**UNDP/GEF TERMINAL EVALUATION**

**TERMS OF REFERENCE International Consultant**

**Promoting Autonomous Adaptation at community level (PAA) Ethiopia**

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 (*full* sized project titled Promoting Autonomous Adaptation at community level (PAA) (PIMs 4107).The essentials of the project to be evaluated are as follows:

Project Summary Table

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Project Title:  |  |
| GEF Project ID: | 2913 |   | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | *at completion (Million US$)* |
| UNDP Project ID: | 00075762 | GEF financing:  | $5,307,885 |  |
| Country: | Ethiopia | IA/EA own: |  |       |
| Region: | Africa | Government: | $ 359,520 |       |
| Focal Area: | climate change Adaptation | Other: | $ 300,000 (UNDP) |       |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): |       | Total co-financing: |  |       |
| Executing Agency: | Ministry of Environment, Forest & Climate Change | Total Project Cost: | $5,967,405 |       |
| Other Partners involved: | NMA, A.A EPA, Wereda & Kebele | ProDoc Signature (date project began):  | 13/01/2011 |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | Proposed:sept 2015 | Actual:31/12/2016 |

Objective and Scope

The **goal** of the project is to support Ethiopia to increase resilience to climate change through both immediate and long-term adaptation measures in development policies, plans, programmes, projects and actions. The project has a total budget of US$ **5,603,761** from which US4 300, 000 is from UNDP and the remaining from the GEF Which will be utilized four **a** period of four years.

The **objective** of this project is to support local communities and administrations at the lowest level of government to design and implement adaptation actions aimed at reducing vulnerability and building resilience, especially in those communities that are particularly vulnerable in Ethiopia. The project plans to build capacity for autonomous adaptation by delivering three integrated outcomes.

The project has three expected outcomes as follows:

Outcome 1 Institutional capacities for coordinated climate-resilient planning and investment strengthened.

Outcome 2 Access to technologies and practices that improve the range and efficiency of adaptation options improved

Outcome 3 Capacity for community-based climate change adaptation improved.

The evaluation will cover all activities supported by UNDP/GEF and, where appropriate, activities supported by the host institution, Ministry of Environment, Forest & Climate change. 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 method[[1]](#footnote-1) 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*](#_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 project sites at Adami Tulu Jido kombolcha woreda of Oromia National Regional State,Asossa woreda of the Benishangul Regional State, Enderta woreda of Tigray Regional state, Gambela woreda of Gambela Regional state Woreda and yeka o1 &Akaki 03 of Addis Ababa city administration.

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](#_TOR_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](#_TOR_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](#_TOR_Annex_D:).

|  |
| --- |
| **Evaluation Ratings:** |
| **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 / 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]](#footnote-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 Ethiopia. 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 30 days according to the following plan: date 1st November . 2015

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Timing | Completion Date |
| **Preparation** | *3* days  | 3rd September , 2016  |
| **Evaluation Mission** | *15*days  | 18th September, 2016 |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | *10* days  | 28th September, 2016 |
| **Final Report** | *2* days  | 30 th September, 2015 |

Evaluation deliverables

The evaluation team 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 |
| **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 evaluation team will be composed of **1 international and 1 national consultant**. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The international consultant is the team leader and will be responsible for finalizing the report. 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 Team members 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 (for the International Consultant).

The **international consultant** will lead the overall Terminal Evaluation Report. He will lead the total evaluation exercise and production of the final terminal Evaluation which will be submitted to UNDP and the GEF. He will be responsible for the overall Terminal Evaluation. She/he will work with the Local consultant, who will arrange meetings both in Addis Ababa and at the site level. Provided translation and other similar services for the successful report production.

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'](http://www.unevaluation.org/ethicalguidelines)

Payment modalities and specifications

| **Instalments of Payment/ Period** | **Deliverables or Documents to be Delivered**  | **Approval should be obtained**  | **Percentage of Payment** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1st instalment  | Up on acceptance of Inception Report | “ | 20% |
| 2nd instalment  | Up on acceptance of Draft Report | “ | 30% |
| 3rd instalment  | Up on acceptance of Final Report | “ | 50% |

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.

Technical proposals will be rated as per the following matrix. A consultant will have to score a minimum of 70% to be considered for the next *step*. Financial evaluation will be conducted for the qualified and responsive technical proposals (i.e 70% and above). Financial Proposal and Technical proposal will constitute 40% and 60% respectively. The responsive and qualified consultant with the highest combined rate will be issued a contract.

 **CRITERIA FOR SELECTING THE BEST OFFER**

Upon the advertisement of the Procurement Notice, qualified Individual Consultant is expected to submit both the Technical and Financial Proposals. Accordingly; Individual Consultants will be evaluated based on Cumulative Analysis as per the following scenario:

* Responsive/compliant/acceptable, and
* Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation. In this regard, the respective weight of the proposals are:
	1. Technical Criteria weight is **70%**
	2. Financial Criteria weight is **30%**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Weight** | **Max. Point** |
| **Technical Competence (based on CV, Proposal and interview (if required))** | **70%** | 100 |
| * Criteria a. Educational relevance: close fit to post
 |  | 10 pts |
| * Criteria b. Understanding the scope of work and organization of the proposal
 |  | 50 pts |
| * Criteria c. Experience of similar assignment
 |  | 30 pts |
| * Criteria d. Previous work experience in Africa/ Ethiopia
 |  | 10 pts |
| **Financial (Lower Offer/Offer\*100)** | **30%** | 30 |
| **Total Score**  | **Technical Score \* 70% + Financial Score \* 30%** |

 **PAYMENT MILESTONES AND AUTHORITY**

The prospective consultant will indicate the cost of services for each deliverable in US dollars **all-inclusive[[3]](#footnote-3) lump-sum contract amount** when applying for this consultancy. The consultant will be paid only after approving authority confirms the successful completion of each deliverable as stipulated hereunder.

The qualified consultant shall receive his/her lump sum service fees upon certification of the completed tasks satisfactorily, as per the following payment schedule:

| **Installment of Payment/ Period** | **Deliverables or Documents to be Delivered**  | **Approval should be obtained**  | **Percentage of Payment** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1st instalment  | Upon submission and approval of inception Report | MEFCC, UNDP & RTA, Key stakeholders | 20% |
| 2nd instalment  | Upon submission and approval of First Draft | “ | 30% |
| 3rd instalment  | Upon submission and approval of Final Report | “ | 50% |

 **RECOMMENDED PRESENTATION OF TECHNICAL PROPOSAL**

For purposes of generating quotations whose contents are uniformly presented and to facilitate their comparative review, a prospect Individual Contractor (IC) is given a proposed ***Table of Contents***. Therefore prospective Consultant Proposal Submission must have at least the preferred contents which are outlined in the IC Proposal Submission Form incorporated hereto.

**XI. CONFIDENTIALITY AND PROPRIETARY INTERESTS**

The Individual Consultant shall not either during the term or after termination of the assignment, disclose any proprietary or confidential information related to the consultancy service without prior written consent. Proprietary interests on all materials and documents prepared by the consultants under the assignment shall become and remain properties of UNDP.

Annex A: Project Results Framework

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Project Strategy | Objectively verifiable indicators |
| Goal | The goal of the project is to support Ethiopia to increase resilience to climate change through both immediate and long-term adaptation measures in development policies, plans, programmes, projects and actions |
|  | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Targets** **End of Project** | **Source of verification** | **Risks and Assumptions** |
| **Project Objective** to support local communities and administrations at the lowest level of government to design and implement adaptation actions aimed at reducing vulnerability and building resilience, especially in those communities that are particularly vulnerable in Ethiopia | Capacity perception index, disaggregated by Gender Adaptation actions implemented in national/sub-national development frameworks Increase in climate resilient agricultural production in the target areas   | Average CCA capacity scorecard rating of 1.26 across men and women Limited mainstreaming of adaptation into national food security and land management programmes Limited mainstreaming of adaptation into sub-national planning processes and policiesCurrently, only ad hoc adoption of adaptation measures by subsistence farmers, and agriculture is climate vulnerable.  | CCA capacity scorecard rating is increased to an average of 3 in target Woredas for both men and women By the end of the project at least two national programmes have mainstreamed climate change adaptation in to their based on lessons learned from this LDCF projectBy the end of the project at least four Woreda and one Regional development plan have been revised to incorporate climate change risks and opportunitiesBy the end of the project, 5000 subsistence farmers have adopted adaptation measures and climate resilient agricultural production has increased by 12.5% in target areas compared to baseline (1t/ha maize) and for adjusted for rainfall.  | Focus group interviews with planning and subject matter specialistsGovernment programmes and plans; Woreda and Regional Development Plans and related budgetsField Surveys and climate vulnerability analyses. |  |

|  | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Targets****End of Project** | **Source of verification** | **Risks and Assumptions** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome 1[[4]](#footnote-4)**Institutional capacities for coordinated climate-resilient planning and investment strengthened. | Number and type of targeted institutions with increased adaptive capacity to minimise exposure to climate vulnerability Capacity perception index, disaggregated by gender. Adaptation actions implemented in national/sub-national development frameworks  | Capacity for climate-related analysis and forward planning is limited at sub-national level with an average CCA capacity score of 1.26 across the 5 functional areas of * Multi-stakeholder dialogue;
* Situation analysis, vision casting and mandate;
* Policy and strategy formulation;
* Budget, Manage and Implement;
* Monitoring and Evaluation

Institutional capacity for cross-sectoral climate change planning is negligible | By end of Project, 4 Woreda and 1 Regional task teams have been trained in and use climate related vulnerability and risk assessments in an integrated area-based planning approach,Average CCA capacity score in the 4 Woreda and 1 Regional level is 3 for both men and women.Climate resilient investment strategies based on integrated climate resilient development plans are in place and attracting funding for 4 Woreda & 1 Regional area.  | Training records, CCA capacity scorecard assessment, area-based integrated climate change adaptation plans at Woreda and Regional levelSub-national climate resilience plans and investment strategiesPartnership agreements for adaptation investments  | The political commitment to build resilience to climate change and invest in adaptation remains. The structural problem that leads to lack of cross-sectoral co-operation and involvement of stakeholders cab be overcome within the area-based planning approach. The participating ministries and Bureaus are able to delegate relevant personnel to the project task teams to be involved with the project.  |
| **Outcome 2**Access to technologies and practices that improve the range and efficiency of adaptation options improved. | % of farmers adopting adaptation technologies, by technology type, disaggregated by gender. Strengthened capacity of extension agents to transfer appropriate adaptation technologies by capacity score | Farmers (83% male-headed, 17% female-headed) currently constrained by limited access to and knowledge of adaptation techniques and practices. Currently there is only anecdotal evidence of capacity to transfer adaptation technologies score average 1.4 | By the end of the project, 5000 subsistence farmers (83% male-headed, 17% female-headed) have been trained in and tested climate change resilience building techniques and practices, of which 35% of both male and female headed farming households have adopted them permanently. By the end of the project 5 project task teams from 4 Woreda and 1 Regional administration have the capacity to transfer adaptation technologies with capacity score of 3 | Gender disaggregated farmer survey; community level vulnerability reduction assessmentCCA Capacity assessment, evidence of training and field demonstration of transfers | The integrated adaptation packages tested and developed are cost effective. Interest from beneficiary communities to engage in community-wide adaptation actions like natural resource management remains sufficiently high to allow activities to take place. The training and field demonstration provided enables lateral extension and transfer of technologies  |
| **Outcome 3**Capacity for community-based climate change adaptation improved. | % of targeted population covered by innovative insurance mechanisms, disaggregated by gender. Increase in climate resilient agricultural productivity in the target areas | Informal coping strategies are in use in target areas, no formal financial risk reducing/insurance approaches yet in place due to lack of meteorological and hazard information in target areasVery limited capacity for applying climate resilient agriculture  | By the end of the project at least 25% of the men and 25% of the women in the target communities are using innovative mechanisms to insure against the inherent uncertainty of climate change By the end of the project, climate resilient agricultural production has increased by 12.5% in target areas compared to baseline (1t/ha maize) and for adjusted for rainfall.  | Records of micro-finance, rotating credit and VSL schemes Local climate / hazard data made available on Woreda.net.Updated climate-related hazard models for the Kebeles,Community level vulnerability reduction assessments. Agriculture Bureau statistics. | Data sharing protocols can be agreed between NMSA and project stakeholders and data can be presented in a sufficiently utilitarian way for local application. Formal risk reducing micro-financing related schemes do not increase indebtedness or vulnerability of participating communities.  |

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 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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution*** | ***Sustainability ratings:***  | ***Relevance ratings*** |
| 6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings 5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS)3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems | 4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability | 2. Relevant (R) |
| 3. Moderately Likely (ML):moderate risks | 1.. Not relevant (NR) |
| 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks1. Unlikely (U): severe risks | ***Impact Ratings:***3. Significant (S)2. Minimal (M)1. Negligible (N) |
| *Additional ratings where relevant:*Not Applicable (N/A) Unable to Assess (U/A |

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 Form[[5]](#footnote-5)**

**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: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Annex F: Evaluation Report Outline[[6]](#footnote-6)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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 Manual[[7]](#footnote-7)) |
| **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 rated[[8]](#footnote-8))  |
| **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
* 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: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](http://www.undp.org/evaluation/handbook), Chapter 7, pg. 163 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
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](http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/M2_ROtI%20Handbook.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. *The term “All inclusive” implies that all costs (professional fees, travel costs, living allowances, communications, consummables, etc.) that could possibly be incurred by the Contractor are already factored into the final amounts submitted in the proposal* [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. *All outcomes monitored annually in the APR/PIR. It is highly recommended not to have more than 4 outcomes.* [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. 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. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)