Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference

|  |
| --- |
| National Consultant for Project Evaluation  |
| Location: | Kyiv, Ukraine |
| Application Deadline: |  |
| Type of Contract: | Individual Contract |
| Post Level: | National Consultant |
| Languages Required: | English, Ukrainian  |
| Starting Date:(date when the selected candidate is expected to start) | 2 October 2017 |
| Duration of Initial Contract : | 15 working days within 3 calendar months period (plus additional 5 days in case if a need for an international consultant’s a mission to Ukraine is confirmed) |

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 UNDP/GEF medium sized project ‘CCCD: Integrating Rio Convention provisions into Ukraine's National Environmental Policy Framework’ (PIMS #4478).

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

Project Summary Table

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Project title: | CCCD: Integrating Rio Convention provisions into Ukraine's National Environmental Policy Framework |
| GEF Project ID: | 4913 |   | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | *at completion (Million US$)* |
| UNDP Project ID: | 00074532PIMS: 4478 | GEF financing:  | 0,9 | 0,9 |
| Country: | Ukraine | IA/EA own: | 0,15 |       |
| Region: | ECIS | Government: | 0,7 |       |
| Focal Area: | Multi-Focal Area | Other: | 0,18 |       |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): | CD-3: To strengthen capacities to develop policy and legislative frameworks | Total co-financing: | 1,03 |       |
| Executing Agency: | UNDP | Total Project Cost: | 1,93 |       |
| Other Partners involved: | All-Ukrainian Environmental League | ProDoc Signature (date project began):  | 9 Dec 2013 |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | Proposed:9 December 2016 | Actual:31 December 2017 |

Objective and Scope

The project was designed to catalyze Ukraine's implementation of the three Rio Conventions on a strengthened policy and institutionally sustainable development baseline. To this end, the project focused on mainstreaming Rio Convention provisions into Ukraine's broader national development framework and strengthening related capacities to implement this framework. The first project objective is to integrate principles and obligations of the three Rio Conventions into Ukraine's national policy framework. Specifically, this involves the preparation of a national Sustainable Development Strategy (SDS) that fully integrates global environmental priorities. This objective is complemented by a second objective to strengthen key institutional and individual capacities to pursue sustainable development that delivers global environmental benefits. This second objective is targeted for implementation of the SDS at the regional level, training government staff at the local, regional and national levels on the specific interpretation of Rio Convention provisions as they apply to their respective roles and responsibilities to implement associated development policies. This second objective is also complemented by a targeted public awareness campaign to raise the understanding of the critical linkages between the Rio Convention principles and the more immediate socio-economic development priorities. Both objectives are supported by learning-by-doing approach. The active participation of stakeholder representatives in the full project life cycle serves to facilitate the strategic adaptation of project activities in keeping with project objectives. The project’s key results thus included:

* Drafting the Sustainable Development Strategy for Ukraine and a Roadmap
* Review of sectoral policies and their compliance with the Rio Conventions requirements
* Public discussions of the results of these reviews; presentation of recommendations to respective responsible institutions and line ministries
* Awareness raising through information campaign, social networks, public events and publications
* Expert support to the Government in the process of SDGs adaptation for Ukraine and policy advice
* Capacity building initiatives at the national and local levels (training and seminars for civil servants)
* Public opinion surveys
* Local mainstreaming mini-projects, including pilot projects and educational events
* Targeted discussions with key stakeholders – Government, local authorities, academia, CSOs, media

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects.

The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

Evaluation approach and method

An overall approach and method[[1]](#footnote-1) for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact,** as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR (Annex C). The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence‐based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator might be expected to conduct a field mission within Ukraine where the project sites are based. If the need for this travel is confirmed by UNDP, the consultant will receive respective travel entitlements as per UNDP policies. The travel period will not exceed one calendar week; the travel dates will be identified based on the dates preferred by the consultant, within the period of 10 October - 20 November 2017*.* Interviews will be held with the key project partners and experts – the list of these stakeholders will be agreed upon at the planning stage of the terminal evaluation.

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, 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 assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in Annex B.

Evaluation Criteria & Ratings

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

|  |
| --- |
| **Evaluation Ratings:** |
| **1. Monitoring and Evaluation** | ***rating*** | **2. IA& EA Execution** | ***rating*** |
| M&E design at entry |       | Quality of UNDP Implementation |       |
| 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: |       |

See more on this, page 29: http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/UNDP-GEF-TE-Guide.pdf

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

Impact

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.[[2]](#footnote-2)

Conclusions, recommendations & lessons

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

Implementation arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Ukraine. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely settlements with the contactor and all related to the terminal evaluation arrangements. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the evaluation team to set up stakeholder interviews, coordinate liaison with the Government, etc. The evaluation team will consist of two consultants: an international consultant and a national consultant. The international consultant will act as a team leader. The National consultant will perform the expert support role within the evaluation team.

Evaluation timeframe

The total duration of the evaluation will be *15* days according to the following plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Timing | Completion Date |
| **Preparation** | *2* days  | *Tentative – 6 October 2017* |
| **Evaluation Process** | *8* days  | *27 October 2017* |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | *3* days  | *17 November 2017* |
| **Final Report** | *2* days  | *18 December 2017* |

DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The Consultant (national expert –evaluation support) will perform the following tasks:

* Collection of background materials upon request of the International Consultant (Evaluation Team Leader);
* Desk review of materials, assistance to the Evaluation Team Leader in developing methodology, detailed work plan and Evaluation;
* Participate in the evaluation kick-off meeting with UNDP;
* Assistance to the Evaluation Team Leader in conducting project results evaluation in accordance with the proposed objective and scope of the evaluation and UNDP evaluation guidelines, including, but not limited to:

- review the original documents and provide short summary in English as might be necessary;

- review the project to understand its relevance and contribution to national priorities and international obligations;

- facilitate and participate in the meetings/interviews with the key stakeholders as might be necessary;

- participate in the field visits to the project sites (if required) and interview national and local level stakeholders;

- recommend actions that may be required for enhancing effectiveness of UNDP’s development assistance in the practice area of Environment and Sustainable Development;

* Provide recommendations for the project’s exit strategy and for ensuring sustainability of its results;
* Participate in the debriefing with UNDP – presentation of findings, conclusions and recommendations;
* Assist the Evaluation Team Leader in drafting and finalizing the draft report by incorporating inputs and feedback from UNDP.

Evaluation deliverables

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Deliverable | Content  | Timing | Responsibilities |
| **Inception Report** | Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method  | 3 days after the contract signature  | Evaluator submits to UNDP CO  |
| **Presentation** | Initial Findings  | 15 days after the contract signature | To project management, UNDP CO |
| **Draft Final Report**  | Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes | 17 November 2017 | Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs |
| **Final Report\*** | Revised report  | Within 2 days of receiving UNDP comments on draft but no later than 18 December 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.

Evaluator

The evaluation will be completed by the experienced evaluators. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The evaluators should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities. The evaluators will receive advice and guidance from the UNDP Country office (project staff, M&E unit) and UNDP/GEF Regional Technical Advisor.

 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

(*this payment schedule is indicative, to be filled in by the CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on their standard procurement procedures)*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| % | Milestone |
| *50%* | Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report |
| *50%* | Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report  |

Application process

Selection will be made on a competitive basis in line with UNDP rules and regulations. Applicants are requested to submit required documents by the deadline set in the ToR. Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their P11 form filled in English. The applicants have to submit their price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment (excluding travel costs: travel entitlements will be covered by UNDP in Ukraine additionally, if the travel is approved, following the UNDP procedures and rates for travel). **Applications without financial proposal will not be considered. The financial offer should be entered in the Comments section of the application.**

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 are encouraged to apply.

Interested individual consultants must submit the following documents/information to demonstrate their qualifications:

Required:

* Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability; the consultant should provide details on his/her availability to travel in Ukraine in October-November, if required.
* Financial Proposal that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price excluding travel costs (the need of travelling to Ukraine will be considered at the evaluation planning stage);
* Duly completed and signed a Personal History Form (P11 form), including information about past experience in similar assignments and at least 3 contact details for referees – PAST EMPLOYERS;
* Brief description of approach to work and why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment (brief information on each of the required qualifications, item by item).

EVALUATION OF APPLICANTS

UNDP will use a two-stage procedure to assess applications. Technical proposals will be assessed prior to any commercial proposals. The Technical proposals will be assessed based on compliance with the Terms of Reference. The following criteria will be rated as indicated below:

Education:

* At least Master's degree in Development Studies, Economics, Management, Public Administration, or other relevant disciplines – 10 points max:
	+ PhD – 10 points;
	+ Master’s degree – 7 points.

Experience:

* Minimum 5 years of professional experience in the area of Development, Environment and Sustainable Development, Energy, Regional development with required technical knowledge in the targeted GEF focal areas: Capacity Development – 20 points max:
	+ more than 7 years of experience – 20 points;
	+ from 5 to 7 years of experience – 15 points.
* At least 5 examples of experience in conducting complex evaluations, especially in Environment and Sustainable Development practice area, with proven accomplishments in undertaking evaluation for international organizations, preferably with UNDP-GEF. The examples will demonstrate knowledge of results based monitoring and methodologies – 25 points max:
	+ more than 10 examples of experience in conducting complex evaluations – 20 points;
	+ from 8 to 10 examples of experience in conducting complex evaluations – 15 points;
	+ from 5 to 7 examples of experience in conducting complex evaluations – 10 points;
	+ experience in conducting evaluations in Environment and Sustainable Development practice area – additional 5 points;
* Experience with high level advisory services related to policy development – at least 2 examples – 10 points max:
	+ Evidence of strong expertise (more than 5 examples) – 10 points;
	+ Evidence of some expertise (2 to 5 examples) – 5 points.

Language Proficiency – 5 points max:

* Fluency in written and spoken English and Ukrainian – 5 points.

Maximum available technical score – 70 points.

EVALUATION METHOD:

Cumulative Analysis

Contract award shall be made to the incumbent whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

a) responsive/compliant/acceptable, and

b) having received the cumulative highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation.

\* Technical Criteria weight: 70%

\* Financial Criteria weight: 30%

Only candidates obtaining a minimum 70% from the maximum available technical score (49 points) would be considered for the Financial Evaluation

The maximum number of points assigned to the financial proposal is allocated to the lowest price proposal and will equal to 30. All other price proposals will be evaluated and assigned points, as per below formula:

30 points [max points available for financial part] x [lowest of all evaluated offered prices among responsive offers] / [evaluated price].

The proposal obtaining the overall cumulatively highest score after adding the score of the technical proposal and the financial proposal will be considered as the most compliant offer and will be awarded a contract.

Annex A: Project Logical Framework

*The Logical Framework can be accessed via the link:* [*http://www.ua.undp.org/content/ukraine/en/home/operations/projects/environment\_and\_energy/integrating-rio-provisions.html*](http://www.ua.undp.org/content/ukraine/en/home/operations/projects/environment_and_energy/integrating-rio-provisions.html) *- page 68 of the Project Document.*

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

1. Methodology:
* The UNDP Evaluation Policy (UNDP, ‘The evaluation policy of UNDP’, DP/2011/3, 10 November 2010, p.10);
* The UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results (PME Handbook, 2009);
* UNDP Guidance on Outcome-level Evaluation, 2011;;
* Guidelines for Outcome Evaluators, 2002, available at <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/HandBook/OC-guidelines/Guidelines-for-OutcomeEvaluators-2002.pdf>.
1. UNDP programme documents:
* Ukraine Country Programme (2012-2016)
* Ukraine Country Programme (2018-2022) – draft
* Outcome evaluation of Energy and Environment Portfolio of UNDP Ukraine (of May 2017)
* Annual UNDP ROAR reports
* Available UNDP annual reports
1. Project’s documentation
* Project Document with annexes
* Project reports (programme, financial, PIRs)
* Minutes of the Project Board meetings
1. Project’s publications and reports
2. Links to websites covering project activities

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?  |
|  | * Is the project relevant to implementation of the Rio Conventions objectives?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * Is the project relevant for the GEF Mullti focal area (land degradation, biodiversity and climate change)?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * Is the project relevant to Ukraine’s environment and sustainable development objectives?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * Is the project addressing the needs of target beneficiaries at the local and regional levels?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * How is the project complementary to the actions of other stakeholders active in the city/country/region?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * Does the project provide relevant lessons and experiences for other similar projects in the future?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * Is the project internally consistent in its design?
 |  |  |  |
| Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? |
|  | * Are the activities and outputs of the project consistent with the project's goals and objectives?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * How is risk and risk mitigation being managed?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * How could the project have been more effective in achieving results?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * What lessons can be drawn regarding effectiveness for other similar projects in the future?
 |  |  |  |
| Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards? |
|  | * Were the accounting and financial systems in place adequate?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * Did the project efficiently utilize local capacity in implementation?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * To what extent have/ will the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been/be achieved?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * Was the expected co-finance leveraged as initially expected?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * Was adaptive managed needed and used in order to ensure efficient use of resources?
 |  |  |  |
|  Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? |
|  | * Were sustainability issues adequately addressed at project design?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * What issues emerged during implementation as a threat to sustainability?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * Which are the main risks to the continuation of policies and actions initiated by the projects? (financial, institutional, socioeconomic, environmental)
 |  |  |  |
|  | * Is there evidence that some partners and stakeholders will continue their activities beyond project termination? Which ones?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * Have the entities/people that will carry on the project been identified and prepared?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * Is there evidence financial resources are committed to support project results after the project has closed?
 |  |  |  |
| **Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?**  |
|  | * How likely is for the project to achieve its long-term goal?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * Has the project demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * Are stakeholders more aware about sustainable development priorities and policies? Which ones?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * What is the impact of the project on general population, women, racial and ethnic minorities, and vulnerable groups?
 |  |  |  |

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[[3]](#footnote-3)**

**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[[4]](#footnote-4)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **i.** | Opening page:* Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
* UNDP and GEF project IDs
* 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[[5]](#footnote-5)) |
| **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[[6]](#footnote-6))  |
| **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/handbook/documents/english/pme-handbook.pdf), Chapter 7, pg. 163 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office:  [ROTI Handbook 2009](http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/M2_ROtI%20Handbook.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. 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-6)