

TERMINAL EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

MAINSTREAMING SUSTAINABLE LAND MANAGEMENT IN AGRO-PASTORAL PRODUCTION SYSTEMS OF KENYA PROJECT

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the *Mainstreaming Sustainable Land Management in Agro-pastoral Production Systems of Kenya Project* (PIMS # 3245.)

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

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	Mainstreaming Sustainable Land Management in Agro-pastoral Production Systems of Kenya			
GEF Project ID:	3370		<u>at endorsement</u> <u>(Million US\$)</u>	<u>at completion</u> <u>(Million US\$)</u>
UNDP Project ID:	00075856	GEF financing:	USD 3,034,734	USD 3,034,734
Country:	Kenya	UNDP	USD 1,000,000	USD 679,469.3
Region:	Africa	Government:	USD 3,660,000	USD 2,816,863
Focal Area:	Land Degradation	Other:	USD 4,000,000	Parallel initiatives supportive of SLM
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):		Total co-financing:	USD 7,660,000	
Executing Agency:	State Dept. of Livestock	Total Project Cost:	USD 11,690,734	
Other Partners involved:	KARLO UON	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		18 th Jan 2011
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: 31 st Dec 2015	Actual: 30 June 2016

OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The project was designed to ensure sustainable land management improves economic development, food security and sustainable livelihoods while restoring the ecological integrity of arid and semi-arid lands. The main objective of the project is to provide land users and managers with the financial incentives, enabling policy and institutional capacity for effective adoption of SLM in the four districts of Mbeere North, Kyuso, Narok North and Dadaab. The project objective was to be achieved through three key outcomes: Outcome 1: Knowledge based land use planning forms the basis for improving drylands sustainable economic development; Outcome 2: Viability of the agro-pastoralism production system increased through diversification and access to finance for SLM; Outcome 3: Policy

and institutional framework supportive of SLM mainstreaming in agro pastoral production systems and ASALs; Outcome 4: Project managed effectively, lessons used to upscale SLM in the ASAL districts and the country.

The evaluation will cover all activities supported by UNDP/GEF and, where appropriate, activities supported by the host institution, State Department of Livestock. It will also cover activities that other collaborating partners are supporting as part of the co-finance to the project.

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 ([fill in Annex C](#)). The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Mbeere North, Kyuso, Narok North and Dadaab. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: State Department of Livestock, University of Nairobi, Kenya Agriculture, Livestock Research Organization (KARLO), GEF/SGP, KAPSLM and Suswatch.

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

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

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 report.

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

MAINSTREAMING

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

IMPACT

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

CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

² 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](#)

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions, recommendations** and **lessons**. Conclusions should build on findings and be based on evidence. Recommendations should be prioritized, specific, relevant, and targeted, with suggested implementers of the recommendations. Lessons should have wider applicability to other initiatives across the region, the area of intervention, and for the future.

IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Kenya. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluator 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 Evaluator to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the evaluation will be 35 working days (weekends excluded) according to the following plan: Start date is 4th July. 2016

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation	3 days	6 th July
Evaluation Mission	15 days	27 th July
Draft Evaluation Report	10 days	10 th Aug.
Final Report	5 days	17 th Aug.

EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluation consultant is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
Inception Report	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission (Due date: 11 th July)	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
Presentation	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission (Due date: 27 th July)	To project management, UNDP CO
Draft Final Report	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission (Due date: 10 th Aug.	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs
Final Report*	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft (Due date: 17 th Aug.	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.

TEAM COMPOSITION

The evaluation will be conducted by one (1) International evaluator with a 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 Team members must present the following qualifications:

- Minimum 10 years of relevant professional experience (25%)
- Knowledge of UNDP and GEF (15%)
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies; (20%)
- Technical knowledge in the Land Degradation focal area (25%)
- Experience of working in Africa is desirable (15%)

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

%	Milestone
10%	Following submission of inception report
40%	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 (date). 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 Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators
Goal	"Sustainable Land Management" provides the basis for economic development, food security and sustainable livelihoods while restoring the ecological integrity of the Arid and Semi-Arid Lands in 4 Districts of Kenya (Mbeere, Narok North, Kyuso, Garissa)

STRATEGIC RESULTS FRAMEWORK, SRF (FORMERLY GEF LOGICAL FRAMEWORK) ANALYSIS

Objective: To provide land users and managers with the enabling policy, institutional and capacity environment for effective adoption of SLM in the agropastoral production system.	Improvement in rangeland condition	Various statistics report that about 80% of rangelands badly degraded	At least 25% of the rangeland registering improvement in rangeland condition in pilot districts (using range condition measurements) by mid-term and 50% cumulative by end of the project	Baseline report augmented by rangeland condition sampling under the M&E system Project reports	Prolonged drought Increased encroachment by agriculture
	Improvement in woodlands condition	Various statistics report that about 70% of the woodlands are degraded	At least 25% of woodlands showing recovery as measured by regeneration and improvements in species index and canopy cover;	Baseline report augmented by ecological sampling under the M&E system linked; Project reports	Prolonged drought Increased encroachment by agriculture
	Quantity of land managed using SLM principles	Limited land under SLM, no clear documentation on what little is under SLM	At least 70,000 ha total (28 sites*2500 ha) under SLM principles supported by experiential learning	Baseline report augmented by ecological sampling under the M&E system linked; Project reports	Conflict driven by politics
	Improvement in food security	Various statistics indicate that over 65% of people in ASAL depend in part on food aid and	Level of dependency on food aid in target landscapes reduced by at least 30%;	Socio-economic baselines and consequent sample assessments and project reports	Prolonged droughts, conflicts driven by political considerations and developments

		face substantive food insecurity	Number of food secure days increased by at least 40% for more than 50% of the population in the target landscapes		
	Carbon mitigated from sustainable charcoaling	Currently no sustainable charcoaling – no carbon mitigated from it	At least half a million tons of carbon dioxide mitigated from sustainable charcoal in the districts by mid-term and a million cumulative at the end of the project	Reports of the charcoal associations on extent of adoption of sustainable charcoal augmented by records of carbon credits ready for sale and/or sold	Voluntary markets dry up due to the global financial crises. This would reduce the incentive for sustainable charcoal; Prolonged drought interferes with establishment and growth of woodlots
Outcome 1: Knowledge based land use planning forms the basis for improving drylands sustainable economic development	Percentage of land and resource users adopting improved practices	Less than 20% engaging in 1-2 improved practices consistently	At least 25% of cultivators in the pilot landscapes adopting 3-5 forms of improved practices by mid-term and 75% cumulatively by project end	Sampling captured in project monitoring reports	Prolonged drought Current levels of political willingness and support for SLM by government and resource users declines
	Change in soil fertility	Very low and declining, exact levels for pilot districts obtained during inception	At least 30% increase in soil fertility from baselines for land users consistently engaging in 3-5 improved practices by mid-term and by 30% cumulatively by end of the project	Sampling captured in project monitoring reports	Prolonged drought Current levels of political willingness and support for SLM by government and resource users declines
	Use of weather data for adapting SLM practices	Less than 5% use of weather information provided by the early warning systems of Kenya Met and Dept of resource mapping and planning	At least 25% of the agriculturalists and pastoralists in the pilot landscapes taking decisions on the basis of the weather and drought early warning information by mid-term and 50% cumulatively by project end	Sampling captured in project monitoring reports	Weather information from Met department continues to be largely inaccurate thereby reducing credibility
	Number of people with	Less than 15% of land users and pastoralists	At least 40% of land users and 30% of technical officers requiring to	Project training reports as part M&E reports	Current levels of political willingness and support for SLM

	relevant skills for SLM	have skills for improved management; less than 50% of technical officers have updated SLM skills	up-date skills have done so by mid-term: by the end of project, at least 60% of land users and 75% of technical officers cumulatively have updated skills.		by government and resource users declines
	Lessons generated	Limited knowledge management happening now, no clear mechanism for generating and sharing lessons	Lessons on improving land and resource tenure, range rehabilitation, sustainable charcoaling, improving livestock mobility, and other important project initiatives available for dissemination through the upscaling project;	Project M&E and technical reports	Project implementation is effective and generates lessons worth sharing

Viability of the agropastoralism production system increased through diversification increased access to finance for SLM	Change in agricultural productivity	Current low and declining, exact levels of selected crops to be obtained during inception	At least 20% increase in agricultural produce for key crops for those adopting 3-5 improved practices consistently by mid-term and 50% cumulative by project end	Project monitoring reports	Unusual weather event such as prolonged drought or El Nino Current levels of political willingness and support for SLM by government and resource users declines
	Increase in livestock trade and prices	Currently livestock trading riddled with problems of insecurity, lack of up to date information on prices and therefore very low prices being obtained	At least a 20% increase in livestock prices being obtained in markets within the pilot landscapes due to better marketing/trading conditions	Household economic activity data captured in project monitoring reports	Conflicts of a political nature flares up; inflation rising higher than increase in trade; national consumption patterns change, affecting demand for meat
	Number of households or individuals accessing micro finance and credits	Less than 10% of households have access	At least 25% increase in numbers accessing micro-finance and credits	Household economic activity data captured in project monitoring reports	Finance institutions are convinced to invest in the rural economy

	Increase in household income	Over 85% of people live below the UN poverty line, living on less than a dollar a day; exact household incomes in the pilot landscape will be established during inception	By mid project - at least 25% increase in household incomes for more than 40% of participating households, cumulatively rising to at least 40% for more than 50% of households	Household economic activity data captured in project monitoring reports	Finance institutions are convinced to invest in the rural economy; Inflation rates don't rise higher than increase in incomes; Political instability doesn't resurface
	Mobile livestock	The current trend is tilted to fast rates of sedentization; specific baseline will be obtained during inception	At least 50% of current mobile pastoralists still retain livestock mobility by the end of the project	Project monitoring reports	Current hostility based on misunderstanding of role of mobility persists; land division reduces possibility for movement further
	Incidents of conflicts over resources (inter and intra pastoralists and agriculturalists)	Very high number of incidents of conflicts, specific baseline will be obtained during inception	At least 10% reduction in incidents of conflicts over land and resources in the pilot districts and a cumulative 50% reduction by project end	Project monitoring reports	Current hostility based on misunderstanding of role of mobility persists Resurgence of politically instigated conflicts
The policy, regulatory and institutional environment support sustainable land management in the agropastoral production system and ASALS	Number of policies mainstreaming SLM	All policy statements mention importance of SLM but don't have details of how SLM will be ensured	At least 2 policies revised to mainstream SLM principles and so provide a better policy environment for SLM;	Policy discussion papers and briefs; project monitoring reports	Policy processes tend to be slow in developing countries. Speeding up the process, especially of formulating legislative frameworks will be necessary for achievement of this indicator
	Number of policies with legislation and institutional arrangement for effective implementation	Few SLM policies have updated and effective frameworks well linked into the local institutions	Discussions for legislation and institutional arrangement for policy implementation for at least 2 key policies held by mid-term and recommendations provided adopted by end of the project	Policy discussion papers and briefs; project monitoring reports	Policy processes tend to be slow in developing countries. Speeding up the process, especially of formulating legislative frameworks will be necessary for achievement of this indicator
	Number of functional charcoal associations	No charcoal associations	At least 5 charcoal associations have rules and regulations for sustainable charcoal and are actively enforcing them;	Charcoal production data captured in project reports	Current willingness and support by government and people to clean up charcoaling processes declines

					Current levels of rent seeking from charcoal persists
Number of groups with operational sustainable charcoal processes	No groups engaging in sustainable charcoal	At least 5 groups with sustainable charcoal production operations and earning money from carbon finance;	Charcoal production data captured in project reports		Voluntary carbon markets recover from current slump occasioned by the global financial melt down
Revenue from charcoal going to District and national revenue	Minimal collection through licensing but none through taxation	Collection of revenue by Districts and Kenya Revenue Authority from charcoal processes increase by 25% by mid-term and 50% cumulatively by end of the project;	Budgets Project monitoring reports		Current levels of rent seeking could divert revenue collection if not changed Slow policy change processes might delay the legislation that allows taxation to start
Adoption of improved kilns in carbonization	Less than 5% use improved kilns in carbonization	Number of charcoal producers using improved kiln in carbonization in pilot landscapes increase by at least 30% by mid-term and a cumulative 50% by project end	Charcoal production data captured in project reports		Current willingness and support by government and people to clean up charcoaling processes declines
Improvement in local resource governance institutions	Currently traditional institutions sidelined in natural resource management but formal institutions not effective at local level	By mid project, traditional resource institutions in pilot landscapes have assessed the effectiveness of their rules and regulations in modern day resource governance and have identified ways to improve; by end of project several agreements entered into with formal institutions for resource governance	Project reports based on project monitoring		Current political support for SLM persists; local institutions can be revived for resource governance under modern conditions

Annex B: List of Documents to be reviewed by the evaluators

Project Documents

1. GEF Project Information Form (PIF)
2. Project Document and Log Frame Analysis
3. Project Implementation Plan
4. Implementing/Executing Partner arrangements
5. List and contact of details of project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Boards, and other partners to be consulted
6. Project sites, highlighting suggested visits
7. Mid Term Review and other relevant evaluations and assessment
8. Annual; Project Implementation Report (APR)
9. Project budget, broken out by outcomes and outputs
10. Project Tracking Tool, [at baseline, at mid-term, at terminal points](#)
11. Financial data
12. Sample of project communications materials, i.e. press releases, brochures, documentaries etc.

UNDP Documents

1. Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF)
2. Country Programme Document (CPD)
3. UNDP Strategic Plan

GEF Documents

1. GEF focal area strategic program objectives

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 5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings 4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS) 3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings 2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems 1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems</p>	<p>Sustainability ratings:</p> <p>4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks</p>	<p>Relevance ratings</p> <p>2. Relevant (R) 1.. Not relevant (NR)</p> <p>Impact Ratings: 3. Significant (S) 2. Minimal (M) 1. Negligible (N)</p>
<p><i>Additional ratings where relevant:</i> Not Applicable (N/A) Unable to Assess (U/A)</p>		

ANNEX E: EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT AND AGREEMENT FORM

Evaluators:

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

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form³

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: _____

³www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE⁴

- 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 Manual⁵)
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 rated⁶)
- 3.1 Project Design / Formulation
 - Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)
 - Assumptions and Risks
 - Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design
 - Planned stakeholder participation
 - Replication approach
 - UNDP comparative advantage
 - Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
 - Management arrangements
- 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)

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

⁵ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

⁶ 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.

- 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
- Annexed in a separate file: TE audit trail
- Annexed in a separate file: Terminal GEF Tracking Tool

Deleted:

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: _____

UNDP-GEF TE REPORT AUDIT TRAIL TEMPLATE

Note: The following is a template for the TE Team to show how the received comments on the draft TE report have (or have not) been incorporated into the final TE report. This audit trail should be included as an annex in the final TE report.

To the comments received on *(date)* from the Terminal Evaluation of *(project name)* (UNDP Project ID-*PIMS #*)

The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft Terminal Evaluation report; they are referenced by institution ("Author" column) and track change comment number ("#" column):

Author	#	Para No./ comment location	Comment/Feedback on the draft TE report	TE team response and actions taken

