. The evaluation will:

- Assess the level of country ownership. Specifically, the evaluator should assess whether the project was effective in providing and communicating biodiversity information that catalyzed action in participating countries to improve decisions relating to the conservation and management of the focal ecosystem in each country.
- Assess the level of country commitment to the generation and use of biodiversity indicators for decision-making during and after the project, including in regional and international fora.

H. Stakeholder participation / public awareness:

This consists of three related and often overlapping processes: information dissemination, consultation, and "stakeholder" participation. Stakeholders are the individuals, groups, institutions, or other bodies that have an interest or stake in the outcome of the GEF-financed project. The term also applies to those potentially adversely affected by a project. The evaluation will specifically:

- Assess the mechanisms put in place by the project for identification and engagement of stakeholders in each participating country and establish, in consultation with the stakeholders, whether this mechanism was successful, and identify its strengths and weaknesses.
- Assess the degree and effectiveness of collaboration/interactions between the various project partners and institutions during the course of implementation of the project.
- Assess the degree and effectiveness of any various public awareness activities that were undertaken during the course of implementation of the project.

I. Financial Planning

Evaluation of financial planning requires assessment of the quality and effectiveness of financial planning and control of financial resources throughout the project's lifetime. Evaluation includes actual project costs by activities compared to budget (variances),

financial management (including disbursement issues), and co- financing. The evaluation should:

- Assess the strength and utility of financial controls, including reporting, and planning to allow the project management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for a proper and timely flow of funds for the payment of satisfactory project deliverables.
- Present the major findings from the financial audit if one has been conducted.
- Identify and verify the sources of co- financing as well as leveraged and associated financing (in co-operation with the IA and EA).
- Assess whether the project has applied appropriate standards of due diligence in the management of funds and financial audits.
- The evaluation should also include a breakdown of final actual costs and co-financing for the project prepared in consultation with the relevant UNEP/DGEF Fund Management Officer of the project (table attached in *Annex 1* to this Appendix Co-financing and leveraged resources).

J. Implementation approach:

This includes an analysis of the project's management framework, adaptation to changing conditions (adaptive management), partnerships in implementation arrangements, changes in project design, and overall project management. The evaluation will:

- Ascertain to what extent the project implementation mechanisms outlined in the project document have been closely followed. In particular, assess the role of the various committees established and whether the project document was clear and realistic to enable effective and efficient implementation, whether the project was executed according to the plan and how well the management was able to adapt to changes during the life of the project to enable the implementation of the project.
- Evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency and adaptability of project management and the supervision of project activities / project execution arrangements at all levels (1) policy decisions: Steering Group; (2) day to day project management in each of the country executing agencies and {lead executing agency}.

K. UNEP Supervision and Backstopping

- Assess the effectiveness of supervision and administrative and financial support provided by UNEP/DGEF.
- Identify administrative, operational and/or technical problems and constraints that influenced the effective implementation of the project.

The *ratings will be presented in the form of a table*. Each of the eleven categories should be rated separately with **brief justifications** based on the findings of the main analysis. An overall rating for the project should also be given. The following rating system is to be applied:

HS	= Highly Satisfactory
S	= Satisfactory
MS	= Moderately Satisfactory
MU	= Moderately Unsatisfactory
U	= Unsatisfactory
HU	= Highly Unsatisfactory

3. Evaluation report format and review procedures

The report should be brief, to the point and easy to understand. It must explain; the purpose of the evaluation, exactly what was evaluated and the methods used. The report must highlight

any methodological limitations, identify key concerns and present evidence-based findings, consequent conclusions, recommendations and lessons. The report should be presented in a way that makes the information accessible and comprehensible and include an executive summary that encapsulates the essence of the information contained in the report to facilitate dissemination and distillation of lessons.

The evaluation will rate the overall implementation success of the project and provide individual ratings of the eleven implementation aspects as described in Section 1 of this TOR. The ratings will be presented in the format of a table with brief justifications based on the findings of the main analysis.

Evidence, findings, conclusions and recommendations should be presented in a complete and balanced manner. Any dissident views in response to evaluation findings will be appended in an annex. The evaluation report shall be written in English, be of no more than 50 pages (excluding annexes), use numbered paragraphs and include:

- i) An **executive summary** (no more than 3 pages) providing a brief overview of the main conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation;
- ii) **Introduction and background** giving a brief overview of the evaluated project, for example, the objective and status of activities; The GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy, 2006, requires that a TE report will provide summary information on when the evaluation took place; places visited; who was involved; the key questions; and, the methodology.
- iii) **Scope, objective and methods** presenting the evaluation's purpose, the evaluation criteria used and questions to be addressed;
- iv) **Project Performance and Impact** providing *factual evidence* relevant to the questions asked by the evaluator and interpretations of such evidence. This is the main substantive section of the report. The evaluator should provide a commentary and analysis on all eleven evaluation aspects (A – K above).
- v) **Conclusions and rating** of project implementation success giving the evaluator's concluding assessments and ratings of the project against given evaluation criteria and standards of performance. The conclusions should provide answers to questions about whether the project is considered good or bad, and whether the results are considered positive or negative. The ratings should be provided with a brief narrative comment in a table (see *Annex 1* to this Appendix);
- vi) **Lessons (to be) learned** presenting general conclusions from the standpoint of the design and implementation of the project, based on good practices and successes or problems and mistakes. Lessons should have the potential for wider application and use. All lessons should 'stand alone' and should:
 - Briefly describe the context from which they are derived
 - State or imply some prescriptive action;
 - Specify the contexts in which they may be applied (if possible, who when and where)
- vii) **Recommendations** suggesting *actionable* proposals for improvement of the current project. In general, Terminal Evaluations are likely to have very few (perhaps two or three) actionable recommendations.

Prior to each recommendation, the issue(s) or problem(s) to be addressed by the recommendation should be clearly stated.

A high quality recommendation is an actionable proposal that is:

1. Feasible to implement within the timeframe and resources available
2. Commensurate with the available capacities of project team and partners
3. Specific in terms of who would do what and when
4. Contains results-based language (i.e. a measurable performance target)
5. Includes a trade-off analysis, when its implementation may require utilizing significant resources that would otherwise be used for other project purposes.

viii) **Annexes** may include additional material deemed relevant by the evaluator but must include:

1. The Evaluation Terms of Reference,
2. A list of interviewees, and evaluation timeline
3. A list of documents reviewed / consulted
4. Summary co-finance information and a statement of project expenditure by activity
5. The expertise of the evaluation team. (brief CV).

TE reports will also include any response / comments from the project management team and/or the country focal point regarding the evaluation findings or conclusions as an annex to the report, however, such will be appended to the report by UNEP EOU.

Examples of UNEP GEF Terminal Evaluation Reports are available at www.unep.org/eou

Review of the Draft Evaluation Report

Draft reports shall be submitted to the Chief of Evaluation. The Chief of Evaluation will share the report with the corresponding Programme or Project Officer and his or her supervisor for initial review and consultation. The DGEF staff and senior Executing Agency staff are allowed to comment on the draft evaluation report. They may provide feedback on any errors of fact and may highlight the significance of such errors in any conclusions. The consultation also seeks feedback on the proposed recommendations. UNEP EOU collates all review comments and provides them to the evaluators for their consideration in preparing the final version of the report.

4. Submission of Final Terminal Evaluation Reports.

The final report shall be written in English and submitted in electronic form in MS Word format and should be sent directly to:

Michael Spilsbury, Chief,
UNEP Evaluation Office
P.O. Box 30552-00100
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel.: + (254-20)762-5097
Fax: + (254-20)762-3158
Email: Michael.Spilsbury@unep.org

The Chief of Evaluation will share the report with the following individuals:

Brennan Van Dyke,
Director, GEF Coordination Office
UNEP
P.O. Box 30552-00100
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: + (254-20)762-4166
Fax: + (254-20)762-4041/2
Email: Brennan.VanDyke@unep.org

[{Name}](#)
[Task Manager](#)
[{Contact details}](#)

The Final evaluation will also be copied to the following GEF National Focal Points.
{Insert contact details here}

The final evaluation report will be published on the Evaluation and Oversight Unit's web-site www.unep.org/eou and may be printed in hard copy. Subsequently, the report will be sent to the GEF Office of Evaluation for their review, appraisal and inclusion on the GEF website.

5. Resources and schedule of the evaluation

This final evaluation will be undertaken by an international evaluator contracted by the Evaluation and Oversight Unit, UNEP. The contract for the evaluator will begin on ddmmyyy and end on ddmmyyy (# days) spread over # weeks (# days of travel, to {country (ies)}, and # days desk study). The evaluator will submit a draft report on ddmmyyy to UNEP/EOU. The Chief of EOU will share the draft report with the UNEP/DGEF Task Manager, and key representatives of the executing agencies. Any comments or responses to the draft report will be sent to UNEP / EOU for collation and the consultant will be advised of any necessary revisions. Comments to the final draft report will be sent to the consultant by ddmmyyy after which, the consultant will submit the final report no later than ddmmyyy.

The evaluator will after an initial telephone briefing with EOU and UNEP/GEF conduct initial desk review work and later travel to (country(ies)) and meet with project staff at the beginning of the evaluation. Furthermore, the evaluator is expected to travel to {country (ies)} and meet with representatives of the project executing agencies and the intended users of project's outputs.

In accordance with UNEP/GEF policy, all GEF projects are evaluated by independent evaluators contracted as consultants by the EOU. The evaluator should have the following qualifications:

The evaluator should not have been associated with the design and implementation of the project in a paid capacity. The evaluator will work under the overall supervision of the Chief, Evaluation and Oversight Unit, UNEP. The evaluator should be an international expert in { } with a sound understanding of { } issues. The consultant should have the following minimum qualifications: (i) experience in { } issues; (ii) experience with management and implementation of { } projects and in particular with { } targeted at policy-influence and decision-making; (iii) experience with project evaluation. Knowledge of UNEP programmes

and GEF activities is desirable. Knowledge of {specify language(s)} is an advantage. Fluency in oral and written English is a must.

6. Schedule Of Payment

The consultant shall select one of the following two contract options:

Lump-Sum Option

The evaluator will receive an initial payment of 30% of the total amount due upon signature of the contract. A further 30% will be paid upon submission of the draft report. A final payment of 40% will be made upon satisfactory completion of work. The fee is payable under the individual Special Service Agreement (SSA) of the evaluator and **is inclusive** of all expenses such as travel, accommodation and incidental expenses.

Fee-only Option

The evaluator will receive an initial payment of 40% of the total amount due upon signature of the contract. Final payment of 60% will be made upon satisfactory completion of work. The fee is payable under the individual SSAs of the evaluator and is **NOT** inclusive of all expenses such as travel, accommodation and incidental expenses. Ticket and DSA will be paid separately.

When submitting the Travel Claim upon completion of travel, kindly note some of the following points: that UNON's primary operating currency is the US Dollar and reimbursements are made at the USD equivalent at the ruling UN exchange rate and not necessarily the currency of expenditure. If the consultant wishes to be paid in any other currency other than USD the consultant should indicate on the Travel Claim and special arrangements can be made with UNON's bank. The UN has standard rules for reimbursement of travel expenses and UNON enforces compliance on behalf of UNEP. Taxis to and from Hotel to Airport/Train/Bus station are covered by terminal allowances and the maximum reimbursable is USD 38.00. Taxis from Hotel to meeting venues as well as local telephone calls are covered by the Daily Subsistence Allowance (DSA).

In case, the evaluator cannot provide the products in accordance with the TORs, the timeframe agreed, or his products are substandard, the payment to the evaluator could be withheld, until such a time the products are modified to meet UNEP's standard. In case the evaluator fails to submit a satisfactory final product to UNEP, the product prepared by the evaluator may not constitute the evaluation report.

Annex 1 to Appendix 7: OVERALL RATINGS TABLE

Criterion	Evaluator's Summary Comments	Evaluator 's Rating
A. Attainment of project objectives and results (overall rating) Sub criteria (below)		
A. 1. Effectiveness		
A. 2. Relevance		
A. 3. Efficiency		
B. Sustainability of Project outcomes (overall rating) Sub criteria (below)		
B. 1. Financial		
B. 2. Socio Political		
B. 3. Institutional framework and governance		
B. 4. Ecological		
C. Achievement of outputs and activities		
D. Monitoring and Evaluation (overall rating) Sub criteria (below)		
D. 1. M&E Design		
D. 2. M&E Plan Implementation (use for adaptive management)		
D. 3. Budgeting and Funding for M&E activities		
E. Catalytic Role		
F. Preparation and readiness		
G. Country ownership / drivenness		
H. Stakeholders involvement		
I. Financial planning		
J. Implementation approach		
K. UNEP Supervision and backstopping		

RATING OF PROJECT OBJECTIVES AND RESULTS

Highly Satisfactory (HS): The project had no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Satisfactory (S): The project had minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Moderately Satisfactory (MS): The project had moderate shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): The project had significant shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Unsatisfactory (U) The project had major shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): The project had severe shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Please note: Relevance and effectiveness will be considered as critical criteria. The overall rating of the project for achievement of objectives and results **may not be higher** than the lowest rating on either of these two criteria. Thus, to have an overall satisfactory rating for outcomes a project must have at least satisfactory ratings on both relevance and effectiveness.

RATINGS ON SUSTAINABILITY

A. Sustainability will be understood as the probability of continued long-term outcomes and impacts after the GEF project funding ends. The Terminal evaluation will identify and assess the key conditions or factors that are likely to contribute or undermine the persistence of benefits after the project ends. Some of these factors might be outcomes of the project, i.e. stronger institutional capacities, legal frameworks, socio-economic incentives /or public awareness. Other factors will include contextual circumstances or developments that are not outcomes of the project but that are relevant to the sustainability of outcomes.

Rating system for sustainability sub-criteria

On each of the dimensions of sustainability of the project outcomes will be rated as follows.

Likely (L): There are no risks affecting this dimension of sustainability.

Moderately Likely (ML). There are moderate risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.

Moderately Unlikely (MU): There are significant risks that affect this dimension of sustainability

Unlikely (U): There are severe risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.

According to the GEF Office of Evaluation, all the risk dimensions of sustainability are deemed critical. Therefore, overall rating for sustainability will not be higher than the rating of the dimension with lowest ratings. For example, if a project has an Unlikely rating in any of the dimensions then its overall rating cannot be higher than Unlikely, regardless of whether higher ratings in other dimensions of sustainability produce a higher average.

RATINGS OF PROJECT M&E

Monitoring is a continuing function that uses systematic collection of data on specified indicators to provide management and the main stakeholders of an ongoing project with indications of the extent of progress and achievement of objectives and progress in the use of allocated funds. Evaluation is the systematic and objective assessment of an on-going or completed project, its design, implementation and results. Project evaluation may involve the definition of appropriate standards, the examination of performance against those standards, and an assessment of actual and expected results.

The Project monitoring and evaluation system will be rated on 'M&E Design', 'M&E Plan Implementation' and 'budgeting and Funding for M&E activities' as follows:

Highly Satisfactory (HS): There were no shortcomings in the project M&E system.

Satisfactory(S): There were minor shortcomings in the project M&E system.

Moderately Satisfactory (MS): There were moderate shortcomings in the project M&E system.

Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): There were significant shortcomings in the project M&E system.

Unsatisfactory (U): There were major shortcomings in the project M&E system.

Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): The Project had no M&E system.

“M&E plan implementation” will be considered a critical parameter for the overall assessment of the M&E system. The overall rating for the M&E systems will not be higher than the rating on “M&E plan implementation.”

All other ratings will be on the GEF six point scale.

GEF Performance Description	Alternative description on the same scale
HS = Highly Satisfactory	Excellent
S = Satisfactory	Well above average
MS = Moderately Satisfactory	Average
MU = Moderately Unsatisfactory	Below Average
U = Unsatisfactory	Poor
HU = Highly Unsatisfactory	Very poor (Appalling)

Annex 2 to Appendix 7: Co-financing and Leveraged Resources

Co financing (Type/Source)	IA own Financing (mill US\$)		Government (mill US\$)		Other* (mill US\$)		Total (mill US\$)		Total Disburseme (mill US\$)	
	Planne d	Actua l	Planne d	Actual	Planne d	Actua l	Planne d	Actua l	Planne d	Act
- Grants										
- Loans/Concessional (compared to market rate)										
- Credits										
- Equity investments										
- In-kind support										
- Other (*)										
-										
-										
-										
-										
Totals										

Co-financing (basic data to be supplied to the consultant for verification)

* Other is referred to contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector and beneficiaries.

Leveraged Resources

Leveraged resources are additional resources—beyond those committed to the project itself at the time of approval—that are mobilized later as a direct result of the project. Leveraged resources can be financial or in-kind and they may be from other donors, NGO's, foundations, governments, communities or the private sector. Please briefly describe the resources the project has leveraged since inception and indicate how these resources are contributing to the project's ultimate objective.

Table showing final actual project expenditure by activity to be supplied by the UNEP Fund management Officer. (insert here)

Annex 3 to Appendix 7

Review of the Draft Report

Draft reports submitted to UNEP EOU are shared with the corresponding Programme or Project Officer and his or her supervisor for initial review and consultation. The DGEF staff and senior Executing Agency staff provide comments on the draft evaluation report. They may provide feedback on any errors of fact and may highlight the significance of such errors in any conclusions. The consultation also seeks agreement on the findings and recommendations. UNEP EOU collates the review comments and provides them to the evaluators for their consideration in preparing the final version of the report. General comments on the draft report with respect to compliance with these TOR are shared with the reviewer.

Quality Assessment of the Evaluation Report

All UNEP GEF Mid Term Reports are subject to quality assessments by UNEP EOU. These apply GEF Office of Evaluation quality assessment and are used as a tool for providing structured feedback to the evaluator.

The quality of the draft evaluation report is assessed and rated against the following criteria:

GEF Report Quality Criteria	UNEP EOU Assessment	Rating
A. Did the report present an assessment of relevant outcomes and achievement of project objectives in the context of the focal area program indicators if applicable?		
B. Was the report consistent and the evidence complete and convincing and were the ratings substantiated when used?		
C. Did the report present a sound assessment of sustainability of outcomes?		
D. Were the lessons and recommendations supported by the evidence presented?		
E. Did the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?		
F. Did the report include an assessment of the quality of the project M&E system and its use for project management?		
UNEP EOU additional Report Quality Criteria	UNEP EOU Assessment	Rating
G. Quality of the lessons: Were lessons readily applicable in other contexts? Did they suggest prescriptive action?		
H. Quality of the recommendations: Did recommendations specify the actions necessary to correct existing conditions or improve operations ('who?' 'what?' 'where?' 'when?'). Can they be implemented? Did the recommendations specify a goal and an associated performance indicator?		
I. Was the report well written? (clear English language and grammar)		
J. Did the report structure follow EOU guidelines, were all requested Annexes included?		
K. Were all evaluation aspects specified in the TORs adequately addressed?		
L. Was the report delivered in a timely manner		

GEF Quality of the MTE report = 0.3*(A + B) + 0.1*(C+D+E+F)

EOU assessment of MTE report = 0.3*(G + H) + 0.1*(I+J+K+L)

Combined quality Rating = (2* 'GEF EO' rating + EOU rating)/3


The Totals are rounded and converted to the scale of HS to HU

Rating system for quality of terminal evaluation reports

A number rating 1-6 is used for each criterion: Highly Satisfactory = 6, Satisfactory = 5, Moderately Satisfactory = 4, Moderately Unsatisfactory = 3, Unsatisfactory = 2, Highly Unsatisfactory = 1, and unable to assess = 0.

APPENDIX 8

DECISION MAKING FLOW CHART AND ORGANIZATIONAL CHART



APPENDIX 9

Terms of Reference

REGIONAL ADVISORS FOR THE PROJECT ON “SUPPORT FOR PREPARATION OF THE THIRD NATIONAL BIOSAFETY REPORTS

Region: Africa

National Executing Agency: From the participating parties

I. Objective(s) and Justification for the Regional Advisor

The UNEP-GEF Project on “Support for Preparation of the Second National Biosafety Reports” aims at assisting GEF eligible parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety to prepare and make timely submission of their Second National Reports on measures that each party has taken to implement the Protocol in line with Article 33.

The Project requires regional advisors to advise countries on the national obligations to, interpretation of obligations and related measures in the preparation of national reports showing status of implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety.

The Enabling Activity on National Reporting project seeks consultants to assist eligible Parties in the Africa Region in the consultative processes and preparation of the second national reports and to assist in the analysis of the reports. . The consultants must have excellent communication skills and strong professional background in biosafety related issues especially as it relates to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, to provide assistance and expertise to participating countries.

II. Proposed TORs of the Regional Advisor

To provide support on

- i. Interpretation of biosafety protocol articles and providing guidance on Protocol related matters
- ii. Assist in accessing relevant data to facilitate preparation of national reports
- iii. Review draft national reports

APPENDIX 10

SAMPLE LETTER of ENDORSEMENT

Date: _____

Ms. Brennan van Dyke
GEF Executive Coordinator and Director
Global Environment Facility (GEF) Coordination Office
UNEP
Nairobi, Kenya

Dear _____,

Re: Letter of endorsement for the Project – Support for Preparation of the Third National Biosafety Reports

[Country name] fully endorses the proposal for the GEF□funded Project “Support for Preparation of the Third National Biosafety Reports”, and wishes to express its interest in participating in this project.

[Country name] meets the eligibility criteria for this project, by being a Party to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and eligible for GEF funding support.

The Government of [country name] is also willing to contribute US\$ [] as in kind/in cash co-financing to this project.

Signed by GEF Operational Focal Point

Copy to
National Focal Point – Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety

APPENDIX 11
PARTICIPATING COUNTRIES-ASIA-PACIFIC REGION

CARTAGENA PROTOCOL ON BIOSAFETY GEF ELIGIBLE PARTIES

See Attached Spreadsheet

Appendix 12

Summary of status of reporting by Parties to the Protocol in Regional Groupings

Region	CPB Parties	No. of interim report submitted	No. of 1 st Report Submitted	No. of Second Report Submitted	No. of GEF Eligible Parties
Africa	49	9	24	49	49
Asia – Pacific	48	7	20	38	43
CEE	22	12	16	21	11
GRULAC	30	9	12	24	30
WEOG	20	17	16	18	0
	169				133