

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 **“Scaling-up Risk Transfer Mechanisms for Climate Vulnerable Agriculture-based Communities in Mindanao”** otherwise known as the **“Weather Index-Based Insurance (WIBI) Mindanao Project” (PIMS # 5076).**

The Philippines is one of the most disaster-prone countries in the region and the world. In 2012, the country recorded the highest number of fatality from natural disasters – predominantly from Typhoon Bopha – with 1,500 deaths, which account for 47% of all deaths in the region, and displaced nearly 1 million people. The 2009 Typhoon Ketsana caused \$4.3 billion in damage with 90% of the losses was borne by poor households. These natural disasters exemplify how they disproportionately affect the poor and reverse the development gains achieved over a long period of time. With a projection of increasing intensity and/or frequency of such hydro-meteorological disasters and increasing weather variability, climate change will impose additional strains on the lives and livelihoods of the country’s 25.6 million people who live below the national poverty line.

Future projection of climate change also points to an increasing variability and uncertainty in the amount, patterns, and timing of rainfall. This puts livelihoods of millions of farmers at risk and ultimately poses a significant risk in attaining food security of the country.

The project was designed to address two types of climate risks: increasing variability in climate and climate change-induced natural disasters. In particular, weather index-based insurance (WIBI) which has been pilot tested on a small scale in the last 4 years will be expanded to at least 2,000 households. At the same time, the concept of Disaster Risk Management will be introduced, disseminated and strengthened at community level in the same locations where WIBI will be delivered in at least 30 barangays (covering approximately 85,000 individuals living in the barangays). It is believed that the provision of climate change adaptation options for two types of climate risks – increasing variability and intensifying/increasing extreme events – in a synchronized manner will increase the adaptive value of such options and reduces vulnerability of small-holder farmers.

The island of Mindanao has been chosen as the target sites for this project because of several considerations. First, Mindanao is considered the food basket of the Philippines and thus increasing vulnerability of farmers in Mindanao has a direct bearing on food security of the country. Second, the food production in Mindanao is characterized by small-scale operations and poverty is more prevalent than many other parts of the country, which make this region and region’s agriculture exceptionally vulnerable to future changes in climate. Lastly, working in Region 10 and 11 in Mindanao offers the opportunity to align closely with an ongoing UNDP baseline project.

The project was designed to reduce poverty by strengthening the resilience of vulnerable agriculture-based rural communities in Mindanao through climate risk transfer mechanisms and

productivity enhancement measures. The project will achieve this objective by delivering the following three outcomes:

1) Policy Advocacy and Knowledge- Regulatory and fiscal incentive structures adjusted to stimulate private sector engagement in climate risk reduction and transfer for agriculture-based rural households;

2) Climate Risk Financing and Transfer - Weather index-based integrated financial package customized and applied to strengthen climate resilience in the agriculture sector in Mindanao; and

3) Community-based adaptation learning and measures – Farmers and producer organizations and other local stakeholders able to analyze climate risk and develop and implement adaptation practices to enhance productivity in agriculture and off-farm enterprises in support of a sustainable, diversified and market-driven economic base.

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

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:		"Scaling-up Risk Transfer Mechanisms for Climate Vulnerable Agriculture-based Communities in Mindanao" or "Weather Index-Based Insurance (WIBI) Mindanao Project"		
GEF Project ID:	4967		<u>at endorsement (Million US\$)</u>	<u>As of June 30, 2017 (Million US\$)</u>
UNDP Project/ Output ID:	00076666/ PIMS #5076	GEF financing:	1,050,000.00 (SCCF)	835,820.10
Country:	Philippines	IA/EA own:	160,200.00	
Region:	Asia Pacific	Government:	14,650,000.00	
Focal Area:	Inclusive and Sustainable Development (ISD) Unit	Other (UNDP):	1,600,000.00	
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	Climate Change Adaptation	Total co-financing:	16,410,200.00	
Executing Agency:	Philippine Crop Insurance Corporation	Total Project Cost:	17,460,200.00	
Other Partners involved:	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		27 November 2014	
	(Operational) Closing Date:		Proposed: 31 December 2017	Actual: 31 December 2017

OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The evaluation shall be conducted to assess Project performance vis-à-vis its targets and expected outputs, and its contribution relative to its objective. It will draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming. The evaluation will cover the implementation period November 2014 – June 2017.

The specific objectives of the evaluation include:

- To assess project performance relative to its objective and targets, as stated in the Project Document and AMAT (1.2.2. & 2.3.1.2.)

- To assess the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of the Project's implementation and strategies in achieving the set outputs and results;
- To determine local capacities developed and level of participation of stakeholders in the achievement of the outputs and results; and
- To identify lessons learned and innovative practices and recommendations to inform the potential scale up of the project.

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.

EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

The overall approach and methodology of the terminal evaluation shall be guided by the provisions set forth in the UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results and the UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation (refer to attached documents). It should be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation.

The evaluation should employ a mixed methods approach, using both qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods and instruments (e.g. documents review, key informant interviews (KIIs), focus group discussions (FGDs), surveys, and observations from project site visits). 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.

The technical proposal of the Evaluator would have to indicate specific activities, data sources, data collection and analysis methods needed to meet the evaluation purpose and objectives. A set of evaluation questions covering each of these criteria shall also be drafted by the evaluator as part of the inception report (see 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 selected members of the Project Board, GEF Operational Focal Point, UNDP Country Office, Project Team, UNDP-GEF Technical Adviser and relevant PCIC and LGU personnel based in the region. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission in Regions X and XI, including the following project sites: i) Malaybalay and Valencia in Bukidnon; and ii) Tugbok and Calinan Districts in Davao City. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: i) municipal agriculturists; ii) agricultural extension workers; iii) agricultural technicians; iv) chief executives (barangay, municipal and city); v) farmer groups (if present) and vi) responsible parties.

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, inception report, project reports – including Annual Progress Report (APR)/Project Implementation Report (PIR), project budget revisions, Quarter Progress Reports (QPR), 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**. A rating scale for each criterion and overall Project performance will have to be defined by the Evaluator and must include a description for each rating as basis for interpretation. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in [Annex D](#).

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

PROJECT FINANCE / COFINANCE

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator 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.¹

CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions, recommendations and lessons**. Conclusions should build on findings and based on the evidences gathered and processed by the evaluator. Recommendations should be prioritized, specific, relevant and targeted with suggested entity or person in charge to implement the recommendation(s). Lessons generated from the experiences of the project should have broader applicability to other initiatives across regions or area of intervention.

IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in the Philippines. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluator(s) 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 Evaluation team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc., and other participants who will be involved in the evaluation process.

EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the evaluation will be 42 days over a time period of three (3) months according to the following schedule:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation of the Draft Inception Report <ul style="list-style-type: none">Inclusive of the initial meetings	10 days	15-24 August
Submission of the Final Inception Report <ul style="list-style-type: none">Circulation of the draft inception report, consolidation of comments from the ERG, revision and approval (5 days, 25-29 August)	2 days	30-31 August
Data Collection Period <ul style="list-style-type: none">Field visits and meetings with partners	10 days	01-10 September
Draft Evaluation Report	10 days	11-20 September
Submission of the Final Evaluation Report <ul style="list-style-type: none">Circulation of the draft evaluation reports, consolidation of comments from the ERG (10 days, 21-30 September)	10 days	01-10 October

EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluator is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing / Due Date	Responsibilities
Draft Inception Report	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and methods	No later than 2 weeks before the data collection period. 24 August 2017	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO / PMO
Final Inception Report	Finalized methodologies and data collection	Within 2 days after all the comments from the ERG have been collected	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO / PMO

¹ 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](#)

	instrument, analysis (etc.)	31 August 2017	
Presentation and Submission of the Draft Evaluation Report	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 10 days after the end of data collection period 20 September 2017	Sent to ERG
Final Report*	Revised report with annexes and presentation to the project (November 2017)	Within 10 days after receiving the comments from ERG 10 October 2017	Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC.

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

THE CONSULTANT

The Consultant (Individual Contractor) shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF-financed projects is an advantage. The Project Management Office (PMO) will provide assistance (logistical arrangement, translation, etc.) to the national consultant for the TE duration in liaison with the UNDP, PCIC and LGUs in the project sites. 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 **consultant** must present the following qualifications:

- Master’s degree in development economics, development studies, management and other climate change adaptation-related fields. Experience in climate finance is an advantage;
- At least five (5) years experience with result-based management and evaluation methodologies particularly in the area of sustainable development and/or climate change adaptation with gender sensitive analysis;
- Knowledge or experience working with UNDP and/or GEF-projects and evaluations;
- Familiarity with the key issues and stakeholders in the agriculture sector of the Philippines;
- Demonstrated interviewing and writing skills with a strong capacity to produce evaluation and terminal reports based on a sound analysis of facts gathered;
- Demonstrated ability to assess complex situations particularly in agricultural financing, distill critical issues and to outline forward-looking conclusions and recommendations.

SUBMISSION OF PROPOSAL AND BASIS FOR SELECTION

Submission of proposal is open to all interested and qualified individuals. The proposal shall contain both technical and financial components and submitted to the address indicated in the Procurement Notice. The technical and financial proposals shall comprise 70% and 30%, respectively, of the evaluation criteria. The technical proposal shall include the following: (1) updated CV of the consultant; (2) at least two final/published version of terminal evaluation reports; (3) plan of approach and methodology; and (4) letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability (using the template of UNDP).

The *technical proposal* shall be evaluated based on the following criteria: (1) background and experience of the evaluator and submitted sample works **(30%)**; and (2) plan of approach and methodology **(70%)**.

The *financial proposal* shall indicate both breakdown and total costs of the engagement. It should be all-inclusive covering professional fee, travel expenses (i.e. vehicle rental and airfare), office supplies, food and accommodation, insurance coverage and other incidental expenses.

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

The national consultant will be contracted by UNDP and remunerated according to the reviewed and accepted financial proposal. The contract will be output-based and payment issued only upon delivery of satisfactory outputs and milestones.

%	Milestone
10%	Upon contract signing with the national consultant
20%	Following submission of the TE inception report
35%	Following submission and approval of the 1st draft terminal evaluation report
35%	Following submission and approval (members of ERG) of the final terminal evaluation report

APPLICATION PROCESS

Applicants are requested to apply online (<http://jobs.undp.org>, etc.) by 28 July 2017. Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV, technical and financial proposals for these positions. The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in English with indication of the e-mail and phone contact. Shortlisted candidates will be requested to submit a price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs).

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

ANNEX A. PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

<p>This project will contribute to achieving the following Outcome as defined in the CP: Country Programme/UNDAF Outcome 4: Adaptive Capacities of vulnerable communities and ecosystems are strengthened to be resilient to threats, shocks, disasters, and climate change</p>					
<p>Country Programme Outcome Indicators Percentage of local development plans incorporating and budgeting disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation measures; percentage of degradation rates of critical environment and natural resources, Percentage decrease in mortalities, morbidities and economic losses from natural hazards and environmental degradation</p>					
<p>Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area: Promote climate change adaptation</p>					
<p>Applicable GEF SCCF Goal: To implement long-term adaptation measures that increase the resilience of national development sectors to the impacts of climate change</p>					
<p>Applicable GEF Expected Impact: CCA1-Reduced vulnerability in development sectors; CCA2- Strengthened awareness and ownership of adaptation and climate risk reduction processes at local level</p>					
<p>Applicable GEF Impact Indicator: AMAT 1.2.2 & 2.3.1.2</p>					
	Indicator	Baseline	Target End of Project	Source of verification	Risk and assumptions
Project Objective	% of population covered by weather index-based insurance mechanism	No families are currently covered by WIBI in the project target sites	At least 2,000 families in target villages are covered by WIBI	Backend report in PCIC	<p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Financial services in the integrated financial package is available through co-financing support -Marketing and awareness of WIBI is effective target -Product roll out for rice and corn is on schedule (2015) -They are not catastrophic events during the project implementation cycle <p>Risks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Changes of government result in “division” among local chief executives such as between provincial governors and municipal mayors for intervention sites and flow of support is affected and hampered. - The financial allocation of gov’t resources is incrementally reduced affecting provisions for agriculture service extensions - During the course of project, there are a sufficient number of breach in pay-out thresholds for farmer to observe results of WIBI.
Poverty reduction by strengthening the resilience of vulnerable agriculture-based rural communities in climate risk transfer mechanisms and productivity enhancement measures	Reduced damage rate in rice farming	Average damage rate from 30-years history for rice 22-26% but the damage rate from the target population will be established during the inception phase of the project	Beneficiary farmers demonstrate 20% damage rate (i.e 2-6% lower than average) during the normal year (i.e when WIBI pay-outs are not made)	Project progress report (QOR, MTR, and TE) Household survey	

	Indicator	Baseline	Target End of Project	Source of Verification	Risks and Assumption
Outcome 1 ⁴² Regulatory and fiscal incentive structures adjusted to stimulate private sector engagement in climate risk reduction and transfer for agriculture-based rural households.	Availability of an incentive mechanism for private sector in WIBI provision	Currently there is no incentive mechanism in place to stimulate private sector engagement in WIBI provision	The application of AGFP adjusted/expanded for FSPs to avail preferential guarantee coverage	Existence of government order/policy for the use of AGFP	Assumptions: -FPs perceive sufficient incentives from the altered AGFP rules to integrate WIBI into the existing financial package -The level of AGFPs capitalization remains at the current level. Risks: -Bureaucratic and political process delays the approval/endorsement of the modifications in the AGFP rules -Delay in rollout of WIBI for rice and corn have a spill over effect on the ability of PCIC to carry out preliminary assessments for other crops.
	PCIC's readiness in expanding WIBI to new crops beyond rice and corn	PCIC is not ready for designing a new WIBI contract beyond rice and corn	Preliminary assessments for covering a new crops under WIBI are complete and PCIC is ready to start pilot testing	Availability of an preliminary assessment report	
Outputs supporting Outcome 1 1.1. The existing AGFP mechanism revised to align with WIBI provision 1.2. A guideline established for indexing process for WIBI product design 1.3. Improved understanding among DA and PCIC officials about financial sustainability of WIBI.					
Outcome 2 Weather Indexed-based Integrated Financial Package customized and applied to strengthen climate resilience in the agriculture sector in Mindanao	% of population covered by weather index-based insurance mechanism [AMAT 1.2.2]	No families are currently covered by WIBI in the project target sites	At least 2,000 families in target villages are covered by WIBI [The number of female headed households as well as sex-disaggregated performance, where possible, will be reported.	Backend report in PCIC	Assumptions: -Financial services in the integrated financial package is available through co-financing support -Marketing and awareness of WIBI is effective to stimulate sufficient demand to meet the target Risk: - FSPs and other mediators are not willing to engage WIBI Product in their financial package -Lack of demands from farmers -"Good weather" (and lack of pay-out) result in no observation effect to stimulate sufficient take up the product

Outputs Supporting Outcome 2					
2.1. Pre-tested, customized Weather Index-Based Insurance(WIBI) delivered to at least 2,000 farming households (particularly female headed) engaged in rice and corn production					
2.2. Standardized WIBI literacy modules targeting both end clients and FSPs and other mediators developed					
2.3. Improved understanding among regulator and FSPs about the financial implications of WIBI provision and impacts on resilience-building					
Outcome 3 Farmers and producers organizations able to analyze climate risk, and develop and implement adaptation practices to enhance productivity in agriculture	Number of community groups trained in climate change risk reduction [AMAT 2.3.1.2]	Twin Phoenix Project has reached out to 168 barangays in Regions 10 & 11 using the results of the V&A and hazards/risk maps The ATI has on-going projects on Farmers Decision Support System in Regions X and XI that train farmers on climate resilient agricultural practices	At least 30 barangays are aware of both slow and sudden climate risks and of response measures At least 600 farmer and 20 farmers associations have been trained on resilient agriculture techniques[Sex-disaggregated target will be determined during the inception phase of the project	Project progress report (QPR, MTR, and TE)	Assumptions: -The communities are convinced of their key role in risk reduction, preparedness and the value of climate information for safety, productivity in agriculture and enterprises -The baseline agriculture extension service expenditures remain constant over project implementation period Risks: -Local power dynamics result in LGU officers failing to mobilize community members for participatory vulnerability assessment -Community members fail to perceive emerging climate risks in view of other ongoing development risks
Outputs supporting Outcome 3					
3.1. Community-based DRM capacity enhanced in at least 30 barangay					
3.2. Capacity of farmers and farmer associations developed to increase the resilience of agricultural production					

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

- A. Project Document: Scaling-up Risk Transfer Mechanisms for Climate Vulnerable Agriculture-based Communities in Mindanao
- B. Project Inception Report (November 2014)
- C. Annual Progress Reports (2015 – 2016)
- D. Project Implementation Review (2015 – 2016)
- E. Quarter Progress Reports (2015-2017)
- F. Annual Work and Financial Plan (2015 – 2017)
- G. Project Quality Assurance (2016)
- H. Minutes of the Project Board Meeting (1st to 7th) including Board Resolutions
- I. Consultants' Reports, Terms of Reference (TORs) and Contracts
 - 1. Chief Technical Adviser
 - 2. Legal Consultant
 - 3. Weather Index-Based Insurance (WIBI) Indexing Consultant
 - 4. Market Analyst
 - 5. Actuarial Specialist
 - 6. Regional Specialist for Impact Assessment on Poverty Reduction
- J. Responsible Parties' Reports
 - 1. Philippine Rice Research Institute (PhilRice)
 - 2. Philippine Atmospheric, Geophysical and Astronomical Services Administration (PAGASA)
 - 3. Agricultural Credit Policy Council (ACPC)
 - 4. Climate Change Commission (CCC)
 - 5. Agricultural Training Institute (ATI)
- K. Relevant Bills and Policies – House Bill 3560 and Privilege Speech of Congressman Arthur Yap and Draft Bill of Senator Cynthia Villar
- L. Strategy for Upscaling: Draft Project Document for WIBI Phase II and Draft Administrative Order between Philippine Crop Insurance Corporation (PCIC) and PAGASA – ProDoc II
- M. Compilation of Information, Education and Communication (IEC) Materials (e.g. newsletters, policy briefs, brochures, translated briefs, posters)
- N. Project Tracking Tool (AMAT)

ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

This is a generic list with sample questions, to be further detailed by the evaluator during the inception phase.

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?			
To what extent were the project objectives and outputs aligned with member States' and other project stakeholders' development strategies?			
Were the project's expected accomplishments and indicators of achievements properly designed, time-bound and achievable?			
EFFECTIVENESS: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
How effective was the project in building the capacity of policymaker on (...)?			
To what extent does the project contribute to the objective of enhanced capacity of (...) to use the tools and mechanisms developed under this project to (...)?			
Do the project-related activities give the participants adequate access to the benefits and implications of the project?			
EFFICIENCY: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?			
What was the level of involvement of (insert division name) staff in meeting the requests for technical advice?			
How efficiently were human and financial resources used to deliver activities and outputs, in coordination with stakeholders?			
What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the project objectives?			
SUSTAINABILITY: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
To what extent has support from other stakeholders, donors, or other multi-lateral or national partners been obtained to take forward positive outcomes resulting from the project?			
Was there adequate ownership of the project by the end-users, beneficiaries, and was there commitment displayed by them?			
IMPACT: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
To what extent was environmental sustainability integrated into the design and implementation of the project?			
To what extent is the sustainability of environmental concerns assured?			

ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

<p>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution</p> <p>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</p>	<p>Sustainability ratings:</p> <p>4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks</p>	<p>Relevance ratings</p> <p>2. Relevant (R) 1. Not relevant (NR)</p> <p>Impact Ratings:</p> <p>3. Significant (S) 2. Minimal (M) 1. Negligible (N)</p>
<p><i>Additional ratings where relevant:</i> Not Applicable (N/A) Unable to Assess (U/A)</p>		

ANNEX E: EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT AND AGREEMENT FORM

Evaluators:

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

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form²

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: _____

²www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE³

- 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 Manual⁴)

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 rated⁵)

- 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

³The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

⁴ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

⁵ 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.

- 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

- Terms of Reference
- 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
- UNDP-GEF TE Report Audit Trail
- GEF Project Tracking Tool

ANNEX G: EVALUATION REPORT CLEARANCE FORM

(to be completed by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and included in the final document)

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

UNDP GEF RTA

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

