



**UNDP-GEF: TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR TERMINAL EVALUATION
C.A.P.E. BIODIVERSITY CONSERVATION AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT
PROJECT**

PROJECT SUMMARY

Project Title:	C.A.P.E.: Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Development Project
GEF Project ID:	PIMS: 2224
UNDP Project ID:	00031860
World Bank Project ID:	PO75997
Focal Area:	Biodiversity Conservation
GEF Strategic Priority:	SP 1: Protected Areas
Country:	South Africa
Duration:	72 Months
GEF Agency:	UNDP and World Bank
Executing Agency:	South African National Biodiversity Institute
Implementing Agencies:	South African National Biodiversity Institute, South African National Parks Board, Western Cape Nature Conservation Board t/a CapeNature, Wilderness Foundation
Approval Date:	May 16, 2003
Effective Date:	July 24, 2004
Primary Beneficiaries:	Environment
Secondary Beneficiaries:	Local communities/NGOs
DCAS Sector/Subsector:	Environment; (Environment policies, Planning and Legislation)
ACC Sector/Sub-sector:	Natural resources

Project Summary

1. INTRODUCTION

The Government of South Africa has developed the Cape Action for People and Environment (C.A.P.E.) programme to protect the rich biological heritage of the Cape Floristic Region (CFR), and to ensure that biodiversity conservation is mainstreamed into economic development and poverty alleviation strategies.

The basis for this programme was laid by Global Environment Facility (GEF) support in September 2000. In this period, the Cape Action Plan for the Environment, referred to as the CAPE 2000 Strategy, was developed. It identified the key ecological patterns and processes, which need to be conserved in the CFR, the key threats and root causes of biodiversity losses to be addressed to conserve the CFR.

This resulted in a spatial plan identifying the priority areas for conservation intervention and a series of systemic programme activities to be undertaken over a 20-year period to conserve the CFR.

The C.A.P.E. programme is being implemented over a 20-year period through 3 phases. Phase 1 is being supported through incremental funding from the GEF. Phase 2 will seek lower levels of GEF resources and Phase 3 will be funded from domestic resources. Each phase of the programme is designed as a relatively discrete element generating defined global environmental benefits. GEF support to the first 6 years of the C.A.P.E. Program (Phase 1) includes a Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund allocation for civil society involvement, complemented by the C.A.P.E. Agulhas Biodiversity Initiative and the C.A.P.E. Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Development Project. **The present TORs focus exclusively on the terminal evaluation of the C.A.P.E. Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Development Project (“the C.A.P.E. BCSD Project”).**

The overall purpose of the C.A.P.E. BCSD Project is to conserve and manage the natural environment of the CFR and adjacent marine environment in step with the country’s socio-economic transformation, while delivering significant benefits to the people of the region in a way that is embraced by local communities, endorsed by government and recognized internationally.

Specifically, this Project is aimed at (i) establishing the systemic and institutional framework for effective implementation of the C.A.P.E. Program; and (ii) piloting and demonstrating site-based interventions in the CFR by bringing in an additional 4000km² of protected area and to establish the know-how for conservation required to give effect to the C.A.P.E. Program.

GEF supports the C.A.P.E. BCSD Project through two Development Objectives: (1) Securing the co-operation of capable institutions to develop a foundation for mainstreaming biodiversity in the Cape Floristic Region into economic activities; (2) Enhancing the conservation of the Cape Floristic Region through piloting and adapting site-based models for sustainable, effective management.

Key performance indicators are being used to measure project performance. These are set out in the project documents (specific references include: (i) Annex 1 of the Project Appraisal Document; (ii) World Bank GEF Grant Agreement, Schedule 5; and (iii) UNDP Project Document).

The project, which comprises six components, is implemented jointly by UNDP and the World Bank (the Implementing Agencies (IAs) for the GEF. Components 1 and 2 (Institutional Strengthening and Conservation Education) are implemented through UNDP, while components 3-6 (Programme and Project Co-ordination, Protected areas, Biodiversity Economy and Conservation Stewardship, and Watershed Management) are implemented through the World Bank. Moreover, through separate Grant and Project Agreements, each IA assumes responsibility for all aspects of the implementation of its components. This includes Project supervision and monitoring all fiduciary issues and responding to the clients’ needs for technical assistance. In addition, the World Bank is responsible for supervising the implementation of environmental and social due diligence requirements.

The Project Document can be downloaded from the following weblink: <http://gefonline.org/projectDetails.cfm?projID=1516>

Other project documents, including the World Bank PAD, the UNDP Project Document, mission Aide-memoires, Quarterly reports (FMRs), and PIRs, are available from the CCU.

2. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The project was mandated with the following goal and objectives:

The Goal of the Project:

To support the conservation of the Cape Floristic Region (CFR) and adjacent marine environment by laying a sound foundation for scaling up and replicating successful project outcomes.

To achieve the above objective the following six outcomes were identified:

1. Capacitated institutions implement the project.
2. Inhabitants of the CFR contributing to biodiversity conservation through improved awareness raising and environmental education.
3. C.A.P.E. Coordination Unit capacitated to perform project coordination function.
4. Additional 4000kms of viable protected area established and properly managed.
5. Biodiversity in six priority lowland landscapes identified and secured in conjunction with civil society.
6. Biodiversity concerns are integrated into watersheds.

GEF objective and purpose of terminal evaluation

Monitoring and evaluation in the Global Environment Facility (GEF) projects have the following overarching objectives:

- To promote accountability for the achievement of GEF objectives through the assessment of results, effectiveness, processes, and performance of the partners involved in GEF activities. GEF results are monitored and evaluated for their contribution to global environmental benefits.
- To promote learning, feedback, and knowledge sharing on results and lessons learned among the GEF and its partners, as a basis for decision-making on policies, strategies, program management, and projects, and to improve knowledge and performance.

The purposes of conducting evaluations includes the understanding of why and the extent to which intended and unintended results are achieved, and their impact on stakeholders. Evaluation is an important source of evidence of the achievement of results and institutional performance, and contributes to knowledge and to organizational learning. Evaluation should serve as an agent of change and play a critical role in supporting accountability.

In accordance, all full and medium-size projects supported by GEF are subject to a final evaluation upon completion of implementation. In addition to providing an independent in-depth review of implementation progress, this type of evaluation is responsive to GEF Councils' decisions on transparency and better access to information during implementation and on completion of a project.

Specifically, the Terminal Evaluation (TE) must provide a comprehensive and systematic account of the performance of a completed project by assessing its project design, process of implementation and results vis-à-vis project objectives endorsed by the GEF including the agreed changes in the objectives during project implementation. TEs have four complementary purposes as follows:

- To promote accountability and transparency, and to assess and disclose levels of project accomplishments;
- To synthesize lessons that may help improve the selection, design and implementation of future GEF activities;
- To provide feedback on issues that are recurrent across the portfolio and need attention, and on improvements regarding previously identified issues; and,
- To contribute to the GEF Evaluation Office databases for aggregation, analysis and reporting on effectiveness of GEF operations in achieving global environmental benefits and on quality of monitoring and evaluation across the GEF system.

A mix of tools is used to ensure effective project M&E. These can be applied continuously throughout the lifetime of the project – e.g. periodic monitoring of indicators, or as specific time-bound exercises such as mid-term reviews, audit reports and independent evaluations.

3. OBJECTIVES OF THIS TERMINAL EVALUATION

This terminal evaluation (TE) is being carried out to provide a comprehensive and systematic account of the performance of the C.A.P.E. BCSD project by assessing its project design, the process of implementation and results and outputs as they relate to project objectives endorsed by the GEF and other partners (UNDP, World Bank, CapeNature, SANParks) including the agreed changes in the objectives during project implementation. Specifically, the Terminal Evaluation will undertake the following tasks:

- Assess overall performance and review progress towards attaining the project’s objectives and results including relevancy, efficiency and effectiveness of the actions taken given the available funding and capacities for implementation;
- Review and evaluate the extent to which the project outputs and outcomes have been achieved and provide rating employing the six-point rating scale (HS to HU - see Annex 2);
- Assess the project results and determine the extent to which the project objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, and assess if the project has led to any positive or negative consequences and provide a rating of project objective achievement on the six-point rating scale;
- Assess the extent to which the project impacts have reached or have the potential to reach the intended beneficiaries;
- Critically analyze the implementation arrangements and identify strengths and weaknesses in the project design and implementation and provide a rating of the project implementation, employing the six-point rating scale;
- Describe the project’s adaptive management strategy – how have project activities changed in response to new conditions and have the changes been appropriate;
- Review the clarity of roles and responsibilities of the various agencies and institutions and the level of coordination between relevant players;
- Assess the level of stakeholder involvement in the project from community to higher Government levels and recommend on whether this involvement has been appropriate to the goals of the project;
- Describe and assess efforts of UNDP and the World Bank in support of implementation;
- Review donor partnership processes, and the contribution of co-finance;
- Describe key factors that will require attention in order to improve prospects for sustainability of

project results achieved; and,

- Identify and document the main successes, challenges and lessons that have emerged.

4. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

Three main elements to be evaluated are Delivery, Implementation and Finances. Each component will be evaluated using three criteria: effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness

Project delivery: The TE will assess to what extent the C.A.P.E. BCSD project has achieved its immediate objectives. It will also identify what outputs, impacts and results have been produced and how they have enabled the project to achieve its objectives. The consultants are required to make assessment of the following issues under each priority area outlined below:

Institutional arrangement

- Preparatory work and implementation strategies
- Consultative processes
- Technical support
- Capacity building initiatives
- Project outputs
- Assumptions and risks
- Project related complementary activities

Outcome, results and impacts

- Efficiency of all project activities under the three major components
- Progress in the achievement of the immediate objectives (include level of indicator achievement when available)

Partnerships

- Assessment of national level involvement and perception
- Assessment of local partnerships, and involvement of stakeholders
- Assessment of collaboration between government, intergovernmental and non-governmental organisations

Risk management

- Were problems/constraints, which impacted on successful delivery of the project identified at the project design stage and subsequently as part of the Mid Term Evaluation (MTE)?
- Were there new threats/risks to project success that emerged during project implementation?
- Were both kinds of risk appropriately dealt with?
- Were recommendations arising from the MTE addressed?

Monitoring and Evaluation

- Assess the extent, appropriateness and effectiveness of adaptive management at all levels of the project implementation
- Has there been a monitoring and evaluation framework for the project and how was this developed?

- Is the reporting framework effective/appropriate?
- Is this framework suitable for replication/continuation for any future project support?

Project Implementation

- Review the project management and implementation arrangements at all levels, in order to provide an opinion on its efficiency and cost effectiveness. This includes:
 - i. Processes and administration:
 - Project related administration procedures
 - Milestones(Log-frame matrix)
 - Key decisions and out puts,
 - Major project implementation documents prepared with an indication of how the documents and reports have been useful
 - ii. Project oversight and active engagement by: UNDP and World Bank and project steering committee
 - iii. Project execution: South African National Biodiversity Institute as the executing agency and project sub-executing agencies: SANParks, CapeNature and Wilderness Foundation
 - iv. Project implementation: UNDP and World Bank as the Implementing Agencies

Project Finances

How well and cost effectively have financial arrangements of the project worked? This section will focus on the following three priority areas:

1. Project disbursements
 - Provide an overview of actual spending against budget expectations
 - Critically analyse disbursements to determine if funds have been applied effectively and efficiently.
2. Budget procedures
 - Did the Project Document provide adequate guidance on how to allocate the budget?
 - Review of audits and any issues raised in audits and subsequent adjustments to accommodate audit recommendations;
 - Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and provide an opinion on the appropriateness and relevancy of such revisions
3. Coordination mechanisms
 - Evaluate appropriateness and efficiency of coordinating mechanisms between executing agencies, UNDP and the World Bank
 - Does the C.A.P.E. BCSD approach represent an effective means of achieving the objectives?
 - How can the approach be improved?

5. EXPECTED OUTPUT

The TE evaluators will be expected to produce:

A) **An evaluation report**, of approximately 40-50 pages, structured along the outline indicated in Annex 1 and 2.

- A detailed record of consultations with stakeholders will need to be kept and provided (as part of the information gathered by the evaluators), as an annex to the main report.
- If there are any significant discrepancies between the impressions and findings of the evaluation team and stakeholders these should be explained in an Annex attached to the final report.

B) **A Power Point Presentation** (circa 20-25 slides) covering the key points of the TE.

C) **A presentation** to the TE Steering Committee (precise date to be agreed as part of evaluators contract), and possibly a presentation to the C.A.P.E. Implementation Committee on 19 May 2010.

A draft of both A) and B) above should be submitted within two weeks of the end of the in-country component of the evaluators' mission, and a final copy within two weeks after receiving written comments on the drafts.

The draft and final versions of the products should be submitted to the C.A.P.E. Coordination Unit, who will be responsible for circulating it to key stakeholders.

6. METHODOLOGY OF EVALUATION APPROACH

The evaluation will be conducted in a participatory manner through a combination of processes. It is anticipated that the methodology to be used for the TE will include the following:

A) **Review of documentation including but not limited to:-**

- Project Document and Project Appraisal Document;
- Project implementation reports (APR/PIR's);
- Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams;
- Audit reports;
- Mid Term Evaluation report;
- METT Tools;
- M & E Operational Guidelines, all monitoring reports prepared by the project; and
- Financial and Administration guidelines.

The following documents will also be available:

- The C.A.P.E. 2000 strategy;
- Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems;
- Minutes of the C.A.P.E. Implementation Committee and other project management meetings;
- Maps;

- The GEF and World Bank Implementation Completion Report guidelines; and
- The World Bank and UNDP Monitoring and Evaluation Frameworks.

B) Interviews in the field with stakeholders shall include:

- World Bank and UNDP staff who have project responsibilities;
- Executing agencies (including but not limited to senior officials and task team/ component leaders: SANBI, SANParks, CapeNature, and Wilderness Foundation);
- The Chair and Deputy Chair of the C.A.P.E. Implementation Committee;
- Project stakeholders, to be determined at the inception meeting; and
- Relevant staff of the National Department of Environmental Affairs.

7. ATTRIBUTES OF THE EVALUATION CONSULTANTS

The TE Team will consist of a Team Leader and an appropriate project staff as required. The team will be responsible for the delivery, content, technical quality and accuracy of the evaluation, as well as the recommendations.

The team should ideally have the following competencies and attributes:

Expertise in:

- Capacity building and strengthening institutions;
- Integrated natural resource management;
- Community-based natural resource management;
- Protected Area management; and,
- Project evaluation, specifically undertaking complex programmatic reviews.

Some prior knowledge of the following would be ideal:

- GEF, UNDP and World Bank reporting frameworks;
- GEF principles and expected impacts in terms of global benefits;
- The C.A.P.E. Programme and the institutional environment of South Africa;
- The Principles of the Ecosystem Approach of the Convention on Biological Diversity; and,
- Knowledge to assess fit with CBD work programs and 2010 targets

Competency in the following is also required:

- Demonstrated experience in institutional analysis;
- Excellent English writing and communication skills.
- Demonstrated ability to assess complex situations in order to succinctly and clearly distil critical issues and draw forward looking conclusions; and,

- Excellent facilitation skills.

8. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The evaluation will be conducted for a period of 20 working days, with most of the effort occurring within the period 28 April 2010 to 21 May 2010. SANBI will finalize the TOR, recruit the consultants and coordinate the evaluation. The project will be responsible for logistical arrangements in the field (setting up meetings and organizing travel).

The detailed TE methodology will be agreed as part of the contract finalisation process during April 2010, by way of virtual communication with the TE Steering Committee and the relevant World Bank and UNDP representatives.

The evaluation will start with an inception meeting with the TE Steering committee and the joint World Bank/ UNDP Mission and a review of the key project documentation including key reports and correspondence. It will include presentations from the various project components, visits to executing and implementing agency offices, interviews with key individuals both within the project, the government, and independent observers of the project and its activities, as well as project personnel. Field visits to project sites will be conducted to view activities first hand.

9. SUBMISSIONS

Interested consultants are requested to submit an expression of interest and relevant Curriculum Vitae of the project team that demonstrates the qualifications, skills, experience and track record to deliver the services required and that reflects an understanding of key issues relating to the scope of work. Please also provide three contactable references.

The preferred service provider will be selected based on the experience and qualifications expressed in the Expression of Interest submitted. **A joint technical and financial proposal will only be requested from the preferred service provider.**

Submissions are to be made by e-mail to Azisa Parker, at a.parker@sanbi.org.za by no later than 12h00 on 19 March 2010. Note that no hard copy submissions will be accepted.

Submissions should be under 3 MB in size.

Enquiries can be directed to:

Azisa Parker
Programme Developer
SANBI Fynbos Programme/ C.A.P.E. Coordination Unit
Email: a.parker@sanbi.org.za
Phone: 021 799 8866

ANNEX 1 - REPORT SAMPLE OUTLINE

Terminal Evaluation Report – Sample outline

1. Executive summary

- Brief description of project;
- Context and purpose of the evaluation;
- Main conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned;

2. Introduction

- Purpose of the evaluation;
- Key issues addressed;
- Methodology of the evaluation;
- Structure of the evaluation.

3. The project(s) and its development context

- Project start and its duration;
- Problems that the project seek to address;
- Immediate and development objectives of the project;
- Main stakeholders;
- Results expected.

4. Findings and Conclusions

4.1 Project Formulation

- ✓ Implementation
- ✓ Stakeholder participation
- ✓ Replication approach
- ✓ Cost effectiveness
- ✓ Linkage of the project and other interventions within the sector
- ✓ Indicators

4.2. Project Implementation

- ✓ Delivery
- ✓ Financial management
- ✓ Monitoring and evaluation
- ✓ Execution and implementation modalities
- ✓ Management by UNDP, World Bank and other partners
- ✓ Coordination and operational issues

4.3 Results to date

- ✓ Attainment of Objectives
- ✓ Sustainability
- ✓ Contribution to upgrading skills at National level

5.0 Lessons learned

6.0 Conclusions and recommendations, including overall rating of project implementation and the achievement of project outcomes and objective.

7.0 Evaluation report Annexes

- Evaluation TORs , Itinerary and list of persons interviewed
- Summary of field visits, including evaluators findings, issues raised and recommendations by different stakeholders
- List of documents reviewed
- Questionnaire used and summary of results if any
- Comments by stakeholders (only in case of discrepancies with evaluation findings and conclusions)

Annex 2 - Explanation on Terminology provided in the GEF Guidelines to Terminal Evaluations

Implementation Approach includes an analysis of the project's logical framework, adaptation to changing conditions (adaptive management), partnerships in implementation arrangements, changes in project design, and overall project management.

Some elements of an effective implementation approach may include:

- The logical framework used during implementation as a management and M&E tool
- Effective partnerships arrangements established for implementation of the project with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region
- Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project implementation
- Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management.

Country Ownership/Driveness is the relevance of the project to national development and environmental agendas, recipient country commitment, and regional and international agreements where applicable. Project Concept has its origin within the national sectoral and development plans

Some elements of effective country ownership/driveness may include:

- Project Concept has its origin within the national sectoral and development plans
- Outcomes (or potential outcomes) from the project have been incorporated into the national sectoral and development plans
- Relevant country representatives (e.g., governmental official, civil society, etc.) are actively involved in project identification, planning and/or implementation
- The recipient government has maintained financial commitment to the project
- The government has approved policies and/or modified regulatory frameworks in line with the project's objectives

For projects whose main focus and actors are in the private-sector rather than public-sector (e.g., IFC projects), elements of effective country ownership/driveness that demonstrate the interest and commitment of the local private sector to the project may include:

- The number of companies that participated in the project by: receiving technical assistance, applying for financing, attending dissemination events, adopting environmental standards promoted by the project, etc.
- Amount contributed by participating companies to achieve the environmental benefits promoted by the project, including: equity invested, guarantees provided, co-funding of project activities, in-kind contributions, etc.
- Project's collaboration with industry associations

Stakeholder Participation/Public Involvement 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.

Examples of effective public involvement include:

Information dissemination

- Implementation of appropriate outreach/public awareness campaigns

Consultation and stakeholder participation

- Consulting and making use of the skills, experiences and knowledge of NGOs, community and local groups, the private and public sectors, and academic institutions in the design, implementation, and evaluation of project activities

Stakeholder participation

- Project institutional networks well placed within the overall national or community organizational structures, for example, by building on the local decision making structures, incorporating local knowledge, and devolving project management responsibilities to the local organizations or communities as the project approaches closure
- Building partnerships among different project stakeholders
- Fulfillment of commitments to local stakeholders and stakeholders considered to be adequately involved.

Sustainability measures the extent to which benefits continue, within or outside the project domain, from a particular project or program after GEF assistance/external assistance has come to an end. Relevant factors to improve the sustainability of project outcomes include:

- Development and implementation of a sustainability strategy.
- Establishment of the financial and economic instruments and mechanisms to ensure the ongoing flow of benefits once the GEF assistance ends (from the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and market transformations to promote the project's objectives).
- Development of suitable organizational arrangements by public and/or private sector.
- Development of policy and regulatory frameworks that further the project objectives.
- Incorporation of environmental and ecological factors affecting future flow of benefits.
- Development of appropriate institutional capacity (systems, structures, staff, expertise, etc.) .
- Identification and involvement of champions (i.e. individuals in government and civil society who can promote sustainability of project outcomes).
- Achieving social sustainability, for example, by mainstreaming project activities into the economy or community production activities.
- Achieving stakeholders consensus regarding courses of action on project activities.

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). Examples of replication approaches include:

- Knowledge transfer (i.e., dissemination of lessons through project result documents, training workshops, information exchange, a national and regional forum, etc).
- Expansion of demonstration projects.
- Capacity building and training of individuals, and institutions to expand the project's achievements in the country or other regions.
- Use of project-trained individuals, institutions or companies to replicate the project's outcomes in other regions.

Financial Planning includes actual project cost by activity, financial management (including disbursement issues), and co-financing. If a financial audit has been conducted the major findings should be presented in the TE.

Effective financial plans include:

- Identification of potential sources of co-financing as well as leveraged and associated financing¹.
- Strong financial controls, including reporting, and planning that allow the project management to make informed decisions regarding the budget at any time, allows for a proper and timely flow of funds, and for the payment of satisfactory project deliverables
- Due diligence due diligence in the management of funds and financial audits.

Co-financing includes: Grants, Loans/Concessional (compared to market rate), Credits, Equity investments, In-kind support, Other contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector and beneficiaries. Please refer to Council documents on co-financing for definitions, such as GEF/C.20/6.

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.

Cost-effectiveness assesses the achievement of the environmental and developmental objectives as well as the project's outputs in relation to the inputs, costs, and implementing time. It also examines the project's compliance with the application of the incremental cost concept. Cost-effective factors include:

- Compliance with the incremental cost criteria (e.g. GEF funds are used to finance a component of a project that would not have taken place without GEF funding.) and securing co-funding and associated funding.

¹ Please refer to Council documents on co-financing for definitions, such as GEF/C.20/6. The following page presents a table to be used for reporting co-financing.

- The project completed the planned activities and met or exceeded the expected outcomes in terms of achievement of Global Environmental and Development Objectives according to schedule, and as cost-effectively as initially planned.
- The project used either a benchmark approach or a comparison approach (did not exceed the costs levels of similar projects in similar contexts)

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? Wherever possible the evaluator should also compare the cost-time vs. outcomes relationship of the project with that of other similar projects.

The evaluation of relevancy, effectiveness and efficiency will be as objective as possible and will include sufficient and convincing empirical evidence. Ideally the project monitoring system should deliver quantifiable information that can lead to a robust assessment of project's effectiveness and efficiency. Since projects have different objectives assessed results are not comparable and cannot be aggregated. To track the health of the portfolio project outcomes will be rated as follows:

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.

Relevance and effectiveness will be considered as critical criteria. The overall outcome rating of the project 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.

The evaluators will also assess positive and negative actual (or anticipated) impacts or emerging long term effects of a project. Given the long term nature of impacts, it might not be possible for the evaluators to identify or fully assess impacts. Evaluators will nonetheless indicate the steps taken to assess project impacts, especially impacts on local populations², local environment (e.g. increase in the number of individuals of an endangered species, improved water quality, increase in fish stocks, reduced greenhouse gas emissions) and wherever possible indicate how the findings on impacts will be reported to the GEF in future.

Assessment of Sustainability of project outcomes

² Impacts are positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended. *Glossary of key terms in evaluation and results based management*. OECD, Development Assistance Committee. For the GEF, environmental impacts are the main focus.

The GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy, 2006, specifies that a TE will assess at the minimum the “likelihood of sustainability³ of outcomes at project termination, and provide a rating for this.” The sustainability assessment will give special attention to analysis of the risks that are likely to affect the persistence of project outcomes. The sustainability assessment should also explain how other important contextual factors that are not outcomes of the project will affect sustainability. Following four dimensions or aspects of sustainability will be addressed:

- **Financial resources:** Are there any financial risks involved in sustaining the 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)?
- **Sociopolitical:** Are there any social or political risks that can undermine the longevity of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits 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:** Do the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes pose any threat to the continuation of project benefits? While assessing on this parameter also consider if the required systems for accountability and transparency, and the required technical know-how is 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 neutralizing the biodiversity related gains made by the project.

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.

All the risk dimensions of sustainability are 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 either 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.

Project monitoring and evaluation system will be rated as follows on each of the dimensions:

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

³ Sustainability will be understood as the likelihood of continued benefits after the GEF project ends.

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