## UNDP-GEF TE Report Audit Trail

**To the comments received in February 2016 from the Terminal Evaluation of the project titled, Mainstreaming Agro-Biodiversity Conservation into the Farming Systems of Ethiopia  (UNDP Project ID-*PIMS #2913)***

*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** | **#/Date** | **Para No./ comment location** | **Comment/Feedback on the draft TE report** | **TE Team’s**  **response and actions taken** |
| Stephanie Ullrich, UNDP-GEF Evaluation Consultant (SU) | #1, Feb 18th 2016 | Executive summary, Pg. iv | The rating definition for moderately satisfactory (for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution) is missing in the rating scale table in the executive summary on pg iv. | Amended |
| SU | 2 | Executive summary | The executive summary should obviously be completed in the final draft. |  |
| SU | 3 | Section 1.1, Pg. 1, Purpose | The description of the purpose of the evaluation (pg. 1) should be expanded to include why the evaluation was needed at that point in time, the stakeholders who needed the information and the scope and nature of information expected from the evaluation. | Amended |
| SU | 4 | Section 1.1, Pg. 1, Purpose | The key objectives of the evaluation should be clearly outlined in relation to the purpose of the evaluation. | Added |
| SU | 5 | Section 1.2, Scope and Methodology | The evaluation criteria used in the TE (e.g relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability, impact) should be identified and explained. For definitions, the evaluators can refer to the [UNDP-GEF TE Guidance](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/UNDP-GEF-TE-Guide.pdf). The TE evaluation timing (in terms of when the project’s planned/actual closing date is/was) should also be mentioned. | Amended and explained |
| SU | 6 | Section 1.2, Scope and Methodology | The data collection tools (i.e. surveys, interview guides and protocols) - if any - and how they were designed should be described. | Added |
| SU | 7 | Annex 6, Evaluation Question Matrix | Because Annex 6 (the Evaluation Question Matrix) was not filled out, I was unable to tell if there were any guiding evaluation questions and if this evaluation approach was defensible. I also could not assess if human rights and gender perspectives integrated into the evaluation methodology and questions. | Annex 6 has been completed |
| SU | 8 | Section 1.2, Scope and Methodology | The principles for ensuring the quality and integrity of the evaluation should also be described (e.g. was there a triangulation process? How was the confidentiality of the interviewees maintained?) | Added |
| SU | 9 | Section 1.2, Scope and Methodology | Any other limitations of the evaluation (e.g. the relatively short in-country mission, language barriers) should be described. | Amended |
| SU | 10 | Throughout | The report should additionally present the geographical coverage of the subject of evaluation, with maps, for example. | A map was added and chapter 2.3 was amended |
| SU | 11 | Section 1.2, Scope and Methodology/ Annex 2 Detailed Methodology | In the methodology section (or in the Annex 2 Detailed Methodology), the rational/criteria (i.e. sampling approach) for the selection of persons interviewed, sites visited, and other data reviewed should be described. Additionally, the nature of stakeholder involvement in conducting the evaluation should be described beyond just the inclusion of the annexed list of people interviewed. Furthermore, the evaluation approach should clearly explain how it yielded answers to the evaluation question and how it achieves the evaluation purposes and objectives. | Selection procedures for evaluation tools and data credibility process added and described. |
| SU | 12 | Section 3.1.7, Linkages between project… | Section 3.1.7 should expand on the programme partnerships and implications for programme outcome. | There is no more detailed info expand further ; the partnerships are mentioned (2nd para) and the implications (rationale in 3rd & 4th para) |
| SU | 13 | List of Abbreviations, pg. v | The consultants should ensure that all acronyms are expanded in the report at first use, as well as included in the acronym list. This TE should be a stand-alone document that doesn't extensively reference other documents. | Done for all acronyms (!) |
| SU | 14 | Section 3.2.5, Monitoring and Evaluation: design at entry and implementation | Section 3.2.5 should also include a discussion on GEF-required M&E components (e.g. the GEF Focal Area tracking tools [TTs], the Project Implementation Reviews [PIRs], the Midterm Review [MTR].) There is not enough evidence here to support these ratings. | No info on the GEF tracking tool (?); additional para were drafted for PIR and MTR |
| SU | 15 | 3.2.6, Implementation and Execution | The ratings for implementation and execution in section 3.2.6 should be substantiated with more evidence. | We provided an example for nearly each statement |
| SU | 16 | Section 3.3, Project Results | The way the project results are presented in section 3.3 makes it very difficult to ascertain what the progress was against the project's targets. Without the end-of-project benchmarks, it is hard to judge if these activities were planned and successfully executed, or if any there were any variances between planned and actual results obtained. | Summary Annex prepared and added |
| SU | 17 | Section 3.3.3, Effectiveness and Efficiency | Effectiveness and Efficiency are grouped and analyzed together in the report, and without criteria definitions, it's not clear how the two separate criteria have been differently interpreted by the evaluator. While effectiveness and efficiency are certainly related, I suggest the evaluator separates the two analyses in order to justify the separate ratings given for each criteria. Despite them being grouped together in the ToR, the TE Guidance states that the two evaluation criteria are different and should be assessed separately. | The chapter has been rewritten with additional info on effectiveness |
| SU | 18 | Section 3.3.5, Mainstreaming | In section 3.3.5, the mainstreaming discussion is only limited to gender mainstreaming. The evaluators should also analyze the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation,  improved governance, health improvements, and the prevention and recovery from natural disasters. | Already addressed partly in the first para of 3.3.5; more info was added. |
| SU | 19 | Section 3.2.3 , Adaptive management | The TE report should also briefly outline the MTR recommendations and how these individual recommendations were or were not addressed in the time since the MTR. | Additional specific para added in 3.2.3 |
| SU | 20 | Section 3.3.6, Elements of Sustainability | The report includes a lesson about exit strategy (pg. 39), but neglects to comment on whether this project actually developed an exit strategy/sustainability plan and if they took into consideration the risks to sustainability. | This is now mentioned in 3.3.6.3 |
| SU | 21 | Section 4.2, Recommendations and lessons/ Executive Summary | Recommendations should be numbered. | Done |
| SU | 22 | Annexes | The seven annexes of the ToR don't also need to be included in the TE report. In addition to the annexes included, the consultants should also include the following annexes:   * Summary of field visits * (Completed) Evaluation Question Matrix * Questionnaire used (if applicable) and brief summary of results * (Signed) Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form * Report Clearance Form (to be signed by the RTA and CO once the final report is approved) * *Annexed in a separate file:* TE audit trail * *Annexed in a separate file:* Terminal GEF Tracking Tools | 7 annexes have been removed  Added  Added  Added |
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