TERMINAL EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

NATIONAL BIODIVERSITY PROJECT: CONSERVATION OF IONA NATIONAL PARK (ANGOLA)

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 *National Biodiversity Project: Conservation of Iona National Park* (PIMS #4581.)

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

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	National Biodiversity Project: Conservation of Iona National Park			
GEF Project ID:	4082		*at endorsement (Million US$)*	*at completion (Million US$)*
UNDP Project ID:	PIMS: 4581 Atlas ID: 81396	GEF financing:	2,000,000	2,000,000
Country:	Angola	IA/EA own:	1,440,000	1,440,000
Region:	Central Africa	Government:	2,000,000	2,000,000
Focal Area:	Biodiversity SO-1: Catalyzing sustainability of protected area systems	Other: EU	5,265,000	4,290,000[a]
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	BD-SP3 Strengthening Terrestrial Protected Area Networks	Total co-financing:	8,705,000	7,730,000
Executing Agency:	Ministry of Environment of Angola	Total Project Cost:	10,705,000	9,730,000
Other Partners involved:	European Union	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		13 Feb 2013
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: 12 Feb 2017	Actual: 20 Apr 2018

[a] Change in funding due to variation in exchange rate

OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

Angola's protected area system was created during the colonial era (i.e. prior to 1975). It comprises 13 protected areas (9 national parks, 2 strict nature reserves, and 2 partial reserves), covering ~12.6% (162,642 km^2) of the territory.

During the prolonged periods of instability in the country (1975-2002), aggravated by growing population needs, many of the conservation areas had been almost completely abandoned, without adequate funding, equipment or staff. Angola's conservation areas are served by a weak administrative system, with limited resources and capacity. The rehabilitation of the existing network of conservation areas, and the creation of new conservation areas, are considered important interventions required for the effective conservation of Angola's globally significant biodiversity.

The Project is designed as the first phase of a more comprehensive national program to rehabilitate, strengthen and expand Angola's system of protected areas. For this phase of the national program, the project focused outputs and activities at two levels of intervention.

At a national level, the project supported the government in the establishment and operationalisation of the Instituto Nacional de Biodiversidade e Áreas de Conservação (INBAC). It specifically supported: (i) the preparation of a strategic planning framework for the protected area system; (ii) an assessment of the current state (biodiversity, infrastructure, management, settlement, land use, etc.) of national parks and strict nature reserves; and (iii) the preparation of detailed implementation plans for the rehabilitation of these national parks and strict nature reserves.

At a local level, the project assisted the government to rehabilitate one of the largest National Park in Angola, Iona National Park (15,150 km^2) - through: (i) the establishment, training, and equipping of a functional staff complement for the park; (ii) the renovation and construction of key park infrastructure (i.e. accommodation, offices, water supply, electrical supply, basic tourism facilities etc.); (iii) the development of a management plan and related studies (community survey, fauna and livestock survey) for the park; and (iv) the piloting of community based tourism involving the traditional communities residing in the park. The latter was also intended as a first step towards a cooperative governance framework for the park, involving the local communities.

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.

The TE comprises all components of the project, irrespective of the source of financing of a specific activity or output. Specifically, the evaluation should be carried out in close collaboration with the EU Delegation (EUD), and the final report need to be endorsed by the EUD before approval and the input of EUD should be taken into account in the formulation of the final version.

EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

An overall approach and method[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

---

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

criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR (*Annex C*) The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser, EUD and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Angola, including the following project sites: Luanda, Iona National Park (Namibe Province). For approximate number of days to be spent at different locations see below. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: Ministry of Environment in Luanda (GEF operational focal point, National Director of Biodiversity, possibly Secretary of State for Biodiversity), National Institute for Biodiversity and Protected Areas (INBAC – Director General, senior staff, National Project Coordinator for Iona project), European Union Delegation (Luanda), UNDP Country Office (Country Director, Head of Inclusive Growth Cluster, Environment Specialist, Administrative and Finance Officer), Municipal Administrator of Tombwa (Namibe Province), Communal Administrator of Iona (Namibe Province), Iona National Park staff (Park Administrator, International Advisor), local tour operators (Namibe Province).

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	*rating*	**2. IA & EA Execution**	*rating*
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	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$)		Government (mill. US$)		EU (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**. 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 providing for the sustainability of project activities.

IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

---

[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

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Angola. 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 30 days over a time period of *12* weeks according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation	*3 days*	*31/12/2017*
Evaluation Mission	*19 days out of which ca. 8 days in Iona*	*15/02/2018*
Draft Evaluation Report	*5 days*	*05/03/2018*
Final Report	*3 days*	*10/04/2018*

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: *31/12/2017*	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
Presentation	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission: *15/02/2018*	To project management, UNDP CO
Draft Final Report*	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission: *05/03/2018*	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs
Final Report**	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft: *10/04/2018*	Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC.

*To be submitted for comment to UNDP and EU.

**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. The final report should be also endorsed by the EU since the final evaluation also for the use of EU for future initiatives.

TEAM COMPOSITION

The evaluation team will be composed of 1 international evaluator who will be supported for logistical purposes and the organization of project documents by CO staff. The consultant shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF and/or EU financed projects is an advantage. The international evaluator will be

responsible for finalizing the evaluation report. 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 Team members must present the following qualifications:

- A post-secondary / advanced degree (Masters level or higher) in biodiversity conservation, natural resource management or a related discipline;
- Minimum *10* years of relevant professional experience;
- Knowledge of and/or experience with UNDP and/or GEF;
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
- Experience in Africa required, with experience in the Central-Southern Africa region a distinct advantage;
- Portuguese speaking, reading and understanding.

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

Applicants are requested to apply online (http://jobs.undp.org) by 15 November 2017. Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for this position. The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in English with indication of the e-mail and phone contact, as well as a price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs).

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

ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

SECTION II: STRATEGIC RESULTS FRAMEWORK (SRF)

This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPAP: <u>Outcome 6</u> (*Strengthen national capacities to mainstream environmental protection into national development plans and programmes through a pro-poor growth perspective*); <u>Output 6.1</u> (*Effective implementation of biodiversity strategy and action plan*)
Country Programme Outcome Indicators: <u>Output 6.1</u> - *Number of programmes designed and implemented in accordance with the National Biodiversity Strategy*
Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area: *Expanding access to environmental and energy services for the poor*
Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program: <u>SO 1</u> (*Catalyzing sustainability of protected area systems*); <u>SP 3</u> (*Strengthening terrestrial protected area networks*)
Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes: *Improved management of terrestrial protected areas*
Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators: *Protected area management effectiveness as measured by individual protected area scorecards*

	Indicator	Baseline	Target/s (End of Project)	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
Project Objective Catalyze an improvement in the overall management of the protected areas network, through	1. Financial sustainability scorecard for national system of protected areas	3%	>10%	Review of Financial Sustainability Scorecard	**Assumptions:** − INBAC develops its organisational structure to meet its mandate for administering the protected area system
	2. Capacity development indicator score for protected area system	Systemic: 42% Institutional: 39% Individual: 35%	Systemic: 55% Institutional: 50% Individual: 45%	Review of Capacity Development Indicator Scorecard	

	Indicator	Baseline	Target/s (End of Project)	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
rehabilitating Iona National Park	3. Total government budget allocation (including operational, HR and capital budget) (US$ per annum) for protected area management	US$1.5 million (as at 2010/11)	>US$8 million[3]	Audited financial reports of INBAC and MINAMB	− Revenues from protected areas are reinvested in the protected area system − Models of public-private partnerships are developed and implemented in protected areas **Risks:** − Political and institutional processes delay the effective establishment of INBAC − The government assigns less priority and limited financial support for PA development − INBACs financial sustainability does not improve sufficiently fast, as government, potential donors, foundations and private sector are reluctant to invest in protected areas
	4. Number of protected areas in which the METT is adopted as a tool to monitor effectiveness of PA management	0	>7	Annual reports of INBAC and MINAMB	
Outcome 1 Rehabilitation of Iona National Park	**Outputs:** 1.1 Park staff are appointed, trained, adequately equipped and deployed in the park 1.2 Establish key park infrastructure, equipment and services 1.3 Develop and integrated park management plan 1.4 Build community and local government support for, and participation in, the conservation of the park				

---

[3] No annual adjustment for CPI

	Indicator	Baseline	Target/s (End of Project)	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	5. Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool scorecard: Iona National Park	7%	>45%	Review of METT scorecard (every two years)	**Assumptions:** − MINAMB recruits and funds the appointment of suitable permanent park personnel − The government of Namibe transfers the use of infrastructure at Espinheira and Charojamba to the park − Adequately qualified contractors can be sourced to undertake the construction projects in the park − The appointment of international/ regional consultants/contractors is not unduly delayed by bureaucratic processes − Local communities in the park are amenable to employment and alternative livelihood opportunities created by park management **Risks:** − Local communities resident in the park conflict with the park
	6. Number of park management staff appointed, equipped, trained and deployed in the park	0	12	Annual reports of INBAC and MINAMB Project reports Park annual reports	
	7. Percentage (%) of park visitors[4] obtaining a permit to traverse/overnight in the park	0%	>80%	Park visitor survey data Record of permits issued Park monthly and annual reports	
	8. Proportion (%) of the plains grassland habitats of the park (~600km^2) overgrazed by livestock (goats and cattle)	>35%	<20%	Livestock impact assessment data Park annual reports	
	9. Increase in wildlife populations: Oryx Hartmann's Zebra Springbok Ostrich	1650 265 2400 400	>2000 >300 >3500 >500	Game count survey data Park annual reports	

---

[4] 'Visitors' are defined as any person not permanently residing in the park

	Indicator	Baseline	Target/s (End of Project)	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	10. Number of critical natural freshwater springs and wells secured and accessible for use by medium-sized and large wildlife species	0 (of 16)	4 (of 16)	Records of community meetings Formal community-park agreements Minutes of the cooperative governance structure established for the park Park annual reports	authority over restrictions on their traditional nomadic transhumance and other resource-use practices – Climate change exacerbates habitat fragmentation in terrestrial ecosystems in the park – The proposed Baynes Mountain Dam and hydro-power project results in severe negative impacts on the park during the construction and operational phases.
	11. Number of poaching incidents (park visitors) recorded in the park/annum	No data	<12	Park monthly and annual reports	
	12. Proportion (%) of communities living in the park that are adequately represented in the park management decision-making processes.	0	>60%	Records of community meetings Minutes of the cooperative governance structure established for the park	
	13. Number of job opportunities (direct and indirect) created for local communities living in, or adjacent to, the park	Direct: 0 Indirect: 0	Direct: >10 Indirect: >30	Socio-economic surveys of park communities Park annual reports	
	14. Average annual income (US$) of households living in the park	US$155/annum	>US$250/annum	Socio-economic surveys of park communities Park annual reports	

	Indicator	Baseline	Target/s (End of Project)	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Outputs: 2.1 Prepare a strategic plan for the protected area system 2.2 Develop the organizational structure and staff complement for the protected area system 2.3 Assess the current state of national parks and strict nature reserves 2.4 Prepare detailed implementation plans for the rehabilitation of national parks and strict nature reserves				
Outcome 2 Strengthen institutional capacity to manage the protected areas network	15. Strategic Plan, and a policy framework, for the system of protected areas formally approved by government	No	Yes	Government Decree	**Assumptions:** − The government formally approves and adopts equitable job descriptions and remuneration levels for protected area staff − There is a pool of sufficiently qualified and experienced personnel who could be sourced, appointed and deployed to administer protected areas − The knowledge about, and access to, individual protected areas is freely available **Risks:** − Political and institutional processes delay the effective establishment of INBAC − The government assigns less priority and limited financial support for PA development
	16. Organizational structure for protected areas and job descriptions, remuneration levels and conditions of service for protected area staff formally adopted by government	No	Yes	Public Service Regulation	
	17. Recruitment of staff to approved protected area posts in the organogram of the protected area agency (as a % of posts with permanent staff appointed)	0	>50%	Annual report of PA agency	
	18. Number of protected area staff completing in-service training and skills development programmes	0	20	Annual report of PA agency	
	19. Number of senior protected area staff in a structured mentoring programme	0	3	Annual report of PA agency	
	20. Number of national parks and strict nature reserves with fully documented up-to-date assessments of their state and biodiversity value	0	7	State of Parks/Reserves reports	
	21. Number of protected areas where a structured rationalisation and rehabilitation	1	4	Annual report of PA agency	

	Indicator	Baseline	Target/s (End of Project)	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	programme is adequately resourced and under implementation				− INBACs financial sustainability does not improve sufficiently fast, as government, potential donors, foundations and private sector are reluctant to invest in protected areas

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

GEF Project Information Form (PIF), Project Document, Log Frame Analysis (LFA), Extension request

EU project information (Description of the Action), Extension request, Reports

Project Inception Report

Annual Project Implementation (APR/PIR) Reports

Mid Term Review (MTR) Report

Annual and other progress reports of the project to the EU

Reports of Steering Committee meetings

Select project workshop reports

Iona Park Management Plan and other key plans and assessment reports produced by the project

List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Boards, and other partners to be consulted

Project sites, highlighting suggested visits

Project budget and financial data

Project Tracking Tool, at baseline, at mid-term, and at terminal points

UNDP Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF)

UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD)

UNDP Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP)

GEF focal area strategic program objectives

ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

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?			
• Is the project relevant to the GEF biodiversity focal area?	• Existence of a clear relationship between the project objectives and results and the GEF biodiversity focal area	• Project documents • GEF focal area documents	• Document analysis • Interviews with project stakeholders
• Is the project relevant to Angola's environment and sustainable development objectives and the SDGs?	• Degree of coherence between project objectives and results and Angola's environmental and development goals	• Project documents • National policies and strategies • Key project partners	• Document analysis • Interviews with project stakeholders
• Is the project addressing needs of target beneficiaries at the local level?	• Degree of involvement of local stakeholders in project design and implementation • Strength of link between identified needs of local stakeholders and project activities	• Project documents • Local project partners and stakeholders	• Document analysis • Interviews with partners and stakeholders
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
• Has the project been effective in achieving its intended outcomes and objectives (from GEF, UNDP, EU, Government perspective)?	• Indicators in Project document results framework • Other indicators of success to be proposed by stakeholders	• Project documents • Project stakeholders and partners	• Document analysis • Interviews with stakeholders and partners
• What lessons can be learned regarding effectiveness for other similar projects in the future?	•	• Information collected throughout evaluation	• Analysis of information collected
•		•	•
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?			
• Was adaptive management used to ensure efficient resource use?	• Occurrence of change in project design and implementation approach when needed to improve project efficiency	• Project documents • Project team • Stakeholders	• Document analysis • Interviews with stakeholders and project team
• Were financial resources used efficiently?	• Cost associated with delivery of activities compared to alternatives	• Project documents • Project team	• Document analysis

			Interviews with stakeholders and project team
		Stakeholders	
•	•	•	•

Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
• Can project results be sustained at the site (protected area) level?	• Expectation of available funding from Government and other sources relative to demand at site level over the medium term	• Project stakeholders	• Interviews
• Can project results be sustained at the national level?	• Expected capacity of Government agencies to sustain and translate project investments at national and institutional level into long-term benefits for protected areas system	• Project stakeholders	• Interviews
• What are the financial, institutional, socio-economic and environmental risks to sustaining project results over the long term?	•	• Project stakeholders	• Interviews

Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
• Has the project contributed to improved ecological status at site level?	• Level of management and conservation status of protected area	• Project documents and surveys • Protected area staff • Local stakeholders	• Document analysis • Interviews • Site visit
• Has the project contributed to improved ecological status at protected area system level?	• Level of management and conservation status of protected area system	• Project documents and surveys • Stakeholders	• Document analysis • Interviews

ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

Ratings for Effectiveness, Efficiency, Overall Project Outcome Rating, M&E, IA & EA Execution	Sustainability ratings:	Relevance ratings
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	4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks	2. Relevant (R) 1. Not relevant (NR)
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]

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]

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[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])

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

---

[6]The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes).

[7] UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

[8] 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

(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