**Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference**

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the *Small Decentralized Renewable Energy Generation Project* (PIMS # 4695).

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

Project Summary Table

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Title: |  | | | | | |
| **GEF Project ID:** | | 4749 |  | ***at endorsement (Million US$)*** | | ***at completion (Million US$)*** |
| **UNDP Project ID:** | | 4695 | **GEF financing:** | 1.45 | |  |
| **Country:** | | Lebanon | **IA/EA own:** | 0.125 | |  |
| **Region:** | | Arab States | **Government:** | 0.5 | |  |
| **Focal Area:** | | Climate Change | **Other:** | 10.991 | |  |
| **FA Objectives, (OP/SP):** | | CCM3 | **Total co-financing:** | 11.616 | |  |
| **Executing Agency:** | | Ministry of Energy and Water | **Total Project Cost:** | 1.575 | |  |
| **Other Partners involved:** | | Center for Development and Reconstruction | **ProDoc Signature  (date project began):** | | | 11-February-2014 |
| **(Operational) Closing Date:** | | Proposed:  30-Sep-2018 | Actual:  30-Sep-2018 |

Objective and Scope

The project was designed to catalyze and remove barriers to the widespread application of decentralized renewable energy-based power generation in Lebanon, with a target to facilitate the installation of at least 1.75 MW of new, decentralized renewable energy power generation capacity during the implementation of the project. In addition, the project has a yearly target of 3,285 MWh/year as renewable energy generation, a total target of 35,500 tonnes of CO2eq savings over the 20-year default lifetime of the investments made during project implementation, and a total volume of investments mobilized equal to $8.75 million.

The project’s key outcomes are:

1. Investments in decentralized renewable energy power generation increased

2. Supportive policy and regulatory environment enforced for attracting investments for privately-owned, grid-connected renewable energy power generation

3. Monitoring and quality control of RE-based decentralized power generation introduced and sustained

The project spans over four years and is being executed in Lebanon with a total budget of $1.575m from the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and the UNDP. The co-financing for the project will come from the Central Banks’ NEEREA loans ($4.6 M), the Ministry’s in-kind donation ($500,000), Transenergie ($134,000), and the UNDP CEDRO, MED-SOLAR, and LECB Projects ($6.257M).

The project is to be nationally executed by the Ministry of Energy and Water of the Government of Lebanon and implemented by UNDP through the “Support to the NIM” modality. UNDP accordingly manages and implements the project activities in line with the project document. The procurement and financial management follows UNDP policies and guidelines. The Ministry has assigned two senior officers as a National Focal Points to coordinate the project activities with activities of other Government entities and certify the expenditures are in line with approved budgets and work-plans.

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 recommendations will feed into new project design approaches.

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. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR (*fill in* [*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, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders.

The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Beirut, Lebanon, and site visits will be organized to one or more of the project beneficiary sites that are located in different areas in the country. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: UNDP Lebanon Energy and Environment Programme team, Project Managers of other donor-funded projects that are relevant, including but not limited to climate change and other renewable energy projects, the Ministry of Energy and Water (various individuals), the Central Bank of Lebanon (BDL), etc.. The Project Team will be responsible for organsing these interviews and will support the consultant in the logistics of these meeting. Approximately 5 – 10 meetings/interviews will be undertaken.

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](#_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. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

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

Mainstreaming

UNDP supported GEF financed projects are key components in UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programmes. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender. The evaluators can use the following tools, inter alia: (i) Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation - Towards UNEG Guidance[[2]](#footnote-2).

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**.

Implementation arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in *Lebanon.* 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 *20* days according to the following plan spread over a period of 11 calendar weeks (but no later than 15 September 2018):

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Timing | Completion Date |
| **Preparation** | *5* days | *16 July 2018* |
| **Evaluation Mission** | *5* days | *31 July 2018* |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | *8* days | *21 August 2018* |
| **Final Report** | *2* days | *15 September 2018* |

The evaluation mission is tentatively scheduled to mid-end of July 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. | Evaluator submits to UNDP CO |
| **Presentation** | Initial Findings | End of evaluation mission | To project management, UNDP CO |
| **Draft Final Report** | Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes | Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission | Sent to CO, reviewed by 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 evaluation team will be composed of 1 international evaluator*.* The consultant shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The evaluator selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The consultant must present the following qualifications:

* Higher degree in energy, electrical engineering, renewables or closely related field
* Minimum 10 years of relevant professional experience
* Knowledge of the renewable energy and energy efficiency sectors
* Previous experience with results‐based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
* Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations is preferable;
* Experience working in Arab States is preferable;

Evaluator Ethics

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex E) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the [UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'](http://www.unevaluation.org/ethicalguidelines).

Payment modalities and specifications

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| % | Milestone |
| *10%* | Upon approval of the final TE Inception Report |
| *30%* | Upon submission of the draft TE report |
| *60%* | Upon finalization of the TE report |

Application process

Applicants are requested to apply online at

http://www.lb.undp.org/content/lebanon/en/home/procurement.html by (date). Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions. The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in 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.

The award of the contract should be made to the Individual Consultant whose offer has received the highest score out of the following criteria:

Technical Criteria weight: 70%

Financial Criteria weight: 30%

Only candidates obtaining a minimum technical score of 70 points would be considered for the financial evaluation.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Weight** | **Max. Point** |
| Technical Competence | 70% | 100 |
| Academic Qualifications (relevant)  Master’s degree: (10 points)  PhD: (12 points)  Relevant trainings/certificates: +3 Points |  | 25 |
| Years of Relevant Experience  10 Years: (10 points)  Above 10 years (20 points) |  | 30 |
| Relevant Experience  Experience in renewable energy and/or energy efficiency (10 points)  Previous experience with results‐based monitoring and evaluation methodologies (10 points)  Experience in undertaking GEF evaluations (10 points)  Regional knowledge and experience; (5 points)  Knowledge of energy economics; (5 points)  Experience with UN or international donor project(s) (5 points) |  | 45 |
| Financial (Lower Offer/Offer\*100) | 30% | 100 |
| **Total Score** | **Technical Score \* 0.7 + Financial Score \* 0.3** | |

Annex A: Project Logical Framework

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Targets End of Projects** | **Source of Verification** | **Risks and Assumptions** |
| **Project Objective**  Reducing greenhouse gas emissions by the removal of barriers to widespread application of decentralized renewable energy based power generation. | Amount of reduced CO2 emissions by the investments facilitated by the project | 0 tonnes of CO2eq | Direct: 35,500 tonnes of CO2eq over the 20-year default lifetime of the investments made during project implementation | Project monitoring reports and final evaluation. | Adoption of a supportive regulatory framework for adequate feed-in tariffs, net-metering, grid code and related financial incentives. |
| Cumulative renewable energy capacity installed and operational (MWp) | 0 MWp | 1.75 MWp |
| Cumulative renewable energy generation (MWh/year) | 0 MWh/year | 3,285 MWh/year |
| **Outcome 1**  Investments in decentralized renewable energy (RE) power generation increased. | Volume of investments mobilized. | 0 | US$ 8.75 million | Project monitoring reports and final evaluation. | As above. |
| **Outcome 2**  An enforced supportive policy and regulatory environment for attracting investments for privately owned, grid-connected power generation by RE sources. | Extent to which RE policies and regulations are adopted and enforced. | A net-metering scheme is developed but not very functional with mixed results. The Regulations for feed-in tariffs are under consideration. | Net metering complemented with other required regulations and/or guidance, including updated technical guidelines for grid connection as well as adopted standards and procedures for performance testing and quality control.  Mechanism and guidelines for the implementation of feed-in tariffs developed. | Project monitoring reports and final evaluation. | The proposed legal and regulatory improvements passing swiftly through the Government approval process. |
| **Outcome 3**  Monitoring and quality control for RE-based decentralized power generation established and operational. | Availability of annual market data;   Verified customer satisfaction with the RE technologies in use.  Number of capacity building and awareness raising activities organized and/or participated in. | No adequate market monitoring and quality control mechanisms in place | Availability of annual market data for new sales, total installed capacity and net production of all main RE applications sold in Lebanon by March/April each year.   Over 70% customers satisfaction on the RE installations made. | Project reports Consumer surveys | Agreement reached with the key market players to regularly and timely submit the required data on time.  Adequate quality control and certification scheme in place supported by the required institutional arrangements and legal provisions. |

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

1. PIF
2. UNDP Project Document
3. Project Inception Report
4. Midterm Review Report
5. All Project Implementation Reports (PIRs)
6. All Annual work plans
7. Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools at CEO endorsement and midterm
8. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
9. Project Website
10. All Combined Delivery Report (CDRs)
11. ATLAS Risk Management
12. Co-financing Table

The following documents will also be available:

1. Project operational guidelines, reports, manuals and systems
2. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
3. Minutes of the *DREG* Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
4. Project site location maps

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 shortcomings  4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS)  3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings  2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems  1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems | 4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability | 2. Relevant (R) |
| 3. Moderately Likely (ML):moderate risks | 1.. Not relevant (NR) |
| 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks  1. Unlikely (U): severe risks | ***Impact Ratings:***  3. Significant (S)  2. Minimal (M)  1. Negligible (N) |
| *Additional ratings where relevant:*  Not Applicable (N/A)  Unable to Assess (U/A | | |

Annex E: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form

**Evaluators:**

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

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form[[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://www.undp.org/evaluation/handbook), Chapter 7, pg. 163 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. <http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/980> [↑](#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)