**Terms of Reference**

**INDEPENDENT CONSULTANT: PASTURELANDS/FORESTS MANAGEMENT FOR CLIMA EAST FINAL EVALUATION**

**Type of Contract:** IC (Consultant)

**Languages Required:** English

**Duration:** 27 September 2016 – 15 September 2017 (estimated work input: 55 working days)

**Location:** home-based, with possible missions to Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia and Moldova

**1. Background**

In accordance with UNDP M&E policies and procedures, and the EU-UNDP Agreement of the *'Clima East: Supporting Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation in Neighbourhood East and Russia (Clima East Pilots)',* the project is required to undergo a final evaluation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for the Final Evaluation (FE) of the Clima East Pilots. The essentials of the project to be evaluated are as follows:

Project Summary Table

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Title: |  | | | | | |
| Countries: | | Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Moldova, Russia, Ukraine | | *at endorsement (Million Euro)* | | *at completion (Million US$)* |
| Region: | | Europe & CIS | EU financing: | 11 | | 11 |
| Other Partners involved: | | Relevant ministries of Environment, agencies of Protected areas, municipalities in each country | ProDoc Signature (date project began): | | | 22 July 2008 |
| Official EU Clima East Project start date:  EU Clima East project start-up (implementation): | | | Dec 2012  July 2013[[1]](#footnote-1) |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | | Proposed:  2016 | Actual:  2016-2017[[2]](#footnote-2) |

Objective and Scope

The Clima East Pilots Project is part of a broader EU financing package 'Clima East: Supporting Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation in Neighbourhood East and Russia' which will be implemented in the years 2013-2016 in cooperation with the partner countries Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Moldova, Russian Federation and Ukraine. The Clima East package consists of: - The Clima East Policy project, the main aim of which is to improve the information access of partner countries to EU climate change Acquis Communautaire (legislation), policies, knowledge and experience, both on an EU and member-state level and - The Clima East Pilots project, a project (ENPI/2012/303-093) with a maximum budget of 11 MEUR, implemented by UNDP in cooperation with national and international partner organisations. The main aim of the Clima East Pilots project, which is the subject of this evaluation, is to show through pilot projects the feasibility of ecosystem-based approaches to climate change, meaning that intact ecosystems such as peatlands, permafrost landscapes, boreal forests and pasture land can have a strong and cost-efficient positive effect both on climate change mitigation and adaptation.

The Clima East Pilots Project is financed from the Regional Action Programme 2011-2013 of the EU Eastern Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument, ENPI, with contributions made from UNDP in some pilot countries. The Clima East Policy and the Clima East Pilots projects are intrinsically linked. Results achieved in the ecosystems-based Clima East Pilots project will be integrated into adaption and mitigation strategies supported by the Clima East Policy project.

The Clima East Pilots project is broken down into 4 components and further into 9 constituting elements, each managed by a separate country office of UNDP:

***Peatlands component***

1. Belarus peatlands conservation and restoration (implemented by UNDP Belarus, Minsk)

2. Ukraine peatlands conservation and restoration (implemented by UNDP Ukraine, Kiev)

3. Russia steppe peatlands restoration (Implemented by UNDP Russia, Moscow)

***Permafrost and boreal forests component***

4. Russia permafrost peatlands and boreal forests in Komi and NAO (Implemented by UNDP Russia,

Moscow)

***Southern pastures and forest management***

5. Moldova ecosystem based approaches to climate change in Orhei National Park (implemented by UNDP

Moldova, Chisinau)

6. Azerbaijan pastures restoration and protection (Implemented by UNDP Azerbaijan, Baku)

7. Georgia pastures restoration and protection (Implemented by UNDP Georgia, Tblilisi)

8. Armenia pastures restoration and protection (Implemented by UNDP Armenia, Yerevan)

***Global***

9. Global component on technical knowledge generation and sharing, evaluation and awareness raising (implemented by UNDP EEG Headquarters represented by Istanbul Regional Hub, which also has the overall supervision responsibility for the package and reporting in front of EC).

The FE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Office’s Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Results (<http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/handbook/me-handbook.pdf>), and as agreed in the EU-UNDP Financial and Administrative Framework Agreement (FAFA).

A mid-term evaluation for the Clima East Pilots Project was conducted in April-June 2015. The final evaluation will take the considerations of the mid-term review and follow-up management responses in evaluating project implementation.

The objectives of the evaluation are to assess progress towards the achievement of the Clima East Pilot Project objective, identify and document lessons learned and to provide recommendation that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming. The evaluation shall also look at the linkages within the overall Clima East package – between Clima East Pilots and Clima East Policy. The added value of the Global component shall also be considered and its role in facilitating the regional purpose of the Clima East Pilots Project.

**2. Description of Responsibilities**

Evaluation approach and method

An overall approach and method[[3]](#footnote-3) for conducting project final evaluations of UNDP-implemented 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, the overall approach of which is also relevant for this EU-funded project. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR ([*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 Project Directors, UNDP Country Office, project team, EU Clima East Pilot Project Regional Coordinator and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct field missions to the pilots*.* Interviews with the main institutions and organizations involved in the Pilots project are to be conducted during the missions.

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, 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 Clima East Pilots Project Indicative Indicators Framework (see  [Annex A](#_TOR_Annex_A:).1) and the Results Resource Frameworks (RRF) prepared by the country pilots, which provide 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 scale*** | **2. IA& EA Execution** | ***Rating scale*** |
| 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 scale** | **4. Sustainability** | **Rating scale** |
| Relevance | 2 pt | Overall likelihood of risks to Sustainability | 4 pt |
| Financial resources: | 4 pt |
| Effectiveness | 6 pt | Socio-political: | 4 pt |
| Efficiency | 6 pt | Institutional framework and governance: | 4 pt |
| Overall Quality of Project Outcomes | 6 pt | Environmental : | 4 pt |
| **Impact: Significant, Minimal, Negligible** | | **Rating scale** | |
| Environmental Status Improvement | | 3 pt | |
| Environmental Stress Reduction | | 3 pt | |
| Progress towards stress/status change | | 3 pt | |
| Overall project results | | 6 pt | |

The evaluation will provide a rating for each pilot, as well as on the global component. The Indicative Indicators for the global component were developed only at the end of 2014. Thus, the evaluation of the global component shall include the evaluators’ analysis of the indicators developed, their relevance and added value to the Pilots project. As a result of the mid-term evaluation, the indicators for pilots were expanded.

Project finance

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project. 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 offices (CO) and project teams to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the Evaluation report.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Co-financing  (type/source) | EU Financing (mill. US$) | | Government  (mill. US$) | | UNDP financing  (mill. US$) | | Other | | Total  (mill. US$) | |
| Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual |
| Grants | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Loans/Concessions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| In-kind support |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Mainstreaming

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. Any collaboration and cooperation conducted with other EU-funded projects (regional and national) shall be noted.

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.[[4]](#footnote-4)

Conclusions, recommendations & lessons

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions**, **recommendations** and **lessons**. This section should include observations not only on the specific pilot, but also consider regional-level recommendations in lieu of identifying cooperation and lessons learned among the pilots, as well as between the Pilots and Policy components within the Clima East package.

Implementation arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the Clima East Regional Coordinator and the UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub. The UNDP IRH will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements to the countries for the evaluation team. The national Pilots Project teams 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 staggered over a span of ten months; expected to be distributed according to the following plan:

Independent International Evaluator (pasturelands/forests) will cover pilots in Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia and Moldova

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Time allocation | Tentative timeframe |
| **Preparation** | *App. 12* days | *October 2016* |
| **Evaluation Mission** | *App. 20* days (incl.travel) | *6 days Georgia and 4 days Moldova in September 2016; 5 days each to Armenia and Azerbaijan in August 2017* |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | *App. 15* days | *By September 2017* |
| **Final Report** | *App. 8* days | *By September 2017* |

The evaluator will be responsible for the assessment of the particular pilots within their scope for the missions and for the Pilots-specific parts of the report. In addition, the evaluator will be requested to evaluate the global component and to work as a team in drafting the evaluation report and integrating comments. During preparation of the mission, the evaluation team will be requested to submit a plan for the elaboration of the report with the contributions of the individual evaluators identified for clarity of roles and responsibilities.

Evaluation deliverables

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Deliverable | Content | Timing | Responsibilities |
| **Inception Report** | Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method, including proposed evaluation questions (Annex C) | No later than 2 weeks before the first evaluation mission. | Evaluator submits to Clima East Regional Coordinator, who, in turns coordinates with EU Task Manager |
| **Presentation** | Initial Findings | End of each respective evaluation mission | To project management, relevant UNDP CO and Regional Coordinator |
| **Draft Final Report** | Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes | Within 3 weeks of the completion of the last evaluation mission | Sent to Clima East Regional Coordinator, COs, PCUs |
| **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.

**3. Competencies**

The evaluation is conducted by two international evaluators with prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with UNDP implemented 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.

Corporate competencies:

* Demonstrates integrity by modeling the UN’s values and ethical standards;
* Promotes the vision, mission, and strategic goals of UNDP;
* Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability
* Treats all people fairly without favoritism;
* Fulfills all obligations to gender sensitivity and zero tolerance for sexual harassment

Functional competencies:

* Strong interpersonal skills, communication skills, ability to work in a team
* Openness to change and ability to receive/integrate feedback
* Ability to work under pressure and stressful situations
* Strong analytical, reporting and writing abilities
* Excellent public speaking and presentation skills

4. Evaluator Ethics

Evaluation consultant 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)

**5. Qualifications**

The evaluator (pastures management) must present the following qualifications:

Education:

* Masters’ degree in environmental issues or management or related field

Experience:

* Minimum *4* years of relevant professional experience (biodiversity, land management, climate change, adaptation)
* Work experience conducting evaluations with UNDP required, experience in EU –funded projects is considered to be an asset;
* Previous experience with results‐based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
* Work experience and technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s). Work experience and knowledge of role of biodiversity (eco-system management) in climate change issues (including GHG mitigation benefits and pastures role in carbon monitoring – issues related to LULUCF – land use and land use change) is considered an asset;
* Work experience with protected area policies and management structures in Eastern Europe/CIS/Russia

Language skills:

* Fluency in English is required.

6. Payment modalities and specifications

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| % | Milestone |
| *10%* | At contract signing and after submission of the inception report listed under ‘Evaluation deliverables’ |
| *20%* | First payment by following submission and approval of the 1ST draft FE report for Georgia and Moldova |
| *20%* | Second payment for the 1ST draft FE report after completion of all pilots |
| *50%* | Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and Regional Coordination) of the final evaluation report |

*Payments will be made upon confirmation by UNDP of satisfactory delivery of the contract obligations.*

***General Terms and conditions*** *as well as other related documents can be found under:* [*http://on.undp.org/t7fJs*](http://on.undp.org/t7fJs)

*Individual Consultants are responsible for ensuring they have vaccinations/inoculations when travelling to certain countries, as designated by the UN Medical Director. Consultants are also required to comply with the UN security directives set forth under dss.un.org*

Annex A.1: Indicative indicators Table

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Activity** | **Indicator** | **Other measures/effects** |
| **Component 3: Sustainable management of pastures in the Caucasus (Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia) to demonstrate climate change mitigation and adaptation benefits and dividends for local communities** | | | |
| 3.1. Armenia pastures | Restoration of pastures and forests, and putting them under sustainable management in Gegharkunik region | 2,000 ha of degraded pastures restored and 60 ha of degraded forests restored | New set of policies and standards on sustainable pasture management approved at the local level (by local authorities in the target districts)  Increased quality of fodder production at target sites resulting in higher productivity and higher income from cattle products for local population  Reduced grazing pressure on degraded areas |
| 3.2. Azerbaijan pastures | Restoration and sustainable management of pastures in Ismayilli and Shamakhi regions | 3,000 ha of degraded pastures restored | Increased quality of fodder production at target sites resulting in higher productivity and higher income from cattle products for local population  Reduced grazing pressure on degraded areas  Advanced knowledge on the carbon storage and carbon flow capacities of the Azerbaijani grasslands (before and after restoration) |
| 3.3. Georgia pastures | Restoration and sustainable management of pastures in a close vicinity of the Vashlovani protected areas | 4, 064 ha of degraded pastures restored  Methods for migratory route rehabilitation applied in 300 ha area | Improved status of protected areas (35,053 ha)  A model of involvement of local communities in protected area management  Sustainable livelihood opportunities explored for local people (wool production, milk products). |
| **Component 4: Sustainable management of pastures and community forests in Moldova’s first National Park Orhei to demonstrate climate change mitigation and adaptation benefits and dividends for local communities** | | | |
| 4.1. Moldova pastures | Restoration of pastures and community forests within the territory of the Orhei National Park | 500 ha of pasture land restored  150 ha of degraded lands afforested | Development of pasture management plans and community forest plans for 18 communities (5,890.92 ha) and 1,392 ha, respectively in a participatory manner  Improved management of pastures and community forests to reduce pressures from grazing and unsustainable use  A robust system for monitoring of the carbon dividends and ecological integrity of pastures and forest ecosystem in place to ensure ability of park administration to respond to trends of pressures on natural resources in the area |
| **Global component** on technical knowledge generation and sharing, evaluation and awareness raising | | | |
| G.1. Technical knowledge | Promotion of technical exchanges among pilots | Technical knowledge generated on pilots-level shared regularly.  Technical experience from carbon measurements and monitoring in pilots gathered and scientific review prepared | By end of project, technical knowledge in region on carbon potential in protected areas of peatlands and pastures/forests increased.  Cooperation among researchers in region facilitated. |
| G.2. Eco-system based approach to climate issues | Knowledge and awareness of eco-system based approach to climate issues raised | Experiences in eco-system based approach to climate change shared at regional level through:  - at least 4 sub-regional and regional workshops;  - study tours among countries in the region (at least 3)  - common scientific reviews  - through the Clima East Project website | Knowledge and awareness of linkages between biodiversity and climate change increase in the region |

Summarizing all carbon benefits as stated in the project description, the total GHG benefit (emissions avoided + carbon sequestered) resulting from the implementation of the project in all countries is assessed to be approximately 170,000 tCO2-eq per year, or over 3.4 mln tCO2-eq in 20 years following the implementation of project activities (20 year scale is use as a standard for LULUCF projects in Voluntary Carbon Market and by Global Environment Facility).

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

* Project Description of Action
* Pilots’ project documents (Armenia pasturelands/forests, Azerbaijan pastures, Georgia pastures, Moldova pastures and forests)
* Pilots Inception Reports
* Quarterly operational reports
* Annual Project Implementation Reports
* Results-oriented Monitoring Mission (ROM) reports
* Management response to ROM reports
* Mid-term evaluation Reports Volume I and II, management responses to the reports
* Project Steering Committee meeting minutes
* Notes from project monitoring missions
* Financial management documents, such as project budget revisions and audit reports
* Various reports and documents available on the project website/with the PIU

Annex C: Evaluation Questions

*This is a generic list, to be further elaborated during the evaluation mission.*

| **Evaluative Criteria Questions** | | **Indicators** | **Sources** | **Methodology** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the EU regional programme, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels? | | | | |
|  | * Did the project’s objectives fit EU strategic priorities? |  |  |  |
|  | * Did the project’s objectives fit within national priorities, priorities of the local government and local communities? |  |  |  |
|  | * Do the project’s objectives support implementation of the relevant multi-lateral environmental agreement? |  |  |  |
| Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? | | | | | |
|  | * To what extent have the project Objective and Outcomes have been achieved? | * Indicators at the level of project Objective and Outcomes achieved as planned/otherwise | * Project indicators, RRFs, Annual report |  | |
|  | * How did stakeholder involvement and public awareness contribute to the achievement of project objective and outcomes? | * Stakeholder pools from the project show raise of interest to project objective and activities; corresponding indicator values show progress as planned; interview with the project management and key stakeholders confirmed/otherwise PM reports on stakeholder involvement | * Annual reports, Project indicators, interviews |  | |
|  | * Which were the key factors that contributed to project success/underachievement; can positive key factors be replicated in other cases, or could negative factors have been anticipated and minimized? |  |  |  | |
| Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards? | | | | | |
|  | * Was the project cost-effective? In case its implementation was delayed, did that affect cost-effectiveness? Were expenditures in line with international standards and norms? Was co-financing received at the level anticipated in the project document? | * Project expenditures for each of the outcomes correspond with rates agreed in the project document; project management costs did not exceed acceptable levels; project audits revealed no questionable costs and/or violation of procurement, financial and HR administration rules | * Project financial statements, co-financing reports, PIRs, NIM audit reports |  | |
|  | * Was the project management effective? Were there any particular challenges with the management process? Did the project Steering Committee provide the anticipated input and support to project management? Were risks assessed in time and adequately dealt with? Was the level of communication and support from the implementing agency adequate and appropriate? | * Project management arrangements contributed/otherwise to attainment of project objective and outcomes, and were implemented according to the established principles and procedures | * Interviews with key project stakeholders, incl. National Implementing Agency and UNDP; project risk log, project Steering Committee minutes |  | |
| Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? | | | | | |
|  | * What is the likelihood that any required financial resources will be available to sustain the project results once the EU funding is over? | * Major project endeavors (such as financial instruments, institutional arrangements, infrastructure support) will get financial support and be maintained without EU funding | * Interviews with stakeholders, project reports, financial data if available |  | |
|  | * What is the likelihood that institutional and technical achievements, legal framework, policies and governance structures and processes will allow for the project results to be sustained? Are there key institutional and governance risks to sustainability? | Major institutional changes, technical solutions, legal framework amendments get strong support at policy and decision-making levels | Interviews with stakeholders, project reports, |  | |
|  | * Are there any environmental risks that can undermine the post-project impact and global environment benefits? |  |  |  | |
|  | * What is the likelihood that the technical achievements, investments in capacity development, etc introduced through the project will be sustainable in the target communities? |  |  |  | |
| **Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?** | | | | | |
|  | * Did the project achieve its planned impacts? Why or why not? |  |  |  | |
|  | * Are there (and what are) secondary impacts achieved by the project, especially as related to local livelihoods? |  |  |  | |
|  | * Which where the key lessons learned in course of project implementation? |  |  |  | |

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 shortcomings  4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS)  3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings  2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems  1. 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 risks  1. 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 implemented EU financed project * UNDP project ID#s. * Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report * Region and countries included in the project * 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 Indicative indicators/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators), including regional-level 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 the Pilots and Policy project, linkages among the different Pilots and other interventions within the sector, including other EU projects in the region * 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 * Identified recommendations for strengthening regional component |
|  | 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 |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |

1. Specific start dates of implementation vary from country to country and the Belarus component implementation began in February 2014. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Georgia and Moldova are completing their activities 31 December 2016 while the remaining pilots are completing their work by 30 September 2017. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. 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-3)
4. 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-4)
5. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. The Report length should not exceed *60* 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)