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 *UNDP/GEF* ***“NIP update, integration of POPs into national planning and promoting sound healthcare waste management in Kazakhstan”*** (Kazakhstan) (PIMS # 4612)

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

Project Summary Table

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Title: | NIP update, integration of POPs into national planning and promoting sound healthcare waste management in Kazakhstan | | | | | |
| GEF Project ID: | | #4442 |  | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | | *at completion (Million US$)* |
| UNDP Project ID: | | 00085149 (PIMS #4612)  00071893 (Atlas ID) | GEF financing: | 3,400,000 | | 3,400,000 |
| Country: | | Kazakhstan | IA/EA own: |  | |  |
| Region: | | RBEC/CA | Government: | 34,315,820 | | 34,315,820 |
|  | |  | UNDP: | 75,000 | | 75,000 |
|  | |  | UNDP (in-kind): | 100,000 | | 100,000 |
| Focal Area: | | Persistent Organic Pollutants CHEM-1, 3, 4 | Other: | 521,938 | | 521,938 |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): | |  | Total co-financing: | 35,012,758 | | 35,012,758 |
| Executing Agency: | |  | Total Project Cost: | 38,412,758 | | 38,412,758 |
| Other Partners involved: | | Ministry of Energy of RK | ProDoc Signature (date project began): | | | 22.10.2013 |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | | Proposed:  30.09.2017 | Actual:  30.09.2017 |

Objective and Scope

The project was designed to reduce the releases of unintentionally produced POPs and other globally harmful pollutants into the environment by promoting sound healthcare waste management in Kazakhstan, and to assist the country in implementing its relevant obligations under the Stockholm Convention

The goals will be achieved through implementation of 4 components:

* Stockholm Convention NIP update and improved institutional coordination on chemical MEAs;
* Overall mercury situation assessed and initial mercury reduction and containment plan formulated;
* Minimization of unintentional POPs and mercury releases in selected hospitals through demonstration of sound Healthcare Waste Management approaches
* Monitoring, learning, adaptive feedback, outreach, and evaluation.

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

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

Evaluation approach and method

An overall approach and method[[1]](#footnote-1) for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact,** as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR (*see* [*Annex C*](#_TOR_Annex_C:)) The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence‐based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Astana, Kostanay and Ust-Kamenogorsk cities, including the following project sites:

* “Medox” LLP in Astana city;
* “Kostanay ecomedutilizatsiya 2016” LLP in Kostanay city;
* PSE on REM “Zhitikara Central Rayon Hospital” in Kostanay region;
* PSE on REM “Center of Mother and Child” ;
* PSE on REM “Central Rayon Hospital of Katon-Karagay Rayon”
* PSE on REM “Central Rayon Hospital of Zaisan Rayon”

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

**Project**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Name** | **Title** | **Organization** |
| 1 | Ms. Nina Gor | Project Manager | UNDP/GEF project |
| 2 | Ms. Assel Shakhanova | Expert on healthcare waste and mercury pollution management |
| 3 | Ms. Saltanat Bayeshova | Expert on capacity building in the field of persistent organic pollutants and other harmful chemical substances |
| 4 | Ms. Zulfiya | Project Assistant |
| 5 | Ms. Madina Kassenova | Procurement Assistant |

**UNDP**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Name** | **Title** | **Organization** |
| 1 | Mr. Maksim Surkov | UNDP-GEF RTA | UNDP, Istanbul |
| 2 | Mr. Rassul Rakhimov | Head of SDU unit | UNDP CO |
| 3 | Ms. Victoria Baigazina | Programme Associate of SDU unit, project supervisor |
| 4 | Ms. Zhanetta Babasheva | M&E focal point |

**GEF Operational Focal Point**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Name** | **Title** | **Organization** |
| 1 | Mr. Gani Sadibekov | Vice Ministry | Ministry of Energy of the Republic of Kazakhstan |

**Ministry of Energy of RK – Main Partner**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Name** | **Title** | **Organization** |
| 1 | Ms. Bizara Dosmakova | Deputy Director of the Waste Management Department, National Project Director | Waste Management Department, Ministry of Energy of RK |

**Project Partners**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Name** | **Title** | **Organization** |
| 1 | Zhan Nurbekov | Director of Waste Management Department | Ministry of Energy of RK |
| 2 | Zhanar Asanova | Head of the Ownerless Waste Management Department | JSC "Damu Zhasyl" under the Ministry of Energy of the Republic of Kazakhstan |
| 3 | Zhuldyz Urazbekova | Head Expert of Sanitary and Hygienic Surveillance Department | Committee for Public Health Protection under the Ministry of Public Healthcare of RK |
| 4 | Danara Alimbayeva | Director of the Environmental Monitoring Department | Kazhydromet |
| 5 | Samat Kaliyev | Deputy Head | Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Governance of Kostanay region |
| 6 | Svetlana Arsentyeva | Head of Unit | Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Governance of Kostanay region |
| 7 | Vladimir Mikhailenko | Chief Doctor of “Kostanay Regional Narcological Dispensary” |  |
| 8 | Sergey Mukashev | Specialist of State Environmental Control Unit | Department of Ecology of Kostanay region |
| 9 | Tatyana Kozlyanskaya | Head of the Integrated Environmental Monitoring Laboratory | Branch of the RSE "Kazhydromet" for East Kazakhstan region |
| 10 | Sergey Popov | Head of the Center | Center of Mother and Child of East-Kazakhstan region |
| 11 | Kazken Orazalina | Expert on chemicals | NGO |
| 12 | Kavira Mukasheva | Senior teacher Department of Occupational Health, Communal Hygiene | JSC "Medical University of Astana" |

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

Evaluation Criteria & Ratings

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

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

Project finance / cofinance

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Co-financing  (type/source) | GEF own financing (US$) | | Government  (US$) | | Other\*  (US$) | | Total  (US$) | |
| Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Actual | Actual |
| Grants | 3,400,000 | 3,400,000 | 34,315,820 | 34,315,820 | 521,938 | 521,938 | 38,237,758 | 38,237,758 |
| UNDP co-financing | 75,000 | 75,000 |  |  |  |  | 75,000 | 75,000 |
| Loans/Concessions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * In-kind support |  |  |  |  | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 |
| * Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals | 3,475,000 | 3,475,000 | 34,315,820 | 34,315,820 | 621,938 | 621,938 | 38,412,758 | 38,412,758 |

Mainstreaming

UNDP supported GEF financed projects are key components in UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programmes. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender.

Impact

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.[[2]](#footnote-2)

Conclusions, recommendations & lessons

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions**, **recommendations** and **lessons**.

Implementation arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Kazakhstan. 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 29 days according to the following plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Timing | Completion Date |
| **Preparation** | 5 working days | *22-26 May 2017* |
| **Evaluation Mission** | 11 working days (Astana – 3 days, Kostanay – 3 days, including the flight between cities, East-Kazakhstan – 5 days) | *11-23 June 2017* |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | 10 working days | *1-10 July 2017* |
| **Final Report** | 3 working days (for the international consultant only) | *20-24 July 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: due 6 June 2017 | Evaluator submits to UNDP CO |
| **Presentation** | Initial Findings | End of evaluation mission: due 23 June 2017 | To project management, UNDP CO |
| **Draft Final Report** | Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes | Within 2 weeks of the evaluation mission: due 10 July 2017 | Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs |
| **Final Report\*** | Revised report | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft: due 24 July 2017 | 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 and 1 national evaluator.* The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The international evaluator will be designated as the Team Leader and will be responsible for finalizing the report. The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The Team members must present the following qualifications:

* Master’s degree in the sphere of chemical matters/ hazardous wastes, biology, medical sphere or other closely related fields;
* Minimum 5 years of professional experience in relevant natural sciences;
* Experience with results‐based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
* Knowledge of results-based evaluation policies and procedures;
* Technical knowledge in chemical matters/ hazardous wastes, biology, medical sphere or other closely related fields;
* Competence in Adaptive Management, as applied to chemicals and/or hazardous waste management projects;
* Recognized expertise in the management of chemicals and hazardous waste;
* Familiarity with chemicals and hazardous waste management policies and governance structures in Kazakhstan;
* Skills in drafting the institutional documents, reviews and background papers related chemicals and waste;
* Experience working with international organizations like UNDP and/or GEF or GEF-evaluations;
* Excellent knowledge of English, communication and demonstrable analytical skills, knowledge of the Russian language is an advantage;
* Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and (fill in GEF Focal Area); experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis;
* Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset.

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| % | Milestone |
| *10%* | At submission and approval of the Inception Report |
| *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 (indicate the site, such as http://jobs.undp.org, etc.) by 03 May 2017. Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV and P11 for these positions. The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in English with indication of the e‐mail and phone contact. Financial Proposal that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price, supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template provided. If an Offeror is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the Offeror must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

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.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **COA** (MUST BE INDICATED IN NUMBERS) | | | | | | | |
| **Project ID** | **Activity** | **Account** | **Amount** | **Fund** | **Dept ID** | **Impl Agency** | **Donor** |
| **00085149** | **4** | **71200** |  | **62000** | **55205** | **001101** | **10003** |
| **JOB DESCRIPTION AUTHORISATION** | | | | | | | |
| Supervisor  *Nina Gor/* *Project Manager*  Name/Title Signature | | | | | | | |
| Programme officer  *Victoria Baigazina/Programme Associate*  Name/Title Signature | | | | | | | |

Annex A: Project Logical Framework

| Project’s Strategy | Objective indicators | Baseline | Target | Verification source | Assumption |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The long-term objective that the project will contribute to: Communities, national, and local authorities use more effective mechanisms and partnerships that promote environmental sustainability and enable them to prepare, respond and recover from natural and man-made disasters | | | | | |
| Objective: to reduce the releases of unintentionally produced POPs and other globally harmful pollutants into the environment by promoting sound healthcare waste management in Kazakhstan, and to assist the country in implementing its relevant obligations under the Stockholm Convention | Stockholm Convention NIP update and improved institutional coordination on chemical MEAs | No inventory on POPs; NIP not updated; Fragmented legislation controls | Sources of uPOPs and new POPs identified; NIP updated to include new POPs, legislative gaps found and amendments prepared. | Experts’ inventory reports, regulations adopted. | The government will focus efforts on improving the POPs monitoring system; the coordination center on chemical conventions established.  Steps will be taken to accede to the MInamata Convention  Non-incineration healthcare waste treatment plants are used by healthcare facilities. Mercury thermometers are no longer used in the healthcare system.. |
| Initial mercury inventory and reduction plan prepared | No mercury inventory; | Mercury sources identified; recommendations for the Government on accession to Minamata Convention prepared | Inventory reports;  letters; minutes |
| POPs emissions from healthcare waste incinerators reduced through a demonstration component, and wider replication of result | Waste segregation for waste source reduction is not a standard accepted approach in medical facilities;  Reporting data;  Routine waste incineration without emission controls and risk reduction measures is commonly practiced | Segregated waste collection introduced; non-incineration methods for treatment of infected wastes used by healthcare facilities; | Reports; letters; regulations |
| POPs inventories improved for informed decision making and priority setting | POPs inventory mechanism established; industrial sources of uPOPs identified; industries using new POPs identified | Lack of information about new POPs and uPOPs | POPs capacity building program | Reports, correspondence; regulations | Government provides functional support |
| No inventory of new POPs and uPOPs | Inventory of new POPS completed |
| No full range of POPs handled by existing laboratories | Methods for analyzing POPs in the environment developed; Laboratories for further accreditation identified; |
| Legislation contains only general requirements on POPs ; | Recommendations for the legislation on POPs management |
| No POPs coordination center in existence | Chemical conventions coordination center established |
| No confirmed data on environmental impact of POPs | POPs are monitored in industrial processes and environment |
| Component 2:  Mercury assessment implemented, national consultations held to identify priorities for actions and capacity building on mercury risks carried out | Capacity building programme for stakeholders and data tracking on risks | No previous efforts applied in relation to negotiations about Mercury Convention accession | Ratification of Minamata Convention prepared | Reports, correspondence, minutes | The government understands the gravity of the problem and makes efforts to regulate the process. Environmental users have concerns about fulfilling their obligations to manage mercury in industrial processes. |
| Mercury situation in Kazakhstan assessed | No mercury assessment, no mercury sources inventory | Initial mercury inventory | Reports, correspondence, no-objection procedure |
| Public awareness raising campaigns on mercury risks for health and environment conducted | Lack of understanding of a degree of impact on health | Mercury impact on human health assessed; Capacity building program on mercury; Seminars, trainings |  |
| Component 3: Sound health-care waste management through uPOPs and mercury reduction approaches are demonstrated in 3 regions of the country | Review of national policies and update of HCWM regulatory framework |  | | Memoranda on cooperation, minutes, reports, regulations |  |
| No comprehensive conceptual note on improving HCWM policies is in existence | Regulations on HCWM |
|  | |
| No standards on HCWM |  |
| Development of Regional HCWM Management Plan in selected provinces | No HCWM plans, reporting system needs improvement | The target indicators of the plans are included in the Program for the Development of Pilot Territories | programs |
| Replacement of mercury thermometers | No alternative to mercury thermometers | Mercury thermometers are replaced by electronic thermometers, followed by sound mercury wastes management. | Acceptance certificate |
|  | Establishment of HCW treatment centers at pilot sites | Health facilities have no access to organised waste treatment system, the waste is incinerated, pilot regions do not have non-incineration facilities | Functional HCW treatment centers. Emissions from uPOPS are reduced. | Certificates, reports |  |

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

1. GEF Project Information Form (PIF)
2. Project Document (ProDoc) endorsed by GEF CEO
3. Log Frame Analysis (LFA)
4. UNDP/GEF Project Document signed by UNDP and National Implementing Agency
5. Project Inception Report
6. Mid-Term Evaluation Report
7. Management Response to recommendations of Mid-Term Evaluation
8. Project quarterly (QORs and QPRs) and annual reporting (Project Implementation Reports [PIRs] and Annual Project Implementation Reports [APRs])
9. Minutes of Project Board meetings
10. Project budget and financial data
11. Project GEF Tracking Tool, at baseline, at mid-term, and at terminal points
12. Reports on monitoring of project office and pilot sites
13. ROARs
14. Project briefs and success stories
15. Project knowledge products
16. Government documentation (as an evidence of project outcomes achieved)
17. UNDP Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF)
18. UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD)
19. UNDP Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP)
20. GEF focal area strategic program objectives
21. List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Boards, and other partners to be consulted
22. Project sites, highlighting suggested visits.

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? | | | | |
|  | * Are project outcomes contributing to national development priorities and plans in accordance with the national legal and regulatory frameworks? | * Changes and amendments to the regulations | * Project reporting, national statistics and reporting | * UNDP/GEF Monitoring & Evaluation Policies, Project and government reporting/statistics review |
|  |
|  | * How has the project contributed to reduction of uPOPs emissions? | * % reduction of uPOPs from healthcare wastes incineration | * Project reporting, national statistics and reporting | * UNDP/GEF Monitoring & Evaluation Policies, Project and government reporting/statistics review |
| Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? | | | | | |
|  | * Are the achieved project outcomes commensurate with the original or modified project objectives? | * Yes/No | * Project reporting | * UNDP/GEF Monitoring & Evaluation Policies, Project reporting review | |
|  | * Whether the project outcomes provided the most effective way towards results? | * Yes/No | * Project reporting, national statistics and reporting | * UNDP/GEF Monitoring & Evaluation Policies, Project and government reporting/statistics review | |
|  | * The degree of efficiency of the HCWM system proposed within the framework of the project | * Same methods are used in other regions | * Project reporting, national statistics and reporting | * UNDP/GEF Monitoring & Evaluation Policies, Project and government reporting/statistics review | |
| Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards? | | | | | |
|  | * How efficient was the financial management of the project, including specific reference to cost-effectiveness of its interventions? | * Extent to which results have been delivered with the least costly resources possible | * Project reporting | * UNDP/GEF Monitoring & Evaluation Policies, Project reporting review | |
|  | * What was the role of UNDP and National Implementing Agency in meeting the requirements set out in UNDP Programme and Operations Policies and Procedures? | * Extent of influence to ensure meeting the required international standards | * Project reporting | * UNDP/GEF Monitoring & Evaluation Policies, Project reporting review | |
|  | * Are the systems for accountability and transparency of project management approach/results and meeting the relevant national norms and standards in place? | * # of national norms and standards met | * Project and national reporting | * UNDP/GEF Monitoring & Evaluation Policies, Project and government reporting/statistics review | |
| Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? | | | | | |
|  | * Whether the risks identified in project document and PIRs were appropriate and corresponding risk management strategies/systems were adopted and implemented? | * Extent of risk appropriateness * Yes/No | * Project reporting, UNDP-GEF Risk Management System | * UNDP/GEF Monitoring & Evaluation Policies | |
|  | * Whether or not national stakeholders participated in project management and decision-making have ownership for project outcomes and their further replication and scaling-up? | * Yes/No | * Project reporting, government reporting/documentation | * UNDP/GEF Monitoring & Evaluation Policies, Project and government documentation review | |
|  | * Was the project sustainability strategy relevant and efficient? | * Yes/No | * Project reporting; national evidences | * UNDP/GEF Monitoring & Evaluation Policies, Project and government documentation review | |
|  | * Are there any environmental risks that may pose a threat to the sustainability of the project outcomes? | * No/No |  |  | |
| **Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?** | | | | | |
|  | • What contribution was made by the established HCW treatment centers in improving the environmental situation in the pilot regions? | * uPOPs and other pollutants emissions reduced | * Project reporting, government reporting/documentation/statistics | * UNDP/GEF Monitoring & Evaluation Policies, Project and government documentation review | |
|  | * How the project did enable reducing pressure on corresponding natural resources (e.g. through reduced use of primary energy sources, and/or use of renewables)? | * It is possible to use healthcare wastes as secondary raw materials | * Project reporting, government reporting/documentation/statistics | * UNDP/GEF Monitoring & Evaluation Policies, Project and government documentation review | |

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[[3]](#footnote-3)**

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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[[5]](#footnote-5)) |
| **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[[6]](#footnote-6)) |
| **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 * *Annexed in a separate file:* TE audit trail * *Annexed in a separate file:* Terminal GEF Tracking Tool |

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: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Annex H: TE Report audit trail

The following is a template for the evaluator to show how the received comments on the draft TE report have (or have not) been incorporated into the final TE report. This audit trail should be included as an annex in the final TE report.

**To the comments received on (*date*) from the Terminal Evaluation of (*project name*) (UNDP *PIMS #)***

*The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft Terminal Evaluation report; they are referenced by institution (“Author” column) and track change comment number (“#” column):*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author** | **#** | **Para No./ comment location** | **Comment/Feedback on the draft TE report** | **TE team response and actions taken** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

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. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. 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-6)