**Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference**

**Project name**: Biomass Production and Utilization in Georgia

**Post title:** International Consultant for the Final Evaluation (FE) of full-sized UNDP-GEF project

**Type of contract:** Individual Contract (IC)

**Assignment type:** International Consultant

**Country / Duty Station**: Home Based with one mission of 7 working days (not including travel days) to Georgia

**Expected places of travel (if applicable)**: Tbilisi, Georgia and day trips to pilot projects in other parts of Georgia (with return to Tbilisi by evening)

**Languages required**: English

**Starting date of assignment**: 1st July – 31st October 2017

**Duration of Contract**: 22 working days spread over a four months period from 1st July – 31st October 2017

**Duration of Assignment**: 22 working days of which a minimum of 7 working days which must be spent in Georgia

**Payment arrangements**: Lump-sum contract (payments linked to satisfactory performance and delivery of results)

**Administrative arrangements:** UNDP Georgia will arrange travel to Tbilisi, Georgia and transport for day trips within Georgia. The international consultants shall be paid for their travel by UNDP Georgia in accordance with UNDP rules and regulations.

**Evaluation method**: Desk review with validation interview

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 the Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the Promotion of Biomass Production and Utilization in Georgia (PIMS #4335.) This ToR also sets out the scope of work, deliverables, timeframe and payment terms for International Evaluator, Team Leader.

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

Project Summary Table

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Project Title:  |  |
| GEF Project ID: | 4157 |   | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | *at completion (Million US$)* |
| UNDP Project ID: | 4335 | GEF financing:  | 0.925 | 0.925 |
| Country: | Georgia | IA/EA own: | 0.155 | 0.155 |
| Region: | Europe and Central Asia | Government: | 0 | 0 |
| Focal Area: | Climate Change | Other: | 0 | 0 |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): | 0 | Total co-financing: | 0 | 0 |
| Executing Agency: | Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources Protection of Georgia (MoENRP) | Total Project Cost: | 1.08 | 1.08 |
| Other Partners involved: | N/A | ProDoc Signature (date project began):  | 06/10/2013 |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | Proposed:31/10/2017 | Actual:31/10/2017 |

Objective and Scope

The project has been designed to promote sustainable production and utilization of upgraded biomass fuels to meet the municipal services sector’s heating needs in a sustainable and efficient way, thereby reducing dependence on fossil fuels and avoiding GHG emissions. There are four major expected outcomes of the project:

Enhanced and approved policy and regulatory framework for efficient utilization of biomass energy Increased market confidence in the feasibility of production and utilization of upgraded biomass fuels Created local supply of and demand for upgraded biomass fuels Improved public knowledge and stakeholder capacities for bioenergy development and replication

A copy of the project document which provides more information about the project can be found at the following link:

<http://www.ge.undp.org/content/georgia/en/home/operations/projects/environment_and_energy/promoting-the-production-and-use-of-biomass-in-georgia.html>

A main objective of this project is to facilitate a shift from fossil to biomass fuels, and to promote their production and usage in the municipal services sector with the main goal that by the end of this project a municipal biomass project (for heating) has been designed, underway, and has been implemented with the biomass pellets being supplied by a private sector company. Currently, the situation in Georgia is that there is very limited use of biomass energy (for either heat supply or electricity) due to a number of legal, regulatory, policy, financial, and awareness barriers. The goal of this project is therefore to help overcome these barriers with targeted technical assistance so that by the end of the project there is increased awareness of the importance of biomass energy and that by the end of this project there is significantly increased awareness of the importance of biomass energy and the first biomass demonstrations projects in Georgia have successfully been implemented with the support of this project.

The Terminal Evaluation 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, to assess the extent to which the project has successfully carried out adaptive management following the mid-term review, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of future UNDP programming.

The project has originally had a duration of 4 years and has been planned to last from November 2011 to November 2015 but due to a late start and the fact that the project only really started in June 2013 the project applied for and received a 2 year extension from November 2015 to the end of October 2017. A mid-term review of the project was carried out in November 2015 which made recommendations on how to improve the project over the last 2 years of the project implementation.

The total GEF Budget for the project amounted to $925,000.In addition the project, as originally designed, envisaged $4,555,000 USD of co-financing as follows:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Name of Co-financier (source)*** | ***Classification*** | ***Type*** | Project  | % |
| Tbilisi Municipality  | Local Government | Cash | 3,000,000 | 67 |
| Ministry of Environment  | National Government | In-kind | 100,000 | 2 |
| D&V Ltd | Private Sector | Cash | 500,000 | 11 |
| Dioskuria Ltd.  | Private Sector | Cash | 400,000 | 9 |
| Georgia Coal Ltd.  | Private Sector | Cash / in-kind | 300,000 | 7 |
| UNDP | Implementing Agency | Cash | 155,000 | 3 |
| **Total Co-financing** | **4,455,000** | **100** |

The Terminal Evaluation should also evaluate the extent to which this co-financing materialized as envisaged in the project design and the extent to which adaptive management was successfully undertaken to seek new co-financing , when co-financing failed to materialize. This is of particular importance in the case of this project due to the fact that most of the original co-financing envisaged in the project did not materialize and was instead replaced by new co-financing. It is important therefore, that the terminal evaluation assesses why this was the case and what are the lessons learned from this need to shift co-financing partners.

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[[2]](#footnote-2). A set of questions covering each of these criteria will be provided to the selected evaluator (see [*Annex C*](#_TOR_Annex_C:)). The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence‐based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point and Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources Protection, as well as UNDP Country Office, project team including international CTA, UNDP GEF Regional Technical Adviser on Climate Change Mitigation and other key stakeholders including co-financing partners as listed in the project document and new partners identified during the course of the project. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to three project sites in eastern Georgia: Matani (Akhmeta), Manavi (Sagarejo) and Ponichala to conduct interviews with project grantees*.* Interviews will be also held with the project board members, key partners, contractors, grantees as well as few other stakeholders. The list of organizations/individuals will be provided by UNDP Georgia during the inception phase though at a minimum it should include following: UNDP Georgia, UNDP Istanbul Regional Centre, Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources Protection of Georgia, National Nursery, National Forestry Agency, NGOs - World Experience to Georgia, New Technology Center, Energy Efficiency Center, Greens Movement of Georgia, , “Greenergy” Ltd, “Nisoni” Ltd, and Biomass Association of Georgia. In addition, the evaluator should meet with and/or discuss the project with Tbilisi municipality, D&V limited, Dioskuria Limited, and Georgia Coal Limited all of whom provided co-financing letters to the project but did not participate with the view of understanding why they did not participate in the project. The reason for these meetings/discussions is to understand why these partners did not eventually participate in the project.

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 biomass strategy and related documents, feasibility studies on biomass, documents related to the establishment of the biomass association of Georgia, and other legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in [Annex B](#_TOR_Annex_B:) of this Terms of Reference.

Evaluation Criteria & Ratings

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

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

Project finance / cofinance

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. The extent to which adaptive management was undertaken to replace co-financing that did not materialize shall also be assessed and evaluated. 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 supports 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.[[3]](#footnote-3)

Conclusions, recommendations & lessons

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

Implementation arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Georgia. 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 *2*2 working days including one mission to Georgia of at least 7 working days (not including travel days or weekend days spent in Georgia) according to the following plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Timing | Completion Date |
| **Preparation for Mission and Inception Report** | *2* days | July 3, 2017 |
| **Evaluation Mission** | 7 working days + 2 travel days = 9 days in total | Before end of July 2017. |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | *8* days | September 6, 2017 |
| **Final Report** | *3* days | October 6, 2017 |
| **Total** | *22 days* |  |

Evaluation deliverables

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following deliverables:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Deliverable | Content  | Timing | Responsibilities |
| **Inception Report** | Evaluator provides methodology, timing, and approach to final evaluation and initial observations based upon desk review of materials | No later than 1 week before the evaluation mission.  | Evaluator submits to UNDP CO  |
| **Presentation** | Initial Findings  | End of evaluation mission | To project management, UNDP CO and to national partners, as appropriate |
| **Draft Final Report**  | Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes | Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission | Sent to CO, reviewed by UNDP RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs |
| **Final Report\*** | Revised report  | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft  | Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC.  |

\*When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluator is required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report.

Team Composition

The terminal evaluation will be undertaken and led by independent International Evaluator, Team Leader and will be assisted by the National Consultant, Team Member. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating sustainable energy projects either for UNDP or for other donors. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The Team leader must present the following qualifications:

* A Master’s degree in fields related to Environment, Natural resources, M&E, Renewable energy, Management, or other related field.
* Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;
* Experience/proven record in undertaking evaluations with international organizations in the past 7 years;
* Experience/proven record in undertaking evaluations for UNDP or for GEF will be an advantage;
* Experience of working in former Europe & CIS Countries, preferably in energy or environment sector in the past 7 years;
* Experience working in Georgia in the past 7 years in the energy or environment sector is an asset;
* Work experience related to renewable energy in any country during the last 7 years is an asset;
* Work experience related specifically to Biomass energy projects will be an advantage;
* Fluency in English.

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

Payment terms are as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| % | Milestone |
| *10%* | upon approval of the final Inception Report and prior to the mission to Georgia |
| *40%* | upon submission of the draft report and following the mission to Georgia |
| *50%* | upon finalization of the Terminal Evaluation report including taking into account and considering all of the comments on the draft report |
| 100% of travel costs  | (including living allowance, ticket cost and any other travel related transfer costs)Upon arrival in Tbilisi, Georgia |

Application process

Selection will be done using RBEC vetted roster. Selected individuals will be interview by Skype. Candidates shortlisted after the interview will be requested to submit a price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment (including daily consultancy fee, flight ticket, DSA and any other travel costs).

Annex A: Project Logical Framework

|  |
| --- |
| **This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPAP or CPD:** Underlying disaster risk factors are reduced, focusing on sustainable environmental and natural resource management |
| **Country Programme Outcome Indicators:** Enabling environment and status of implementation of national and international environmental commitments |
| **Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area (same as that on the cover page): 1. Mainstreaming environment and energy** OR 2. Catalyzing environmental finance OR 3. Promote climate change adaptation OR 4. Expanding access to environmental and energy services for the poor. |
| **Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program:** GEF-4 Strategic Programme #4 on “Promoting Sustainable Energy Production from Biomass”. |
|  | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Targets** **End of Project** | **Source of verification** | **Risks and Assumptions** |
| **Project Goal**Reduction of GHG emissions associated with thermal energy use in the municipal services sectors in Georgia | GHG emission reductions, achieved during project lifetime, from project-supported installation and operation of biomass boilers in Tbilisi | Zero | 7,000 tons CO2eq | Project monitoring system | - Feasibility studies prove cost-effectiveness of biomass technologies in Georgian context - Required investments are forthcoming |
| **Project Objective** To promote sustainable production and utilization of upgraded biomass fuels in heating applications in the municipal services sector of Georgia | Installed capacity of incremental biomass heating systems, substituting fossil fuel-based heating, supported by the project | Zero  | At least 2 MW | Commissioning reports | - Feasibility studies prove cost-effectiveness of biomass technologies in Georgian context - Required investments are forthcoming  |
| **Outcome 1:** Enhancedand approvedpolicy and regulatory framework for efficient utilization of biomass energy | Availability of long-term vision for bioenergy development in Georgia  | No long-term vision for bioenergy sector in Georgia  | National Bioenergy Strategy and Action Plan, which reflects broad stakeholder consensus, adopted by the Government of Georgia | Bioenergy strategy; stakeholder consultation reports | Government of Georgia willing to formalize vision for bioenergy development in the country  |
| Share of upgraded biomass fuels on the Georgian market that meet the national quality standards | No standards  | Quality standards for upgraded biomass fuels and biomass heating systems are in placeAt least 30% of upgraded biomass fuels meeting the standards | Testing reports  | Relevant stakeholders provide sufficient level of cooperation |
| Availability of detailed information on the amount and location of biomass in Georgia | Biomass information scarce and unreliable  | Detailed inventory of available biomass resources with update mechanisms in place Established biomass monitoring system | Inventory database, reports | Relevant stakeholders provide sufficient level of cooperation  |
| **Outcome 2** Increased market confidence in the feasibility of production and utilization of upgraded biomass fuels  | Status of investors’ decision to co-finance a biomass upgrading plant in Tbilisi | Preliminary co-financing agreements made | Investors closed financing as per pilot plant’s business plan  | Biomass plant business plan; financial closure statements | Biomass upgrading plant technical, operational, economics and risk profiles meet the investor’s thresholds |
| Status of Tbilisi Municipality’s decision to co-finance installation of 10 biomass boilers heating systems in municipal buildings  | Preliminary co-financing agreements made | Tbilisi Municipality closed financing for the pilot boilers installation business plan  | Biomass plant business plan; financial closure statements | Biomass boilers technical, economics, operational profiles meet Tbilisi Municipality’s requirements  |
| Status of a dedicated funding window for bioenergy projects in Georgia | No dedicated funding window available  | Dedicated funding window for bioenergy projects fully agreed with KfW (or other facility) and operational  | Financial facility agreements  | Relevant Government ministries (most importantly, Ministry of Energy and Ministry of Finance) cooperate |
| **Outcome 3** Created local supply of and demand for upgraded biomass fuels | Status of Investment Grant Mechanism | No mechanism | Operational criteria agreed with relevant stakeholders and investment grants released | Project monitoring system | Co-financing partners keep their financial commitments  |
| Biomass upgrading plant in Tbilisi | No biomass upgrading plant in Tbilisi  | Biomass upgrading plant in Tbilisi launched and operational  | Commissioning report, project monitoring system | Relevant stakeholders provide sufficient level of cooperation |
| Number of municipal buildings operating new biomass boilers using upgraded biomass fuels | Zero  | At least 10 biomass boilers using biomass installed and in operation | Commissioning reports project monitoring system | Biomass fuel supplies and boiler efficiency sustained at designed level |
| **Outcome 4:** Improved public knowledge and stakeholder capacities for bioenergy development and replication | Status of Bioenergy Association of Georgia  | No formal vehicle for bioenergy stakeholder interaction  | Established Bioenergy Association of Georgia with a sustainable business plan which is able to continue operations after the project ends | Surveys reports  | Sufficient level of interest among potential bioenergy sector participants  |
| Number of new bioenergy projects initiated in Georgia  | No bioenergy projects, insufficient capacities  | At least 2 new bioenergy projects designed with financial closure and construction initiated  | Project monitoring system  | Sufficient level of interest among potential bioenergy sector participants |

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

1. UNDP Project Document
2. All Project Implementation Reports (PIR’s)
3. Progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
4. Audit reports
5. Mid Term Review report and management response
6. Biomass Expert reports
7. Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools at CEO endorsement and midterm
8. Oversight mission reports
9. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
10. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team
11. Minutes of Project Executive Board meeting and other meetings (e.g. stakeholders meetings)
12. Pilot project location maps

Other relevant project related documents will be provided upon need and request.

Annex C: Evaluation Questions

*This is a generic list, to be further detailed with more specific questions by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on the particulars of the project.*

| **Evaluative Criteria Questions** | **Indicators** | **Sources** | **Methodology** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards? |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?**  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Annex D: Rating Scales

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution*** | ***Sustainability ratings:***  | ***Relevance ratings*** |
| 6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings 5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS)3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems1. 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 risks1. 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[[4]](#footnote-4)**

**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[[5]](#footnote-5)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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[[6]](#footnote-6)) |
| **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[[7]](#footnote-7))  |
| **3.1** | Project Design / Formulation* Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)
* Assumptions and Risks
* Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design
* Planned stakeholder participation
* Replication approach
* UNDP comparative advantage
* Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
* Management arrangements
 |
| **3.2** | Project Implementation* Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
* Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)
* Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management
* Project Finance:
* Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (\*)
* UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (\*) coordination, and operational issues
 |
| **3.3** | Project Results* Overall results (attainment of objectives) (\*)
* Relevance(\*)
* Effectiveness & Efficiency (\*)
* Country ownership
* Mainstreaming
* Sustainability (\*)
* Impact
 |
| **4.**  | Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons* Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
* Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
* Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
* Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success
 |
| **5.**  | Annexes* ToR
* Itinerary
* List of persons interviewed
* Summary of field visits
* List of documents reviewed
* Evaluation Question Matrix
* Questionnaire used and summary of results
* Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form
 |

Annex G: Evaluation Report Clearance Form

*(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: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/handbook/english/documents/pme-handbook.pdf), Chapter 7, pg. 163 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. See the [link for the Guidance](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/gef/undp-gef-te-guide.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. 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-3)
4. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. 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-7)