

TERMINAL EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP supported GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the Namibia Protected Landscape Conservation Areas (NAMPLACE) Project, (PIMS 4173). The essentials of the project to be evaluated are as follows:

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:		Namibia Protected Landscape Conservation Areas (NAMPLACE)		
GEF Project ID:	00059705		<i>at endorsement (Million US\$)</i>	<i>at completion (Million US\$)</i>
UNDP Project ID:	00074796	GEF financing:	4,500,000	4,500,000
Country:	Namibia	IA/EA own:	100,000	100,000
Region:	Africa	Government:	14,000,000	14,000,000
Focal Area:	Biodiversity	Other (Private sector, UNDP, Bilateral Aid Agencies):	17,883,000	17,983,000
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	GEF Strategic Program 3: Strengthening Terrestrial Protected Areas; GEF Strategic Priority 1: Strengthening National Protected Area Systems.	Total co-financing:	31,983,000	31,983,000
Executing Agency:	Ministry of Environment and Tourism	Total Project Cost:	36,483,000	36,483,000
Other Partners involved:	Gondwana Collection Namib Rand Nature Reserve Farm Dustenbruck Wilderness Safaris.	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		3 February 2011
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: December 2015	Actual: June 2016

The proposed project is designed to lift the barriers to establishment of a large scale network of protected landscapes and in doing so address threats to habitat and species loss on a landscape level approach, ensuring greater responsiveness to variability and seasonality issues around climate change. The project will directly bring an additional 15,550 ha of land under PA collaborative management arrangements designed to conserve biodiversity, including unprotected lands by establishing the five Protected Landscape Conservation Areas (PLCA).

The objective of the project is to ensure that ***Protected Landscape Conservation Areas are established and ensure that land uses in areas adjacent to existing Protected Areas are compatible with biodiversity conservation objectives, and corridors are established to sustain the viability of wildlife populations.***

OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

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

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

EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

An overall approach and method¹ 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 (*in Annex C*). The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct field missions to **at least 3 of the five LCAs**. The 5 landscapes are Mudumu Landscape (northeast Namibia), Greater Waterberg Landscape (central east Namibia), Greater Sossusvlei-Namib Landscape (southwest Namibia), Greater Fish River Landscape (southern Namibia) and the Windhoek Greenbelt Landscape (central Namibia).

Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum;

- Ministry of Environment and Tourism: Directorate of Parks and Wildlife Management (DPWM), Directorate of Environmental Affairs (DEA), Directorate of Tourism (DoT), Directorate of Scientific Services,
- Gondwana Collection (Private Sector),
- Namib Rand Nature Reserve (Private Sector),
- Conservancy members from Mudumu and the Greater Waterberg Landscapes,
- Local farmers (Private Sector) who are part of the landscapes in Windhoek Greenbelt and Greater Waterberg Landscapes,
- Local Authorities,
- Civil Society (NGOs and CBOs),

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

- UNDP staff

Stakeholder	Role in the project
Ministry of Environment and Tourism(MET)	MET is considered the key institution in the NAMPLACE project at various levels, potentially including the National Implementing Partner (NIP). DPWM is the directorate tasked with the conservation mandate within the state protected areas as well as management of the national Community Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM). DEA is responsible for the preparation and implementation of the Environmental Management Act (EMA), a land mark piece environmental legislation for Namibia. DEA is also the host for several GEF Projects and provides technical support to the implementation of NAMPLACE.
Local Authorities	Traditional Authorities (TAs) play an important role in societies and are useful in the development of the PLCAs as they can effectively supervise and ensure the observance of the customary laws of that community by its members, such as uphold, protect and preserve the culture, tradition values and language; administer and allocate land.
Communal conservancies	Several communal and commercial conservancies have been part of the consultations for the preparation of the NAM-PLACE project, and numerous conservancies have expressed a keen interest in becoming partners in PLCAs in their area. Conservancies or other local community associations concerned with conservation efforts are an integral part of the PLCA concept, which aims to broaden the formal national PA network by establishing collaborative management arrangements with neighbouring conservancies and private conservation investments, and through such collaboration leverage synergistic economic and conservation effects. Consequently the below identified conservancies are key partners on the local implementation level of NAM-PLACE.
Civil Society (NGOs and CBOs)	Several NGO's are active in the conservation arena, although few dedicate resources directly to State PAs. The Namibia Nature Foundation (NNF) has a number of projects and activities which support PA management and biodiversity conservation across the PAs and surrounding landscapes. Others include the Integrated Rural Development and Nature Conservation group (IRDNC), World Wildlife Fund (WWF-US), The Cheetah Conservation Fund (CCF) amongst others.
Municipal Authorities	In Namibia Local Authorities (Municipalities) are independent and must generate their own budgets. Currently within the proposed boundaries of the five pilot PLCAs of NAM-PLACE, only one municipality namely Windhoek the capital of Namibia is

	implicated as a project partner.
Private Sector	A great number of private sector investors representing individual famers, private conservation enterprises, tourism operators etc. have already been involved in the consultations during the NAM-PLACE consultations and they are considered key partners in a national PLCA approach and in the project implementation. During the consultations, representatives of The Gondwana Collection ² , the Namib Rand ³ , and Wilderness Safaris ⁴ were amongst private sector businesses that participated in discussions on NAM-PLACE, amongst others.
Protected Landscape Stakeholders.	The social sustainability of activities and outputs is addressed through the execution of a stakeholder capacity analysis and the elaboration of a detailed collaborative management involvement strategy and plan which identifies stakeholders' interests, desired levels of involvement, capacities for participation (at different levels) and potential conflicts and, responsive mitigation measures.
UNDP CO	The UNDP Namibia country office is the implementing agency for the project and responsible for the overall implementation, eligible use of project resources and monitoring and evaluation to report on progress. UNDP also advises on adaptive management, collaborations/ partnerships and, procurement.

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:

² <http://www.gondwana-desert-collection.com/>

³ www.namibrand.com

⁴ <http://www.wilderness-safaris.com/>

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 / CO-FINANCE

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

Co-financing (type/source)	UNDP own financing (mill. US\$)		Government (mill. US\$)		Partner Agency (Private Sector) (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 has achieved 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.⁵

CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

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

IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

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

EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the evaluation will be 28 days according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation	5 days	5 June 2016
Evaluation Mission	14 days	20 Jun 2016
Draft Evaluation Report	6 days	28 Jun 2016
Final Report	3 days	1 July 2016

EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
Inception Report	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method	Not later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission.	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
Presentation	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission	To project management, UNDP CO
Draft Final Report	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 2 weeks of the evaluation mission	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs
Final Report*	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC.

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

⁵ 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](#)

TEAM COMPOSITION

The evaluation will be carried out by 1 independent international consultant. The consultant shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The evaluator selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The consultant must present the following qualifications/ credentials:

- At least a Master degree in environment, development studies, evaluation theory or a related field;
- Minimum of five (5) years directly relevant work experience (e.g. conducting project/ programme evaluations) in the environment/ development sector;
- Knowledge of doing evaluations for the UNDP and GEF is an advantage;
- Competencies in result-based management, applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios, including adaptive management are essential;
- Demonstrable analytical skills;
- Excellent English communication skills.
- Possessing excellent interpersonal skills and the ability to engage and motivate a wide range of stakeholders
- Experience working in sub Saharan African region.

EVALUATOR ETHICS

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

PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

(this payment schedule is indicative, to be filled in by the CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on their standard procurement procedures)

%	Milestone
20%	At contract signing
30%	Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report
50%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report

APPLICATION PROCESS

Applicants are requested to apply online (<http://jobs.undp.org>) by 6 Jun 2015. Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions. The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in English with indication of the e-mail and phone contact. Shortlisted candidates will be requested to submit a price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs).

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

Annex A: Project Logical Framework

Project Components	Indicator	Baseline	Target by EOP	Sources of Verification	Assumptions
Objective: Landscape Conservation Areas (LCAs) are established and ensure that land uses in areas adjacent to existing Protected Areas are compatible with biodiversity conservation objectives, and corridors are established to sustain the viability of wildlife populations (GEF 4.5 mill USD)	Changes in the movement patterns of animals in relation to corridors created	Existing research on wildlife movement of selected species in Mudumu and Greater Fish River Canyon landscapes	Changes in the movement patterns of animals in relation to corridors created	Research based evidence of wildlife movement between protected areas and adjacent land	There is limited evidence of wildlife movement between protected areas and adjacent land
	5 LCAs are established to improve biodiversity conservation at landscape level.; an additional 15,550 km ² brought under collaborative management with protected areas	4 existing landscape conservation partnerships in place in ML.	5 LCAs established by year 5 with at 15,550 km ² additional land brought under collaborative management with protected areas, being ML (1,469), GWL (7,500), GSNL (173), GFRCL (5,750), WGB (658)	Partnership agreements, monitoring and evaluation of related activities.	All stakeholders remain interested in the landscape concept during the lifespan of the project and support the establishment of partnerships.
	METT scores are improved in protected areas and at landscape level	Landscape management remains uncoordinated and biodiversity is lost over time. Current METT scores as follows: ML (71) GWL (69), GSNL (37), GFRCL (46), WGB (30): average: 51	METT scores are improved in protected areas and at landscape level	Fauna and Flora Monitoring procedures, Biodiversity resources assessments, Ministry and landscape level Reports, and Project Docs, Landscape plans,	Government and landscape partners are effectively supported in training and management to ensure ongoing support and engagement in the process

Project Components	Indicator	Baseline	Target by EOP	Sources of Verification	Assumptions
				maps and GIS files, MTE and Terminal Evaluation (TE)	
	Framework in place for collaborative management among stakeholders within landscapes	Draft MET Protected Area management planning policy guideline in place	Framework for collaborative management among stakeholders within landscapes / targeted 5 LCAs in place by year 5.	Copy of the framework including minutes of consultative meetings.	Stakeholders participate freely in providing best practices and lessons learned to develop a framework.
Component 1: Establish new Landscape Conservation Areas (LCAs)	National level best practice guidelines in place for the establishment of LCAs	Draft MET Protected Area management planning policy guideline in place	National level best practices guidelines for the establishment of new LCAs in place by April 2015	Copy of the guidelines document including minutes of consultative meetings	Stakeholders participate freely in providing best practices and lessons learned to develop national guidelines
	Constitutions in place for 5 landscapes	Constitutions in place for conservancies and drafts for GWC, GSNC and GFRCC.	5 LCAs with constitutions in place for 5 landscapes	5 partnership agreements	All stakeholders continue to participate in the existing partnerships during the lifespan of the project. All partners are willing to formalize the existing partnerships and to have constitutions in place.

Project Components	Indicator	Baseline	Target by EOP	Sources of Verification	Assumptions
(GEF 0.674 million USD)	Standards and codes of practice developed for each LCA National level best practice codes of practice in place	Biodiversity threats defined for all LCAs - Land use zoning maps suggesting suitable land uses at conservancy, park	Standards and codes of practice developed for each LCA by Dec 2015 National level best practice codes of practice in place by Dec 2015	Copy of National level best practice codes document including minutes of consultative meetings	Stakeholders participate freely in providing best practices and lessons learned to develop national guidelines
	Infrastructure based on approved recommended priorities, are in place for 5 LCAs.	Mudumu, fire management equipment, water points; GWC - guard posts, boundary fences, fire management equipment, water points; WGB - park and farm fences, water points, guard post at DVJ; GSNC - fences, water points, guard post; GFRCC - fences, water points, guard posts, solid waste management and Radio communication at /Ai-/Ais	Infrastructure is in place for all LCAs based on assessment by December 2015	Inventories of goods and services procured and the actual goods installed.	Infrastructure enhances biodiversity conservation at the landscape level.

Project Components	Indicator	Baseline	Target by EOP	Sources of Verification	Assumptions
Component 2: Collaborative Governance for LCAs	Key short, medium and long-term development issues identified and disseminated; Strategic Management plans, based on the key issues for each area, in place for 5 LCAs defining management objectives, standards, rules and procedures for CLA functions.	Management and development plans for parks (AHGP, NNP, BMM and Waterberg) - Draft Protected Areas and Wildlife Management Bill (PAWMB) and Regulations - Draft PA Management planning policy guideline in place	Strategic Management plans for each LCA in place by December 2015	Copy of each strategic plan per landscape.	Planning process is supported by landscape stakeholders and they participate fully.
	Management and development plans in place for interested LCA partner (e.g. conservancy, private farm, PA).	- Environmental Management Act, Draft Regulations and guidelines in place to guide development planning - National CBNRM Framework in place - Parks and Neighbours (draft) and Concessions policies in place	Management and development plans are in place for interested LCA partner by year 5.	Copy of each partner's management and development.	Planning process is supported by landscape stakeholders and they participate fully.

Project Components	Indicator	Baseline	Target by EOP	Sources of Verification	Assumptions
(GEF 2.77 million USD)	Partnership roles and responsibilities defined and agreed and "Partnership Committees" in place for each LCA.	Management committees in place at conservancy and complex level and Park Wardens appointed by MET - Roles and responsibilities of Management committees defined in Management and development plans and in the job descriptions of Park Wardens	Partnership Committee for each LCA in place by year 5.	Minutes of committee nomination and election meeting showing names and roles of each committee member per landscape.	Stakeholders support the process and participate as equals during consultations and meetings.
Component 3: Incentives and market transformation	Key development issues defined for the SEA (drawing earlier consultation work); SEA in place with recommendations for tourism development in each LCA.	SEA in place for Hardap region's coastal zone which includes the Namib-Naukluft NP; - Tourism development plan in place for BMM Parks; - Draft Tourism Plan for GFRCC; - National Tourism policy for Namibia; - Tourism addressed under conservancy management plans;	SEA of the tourism sector completed for the 5 LCAs.	SEA Report and minutes of consultative processes.	SEA draws on SEA for Hardap and Karas Regions' coastal zones and the Integrated Regional Land Use Planning (IRLUP) process supported by GTZ.

Project Components	Indicator	Baseline	Target by EOP	Sources of Verification	Assumptions
		Integrated Regional Land Use Plan (IRLUP) for Karas Region			
	Biodiversity monitoring and assessment system developed for each LCA and recommended at national level for integration into a national tourism venture certification system	SPAN Biodiversity indicators (yet to be developed) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - National CBNRM Programme biodiversity indicators published in the State of Conservancy Report (SoCR) - ICEMA biodiversity indicators that would be adopted by MET (for long-term M&E) - NBSAP in place with biodiversity management objectives – national level - Local level monitoring (LLM) systems in place at conservancy level; incident (monitoring) books in place for parks. - CPP integrated sustainable land 	Biodiversity monitoring indicators in place by year 5 for each LCA and across LCAs.	Biodiversity indicators and monitoring system	This process draws on existing indicators developed for Namibia and those proposed by GEF for adequate coverage at regional, national and global levels.

Project Components	Indicator	Baseline	Target by EOP	Sources of Verification	Assumptions
		management indicators and Land Degradation Monitoring System (LDMS) with biodiversity indicators.			
(GEF 0.674 mill USD)	Supply chains developed based on current and potential markets for the diversification of current goods and services and/ or the development of new ones; Supply chains identified for certification; Markets established and mobilised for certified supply chains.	Cheetah-friendly beef initiative that could be used for lessons learnt and best practices - Current biodiversity-friendly off-take/ harvesting practices by private tourism operators/ game farmers (potentially not documented); Research by ICEMA on indigenous natural products.	Supply chains defined and markets explored/ established for new/ diversified goods and services.	Reports on supply chain analysis and definition and potential for marketing and mobilisation.	Stakeholders are willing to provide data freely to ensure adequate analysis and definition of supply chains and exploration of market potential.
MANAGEMENT COSTS 10% (GEF 0.45 mill USD)	Project management in place to allow an engaged and effective process throughout	Nil	Effective project management as demonstrated in PIRs, MTR and TE	Ministry and Departmental Reports, and Project Docs. Landscape plans, maps and GIS files, MTE and Terminal Evaluation (TE) National Reports to CBD.	Management will be effective and support the process throughout

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

1. Project Document
2. Project implementation reports (APR/PIR's)
3. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
4. Audit reports
5. METT Tools; GEF BD Tracking Tool;
6. The Mission Reports and Lessons learnt study
7. M&E Operational Guidelines, all monitoring reports prepared by the project; and
8. Financial and Administration guidelines.
9. MTR report and Management Responses

The following documents will also be available:

10. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
11. Minutes of the Project Steering Committee Meetings
12. Maps
13. The GEF Completion Report guidelines; and
14. UNDP Monitoring and Evaluation Frameworks.

ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

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

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•		•	•
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•

Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?

•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•

ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

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

ANNEX E: EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT AND AGREEMENT FORM

Evaluators:

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

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form⁶

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

Name of Consultant: _____

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____

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

Signed at Place: _____ on Date: _____

Signature: _____

⁶www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE⁷

- i.** Opening page:
 - Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
 - UNDP and GEF project ID#s.
 - Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report
 - Region and countries included in the project
 - GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program
 - Implementing Partner and other project partners
 - Evaluation team members
 - Acknowledgements
- ii.** Executive Summary
 - Project Summary Table
 - Project Description (brief)
 - Evaluation Rating Table
 - Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons
- iii.** Acronyms and Abbreviations
(See: UNDP Editorial Manual⁸)
- 1.** Introduction
 - Purpose of the evaluation
 - Scope & Methodology
 - Structure of the evaluation report
- 2.** Project description and development context
 - Project start and duration
 - Problems that the project sought to address
 - Immediate and development objectives of the project
 - Baseline Indicators established
 - Main stakeholders
 - Expected Results
- 3.** Findings
(In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (*) must be rated⁹)
- 3.1** Project Design / Formulation
 - Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)
 - Assumptions and Risks
 - Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design
 - Planned stakeholder participation
 - Replication approach
 - UNDP comparative advantage

⁷The Report length should not exceed **40** pages in total (not including annexes).

⁸ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

⁹ Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations.

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

ANNEX G: EVALUATION REPORT CLEARANCE FORM

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

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

UNDP GEF RTA

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____