

UNDP/GEF TERMINAL EVALUATION

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Strengthening the Protected Area Network within the Eastern Montane Forest Hotspot of Kenya

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 Strengthening the Protected Area Network of the Eastern Montane Forest Hotspot of Kenya Project (PIMS #4178.)

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

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	Strengthening the Protected Area Network of the Eastern Montane Forest Hotspot of Kenya			
GEF Project ID:	3693		<i>at endorsement (Million US\$)</i>	<i>at completion (Million US\$)</i>
UNDP Project ID:	00072462	GEF financing:	4,500,000	4,500,000
Country:	Kenya	IA/EA own:	1,500,000 (in kind)	
Region:	Africa	Government:	10,470,000 (in kind)	
Focal Area:	Biodiversity	Other:	500,000 (UNDP)	
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):		Total co-financing:	12,470,000	
Executing Agency:	Nature Kenya	Total Project Cost:	16,970,000	
Other Partners involved:	KWS, KFS, KEFRI & MEWNR	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		24/09/2010
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: 31st Dec 2015	Actual:

OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The project was designed to lift the barriers to establishment of a representative and well managed Protected Area (PA) system in the western part of the Eastern Afro Montane Hotspot, specifically constituted for the purpose of biodiversity conservation. The project aimed to increase coverage and strengthen management effectiveness for forests in western and North Rift Kenya. The targeted areas include the Kakamega Forest, North and South Nandi Forests and the Cherangani Hills Forests. The project will directly bring an additional 95,000 ha of land into PA categories designed to conserve biodiversity, including unprotected forest lands and reserve forests being managed for production.

The evaluation will cover all activities supported by UNDP/GEF and, where appropriate, activities supported by the host institution, NATURE KENYA. 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 [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 the Western Montane forests, including the following project sites: Cherengani, Kakamega and South and North Nandi Landscape. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources (MENR), National Museums of Kenya (NMK), National Environment Management Authority (NEMA), Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS), Kenya Forest Service (KFS) and East African Wildlife Society (EAWLS).

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](#).

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

Evaluation Ratings*:			
1. Monitoring and Evaluation	<i>rating</i>	2. IA& EA Execution	<i>rating</i>
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	<i>rating</i>	4. Sustainability	<i>rating</i>
Relevance		Financial resources:	
Effectiveness		Socio-political:	
Efficiency		Institutional framework and governance:	
Overall Project Outcome Rating		Environmental :	
		Overall likelihood of sustainability:	
5. Impact: Significant (S), Minimal (M), Negligible (N)	<i>rating</i>		
Environmental Status Improvement			
Environmental Stress reduction			
Progress towards stress/status change			
OVERALL PROJECT RESULTS			

*Highly satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)

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. In addition, the evaluation will be included in the country office evaluation plan.

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

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 Kenya. 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 Evaluator to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the evaluation will be 30 days according to the following plan: Start date 10th Oct. 2015

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation	3 days	13 th Oct
Evaluation Mission	15days	28 th Oct
Draft Evaluation Report	10 days	8 th Dec
Final Report	2 days	10 th Dec

EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The international 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.	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 3 weeks of the evaluation mission	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs

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](#)

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.

TEAM COMPOSITION

The terminal evaluation will be undertaken by **an international consultant**. The consultant shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The evaluators 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:

- Minimum 10 years of relevant professional experience
- Knowledge of UNDP and GEF
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
- Technical knowledge in the biodiversity focal area
- Experience of working in Africa is desirable

EVALUATOR ETHICS

Evaluation consultant will be held to the highest ethical standards and is 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
20%	At contract signing
40%	Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report
40%	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 RESULTS FRAMEWORK

Project Goal:	<i>The Montane Forest Biodiversity and Ecosystem Values are Conserved and Provide Sustainable Benefit Flows at Local, National and Global Levels.</i>
	Objectively Verifiable Indicators

Project Components	Indicator	Baseline	Target by EOP	Sources of verification	Assumptions
Objective: <i>The biodiversity of the Eastern Montane Forests is adequately represented and managed within Kenya's PA network.</i> (GEF 4.5 mill USD)	65,000 ha of forests gazetted or reclassified to higher status and with improved governance systems and financial scoring allowing for effective management	145,000 ha of forests in Western Kenya focus landscapes under inadequate form of protected area status	65,000 ha of forests in Western Kenya under new or improved PA status; by EOP a marked increase by over in financial scorecards results: total with the 30,000 ha below is 95,000ha under improved management	Gazettment Notices, Ministry and Departmental Reports, and Project Docs. Landscape plans, maps and GIS files, MTE and Terminal Evaluation (TE) National Reports to CBD	The Government of Kenya will continue to support the increase in PA status of the target forest landscapes
	Marked reduction in threats to deforestation and forest degradation as 10,000 ha of forest area put under CCA and 20,000 ha under JFM	Forest cover continues to be depleted by threats as communities living adjacent to and within forests remain isolated from sustainable co management structures	Threats to forests markedly reduced, especially buffers and small patches; a combination of JFM and CCA areas have established up to 30,000 ha of protected areas	Remote sensing data, ground truthing, Project Docs, landscape plans, co management agreements, plans, mid and terminal evaluation	The Government of Kenya will continue to support the reduction of threats and increase in PA status of the target forest landscapes
	Improved systems level operations capacity has ensured a reduced level of threats to forest cover and species composition; Landscapes maintain	Forest management practices continue, leading to stable or ongoing loss to forest cover and species composition and	An increase in METT scores across the four landscapes by over 20% on average; monitoring indicates species diversity either unaffected or increased	Avifauna Monitoring procedures, Biodiversity resources assessments, Ministry and Departmental Reports, and Project Docs. Landscape plans, maps	Government and local 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
	global biodiversity values; METT scores are improved in target landscapes	coverage, measured by declining METT scores		and GIS files, MTE and Terminal Evaluation (TE)	
Component 1: Systemic and Institutional Capacities for Managing an Expanded and Rationalized PA Estate (GEF 1.5 mill USD)	New PAs established: 20,000 ha; threatened forest reserves forests reclassified to higher management category: National Reserve (20,000 ha.)/Nature Reserve(25,000 ha)	PA status in Western Kenya remains under inadequate levels of protection throughout	65,000ha of threatened forests given higher protection status, of which 20,000 are newly protected areas and 45,000 ha under enhanced protected status	Gazettment Notices, Ministry and Departmental Reports, and Project Docs. Landscape plans, maps and GIS files, MTE and Terminal Evaluation (TE) National Reports to CBD	The Government of Kenya will continue to support the increase in PA status of the target forest landscapes
	Governance systems provide for the effective administration of the PA system as part of the regional development agenda by effective mainstreaming into local planning	Forest management practices continue, with threats not contained, owing in large part to a lack of community level engagement in management	>10 Community Conservation Areas established as new PAs >10 Joint Forest Management systems established in the buffer areas	Gazettment Notices, Project Docs, landscape plans, co management agreements, plans, GIS, maps and mid and terminal evaluation reports	Government will continue to support a decentralised policy of forest co management, local level support will continue to develop
	Increase in PA budget of >50 % over baseline of US\$ >5 mill\$ p.a. covers recurrent costs of forest protected area system (PA Financial Score	Kenya's forests remain underfunded leading to habitat encroachment and reduction in species biodiversity	Financial scorecard shows significantly improved results, with PAs receiving sufficient funds to be managed effectively	Financial scorecards, Ministry and Departmental Reports, and Project Docs. Landscape plans, maps and GIS files, MTE and Terminal Evaluation (TE)	Government is willing to prioritise forest management in national budgeting, GEF funds will be utilised effectively alongside co-finance funding
Component 2: Community management of PAs (JFM/CBNRM)	Reduction in forest loss in unprotected forest blocks. CCAs established covering a target area of up to 10,000 ha.	Connectivity between forest protected areas and unprotected forest blocks remains under threat or continues to be lost	CCAs have established an additional area of up to 10,000 ha on formerly unprotected forest blocks	Local and district government plans, CCA management documentation, mid-term and terminal evaluations	Government continues to support establishment of CCAs in policy and practice, local support and engagement is increased

Project Components	Indicator	Baseline	Target by EOP	Sources of verification	Assumptions
(GEF 1 million USD)	Reduction in forest degradation at the forest edge through the creation of JFM buffer zones in Forest PAs (target area up to 20,000 ha)	Forest degradation and deforestation levels maintained at increased as buffer zones continue to be threatened by encroachment activity	Up to 20,000ha of existing forest protected areas have been allocated to JFM	Gazettment notices, local government plans, JFM management documentation, midterm and terminal evaluations	Government continues to support JFM process in policy and practice; incentives for local communities are significant enough to allow acceptance of CCAs approach.
	Cost drivers for PAs are reduced as community acceptance of PAs leads to a reduction of PA incursions	Forest management remains a costly process, with management resources unable to meet the challenges to forest integrity	Cost of managing forest systems reduced as community support adds, rather than depletes, management resources	Financial scorecards, Ministry and Departmental Reports and Budgets	Costs saved in management are not lost elsewhere
	PA management system effectively integrates conservation needs and local livelihoods.	Forests remain under threat due a lack of alternative livelihood options	Business plans define income generation opportunities from sustainable use of forests.	Existence of business plans, community level consultations on business activities pursued and impacts	That local level partners will engage in the business planning and development process
Component 3: Operational Capacities for PA Site Management	Protected Areas are managed to generate effective global and national and local environmental benefits, by agencies with functional capacity (measured by site level Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool).	METT scores remain at status quo levels or decline as operational capacities for PA management do not increase at a sufficient rate	An increase in METT scores across the four landscapes by over 20% on average; monitoring indicates species diversity either unaffected or increased	Avifauna Monitoring procedures, Biodiversity resources assessments, Ministry and Departmental Reports, and Project Docs. Landscape plans, maps and GIS files, MTE and Terminal Evaluation (TE)	Government and local partners are effectively supported in training and management to ensure ongoing support and engagement in the process
	(GEF1 .55 mill USD)	Reduction in forest loss and degradation in forest blocks covering			

Project Components	Indicator	Baseline	Target by EOP	Sources of verification	Assumptions
	an area of 175,000 ha in western Kenya.	estate of Western Kenya			
MANAGEMENT COSTS 10% (GEF 0.45 mill USD)	Project management in place to allow an engaged and effective process throughout	Nil	Effective project management	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

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
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 the international consultant.

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:</p> <p>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)
 - Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management

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.

- 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: _____