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 *“Initial Implementation of Accelerated HCFC Phase Out in the CEIT Region (Belarus, Tajikistan, Ukraine and Uzbekistan)”* (PIMS #4309.)

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

Project Summary Table

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Title: |  | | | | | |
| GEF Project ID: | | 4309 |  | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | | *at completion (Million US$)* |
| UNDP Project ID: | | SVK10, 00066255, 00082456; BLR10, 00070086, 00084272; TJK10, 00066625, 00082745; UKR10, 00066300,00082497; UZB10, 00063869, 00080735 | GEF financing: | US$ 9,000,000 | | TBC at completion |
| Country: | | *Belarus, Tajikistan, Ukraine and Uzbekistan* | IA/EA own: | N/A | | TBC at completion |
| Region: | | Europe and Central Asia | Government: | US$ 5,400,000 | | TBC at completion |
| Focal Area: | | GEF/Ozone | Other: | US$ 23,740,000 | | TBC at completion |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): | | ODS/SP1 | Total co-financing: | US $25,445,000 | | TBC at completion |
| Executing Agency: | | UNDP | Total Project Cost: | US $34,445,000 | | TBC at completion |
| Other Partners involved: | | Ministry of Environments of respective countries | ProDoc Signature (date project began): | | | 31.07.2013 |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | | Proposed:  31.07.2016 | Actual:  31.07.2018 |

Objective and Scope

The project was designed to respond to the obligations incurred by participating countries (Belarus, Tajikistan, Ukraine and Uzbekistan) under their respective phase out schedule for HCFCs of the Montreal Protocol. It is a timely capacity building effort (with investment elements for the manufacturing, where existing, and servicing sectors) designed to improve regulatory measures to help address the accelerated HCFC phase-out in the medium and longer term, and to strengthen the preparedness for the complete phase-out of HCFCs from current use. The project document has been designed to address the following two main components (regional and national):

* Component 1 (Regional information exchange and networking component), addressing barriers associated with incomplete knowledge and awareness and which is aligned with PIF Component 1; Outcomes 1(a-d) - the component to be implemented on UNDP regional level (initially out of UNDP Bratislava Regional Center, and later on from a new UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub);
* Component 2 (National capacity building and technical assistance component), targeting support to the adoption of the fully completed HCFC phase-out strategy (with selected legislative options to control HCFC import/use), capacity building and supply of analytical and servicing equipment/tools for the Environmental Inspectorate and Customs Departments and refrigeration technicians, technological conversions for solvents and rigid foams, modernization of HCFC re-use scheme in the country and demonstration of alternative technologies in refrigeration equipment and A/C sectors, pilot small-scale ODS destruction.

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](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/UNDP-GEF-TE-Guide.pdf) . A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR (see Annex A). 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 IRH and Country Offices, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Dushanbe-Tajikistan, Istanbul-Turkey, Kiev-Ukraine, Minsk-Belarus, Tashkent-Uzbekistan as primary locations with additional visits to projects sites as deemed necessary in each country; and to Uzbekistan to present final TE report during the regional project closure meeting in May-June 2018. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: Ministry of Environments, UNDP Country Offices and project teams of respective project countries (Belarus, Tajikistan, Ukraine and Uzbekistan) and other key stakeholders in the project countries as well as regional project team and MPU/Chemicals team based in UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub.

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 C), 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** | ***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) | UNDP own financing (mill. US$) | | Government  (mill. US$) | | Partner Agency  (mill. US$) | | Total  (mill. US$) | |
| Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Actual | Actual |
| Grants |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Loans/Concessions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * In-kind support |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Mainstreaming

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

Impact

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project 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**. Conclusions should build on findings and be based in evidence. Recommendations should be prioritized, specific, relevant, and targeted, with suggested implementers of the recommendations. Lessons should have wider applicability to other initiatives across the region, the area of intervention, and for the future.

Implementation arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP Istanbul Regional (IRH). The UNDP IRH will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within countries 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 45days according to the following plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Timing | Completion Date |
| **Preparation** | 4 days | 15 January 2018 |
| **Evaluation Missions** | 20[[3]](#footnote-3)days as follows:  4 days mission to each of Minsk-Belarus and Tashkent-Uzbekistan as primary locations with additional visits to projects sites as deemed necessary in each country;  3 days mission to each of Kiev-Ukraine and Dushanbe-Tajikistan as primary locations with additional visits to projects sites as deemed necessary in each country;  2 days mission to Istanbul-Turkey.  4 days for mission reports. | 12 March 2018 |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | 16 days | 16 April 2018 |
| **Final Report** | 3 days | 30 April 2018 |
| **Presentation Mission** | 2 days mission to regional project closure meeting in Uzbekistan. | May-June 2018 (exact date to be confirmed but not later than 30 June 2018) |

Evaluation deliverables

The evaluator 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 missions (due date – 15 January 2018) | Evaluator submits to UNDP IRH |
| **Mission Reports** | Short summary of TE findings | Within 1 week after the completion of evaluation missions (due date – 12 March 2018) | Evaluator submits to UNDP IRH |
| **Draft Final Report** | Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes | Within 4 weeks after the completion of evaluation missions (due date – 16 April 2018) | Sent to UNDP IRH, reviewed by RTA, PCU |
| **Final Report\*** | Revised report | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft (due date – 30 April 2018) | Sent to UNDP IRH for uploading to UNDP ERC. |
| **Presentation** | Presentation of the final TE report during the regional project closure meeting | May-June 2018 (exact date to be confirmed but not later than 30 June 2018) | To regional project meeting participants |

\*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.

QUALIFICATIONS

The evaluation will be conducted by an independent international evaluator. The consultant shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The evaluator selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The evaluator must present the following qualifications:

* A Master’s degree in chemistry, physics, engineering, environmental science, or other closely related field (10%);
* Minimum 5 years of relevant professional experience on Montreal Protocol and Ozone Depleting Substances (20%);
* Previous experience with results‐based monitoring and evaluation methodologies (20%);
* Experience working with the UN and GEF will be considered an asset (10%);
* Experience in Montreal Protocol implementations in the Europe and CIS region of the project will be considered an asset (5%);
* Understanding and basic knowledge of Russian is an asset (5%);

The price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring.

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 |
| *20%* | Following submission of inception report and mission travel plan |
| *40%* | Following submission of evaluation mission reports |
| *40%* | Following submission and approval (UNDP-IRH and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report and its presentation in the regional project closure meeting |

Application process

Qualified candidates are requested to apply online via this website. The application should contain:

* **Cover letter** explaining why you are the most suitable candidate for the advertised position. Please paste the letter into the "Resume and Motivation" section of the electronic application.
* **Filled P11** form including past experience in similar projects and contact details of referees   
  (blank form can be downloaded from

http://www.eurasia.undp.org/content/dam/rbec/docs/P11\_modified\_for\_SCs\_and\_ICs.doc); please upload the P11 instead of your CV.

* **Financial Proposal\*** - Total lump sum amount in USD for tasks specified in this announcement. Mission related costs must NOT be included in the price offer as they will be covered separately as per UNDP rules and regulations.
* **Incomplete applications will not be considered. Please make sure you have provided all requested materials. Please combine all your documents into one (1) single PDF document as the system only allows to upload maximum one document.**

*\* Please note that the financial proposal is all-inclusive and shall take into account various expenses incurred by the consultant/contractor during the contract period (e.g. fee, health insurance, vaccination, personal security needs and any other relevant expenses related to the performance of services...).*

***Payments*** *will be made only upon confirmation of UNDP on delivering on the contract obligations in a satisfactory manner.*

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

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

*Qualified women and members of minorities are encouraged to apply.*

*Due to large number of applications we receive, we are able to inform only the successful candidate about the outcome or status of the selection process.*

Annex A: 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 b: list of documents

1. PIF

2. LPAC minutes

3. Project Documents

4. Environmental and Social Screening results

5. Project Inception Report

6. All Project Implementation Reports (PIR’s)

7. Annual workplans

8. Midterm Review Report

9. Oversight mission reports

10. All monitoring reports prepared by the project

11. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team

The following documents will also be available:

12. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems

13. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)

14. Minutes of the “Initial Implementation of Accelerated HCFC Phase Out in the CEIT Region

(Belarus, Tajikistan, Ukraine and Uzbekistan)” Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)

15. Technical reports documents prepared by the project

Annex C: Project Logical Framework

|  |
| --- |
| **This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPAP or CPD:**  Please refer to specific country annexes |
| **Country Programme Outcome Indicators:**  Please refer to specific country annexes |
| **Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area (same as that on the cover page, circle one):** |
| **Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program:**  **Objectives:** To protect human health and the environment by assisting countries to phase out consumption and production and prevent releases of ODS according to their commitments to Montreal Protocol phase-out schedules, while enabling low-GHG (Greenhouse Gas) alternative technologies and practices.  **Program:** For the period of GEF-4, the GEF will assist eligible countries in meeting their HCFC phase-out obligations under the Montreal Protocol, and strengthening capacities and institutions in those countries that still are faced with difficulties in meeting their reporting obligations. |
| **Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes:**   * + **HCFCs are phased-out according to Montreal Protocol schedule, or faster, in GEF-eligible countries**   + **GEF-eligible countries meet their reporting obligations under the Montreal Protocol** |
| **Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators:**  (1)Indicators for Outcome 1:  (a) ODP adjusted tons of HCFCs phased-out from consumption (GEF-4 replenishment target: HCFCs: 50-70 ODP tons)  (b) Percentage reduction in HCFC consumption in the participating countries  (2) Indicators for Outcome 2:  (a) Percentage of GEF-funded countries that meet their reporting obligations under the Montreal Protocol |

| **Project Strategy** | **Objectively**  **verifiable**  **indicators** | **Baseline** | **Target** | **Sources of**  **verification** | **Assumptions** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Objective: To achieve compliance with the accelerated Montreal Protocol HCFC phase-out requirements through stabilization and progressive reduction of HCFC consumption.** | * Participating country[[4]](#footnote-4) is in compliance with the MP obligations for 2015 and 2020, or accelerates the phase-out earlier than MP requirements are enforced | * Lack of approved HCFC phase-out strategy; * Gaps in institutional capacity and HCFC use control system; * Weak HCFC re-use capacity and low-level of technical knowledge and instrumentation to address HCFC in the servicing sector * Limited technical knowledge relating to good refrigeration practices as regards alternative refrigerants (non-ODS/low GWP such as ammonia, carbon dioxide, etc) * No current information products and programs * Limited availability of technical tools to test gas composition and quality as well as to limit emissions of HCFCs during equipment maintenance * Limited exposure to alternative technologies and understanding of energy-saving aspects of new modern equipment operational on new technologies | * HCFC phase-out strategy fully formulated and recommended for adoption and implementation; * Effective regulatory instruments to control HCFC use, and thus, import of HCFCs and HCFC containing equipment in place and effectively implemented; * Printed materials on various aspects related to HCFC phase-out (policy control options, enforcement and illegal trade, alternative technologies and energy-efficiency, ODS destruction, best refrigeration practices etc) available * Current capacities of project stakeholders strengthened through capacity building and investment support in manufacturing and servicing sectors | * Status of HCFC phase-out strategy as a formal government strategic document; * National legal and regulatory registers * Art 7 reporting to Ozone Secretariat on HCFC import and monitoring of HCFC import reduction; * Project Progress and M/E reports | * Overall government commitment and assumption of appropriate responsibility; * Regulatory enforcement resources and capacity available; * Project stakeholders actively participate in the project implementation and realization of HCFC phase-out strategy; * Accurate monitoring and reporting. |
| **Outcome 1: Regional accelerated phase-out capacity building (all countries)** | | | | | |
| **Outcome 1 (a): Legislative and Policy Options for HCFC phase-out and control** | * Russian language resource materials on HCFC control options prepared * Awareness training for decision-makers on legislative and regulatory actions accomplished * Regional networking on the country with Art 5 and other non Art 5 countries in the region is supported | * Key stakeholders generally have limited awareness of the issue or actions required on the higher or technical level to address HCFC phase-out; * Decision-makers from enforcement department (Environment Protection, Customs) have limited knowledge and lack practical skills on the regulatory approaches to effectively control HCFC related challenges; * Limited number or lack of trained trainers on enforcement and best refrigeration aspects; * Required materials in Russian or local languages, on HCFC control options, Customs enforcement approaches and methodologies, refrigeration sector capacity building, energy-efficiency, alternative technologies and their application, illegal trade and PIC, technician certification and ODS waste management related issues are limited in availability or absent; * Regional networking with other partner countries in the region is lacking which prevents information and experience exchange [see topics above]; * Cooperation between non-Art 5 countries on effective action standards is minimal or absent. | * Availability of key guidance documentation in Russian, or local languages, where required, on HCFC control options, Customs enforcement approaches and methodologies, refrigeration sector capacity building, energy-efficiency, ODS destruction etc; * High-level decision-makers of Environment Protection, Customs, territorial inspectorates, other Governmental agencies such as Ministry of Education, Standardization Committee are well informed and support the objectives of HCFC consumption phase-out and measures to address this process; * Training of a selected number of trainers on the technical level (Customs controls and refrigeration practices) is complete on regional level to initiate trainings on national level * Regional networking with non Art 5 and other Art 5 countries re-established, contacts re-engaged, and overall supports accelerated capacity building of the country as well as essential experience exchange on important HCFC phase-out related topics | * National legal and regulatory registers * Equivalence comparison to international standards * Number of regional/sub-regional meetings attended by each country, and specific department (organized by MLF/UNEP-CAP team or by the current project) * Number of materials, in Russian, or local languages, prepared and used by the countries * Number of involved/trained decision makers and trainers trained in each country * Monitoring of press and media coverage * Project Progress and M/E reports | * In-country interagency coordination is sustainable through high-level Government support and allows for timely participation of various departments in regional meetings * MLF/UNEP-CAP and other regional and sub-regional conferences and meetings are organized on HCFC phase-out subjects etc * Trainers are further deployed for the training at national level * Any additional training will be organized at national level (with or w/o participation of international trainer) |
| **Outcome 1 (b): Capacity Building for Enforcement of HCFC control measures by customs and environmental/technical inspection authorities** | * Russian language resource documentation * Awareness raising activities * Training of Trainers * PIC Network * Regional networking |
| **Outcome 1 (c): Capacity Building for the Refrigeration Sector, Incorporation of Energy-Efficiency and GHG reduction elements** | * Preparation of Russian language training manuals and information materials * ToT on Best Refrigeration Practices |
| **Outcome 1 (d): Support for the development of regional institutions, capacity, and cooperation** | * Preparation of Russian language information materials * Promotion of Information exchange mechanisms * Facilitation of regional dialogue |

Annex D: Rating Scales

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

Annex E: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form

**Evaluators:**

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

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form[[5]](#footnote-5)**

**Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System**

**Name of Consultant:** \_\_     \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Name of Consultancy Organization** (where relevant)**:** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.**

Signed at *place* on *date*

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Annex F: Evaluation Report Outline[[6]](#footnote-6)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **i.** | Opening page:   * Title of UNDP 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 member/s * Acknowledgements |
| **ii.** | Executive Summary   * Project Summary Table * Project Description (brief) * Evaluation Rating Table * Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons |
| **iii.** | Acronyms and Abbreviations  (See: UNDP Editorial Manual[[7]](#footnote-7)) |
| **1.** | Introduction   * Purpose of the evaluation * Scope & Methodology * Structure of the evaluation report |
| **2.** | Project description and development context   * Project start and duration * Problems that the project sought to address * Immediate and development objectives of the project * Baseline Indicators established * Main stakeholders * Expected Results |
| **3.** | Findings  (In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) must be rated[[8]](#footnote-8)) |
| **3.1** | Project Design / Formulation   * Analysis of 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 (if applicable) |

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 by comment number (“#” column):*

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

Annex i: Terminal GEF Tracking Tool

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **PHASE OUT OF ODS** | | | | | |
| **Project title** |  | | | | |
| **Country** |  | | | | |
| **GEF Agency** |  | | | | |
| **GEF PMIS #** |  | | | | |
| **[New tools and regulatory, and economic approaches]** | | | | |  |
| **Indicators** | | **Number** | **Qualitative comments from the project team or the GEF Agency** | | |
| Indicator 1.1.1: Number of demonstrated tools for ODS phase out1 | |  |  | | |
| Indicator 1.1.2: Prioritized list of actions for reducing/eliminating ODS | | NA |  | | |
| Indicator 1.2: Number of technologies demonstrated, deployed and transferred | |  |  | | |
| **[Phase out of ODS]** | |  |  |  |  |
| **Indicators** | | **Quantity  (tons)** | | **Cost1  ($ per ton)** | **Qualitative comments2 from the project team or the GEF Agency** |
| Project target | Achieved to date |
| Indicator 5.1.1: Tonnes of ODS phased out | |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 5.1.2: Tonnes of CO2 equivalent phased out | |  |  |  |  |
| Notes |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Overall costs including packaging, transport, safe storage, and treatment or disposal as appropriate. | | | | | |
| 2. Provide information on disposal technology and whether in-country or abroad. | | | | | |

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. Please note that indicated mission days do not include days spent on travel between the duty station and the project country. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Except Ukraine which will request separate assistance in servicing sector. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)