

TERMINAL EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the *Sustainable Financing of the Protected Areas System in Mozambique* (PIMS 3839)

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

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

| | | | | |
|--------------------------|---|--|--|-------------------------------------|
| Project Title: | Sustainable Financing of the Protected Areas System in Mozambique | | | |
| GEF Project ID: | 3753 | | <u>at endorsement</u> <u>(Million US\$)</u> | <u>at completion (Million US\$)</u> |
| UNDP Project ID: | 3839 | GEF financing: | \$4,850,000 | to be assessed by MTR |
| Country: | Mozambique | IA/EA own: | \$200,000 | to be assessed by MTR |
| Region: | Africa | Government: | \$500,000 | to be assessed by MTR |
| Focal Area: | Biodiversity | Other: | \$13,168,190 | to be assessed by MTR |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): | BD-SP1: Sustainable financing of protected area systems at the national level | Total co-financing: | \$14,118,190 | to be assessed by MTR |
| Executing Agency: | Ministry of Land, Environment and Rural Development (MITADER) (CSO) Gorongosa Restoration Project (CSO) WWF (World Wildlife Fund) | Total Project Cost: | \$18,968,190 | to be assessed by MTR |
| Other Partners involved: | BIOFUND Carr Foundation | ProDoc Signature (date project began): | | Dec. 2011 |
| | | (Operational) Closing Date: | Proposed: Sep. 2015 | Actual: Dec. 31, 2016 |

OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The project was designed to:

Support the Government of Mozambique in developing a financial plan to direct the long-term sustainable financing of the protected area system. It will then strengthen the institutional and individual capacities of the protected area institution/s to implement this financial plan by: (i) supporting the strategic and business planning processes in protected area institutions; and (ii) improving the financial management processes and systems in PA institutions. The project will then support the integration of the national and institutional

financial sustainability plans into the business and management planning of individual protected areas. It is envisaged that the development of a generic business plan template and preparation guidelines will enable the future replication of the business planning approach across the entire system of protected areas. Since the project's inception, there were important institutional changes, in particular the establishment, in 2013, of the National Conservation Areas Administration (ANAC). The entity assumed responsibility for component 1.

A second component of the project, was slated to identify opportunities for potential cost savings in protected area management by evaluating the cost-effectiveness of different types of community-based partnership approaches in and around Gorongosa Mountain in the Gorongosa National Park. In 2008, the Government of Mozambique and the US-based Carr Foundation announced that they had signed a 20-year agreement to restore and co-manage the park, which is assigned to CSO Gorongosa Restoration Project (GRP). GRP is accessing GEF funding through the project to develop knowledge from the implementation of different community-based partnerships, so as to contribute to the global, regional and national evidence base of the cost-effectiveness of different types of community-based partnerships. Since 2012, there has been however insecurity in the Gorongosa zone, possibly threatening the Park's tourism potential. A reassessment of the way forward is needed.

Finally, the project will test and develop mechanisms for increasing income from conventional financial sources for protected areas (trust fund, user fees) and developing innovative alternatives means of revenue generation (carbon payments and biodiversity offsets. The lessons learnt from the implementation of pilot carbon and biodiversity offset initiatives will guide the future adoption and operationalization of these revenue-generating mechanisms across the national system of protected areas). WWF has been responsible for the implementation of this third component, through which the establishment of a national conservation trust fund (BIOFUND) is a key result. BIOFUND would then assume in due course the responsibility for implementing key activities under the third component.

The project was designed to generally improve the sustainability of Mozambique's Protected Area System, by approaching the issue of costs, revenues, flow of funds and how these are to be dynamically balanced to make a more effective contribution to biodiversity conservation.

Project Objective: To strengthen the overall effectiveness and sustainability of Mozambique's protected area system, including financial sustainability, through working partnerships between private, NGO and community stakeholders.

Expected Outcomes:

Component 1: Sustainability of the protected area system institutionalized

Component 2: Co-management models in demonstration sites

Component 3: Business planning and revenue generation

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects.

The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

An overall approach and method¹ for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact**, as defined and explained in the [UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects](#). A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR ([Annex C](#)) The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Maputo. In other circumstances, a visit to Gorogosa National Park would be envisaged, but at current stage, this needs approval from UN Department of Security. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: Ministry of Land, Environment and Rural Development (MITADER) / National Directorate for Administration of Protected Areas (ANAC), Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security (MASA), Gorongosa Restoration Project (the Carr Foundation), WWF Mozambique, Biodiversity Trust Fund (BioFund), and other stakeholders involved into Biodiversity/Conservation field.

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in [Annex B](#) of this Terms of Reference.

EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see [Annex A](#)), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact**. Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in [Annex D](#).

| Evaluation Ratings: | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------|---|---------------|
| 1. Monitoring and Evaluation | <i>rating</i> | 2. IA& EA Execution | <i>rating</i> |
| M&E design at entry | | Quality of UNDP Implementation | |
| M&E Plan Implementation | | Quality of Execution - Executing Agency | |
| Overall quality of M&E | | Overall quality of Implementation / Execution | |
| 3. Assessment of Outcomes | <i>rating</i> | 4. Sustainability | <i>rating</i> |
| Relevance | | Financial resources: | |
| Effectiveness | | Socio-political: | |
| Efficiency | | Institutional framework and governance: | |
| Overall Project Outcome Rating | | Environmental: | |
| | | Overall likelihood of sustainability: | |

PROJECT FINANCE / COFINANCE

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

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 | Planned | Actual |
| Grants | 0.200 | 0.226 | | | 13.168 | to be assessed by MTR | 13.368 | to be assessed by MTR |
| Loans/Concessions | | | | | | | | |
| • In-kind support | | | 0.500 | to be assessed by MTR | | | 0.500 | to be assessed by MTR |
| • Other | | | | | | | | |
| Totals | 0.200 | 0.226 | 0.500 | to be assessed by MTR | 13.168 | to be assessed by MTR | 13.868 | to be assessed by MTR |

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

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 Mozambique. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators and ensure timely provision of all travel arrangements, within the country for the evaluation team, which should be costed in their financial proposal as lumpsum. 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.

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](#)

EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the evaluation will be 25 days according to the following plan:

| Activity | Timing | Completion Date |
|-------------------------|---------|-----------------|
| Preparation | 04 days | Apr. 21, 2017 |
| Evaluation Mission | 12 days | May. 19, 2017 |
| Draft Evaluation Report | 07 days | May. 31, 2017 |
| Final Report | 02 days | Jun. 16, 2017 |

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 evaluator (Team Leader) and 1 national evaluator*. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. 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 targeted focal area(s)
- Fluency in English, both oral and written, is required; and working knowledge of Portuguese is desirable.

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'](#)

PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

| % | Milestone |
|-----|--|
| 10% | At contract signing |
| 40% | 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 Mar. 31, 2017. Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions. The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in English with indication of the e-mail and phone contact. Shortlisted candidates will be requested to submit a price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs).

UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

| |
|---|
| This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in the CPD: More efficient use of available resources to promote equitable and sustainable economic development |
| Country Programme Outcome Indicators: <i>Increased equitable economic opportunities to ensure sustainable livelihoods for both men and women.</i> |
| Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Result Area: (according to the project's objective) |
| Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program: SO 1 - Catalyzing the sustainability of protected areas; SP 1 Sustainable financing of protected area (PA) systems at the national level |
| Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes: SP 1 - PA systems secure increased revenue and diversification of revenue streams to meet total expenditures required to meet management objectives; Reduction in financing gap to meet PA management objectives |
| Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators: SP 1 - Total revenue and diversification in revenue streams |

| | Indicator | Baseline | Target/s (End of Project) | Source of verification | Risks and Assumptions |
|---|---|--|--|--|---|
| Project Objective Strengthen the overall effectiveness and sustainability of Mozambique's Protected Area System, including financial sustainability, through working partnerships between public, private, NGO and community stakeholders | 1. Financial sustainability scorecard for national system of protected areas | 21% | >45% | Review of Financial Sustainability Scorecard | Assumptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Government maintains its current financial allocations to PA institutions – Donor agencies sustain current levels of funding support to PAs – Current levels of revenues generated from use of protected areas is maintained – Models of PA co-management with private foundations and donor agencies are continued Risks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – BIOFUND fails to attract capital investment – Political and institutional conflicts delay the establishment of the new National Administration of Conservation Areas – The legislation does not adequately provide for the implementation of a number of potential PA financing mechanisms |
| | 2. Capacity development indicator score for protected area system | Systemic: 46% Institutional: 46% Individual: 35% | Systemic: 60% Institutional: 55% Individual: 50% | Review of Capacity Development Indicator Scorecard | |
| | 3. Total budget (including operational, HR and capital budget) (US\$ per annum) for protected area management | US\$14.9 million (as at 2008/9) | US\$18.9 million ³ | Annual financial reports of MITUR, MINAG, MPescas and Protected Areas under co-management agreement. Audited reports of donor-funded projects. | |
| | 4. Number of protected areas in which the METT is adopted as a tool to monitor effectiveness of PA management | 0 | >10 | Annual financial reports of MITUR, MINAG, MPescas and Protected Areas under co-management agreement | |
| Outcome 1 Sustainability of the Protected Area | Outputs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1.1 A Financial Plan for Mozambique's system of conservation areas is adopted 1.2 A Strategic Plan for the National Administration of Conservation Areas directs the piloting of business planning processes in conservation areas 1.3 Financial management processes and systems in the National Administration of Conservation Areas are strengthened | | | | |

³ No annual adjustment for CPI

| | Indicator | Baseline | Target/s (End of Project) | Source of verification | Risks and Assumptions |
|--------------------------|--|---|--|--|--|
| System institutionalized | 5. Financial plan for system of protected areas adopted by government | No | Yes | Recommendation of CONDES Annual Report of MITUR/MICOA | Assumptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Financial data for the different categories of protected areas is made available The PA agency regularly prepares accurate annual reports and is independently audited. Risks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Political and institutional conflicts delay the establishment of the new National Administration of Conservation Areas The legislation does not adequately provide for the implementation of a number of potential PA financing mechanisms |
| | 6. Achievement (%) of performance targets detailed in the PA agency's Annual Performance Plan | No plan | 60% | Annual Report of PA agency | |
| | 7. Number of protected areas with business plans that enable the sourcing of adequate funds for the implementation of PA management plan | 3 | 8 | Annual Report of PA agency | |
| | 8. Ratio of human resource to operational costs in PA agency | PA agency still to be established | 60:40 (human resource: operating costs) | Annual Report and audited Financial Report of PA agency | |
| | 9. Number of protected area staff completing in-house specialized financial management training and skills development programmes | 0 | Specialized: 5 General: 40 | Annual Report of PA agency | |
| | 10. Recruitment of staff to approved posts in the organogram of new PA agency (% of posts with staff appointed) | 0 | 75% | Annual Report of PA agency | |
| | 11. % of audit queries adequately resolved by PA agency | N/A | >80% | Audited Financial Report of PA agency | |
| | Outcome 2 Co-management models in demonstration sites | Outputs: 2.1 The extent of deforestation on Gorongosa Mountain is contained, and reforestation and rehabilitation activities are expanded 2.2 A joint venture tourism enterprise on the lower slopes of Gorongosa Mountain provides an alternative source of income for local communities 2.3 Improved productivity and sustainability of cultivated areas in the lowlands incentivises local farmers to abandon slash-and-burn farming practices on Gorongosa Mountain | | | |

| | Indicator | Baseline | Target/s (End of Project) | Source of verification | Risks and Assumptions |
|--|---|---------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
| | 12. Number of native tree species planted on the Gorongosa Mountain slopes | 15,000 ⁴ | 80,000 | GNP Annual Report and audited Financial Report | <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Carr Foundation, and other donors, sustain current levels of funding and operational support to GNP – The District Administration and local communities actively support project initiatives to protect evergreen forests on Gorongosa Mountain <p>Risks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The legal processes for the expansion of GNP are not concluded timeously, resulting in delays to the implementation of activities in and around Gorongosa Mountain – Local communities living in the buffer areas around Gorongosa Mountain are unable to conclude and maintain co-management, partnership or Joint Venture agreements with the GRP |
| | 13. Total area (as a % of the original extent) of evergreen forest on Gorongosa Mountain (above 700m) deforested | 36% ⁵ | <36% | Aerial photography, satellite imagery and ground truthing | |
| | 14. Number of agriculture clearings (<1ha in extent) in the Gorongosa Mountain (above 700m) | 8504 | <100 | Aerial photography, satellite imagery and ground truthing | |
| | 15. Cost of enforcement and compliance in the proposed GNP expansion area (USD/km2/year) | 185 | >100 | GNP Annual Report and audited Financial Report | |
| | 16. Number of community-based rangers employed by GNP | 15 | 30 | GNP Annual Report and audited Financial Report | |
| | 17. Number of wildfires (>1 km2) in the Gorongosa Mountain (above 700m) | 63 | 20 | Aerial photography and satellite imagery | |
| | 18. Average monthly household income of the Canda, Sandjungira and Tambara communities (US\$) | 16-75 | 75-150 | Data from National Institute of Statistics and Gorongosa SDAE | |
| | 19. Number of employed community members in reforestation activities and tourism ventures | 59 | 220 | GNP Annual Report and audited Financial Report. Audited Financial Report of JV | |

⁴ Data from 2009 and first trimester of 2010

⁵ Data from 2008

| | Indicator | Baseline | Target/s (End of Project) | Source of verification | Risks and Assumptions |
|--|---|----------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|
| | 20. Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool scorecard: Gorongosa National Park | 65% | >72% ⁶ | Review of METT scorecard (every two years) | |
| Outcome 3 Business planning and revenue generation | Outputs: 3.1 A conservation trust fund is established, effectively administered and capitalised 3.2 The income from user fees in national parks, national reserves and marine reserves is improved 3.3 The development of a pilot carbon sequestration project in the mangrove forests of a coastal conservation area is catalysed 3.4 The potential for funding conservation areas from the implementation of biodiversity offset and compensation mechanisms is assessed | | | | |
| | 21. Capitalization of BIOFUND by donors/funders (US\$ committed) | US\$5.6m | US\$20m | BIOFUND audited Annual Financial Report | Assumptions: – The National REDD strategy is developed and adopted by government – A proportion of income from biodiversity offsets and carbon sequestration can be ‘ring-fenced’ for reinvestment back into protected areas Risks: – BIOFUND fails to attract capital investment – Political and institutional conflicts delay the establishment of the new National Administration of Conservation Areas – The legislation does not adequately provide for the implementation of a number of potential PA financing mechanisms |
| | 22. Annual revenues generated from protected areas user fees (including concession income) (US\$) | US\$1,680,992 ⁷ | >US\$2.5m ⁸ | Annual Report and audited Financial Report of PA agency | |
| | 23. Average annual revenue generated for protected areas from biodiversity offsets and carbon sequestration (US\$) | US\$0 | >US\$100,000 | Project Implementation Reports | |
| | 24. Annual average value of grants from BIOFUND to protected areas for operational and capital development costs | US\$0 | US\$500,000 | BIOFUND audited Annual Financial Report | |
| | | | | | |

ANNEX B: LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE EVALUATORS

- Project Document (complete with ancillary documentation)
- Midterm review
- Project files

⁶ Includes the additional areas incorporated into the GNP

⁷ Of this amount, only 64% is however retained for re-investment in protected areas (20% is returned to the provincial state budget and 16% distributed to local communities)

⁸ No annual adjustment for CPI

- National strategic and legal documents
- Inception Report
- Annual and quarterly work plans
- Quarterly progress reports
- Annual APR/PIR's
- Other monitoring reports prepared by the project
- Audit reports
- GEF Focal Area Tracking Tools
- Mission reports and lessons learnt studies
- Previous evaluations
- Any studies prepared with project funds or related to the project
- Country Programme Document, UNDAF and other related documents

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

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

ANNEX E: EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT AND AGREEMENT FORM

Evaluators:

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form⁹

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.

⁹www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

Signed at *place* on *date*

Signature: _____

ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE¹⁰

- 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 Manual¹¹)
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 rated¹²)

¹⁰The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

¹¹ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

¹² 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.

- 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

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

UNDP GEF RTA

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____