

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 **Project Strengthening the Institutional and Financial Sustainability of the National Protected Area System (Croatia)** (PIMS 4731), further in the text PARCS Project.

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

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	Strengthening the Institutional and Financial Sustainability of the National Protected Area System (Croatia)			
GEF Project ID:	4731		<i>at endorsement</i> <i>(Million US\$)</i>	<i>at completion</i> <i>(Million US\$)</i>
UNDP Project ID:	77440	GEF financing:	4,953,000	4,953,000
Country:	Croatia (CRO)	IA/EA own:	500,000	500,000
Region:	RBEC	Government:	16,700,000	16,700,000
Focal Area:	Biodiversity	Other:	811,116	811,116
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	OP1	Total co-financing:	17,511,116	17,511,116
Executing Agency:	UNDP	Total Project Cost:	22,964,116	22,964,116
Other Partners involved:	Ministry of Environment and Energy (MoE) Croatian Agency for Environment and Nature (CAEN) 19 Public institutions governing National and Nature parks	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		07.02.2014
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: 07.02.2018	Actual: 31.12.2017

OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The terminal evaluation (TE) is focused on the PARCS project that was designed with the project **goal** “*To develop, and effectively manage, a system of protected areas to conserve a representative sample of the globally unique biodiversity of Croatia, including all ecosystems and species*” and a specific project **objective** of “*Enhancing the management effectiveness and sustainability of national protected areas to safeguard terrestrial and marine biodiversity*”.

The project **outcomes** are to deliver the “Improved management effectiveness of existing and new protected areas” and “Increased revenue for protected area systems to meet total expenditures required for management” and to reach these outcomes the project’s intervention has been organised into two **components**:

The **Component 1**: “*Reforming the institutional framework to strengthen the management effectiveness of national protected areas*” is focused on improving the current institutional framework of national protected areas to address its key systemic and institutional weaknesses (weak coordination, limited performance accountability, duplication of efforts, cost-inefficiencies and inequitable distribution of funds).

Under this component the specific outputs include: (Output 1.1) develop a national planning framework for protected areas, comprising an overarching long-term strategic plan, a medium-term financial plan and a set of operational policies and guidelines that will serve as a mechanism to better coordinate the invested efforts, and align the performance accountability, of the national protected area institutions (i.e. MOE, CAEN and the 19 national protected area Public Institutions [PIs]); (Output 1.2) strengthen the financial management capacities of the institutions managing national protected areas in order to reduce cost-inefficiencies, improve revenues and develop mechanisms for revenue-sharing; (Output 1.3) support the establishment of a ‘shared service center’ (SSC) that will function as a centralized support service to individual parks - as a value-added system-based services for reducing duplication of efforts, and improving the cost-effectiveness in the national protected areas; and (Output 1.4) assess the efficacy of – *over the longer term* – establishing a single, rationalized ‘park agency’.

The **Component 2**: “*Improving the financial sustainability of the network of national protected areas*” is focused on improving the financial sustainability of the national protected areas to ensure that they have adequate financial resources to cover the full costs of their management.

In this component the specific outputs include: (Output 2.1) introducing electronic ticketing system and piloting mooring fees as a means of collecting revenues for boat-based access to marine national protected areas; (Output 2.2) support the expansion and inter-linking of a number of isolated attractions/destinations in national protected areas into a more integrated tourism and recreational products in order to improve the visitor and/or user experience; and (Output 2.3) improve the productive efficiencies in national protected areas by: (i) identifying the mechanisms required to strengthen service standards, and improve economic efficiencies in the high-income generating national parks; and (ii) encouraging the adoption of more energy efficient technologies in national protected area in order to reduce the high recurrent costs of power supply.

The TE should provide the answers to the following basic questions:

- To what extent have the activities of the PARCS project lead to improvement of the existing protected area system in Croatia?
- What would be the state of the protected area system without the activities implemented by the PARCS project?
- To which extent has the project ensured that the Ministry of Environment and Energy has business cases and studies for various models of establishment of cross-subsidization fund between parks, to be able to decide what is the best model?
- To what extent was standardization of 19 protected areas achieved through implemented activities?

- To what extent has the project introduced new mechanisms and technologies to improve management in protected areas?
- To what extent has the project ensured environmental friendly technologies as part of investments?
- To what extent has the project improve capacity of individual institutions through implementation of various activities?
- To what extent has project assured sustainability of the implemented activities?

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 (*fill in [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 project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to

- Croatia

including the following project sites:

- Nature Park Papuk
- Nature Park Kopački rit
- National Park Paklenica
- National Park Krka
- Nature Park Učka
- National Park Risnjak

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

- Ministry of Environment and Energy, Directorate for Nature Protection
- GEF Focal Point
- Croatian Agency for Environment and Nature
- Members of the Project Board
- Members of the Technical Work Group

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

- Project Manager
- National and Nature Park Directors and other relevant staff from selected parks where project had direct investments
- Selected vendors and individual consultants

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 – Implementing Agency (IA)	
M&E Plan Implementation		Quality of Execution - Executing Agency (EA)	
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

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 financing (US\$)	own (mill. US\$)	Government (mill. US\$)	Partner Agency (mill. US\$)	Total (mill. US\$)

	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual
Grants								
Loans/Concessions								
• In-kind support								
• Other								
Totals								

MAINSTREAMING

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

IMPACT

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

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 Project Office in Croatia. The UNDP Project Office 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 20 days over a time period of 10 weeks *starting 1st September 2017* according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation	2 days	15 th September 2017
Evaluation Mission	7 days	30 th September 2017
Draft Evaluation Report	9 days	15 th October 2017
Final Report	2 days	31 st October 2017

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 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: <i>at the latest 15th September 2017</i>	Evaluator submits to UNDP project office
Presentation	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission: <i>at the latest 30th October 2017</i>	To project management, UNDP project Office
Draft Final Report	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission: <i>at the latest 24th October 2017</i>	Sent to Project office, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs
Final Report*	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft: <i>at the latest 31st October 2017</i>	Sent to Project office 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. See [Annex H](#) for an audit trail template.

TEAM COMPOSITION

The evaluation team will be composed of one (1) international and one (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 *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 evaluation will be conducted by two specialists who shall cooperate with each other in performing the work specified in these ToR. Although both specialists are expected to review all of the aspects of the Project, the task related to variations aspects of evaluation and writing the Final Report will be shared and distributed between the two specialists as follows. The International Consultant will act as a Team Leader and will hold the overall responsibility for the submission of the draft and final versions of the Evaluation Report. The Croatian Expert will be responsible for informing the International Team Leader about Croatia's development context and policy and legal framework concerning biodiversity conservation and protected areas. He/she will hold the responsibility of compiling the Final Evaluation Report section "Description of the project and its development context". While the assessment of the project design will be shared among the two team members, it is expected that the National expert provides the key input into the "Country Ownership/Driveness" and the "Stakeholder Participation" sections of the report. One of the key responsibilities for the International Team Leader would be the application of the evaluation methodology. As such, the International Team Leader is expected to provide the key input into the "Project Implementation" section

of the Final Evaluation Report and, in particular, the assessment of the implementation approach, project monitoring and evaluation activities, execution and implementation modalities. The assessment of the project results and the preparation of the FE recommendations will be a shared responsibility of the two team members. Lessons learned section is also expected to be prepared by both members of the team, although the key input is expected mainly from the International Team Leader.

Evaluation Team will have on their disposal an Interpreter/Translator which will accompany evaluators for the field visits when she/he will be under the direct supervision of the Team Leader.

National Evaluation expert must present the following qualifications:

- Minimum 7 years of relevant professional experience related to environment, biodiversity or nature protection;
- A University degree in environmental studies, agronomy, development studies, social sciences or management;
- Experience of UNDP and/or GEF;
- Recent experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- Project management experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset;
- Excellent communication skills;
- Demonstrable analytical skills.

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 submission and approval of 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

The Vetted roster- Ecosystem and Biodiversity, was used as a pre-selection tool for identification of the most suitable candidates. Potential experts were identified by checking their P11 and if available their CV's uploaded.

Applicants are requested to send their applications no later than July 15, 2017, to UNDP CO Croatia at marija.jurcevic@undp.org. Individual consultants are invited to submit applications containing a current and complete

C.V. (P11 Form) 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.

Criteria for Evaluation of Proposal: Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated. Offers will be evaluated according to the Combined Scoring method – where the educational background and experience on similar assignments will be weighted at 70% and the price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring. The applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score that has also accepted UNDP's General Terms and Conditions will be awarded the contract.

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: STRATEGIC RESULT FRAMEWORK (PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK)

STRATEGIC RESULTS FRAMEWORK (SRF) as defined after Mid Term Evaluation and Project Revision (September 2016)

	Indicator	Baseline ³ (2012/2013)	Target/s (End of Project)	Source of verification
Project Objective: Enhancing the management effectiveness and sustainability of national protected areas to safeguard terrestrial and marine biodiversity	Financial sustainability scorecard for national system of protected areas	32%	>45%	Project review of Financial Sustainability Scorecard
	Capacity development indicator score for protected area system	Systemic: 58% Institutional: 57% Individual: 46%	Systemic: 67% Institutional: 77% Individual: 72%	Project review of Capacity Development Indicator Scorecard
	Annual financing gap of the 'optimal management scenario' for national protected areas (US\$)	US\$14.7m	<US\$5m	Execution of State Budget Report MENP, SINP and national protected area PI Annual Financial Reports
	Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool scorecard (average): All national PAs National Parks Nature Parks	All national PAs: 63% National Parks: 62% Nature Parks: 64%	All national PAs: >67% National Parks: >67% Nature Parks: >67%	Project review of METT scorecard (every two years)
	Income/annum (US\$), by source, from national protected areas	Government budget allocation: 9.8% Other government allocation: 1.5% Property income: 2% Own income: 85.3% Donor revenue and other income: 1.4%	Government budget allocation: 6.5% Other government allocation: > 4.5% Property income: > 2.6% Own income: > 84.4% Donor revenue and other income: > 1.9% (target year = 2017)	Report on Execution of the State Budget MENP, SINP and national protected area PI Annual Financial Reports

³ Financial data are from 2011/2012.

	Indicator	Baseline ³ (2012/2013)	Target/s (End of Project)	Source of verification
	Guidelines for the development and revision of the management plans for Natura 2000 developed and adopted using participatory approach	Guidelines for the development and revision of the management plans for Natura 2000 developed: None	Guidelines for the development and revision of the management plans for Natura 2000 developed: Completed	Record of approval of Guidelines for the development of the management plans for Natura 2000 for national PA system
OUTCOME 1: Reforming the institutional framework to strengthen the management effectiveness of national protected areas	Outputs:			
	1.1 Develop a national planning framework for the protected area system			
	1.2 Improve the financial management capacity of protected area institutions			
	1.3 Establish a shared service centre for national protected areas			
	1.4 Assess the feasibility of establishing a park agency to administer national protected areas			
	Framework document with the mid-term (3-5 years) strategic vision and the operational set-up for the national PAs developed and approved.	Strategic framework: None	Strategic framework: Yes	Record of approval of Strategic framework for national PA system
	Guidelines for the development and revision of the management plans for PAs developed and adopted using participatory approach.	Management plan guidelines: Partial, but incomplete	Management plan guidelines: Complete	Record of approval of management plan guidelines for national PA system
Guidelines for determining of pricing in all national PAs developed.	Pricing guidelines: None	Pricing guidelines: Complete	Record of approval of pricing guidelines for national PA system	
Number of financial/business plans developed	National protected area network: 0 Individual national protected areas: 0	National protected area network: 1 Individual national protected areas: >3	Record of approval of active national and park financial/ business plans	
Number of PI and MENP staff completing specialised, targeted short-course financial training and financial skills development programmes	0%	100%	Training records Staff training certification Project reports	
No. of annual financial plans and reports that include improved integration of activity-based	0	19 (all national PAs)	Annual PIs Financial Plans and Reports	

	Indicator	Baseline ³ (2012/2013)	Target/s (End of Project)	Source of verification
	accounting into standardized planning and reporting			
	Number of PIs with available purchase of on-line entrance tickets and services administered through the Web portal "Parks of Croatia"	0	10	Online availability
	Number of users of a joint communication tools for the system of the national protected areas (Web portal, Mobile application and facebook page "Parks of Croatia")	0	Web portal: > 60.000 Mobile application: > 10.000 Facebook: > 15.000	Online analytics
Outcome 2: Improving the financial sustainability of the network of national protected areas	Outputs:			
	2.1	Reduce the transaction costs of user-pay systems in national protected areas		
	2.2	Develop integrated tourism and recreational products and services in national protected areas		
	2.3	Improve the productive efficiency of national protected areas		
	Percentage of annual revenue channelled via e-ticketing for individual PAs	0%	> 80% in the first year of implementation for participating PAs	E-ticketing data management statistics
	Availability of real-time data on PA visitation for participating PAs	Not available.	Available via a centralized system to designated PA and MENP staff.	E-ticketing data management statistics
	Increase in self-generated income (US\$/annum) in targeted national parks and nature parks	Ucka: US\$49k Risnjak: US\$279k Papuk: US\$32k Telascica: US\$614k Vransko jezero: US\$56k	Ucka: >US\$100k Risnjak: >US\$450k Papuk: >US\$50k Telascica: >US\$1m Vransko jezero: >US\$100k	PI Annual Financial Reports
Decrease in costs (US\$/month) of power supply to targeted nature parks	Risnjak Nature Park: US\$1,455 Papuk Nature Park: US\$745	Risnjak Nature Park: <US\$1,000 Papuk Nature Park: <US\$500	PI Annual Financial Reports Monthly power services accounts	
Number of certified trainers in the national PA system for visitor management	0	> 15	Training reports	

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

1. *PIF*
2. *PPG*
3. *UNDP Project Document*
4. *UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results*
5. *Project Inception Report*
6. *All Project Implementation Reports (PIR's)*
7. *Project progress reports and work plans presented to Project Board and Technical Work Group*
8. *Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools at CEO endorsement and mid-term*
9. *Oversight mission reports*
10. *All monitoring reports prepared by the project*
11. *Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team*
12. *Mid Term Review (MTR) report*
13. *MTE Management response*
14. *PIMS 4731 Croatia national PAs_Project Revision_September 2016*
15. *List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Boards, and other partners to be consulted*
16. *Project budget*

The following documents will also be available:

17. *Project office operational guidelines, manuals and systems*
18. *Minutes of the Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)*
19. *Project site location maps*

ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

(Note: 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. Refer to Annex 4 of the TE Guidance for a completed, sample evaluation criteria matrix)

This Evaluation Criteria Matrix must be fully completed/amended by the consultant and included in the TE inception report and as an Annex to the TE report.

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

<i>Ratings for Effectiveness, Efficiency, Overall Project Outcome Rating, M&E, IA & EA Execution</i>	<i>Sustainability ratings:</i>	<i>Relevance ratings</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings 5. Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings 4. Moderately Satisfactory (MS): moderate shortcomings 3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings 2. Unsatisfactory (U): major shortcomings 1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe shortcomings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Relevant (R) 1. Not relevant (NR)
<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 Form⁴

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: _____

⁴www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE⁵

- 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 Manual⁶)
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 rated⁷)
- 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

⁵The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

⁶ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

⁷ See Annex D for rating scales.

- Project Finance
- Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry (*), implementation (*), and overall assessment (*)
- Implementing Agency (UNDP) execution (*) and Executing Agency execution (*), overall project implementation/ execution (*), coordination, and operational issues

3.3 Project Results

- Overall results (attainment of objectives) (*)
- Relevance (*)
- Effectiveness (*)
- Efficiency (*)
- Country ownership
- Mainstreaming
- Sustainability: financial resources (*), socio-economic (*), institutional framework and governance (*), environmental (*), and overall likelihood (*)
- 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
- Report Clearance Form
- *Annexed in a separate file:* TE audit trail
- *Annexed in a separate file:* Terminal GEF Tracking Tool, if applicable

ANNEX G: EVALUATION REPORT CLEARANCE FORM

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

Name: __VALENTINA FUTAČ_____

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