Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP supported 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 theProtected Areas Systems Strengthening (PASS)) Project, (PIMS 4173). The essentials of the project to be evaluated are as follows:

Project Summary Table

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Project Title:  | Protected Areas Systems Strengthening (PASS) Project |
| GEF Project ID: | 4623 |    | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | *at completion (Million US$)* |
| UNDP Project ID: | 00079312 | GEF financing:  | 4,000,000 | 4,000,000 |
| Country: | Namibia | IA/EA own: | 360,000 | 360,000 |
| Region: | Southern Africa | Government: | 14,000,000 | 14,000,000 |
| Focal Area: | Biodiversity | Other (Private sector, UNDP, Bilateral Aid Agencies): |  |  |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): | Sustainable Financing of Protected Area Systems at the National Level (SP 1) | Total co-financing: | 140,000 | 140,000 |
| Executing Agency: | Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET) | Total Project Cost: | 18,500,000 | 18,500,000 |
| Other Partners involved: |  | ProDoc Signature (date project began):  | 1 July 2014 |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | Proposed:December 2015 | Actual:June 2016 |

The Protected Areas Systems Strengthening (PASS) Project, is a project of the Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET), funded by the Global Environmental Facility (GEF), through the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). Over the past years, the Government of the Republic of Namibia has established an impressive system of 21 state-managed Protected Areas (PAs) with a goal of protecting and conserving biological diversity. These efforts are complemented by a strong Community-Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM) Programme delivered through registered communal conservancies. To date, 44% of Namibia’s land area is under conservation management. Over the years, Namibia has been a beneficiary of substantial catalytic investment from the GEF and other development partners whose support has resulted in the expansion and improved management effectiveness of the protected areas system.

However, the protected areas funding gap remains, mostly due to recent expansion of the PA estate and emerging management challenges such as fire outbreaks and Namibia’s vulnerability to the increasing threat of poaching of key species such as elephants and rhinos. Weaknesses in revenue collection and at various entry points of the economic enforcement chain need to be urgently addressed to ensure Namibia’s response to these challenges is adequate. Specific interventions are also needed to reinforce the fire management response in protected areas.

The project objective is **to ensure that the Protected Area system of Namibia is strengthened and financed sustainably through improving current systems for revenue generation, introduction of innovative revenue generation mechanisms; and cost effective enforcement through application of the Enforcement Economics Model**.

Objective and Scope

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 have 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 (*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 field missions to all project sites where substantive investment has been made to date. These include but not limited to; Etosha, Kaudum, Mudumu, Bwabwata National Parks and surround areas/ neighbours*.*

Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum;

* Ministry of Environment and Tourism (relevant Directors and staff; particular Park Wardens at site level)
* Conservancy members from Mudumu and the Greater Waterberg Landscapes,
* Local level stakeholders participating in anti-poaching activities (e.g. local farmers, private sector, police, municipalities, organized community-based structures, etc.)
* Civil Society (NGOs and CBOs),
* UNDP staff

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based review. 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 / co-finance

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 (Private Sector)(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 has achieved 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 Namibia. 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 *28* days according to the following plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Timing | Completion Date |
| **Preparation** | *5*  days  |  5 June 2016 |
| **Evaluation Mission** | *14 days*  | 20 Jun 2016 |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | *6*  days  | 28 Jun 2016 |
| **Final Report** | *3* days  | 1 July 2016 |

Evaluation deliverables

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Deliverable | Content  | Timing | Responsibilities |
| **Inception Report** | Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method  | Not 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 2 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 will be carried out by 1 independent international consultant. The consultant shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The evaluator selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The consultant must present the following qualifications/ credentials:

* At least a Master degree in environment, development studies, evaluation theory or a related field;
* Minimum of five (5) years directly relevant work experience (e.g. conducting project/ programme evaluations) in the environment/ development sector;
* Knowledge of doing evaluations for the UNDP and GEF is an advantage;
* Competencies in result-based management, applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios, including adaptive management are essential;
* Demonstrable analytical skills;
* Excellent English communication skills.
* Possessing excellent interpersonal skills and the ability to engage and motivate a wide range of stakeholders
* Experience working in sub Saharan African region.

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

(*this payment schedule is indicative, to be filled in by the CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on their standard procurement procedures)*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| % | Milestone |
| *20%* | At contract signing |
| *30%* | Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report |
| *50%* | Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report  |

Application process

Applicants are requested to apply online (http://jobs.undp.org) by 6 June 2016. 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 1: PASS Project log frame**

| **Project Components** | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Target by EOP** | **Sources of verification** | **Assumptions** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Objective:** To strengthen and sustainably finance the PAS[[3]](#footnote-3) through improved current systems for revenue generation, introduction of innovative revenue generation mechanisms; and cost effective enforcement through application of the Enforcement Economics Model  | 1. Financial sustainability scorecard for the National System of Protected Areas Reviewed and implemented. | Generic UNDP financial sustainability scorecard for Protected Areas in place | Scorecard implemented | UNDP Financial Sustainability Scorecard | * MET successfully implements the draft PAS sustainable financing strategy
* MoF agrees that revenues from PAs are reinvested in the PAS
 |
| 2. Capacity for cost effective law enforcement (LE[[4]](#footnote-4)) Strengthened | Less-effective LE operations and poor coordination among LE agencies | ToR developed and regional LE coordination forums established and functional | MET reports PASS Baseline Field Assessment Report | LE agencies are willing to cooperate and are committed to regional LE forums. |
| Lack of LE equipment | 100% of the identified essential equipment provided |
| Limited LE capacity | At least 5 key LE training provided |
| 3. Fire Management Strategy developed and implemented through SOPs[[5]](#footnote-5) at the PA level | Draft Fire Management Strategy | Fire Management Strategy implemented | National Fire Management Strategy, Project Periodic Progress Reports and SOPs | MET adopts SOPs for fire management |
| No SOPs for individual PAs | At least 6 SOPs developed for 6 PAs |
|  | 4. Improvement of NAMETT scores in the intervention PAs | Waterberg Plateau Park – 73Bwabwata West – 71Bwabwata East – 71Bwabwata National Park – 71Khaudum National Park – 59Nkasa Rupara – 62Mangetti National Park – 51Mudumu National Park – 75Etosha West – 50Etosha Central – 55Etosha National Park – 52.3Dorob National Park – 50Skeleton Coast Park – 46Spergebiet National Park – 62Namib-Naukluft Park - 44 | Improvement in NAMETT scores by 10% | NAMETT, MET reports | MET will strengthen NAMETT to be adopted as an assessment tool for PA management |
| **Component 1:** Improving Systems for Revenue Generation and Implementing New and Innovative Revenue Generation Mechanisms  (US$810,000.00) | **Outcome 1:** An optimized and accountable revenue collection system with appropriate capacities in place and functioning |
| **Output 1.1:** The MET’s Directorate of Financial Administration and Human Resources (DAFHR) is strengthened to effectively address sustainable PAS |
| Foundation for establishment of the PA Financing Unit in place | No PA Financing Unit in place | Comprehensive ToR for the development of the PA Financing Unit developed, proposed structure and clear functions | MET Reports | The PA Financing Unit will be developed within the project’s time frame |
| **Output 1.2.** Implementation of automated revenue collection system across the entire PA system and reconciliation of fees and PA entrances and exits |
| Increase of revenue from park entry fees collections | Revenue collected during 2012/13 and 2013/14 financial years**Northwest Region*** Etosha NP
* Skeleton Coast Park
* Dorob NP

2012/13N$23,888,549.212013/14N$27,733,481.70**Greater Waterberg Complex*** Waterberg Plateau Park

2012/13N$1,444,630.002013/14N$1,330,130.00**Northeast Region*** Bwabwata NP
* Mudumu NP
* Nkasa Rupara NP
* Khaudum NP

2012/13:N$1,233,963.402012/14:N$1,482,830.00 | Increase by 15% | Annual financial reports MET | - Effective reporting systems are being implemented by MET- Political willingness to invest into the implementation of the sustainable financing plans is guaranteed |
| **Output 1.3:** Fee and licensing structure revised and licensing fee collection strengthened |
| Existing fee and licensing system revised | Fee and licensing system not revised | New fees and licensing system in place and implemented | Quarterly progress reports | The new structure will be implementable. |
| **Output 1.4.:** Other opportunities explored including bio-prospecting, user fees, ear marked taxes, corporate donations, voluntary contributions, cause related marketing |
| **Component 2**Cost effective enforcement through testing and implementing principles of enforcement economics(US$2,840,000.40) | **Outcome 2:** PAS sustainability enhanced through improved capacity for detection monitoring and cost effective enforcement. |
| Weak links in the enforcement chain identified, strengthened and monitored | Some of the elements of the enforcement chain are weak, which has further weakened the enforcement chain | Weakest elements in the enforcement chain improved and strengthened | MET reports | All Law Enforcement agencies are willing to be part of the law enforcement chain |
| **Output 2.2.** Overall wildlife crime related monitoring systems are improved both in PAs and outside PAs |
| 1. Number for key species poached reduced* Elephants: 38
* Rhinos: 4
 | Reported cases of high value species poached in 2013 | Significant reduction of annual poaching numbers in relation to past trends | Poaching reports | Most of the poaching incidences will be reported and most of the wildlife products acquired illegally confiscated |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Amount of wildlife products confiscated | In 2013 the following wildlife articles were confiscated:* Ivory: 1526.34 kg
* Cheetah skin: 0
* Leopard skins: 0
* Rhino horns: 2.15 kg
 | Significant increase in the rate of confiscation of illegal possession of wildlife products | MET Annual reportsDSS quarterly report |  |
|  | **Output 2.3.** Park rangers, conservancy game guards, and other LE agencies have the capacity to take effective enforcement actions |
|  | Number of people trained in enforcement strategies and advanced LE techniques | Low levels of LE training | 5 identified LE training provided | Quarterly progress reports | LE training will improve performance and deterrence of illegal activities |
|  | **Output 2.4.** Appropriate mechanisms and incentives are set in place to reduce complicity in wildlife crimes, encourage public to report wildlife crimes, and to be disincentives for poaching |
|  | Mechanisms and incentives in place to encourage public to report wildlife crimes | At the moment, incentives are available for those who report wildlife crimes, however, the process is lengthy for the reporters to get their rewards | Mechanisms and incentives to encourage the public to report wildlife crimes being implemented | Quarterly progress reports | LE training will improve performance and deterrence of illegal activities |
|  | **Output 2.** Improved legal system & effective prosecution and penalties for wildlife crimes, including those committed by nationals of other countries, is in place |
|  | Legal frameworks pertaining to PA management supported | * Draft Parks and Wildlife Management Bill
* Outdated Nature Conservation Ordinance No. 4 of 1975
 | Legal framework processes supported and especially the enactment process of the Parks and Wildlife Management Bill supported via Review Workshops and other necessary consultations | MET PoliciesDraft Parks and Wildlife Management Bill | Relevant changes will be made to the legal framework pertaining to PA management |
| **Component 3:** Implementation of the Integrated Fire Management Strategy(US$190,000.00) |
| **Outcome Indicator 3:** PAS sustainability enhanced through improved capacity for detection monitoring and cost effective fire management |
| **Output 3.1.:** Standard Operating Procedures for all the PAs based on the Fire Management Strategy developed |
| 1. Fire Management Strategy finalisted and implemented | Draft Fire Management Strategy in place, but not finalised nor implemented | Fire Management Strategy finalised and implemented | Draft Fire Management Strategy | The Fire Management Strategy will be approved and implemented.The SOPs will be implementable |
| 2. SOPs developed and implemented in all PAs within the Project Target Areas | No SOPs for PAs | At least 6 SOPs developed and implemented in the intervention sites | Draft Fire Management Strategy |

**Annex 2: List of Documents**

1. Project Document
2. Project Inception Report
3. Project implementation reports (APR/PIR’s)
4. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
5. Audit reports
6. METT Tools
7. Baseline Assessment Report
8. M & E Operational Guidelines, all monitoring reports prepared by the project; and
9. Financial and Administration guidelines.

The following will also be available:

1. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
2. Minutes of Project Steering Committee Meetings
3. Quarterly Project Planning Meeting Minutes
4. Maps
5. The GEF Completion Report guidelines
6. UNDP Monitoring and Evaluation Frameworks
7. Scoping Report for the Construction of the Waterberg Law Enforcement Training Centre

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[[6]](#footnote-6)**

**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[[7]](#footnote-7)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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[[8]](#footnote-8)) |
| **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[[9]](#footnote-9))  |
| **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. PAS – Protected Areas System [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. LE – Law Enforcement [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. SOPs – Standard Operating Procedures [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. 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-9)