

Ensuring Sufficiency and Predictability of Revenues for the Georgia's Protected Areas System

PIMS 4285, Atlas project number 00074318

Terminal Evaluation Volume II (Annexes)

Georgia

GEF BD SO-1, SP-3 (GEF-4), Outcome 1.1 (GEF-5)

Georgia

Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources Protection

Caucasus Nature Fund (CNF)

United National Development Program (UNDP)

Table of Contents

Annex 1	Terms of Reference.....	2
Annex 2	MTR Itinerary & list of persons interviewed	8
Annex 3	Rating Scales	10
Annex 4	List of members of the Project Executive Board	11
Annex 5	Framework Agreement between APA and CNF.....	12
Annex 6	Criteria used by CNF to select protected areas.....	33
Annex 7	List of documents reviewed.....	34
Annex 8	Example questionnaire used for data collection.....	35
Annex 9	Audit trail of comments on draft TE	38
Annex 10	UNEG Code of Conduct Form	39
Annex 11	TE Final Report Clearance Form.....	40

Annex 1 Terms of Reference

INTRODUCTION

UNDP/GEF seek to hire International Project Evaluation Expert to carry out Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the following projects:

1. "Ensuring Sufficiency and Predictability of Revenues for the Georgia's Protected Areas System" –UNDP Georgia (PIMS #4285)
2. "Catalyzing Financial Sustainability of Armenia's Protected Areas System" – UNDP Armenia (PIMS # 4258)

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).

As a result of the evaluation UNDP COs (Armenia and Georgia) will obtain separate reports for the two projects.

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

PROJECTS SUMMARY TABLE

PROJECT: ENSURING SUFFICIENCY AND PREDICTABILITY OF REVENUES FOR THE GEORGIA'S PROTECTED AREAS SYSTEM

Project Title:	Ensuring Sufficiency and Predictability of Revenues for the Georgia's Prot		
GEF Project ID:	4285		<i>at endorsement (Million US\$)</i>
UNDP Project ID:	00059440	GEF financing:	1,000,000
Country:	Georgia	IA/EA own:	
Region:	RBEC	Government:	2,435,000
Focal Area:	Biodiversity	Other:	1,930,000 (CNF/CPAF ¹) TJS, KfW 144,000 Bank of Georgia 225,000
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	BD-1	Total co-financing:	4,440,00

¹ CNF is used after the establishment of the Caucasus fund and has replaced the CPAF (Caucasus protected areas fund) which is the reference used for this establishment during project development and within the project documents. For purposes of clarity, references to this organization in the evaluation should use the current title -- CNF (Caucasus Nature Fund).

Executing Agency:	CNF	Total Project Cost:		5,440,000	
Other Partners involved:		ProDoc Signature (date project began):			July 2010
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: 2016	Actual: 2016	

PROJECT CATALYZING FINANCIAL SUSTAINABILITY OF ARMENIA'S PROTECTED AREAS SYSTEM SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	Catalyzing Financial Sustainability		
GEF Project ID:	4258		<i>at endorsement (Million US\$)</i>
UNDP Project ID:	00057497	GEF financing:	990,000
Country:	Armenia	IA/EA own:	
Region:	RBEC	Government:	2,425,000
Focal Area:	Biodiversity	Other:	2,161,000 (CPAF) 174,000 (TJS/KfW)
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	BD-1	Total co-financing:	4,760,000
Executing Agency:	NGO	Total Project Cost:	5,750,000
Other Partners involved:	CNF	ProDoc Signature (date project began): October 2010	

OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The projects have two components and objectives: to ensure sufficiency and predictability of revenue sources for the PA system and to raise cost-effectiveness and capacities of PAs through the operation of the regional conservation trust fund (CNF)², including the newly constituted, country - dedicated, 7-year sinking fund.

The duration of the project is seven years. Total budget of the project for Georgia is US\$ 5,440,000 (including 1,000,000 from the GEF) and for Armenia 5,750,000 (including 990,000 from the GEF). The remaining amount is financial and in-kind parallel co-funding, including: respective governments, CNF, KfW/TJS, and other partners.

UNDP is a GEF implementing agency for the project. Sinking Fund operations and management as well as capacity development and provision of high-quality technical advice on sustainable financing of PAs, is delegated to CNF the project management and fund operations responsibilities and reflected in Sinking Fund and Project Management Agreement. CNF was selected for fund operations and the project management is that it is the only organization in the Caucasus with the mandate granted by the governments of three South Caucasus countries to operate Trust Funds, including both endowment and sinking funds in support of Protected Areas in these countries. CNF's organizational structure and operations allow for effective and efficient management of the Trust Fund, whose general rules and policies is defined in the framework agreement between the respective governments the CNF.

² CNF is used after the establishment of the Caucasus fund and has replaced the CPAF (Caucasus protected areas fund) which is the reference used for this establishment during project development and within the project documents. For purposes of clarity, references to this organization in the evaluation should use the current title -- CNF (Caucasus Nature Fund).

A Project Executive Board (PEB) directs the project and is the ultimate decision-maker for it, ensuring that the project remains on course to deliver the desired outcomes of the required quality.

The implementation of the project started as planned and all components of the project are on the way to reaching the project objectives. Projects undergone Mid Term Evaluation (MTEs) in 2014, where the progress was reviewed, the project approach analyzed, lessons learned captured, replication strategy developed and implemented.

Now at the final stage of the projects the Terminal Evaluation (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 method³ 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 ([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 reports. As a result of the assignment there will be two separate report sets prepared for each of the projects.

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 field missions to Georgia and Armenia, including the most appropriate projects sites to be selected by the evaluator in consultation with the UNDP COs and project teams and in accordance with logistical availability, available timeframe and what seems best suited for the purposes of the evaluation. Interviews will be held with representatives from the following organizations in both countries at a minimum:

- UNDP COs (Energy and Environment Portfolio managers and Management);
- Ministries of Nature Protection (Armenia) and Environment (Georgia). GEF Operational Focal Points, CBD focal points, Agency of Protected Areas in Georgia;
- CNF;

³ For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](#), Chapter 7, pg. 163

- from WWF and other key NGOs;
- from World Bank offices, USAID, KFW and other key international partners.

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](#).

Evaluation Ratings:			
1. Monitoring and Evaluation	rating	2. IA& EA Execution	rating
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	
3. Assessment of Outcomes	rating	4. Sustainability	rating
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 reports.

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.⁴

CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

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

In this chapter it is desirable to include recommendations for a strategy for future replication of the project approach for other types of the biodiversity conservation projects for other regions of the country.

IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Georgia. 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 E&E Team in Georgia CO and Armenia CO and/or CNF will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
-------------	---------	--------	------------------

⁴ 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](#)

Inception Reports	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission.	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
Presentation	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission in Georgia End of evaluation mission in Armenia The evaluator may elect to organize one common briefing of initial findings at the end of both missions for the discussion of issues common to both countries	To project management, UNDP CO
Draft Final Reports	Full reports, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs
Final Reports*	Revised reports	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC.

*When submitting the final evaluation reports, 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 reports.

TERMINAL EVALUATION (TE) TEAM DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

- Desk review of documents, development of draft methodology, detailed work plan and TE outline;
- Debriefing with UNDP CO, agreement on the methodology, scope and outline of the TE reports;
- Interviews with Project Executive, relevant Government, Project Manager, NGO and donor representatives and UNDP/GEF Regional Technical Advisor;
- Field visit to two project sites and interviews with PA administration key staff;
- Debriefing with UNDP, Project Executive and Project Manager;
- Development and submission of the first TE reports drafts. The draft will be shared with the UNDP CO, UNDP/GEF (UNDP/GEF IRH Istanbul) and key project stakeholders for review and commenting;
- Finalization and submission of the final TE reports through incorporating suggestions received on the draft reports.

Annex 2 MTR Itinerary & list of persons interviewed

Time	Item	People and Organisation Involved
Monday, 31 October, 2016		
12:00-13:00	Briefing with UNDP management	Nino Antadze - Energy and Environment Team Leader
14:00-15:00	WWF	Mr. Nugzar Zazanashvili-Conservation Director
15:30 - 19:30	Caucasus Nature Fund (CNF)	Mr. George (Geof) Giacomini – Executive Director (skype) Ms. Tea Barbakadze – Project Manager – Country Coordinator in Georgia
Tuesday, November 1, 2016		
11:00-12:30	Meeting with the Transboundary Joint Secretariat	Ms. Lali Tevzadze – National Coordinator in Georgia
13:00-14:00	Meeting with the GFA Consulting Group GmbH (KfW Project: Support Program for Protected Areas)	Ms. Eka Kakabadze – National Coordinator
15:00-18:00	Meeting with the NACRES	Mr. Irakli Shavgulidze – Chairperson Mr. Bejan Lortkipanidze – Conservation Projects Coordinator
Wednesday, November 2, 2016		
10:30 - 11:00	Meeting with the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources of Georgia	Ms. Nino Tkhilava – GEF focal point
11:00-12:30	Meeting with Agency of Protected Area key staff	Mr. Lasha Moistsrapishvili -Head of APA Ms. Tamar Kvantaliani- Deputy head of APA Ms. Nita Tkavadze – Head of the International Relations
12:30-14:30	Meeting with PA administrations	Mr. Vakhtang Giunaidze - Director of Tusheti Mr. Merab Pirosamanishvili - Director of Vashlovani

		Mr. Giorgi Sulamanidze - Director of Lagodekhi
16:00 - 17:00	Meeting with the Twinning – EU funded complementary project (PEB Board Member)	Mr. Mike Garforth – Resident Twinning Adviser
Thursday, November 3, 2016		
12:00 - 13:15	Meeting with KfW Caucasus Regional Office (Donor, Partner)	Mr. Levan Tsitskishvili – Senior Project Coordinator
13:35- 15:20	Meeting with US DoI ITAP	Mr. Paata Shanshiashvili – in Country Coordinator
15:30- 16:00	Skype call "Expansion and Improved Management Effectiveness of the Adjara Region's Protected Areas"	Mr. Irakli Goradze - Project Manager
Friday, November 04, 2016		
14:00- 15:00	Meeting with GFA Consulting Group GmbH (KfW Project: Support Program for Protected Areas)	Mr. Ramaz Gokhelashvili – Team leader
16:30- 18:00	Debriefing with UNDP management	Ms. Nino Antadze - Energy and Environment Team Leader

Annex 3 Rating Scales

Ratings for Progress Towards Results: (one rating for each outcome and for the objective)		
6	Highly Satisfactory (HS)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve or exceed all its end-of-project targets, without major shortcomings. The progress towards the objective/outcome can be presented as “good practice”.
5	Satisfactory (S)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets, with only minor shortcomings.
4	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets but with significant shortcomings.
3	Moderately Unsatisfactory (HU)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve its end-of-project targets with major shortcomings.
2	Unsatisfactory (U)	The objective/outcome is expected not to achieve most of its end-of-project targets.
1	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	The objective/outcome has failed to achieve its midterm targets, and is not expected to achieve any of its end-of-project targets.
Ratings for Project Implementation & Adaptive Management: (one overall rating)		
6	Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Implementation of all seven components – management arrangements, work planning, finance and co-finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting, and communications – is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. The project can be presented as “good practice”.
5	Satisfactory (S)	Implementation of most of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management except for only few that are subject to remedial action.
4	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Implementation of some of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management, with some components requiring remedial action.
3	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Implementation of some of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive, with most components requiring remedial action.
2	Unsatisfactory (U)	Implementation of most of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.
1	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Implementation of none of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.
Ratings for Sustainability: (one overall rating)		
4	Likely (L)	Negligible risks to sustainability, with key outcomes on track to be achieved by the project’s closure and expected to continue into the foreseeable future
3	Moderately Likely (ML)	Moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained due to the progress towards results on outcomes at the Midterm Review
2	Moderately Unlikely (MU)	Significant risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on
1	Unlikely (U)	Severe risks that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained

Annex 4 List of members of the Project Executive Board

Name	Organisation and position
Mr. Lasha Moistsraphishvili	Head of APA
Ms. Nino Antadze	UNDP E&E team leader
Ms. Nestan Khuntsaria	UNDP Energy and Environment portfolio programme associate
Ms. Tamar Kvantaliani	Project Director, Deputy Head of APA
Ms. Nita Tkavadze	Head of International Relations and Project Management
Ms. Tea Barbakadze	Project Manager, Caucasus Nature Fund country coordinator
Ms. Lali Tevzadze	TJS National Coordinator Georgia
Ms. Nino Tkhilava	Head of the Environmental Policy and International Relations Department, GEF Operational Focal Point
Mr. George Giacomini	CNF, Executive Director
Mr. Servi Nabuurs	TJS, International Team Leader
Mr. Nugzar Zazanashvili	WWF Caucasus Programme Office

Annex 5 Framework Agreement between MoENRP and CNF

This is a tripartite agreement with three signatories – MoENRP, APA and the CNF (see following pages)

Annex 6 Criteria used by CNF to select protected areas

The CNF publishes that it uses criteria it uses for selecting protected areas in which it invests i) in the Framework Agreement that it has with APA (see Annex V) and in its Bylaws (of 01 April 2010). In wording, these are identical and they appear here as in Annexes A and F of the Framework Agreement:

Annex A: The definition of a “priority protected area”:

"PPA", or Priority Protected Area, means those protected areas in the Core Countries:

- a) that are part of a wider Priority Conservation Area as defined in the document entitled "An Ecoregional Conservation Plan for the Caucasus", dated May 2006, as such document may be amended and updated from time to time (The "Caucasus Ecoregional Conservation Plan");
- b) the activities within which are integrated into the overall land use patterns of the Priority Conservation Area;
- c) that are legally protected in perpetuity primarily for the purpose of conserving biodiversity (whether as a national park, nature reserve, strict nature reserve or sanctuary); and
- d) that the CP AF Board believes are priority protected areas for the CP AF based on the biological priorities established in the Caucasus Ecoregional Conservation Plan.

Annex F: Currently Effective Grant Allocation Criteria

Irreplaceability - PPAs that contain globally threatened and restricted-range species. The most irreplaceable PP As are those that contain the single most viable population and/or greatest genetic diversity of a target species (i.e., a species classified by IUCN's Red Book);

Representativity - PP As that serve to ensure there is representation of the full spectrum of endemic species and habitats across the protected areas system of the ecoregion;

Urgency - PP As that represent an immediate conservation opportunity and/or are experiencing severe threats to endemic and/or threatened species and their habitats;

Feasibility - PP As that exist within a supportive local and regional context, i.e. that can demonstrate local community support; and

Regional importance - PP As that promote and enhance overall implementation and effectiveness of the Ecoregional Conservation Plan.

Annex 7 List of documents reviewed

1. PIF
2. UNDP Project Document
3. UNDP Project document and Terminal Evaluation of previous UNDP-GEF Project “Catalyzing Financial Sustainability of Georgia’s Protected Area System”
4. Project Implementation Reports (PIR’s) and Quarterly reports
5. MTR Report
6. Budgets and annual workplans
7. Minutes of PEB meetings
8. Project newsletters and press releases
9. CNF website
10. Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools (FSSC)
11. UNDP country programme documents

Annex 8 Example questionnaire used for data collection

1. What is the achievement, so far, of which you are most proud?
2. If you could go back in time, what would you change or do differently?
3. If you could go back in time, which activities would you definitely do again?
4. If the project had an extra USD 2 million and an extra two years, what else would you consider doing?
5. What are you doing to ensure take up/replication of the concept and processes in other landscapes?
6. What are the effects of inflation or changes in the exchange rates to the budgeting and/or expenditure?
7. Please give examples of how you are ensuring cost effectiveness?
8. Please provide all information on cofinance to date, including both cash and in-kind expenditure and a summary of the items on which the co-finance has been spent.
9. What is your role/relationship with the project?
10. What are you doing to ensure sustainability of the project's processes and impacts?
11. This (xxx) success seems very good: what did you do to achieve it?
12. Who are the partners (i.e., people actively working to the same goals) on the project?
13. Who would you say *owns* the project?
14. Who are the stakeholders in the project (i.e., people that are involved in the project, either actively or passively or will be affected by the project in some way)?
15. Who prepares the TOR for all contracting?
16. Who signs the contracts?
17. Imagine this scenario: if the Minister phones you up and says that he needs to make a brief report on the project to the President and he needs 5 bullets on the following subjects:
 - Key successes
 - what would you advise the next door country to do if they were to implement a similar project
 - what works and why
 - what does not work and why
 - key challenges
18. Is the project having any useful (but unplanned) spin-offs?
19. Is the project having any detrimental or negative (but unplanned or unintended) impacts?
20. This is a UNDP project – what advantages or disadvantages does this bring?
What if it was a World Bank project instead – what difference would that bring?
21. If you were to re-write the Project Document, what would you change?
22. Who are the project's champions?
23. Standard issues:
 - Project Manager Forum

- Procurement rules and efficiencies
 - UNDP training/support
 - Financial audits
 - Cofinance information
 - Communication strategy?
 - Monitoring awareness/knowledge
 - Backing up data and digital information
 - Team functionality
 - Staff turn over
 - If training is provided, how is training is now being used in job?
 - How including gender and/or indigenous peoples issues?
 - Need to provide all information, including equipment, inputs, infrastructure, tracking tool data.
 - If there was a delay, what was the reason?
24. How is the project aligned to the national development plan, region-level development plans and the UNDAF?
 25. Is the project trying to increase awareness? If so, among which target groups? How is the project monitoring changes in awareness and attitude? How has any changes in attitude and awareness affected project implementation, and how is it being used in the daily, professional lives of the target groups?
 26. Infrastructure has been developed over the course of this project. Was it in alignment with the strategic plan developed at the landscape level? If not, how was the decision made for any given infrastructural input?
 27. New institutions have been created over the course of the project (specifically the landscape management committees). How will these be sustainable? In five years' time, how do you imagine the committees functioning?
 28. Why did the Financial and Administrative Assistant resign?
 29. At a landscape level, what monitoring activities are being undertaken to determine the impact of the project?
 30. How does the project interface with the land reform processes in the country?
 31. The Project Advisory Committee (PAC) appears to be largely unsuccessful: we aim to propose that no further effort be expended to make it active. However, in the long-term, particularly once the GEF project has ended, will there be a role for i) an umbrella coordination body (to continue the work of the PCU – and if so, should it be independent or remain within govt?) and/or ii) a centralised technical body to assist landscapes with technical issues?
 32. It appears as if some key stakeholders are not part of the landscape management committees – e.g., Regional Governments, Roads, Water, etc. Would it be useful to try to include some of these organizations, at least on an ad hoc basis?
 33. How is the project – and landscape management committees in particular - interfacing with regional governments?
 34. To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results?
 35. To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?
 36. Has the project been implemented efficiently, cost-effectively, and been able to

adapt to any changing conditions thus far?

37. To what extent are project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, and project communications supporting the project's implementation?
38. To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?
- 39.

Six questions to overcome fear of failure:

1. What would you attempt to do if you knew you could not fail?
2. What if I fail — how will I recover?
3. What if I do nothing?
4. What if I succeed?
5. What's truly worth doing, whether you fail or succeed?
6. In this failure, what went right?

Annex 9 Audit trail of comments on draft TE

Comment, location	MTR response
Minor edits, typographical errors	All corrected and incorporated into the final version of the report
Factual errors (of which there were a small number)	All corrected and incorporated into the final version of the report
Other comments and discussions	See Footnotes in main body of report for comments and TE responses.

Annex 10 UNEG Code of Conduct Form

Evaluators/Consultants:

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

TE Consultant Agreement Form

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

Name of Consultant: Stuart Williams

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

Signed at Kampala, Uganda (Place) on 18 January 2017 (Date)



Signature: _____

Annex 11 TE Final Report Clearance Form

Terminal Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared By:

Georgia UNDP Country Office

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____