UNDP-GEF 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 Fifth Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Program in Brazil (PIMS 4578)

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

Project Summary Table

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Project Title:  |  |
| GEF Project ID: | 4560 |   | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | *at completion (Million US$)* |
| UNDP Project ID: | BRA12/G32PIMS 4578 | GEF financing:  | 5,000,000 | 5,000,000 |
| Country: | Brazil | IA/EA own: |       |       |
| Region: | Latin America | Government: |       |       |
| Focal Area: | Multifocal Area - BD, CC, LD | Other: |       |       |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): | BD-2: Mainstream Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use into Production Landscapes, Seascapes and Sectors.CCM-5: Promote conservation and enhancement of carbon stocks through sustainable management of land use, land-use change, and forestry.LD-1: Maintain or improve flow of agro-system services to sustaining the livelihoods of local communities.CD 2: Generate, access and use of information and knowledgeCD 5: Capacities enhanced to monitor and evaluate environmental impacts and trends | Total co-financing: | 5,343,500 | 5,343,500 |
| Executing Agency: | UNDP | Total Project Cost: | 10,343,500 | 10,343,500 |
| Other Partners involved: | Instituto Sociedade, População e Natureza (ISPN) | ProDoc Signature (date project began):  | May 2, 2013 |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | Proposed/Original Expected Date of Operational closure:May 31, 2017 | Actual/Revised expected closing date of Operational Closure:Nov 30, 2018 |

Objective and Scope

The project was designed to secure Global Environment Benefits through community-based initiatives and actions for conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, and maintenance of carbon stocks in the Cerrado and Caatinga biomes. The project will enable a shift away from unsustainable practices by ensuring (i) Biodiversity conservation in the production landscape through community-based sustainable resource use and management of natural resources; (ii) Maintenance of carbon stocks through avoidance of land use change and improved agriculture and forest management at the community level; (iii) Implementation of sustainable land management techniques that prevent land degradation, restore agro-ecosystem services, and improve livelihoods of local communities; (iv) Capacity development and knowledge management to help communities deliver global environmental benefits.

The project is executed under the NGO modality by Instituto Sociedade, População e Natureza (ISPN) and UNDP acts as the GEF Implementing Agency. ISPN, which has been the NGO National Host Institution for GEF-SGP in Brazil before its upgrading, is executing agency, taking over the previous execution role played by UNOPS, and is responsible for the day-to-day management and implementation of project activities with the support of a full time Country Programme Manager (CPM) and under the leadership of the National Steering Committee (NSC). The project is implemented with UNDP support, and UNDP ensures that the project receives technical and managerial support, as needed, from the UNDP Country Office, and from the regional team, as well as the global team responsible for project oversight for all GEF-SGP upgraded Country Programme projects.

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 evaluation should include a mixed methodology of document review, interviews, and observations from project site visits, at minimum, and the evaluators should make an effort to triangulate information. 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 field missions to Caatinga and Cerrado biomes in Brazil, including the project sites. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: ISPN (National Host Instiution), SGP Country Programme Manager, UNDP CO, UCP Global Coordinator, minimum of 4 grantees, minimum of 3 members of the NSC, as well as GEF operational focal point.

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. In addition, the evaluation will be included in the country office evaluation plan.

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 achievements2.

Conclusions, recommendations & lessons

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of conclusions, recommendations and lessons. Conclusions should build on findings and be based in evidence. Recommendations should be prioritized, specific, relevant, and targeted, with suggested implementers of the recommendations. Lessons should have wider applicability to other initiatives across the region, the area of intervention, and for the future.

Implementation arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Brasil. 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 *27 working* days according to the following plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Timing | Completion Date |
| **Preparation** | *2 working* days  | *May 2nd, 2018* |
| **Evaluation Mission** | *10* working days | *May 11th, 2018* |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | *10 working* days  | *May 25th, 2018* |
| **Final Report** | *5* working days  | *June 8th, 2018* |

Evaluation deliverables

The evaluator 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. Due date:May 2nd, 2018 | Evaluator submits to UNDP CO  |
| **Presentation** | Initial Findings  | End of evaluation mission.Due date: May 11th, 2018 | To project management, UNDP CO |
| **Draft Final Report**  | Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes | Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission.Due date: May 25th, 2018 | Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs |
| **Final Report\*** | Revised report  | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft Due date: June 8th, 2018 | 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. See Annex H for an audit trail template.

Team Composition

The evaluation team will be composed of one international/national 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 evaluator must present the following qualifications:

Mandatory criteria:

* Minimum *10* years of relevant professional experience;
* Previous experience with results‐based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
* Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s);
* Fluency in English with excellent writing skills;
* Good knowledge of Spanish.

Qualifying criteria:

* Post-graduate studies in related areas of the TOR;
* Experience of working on GEF evaluations, especially with SGP - Small Grants Programme;
* Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system;
* Competence in adaptive management, as applied to Biodiversity, Climate Change and Land Degradation;
* Demonstrated understanding of issues related to Biodiversity, Climate Change and Land Degradation; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis.
* Experience working in Latin America;
* Capacity of communication in Portuguese;
* Excellent communication skills.

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%* | At contract signing |
| *40%* | Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report |
| *50%* | Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report  |

Application process

Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for this position. The application should contain a current and complete CV in English with indication of the e‐mail and phone contact, as well as a price offer (in US Dollars) indicating the total cost of the assignment. Daily fee, per diem and travel costs (national and/or international) will be provided by UNDP.

The CV and the proposed price **must be submitted in separate files**. Noncompliance with this provision will cause the application to be disregarded.

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.

EVALUATION PROCEDURE

The final criteria for this selection process will be **technical capacity** and **price**.

Individual consultants will be evaluated based on a cumulative analysis taking into consideration the combination of the applicants’ qualifications and financial proposal. The award of the contract shall be made to the individual **consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:**

**1. CLASSIFICATION OF TECHNICAL QUALIFICATION (CV)**

The maximum score in TECHNICAL QUALIFICATION is 100 points.

Qualification criteria are divided into 03 (three) steps:

1. **Step 1 (qualification / mandatory - no scoring)**

Analysis of the CV regarding compliance with the mandatory requirements specified in these Terms of Reference. Candidates who do not meet the minimum mandatory criteria described herein will be disqualified at this stage.

1. **Step 2 (classification / scoring): CV Analysis (Maximum score in this phase is 70 points)**

The criteria for CV analysis are listed in the table below. Only the CVs of candidates accepted under Step 1 of Qualification (review of the CVs on mandatory requirements) will be analyzed.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CRITERIA** | **SCORE** | **WEIGHT** | **SUBTOTAL** |
| **Post-Graduate in related areas of the TOR** |
| Doctorate: 05 points; Master: 03 points; Specialization: 02 points | 0 to 5 | 1 | 5 |
| **Experience** |
| Competence in adaptive management, as applied to Biodiversity, Climate Change and Land Degradation | 0 to 5 | 5 | 25 |
| 05 years or more: 05 points; Less than 05 years: 03 points; Less than 02 years: 01 point   |
| Experience of working on GEF evaluations, especially with SGP - Small Grants Programme | 0 to 5 | 6 | 30 |
| 01 point per evaluation report  |
| Experience working in Latin America |   |   |   |
| 04 years or more: 05 points; Less than 04 years: 03 points; Less than 2 years: 01 point   | 0 to 5 | 2 | 10 |
| **Total** |  |  | **70** |

**Step 3 (classification / scoring): Interview (Maximum score in this phase is 30 points).**

Interviews will be conducted by telephone or Skype.

|  |
| --- |
| **Interview** |
| Demonstrated understanding of issues related to Biodiversity, Climate Change and Land Degradation; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis | 1 to 5 | 6 | 30 |
| Knowledge of GEF project monitoring and evaluation methodologies  |
| Capacity of communication in Portuguese or Spanish |
| **Total** |  |  | **30** |

5 points 🡪 excellent

4 points 🡪 very good

3 points 🡪 good

2 points 🡪 satisfactory

1 point 🡪 poor

**2. CLASSIFICATION OF FINANCIAL PROPOSALS (PRICE) – FINAL**

Only the financial proposals (price) of candidates who attain **a final Score of 70 points or higher in the TECHNICAL CLASSIFICATION** will be taken into consideration.

The Final Score—FS—of the process will be reached by the sum of the **final Technical Score—TS multiplied by a factor of 0.70**, and the **Price Proposal score—PS—multiplied by a factor 0.30**, i.e.:

FS = TS x 0.70 + PS x 0.30

The **PS** score will be calculated according to the following formula:

**PS = 100 x LPP / Ppe**

Where:

PS = score of the price proposal

LPP = lowest price proposal

Ppe = price proposal under evaluation

The lowest price proposal will score one hundred (100).

**The proposal achieving the highest final score will be selected.**

Annex A: Project Logical Framework

| **Objective** | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Targets** **End of Project** | **Source of verification** | **Risks and assumptions**  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Conservation of the Cerrado and Caatinga biomes of Brazil through community initiatives on sustainable resource use, and actions that maintain or enhance carbon stocks and increase areas under sustainable land management | Increased area in production landscapes meeting sustainability standardswith enhanced biodiversity conservation | 200,000 hectares managed sustainably as a result of SGP support in OP4 | Additional 300,000 ha sustainably managed in the Cerrado ecosystem 100,000 ha in the Caatinga ecosystemSustainability criteria and standards developed and adapted to social and environmental conditions of Cerrado and Caatinga  | Final reports and independent evaluations | Market forces will be favorable for conservation and sustainable land-use practices Public rural development policies will be conducive to conservation-oriented and sustainable natural resource use initiativesCommunity-based organizations and partner institutions will have sufficient capacity to comply with and implement sustainability criteria and standards SGP Brazil and/or partners will have sufficient financial and human resources to carry out certification on the ground  |
| Carbon stocks maintained or increased through maintenance and expansion of habitats  | Deforestation rate in the Caatinga biome is 276,300 ha/p.a and 1,418,000 ha/p.a in the Cerrado  | 500 hectares of Caatinga ecosystem restored, equivalent to 18,200 tCO2e sequestered500 hectares of Cerrado ecosystem restored, equivalent to 37,400 tCO2e sequestered during life of project80,000 hectares with avoided conversion to pasture or monoculture and environmental services maintained, equivalent to 4,370,400 tCO2e of emissions avoided during the life of the project  | Independent monitoring reports on sample of projects  | Community-based organizations and partners institutions will have sufficient capacity to comply with and implement carbon monitoring and measuring proceduresCommunities are open to adopting habitat restoration practicesTechnical assistance will be available at the local level through NGOs or government agenciesMarket conditions (commodity prices, etc.) do not increase pressures on habitat conversion far beyond current levels  |
| Increased area of sustainable land management techniques that sustain the flow of environmental services in agro-ecosystems by communities supported by SGP  | 2200 ha (as a result of SGP support in OP 4) | An additional 200 hectares in Caatinga and 400 hectares in the Cerrado in which communities apply innovative soil management techniques2,000 hectares with improved ecosystem services as a result of community adoption of innovative water management techniques | Final reports and independent evaluations | Communities are open to adopting sustainable land and water management practicesTechnical assistance will be available at the local level through NGOs or government agencies  |
| Sustainable use and management of natural resources by communities to enhance conservation of biodiversity in the production landscape | Number of sustainable land use plans or resource use plans developed, as well as plans for conservation of endangered species | There are no existing plans in targeted communities  | 15 plans developed by stakeholders | Land use and species conservation plans and project reports | Communities are open to adopting sustainable resource use and biodiversity management practicesTechnical assistance available at the local level through NGOs or government agencies Communities have market access for selling their goods  |
| Number of native plant and animal species considered endangered or important for sustainable livelihoods conserved in-situ and sustainably used | 29 endangered plant species, 6 endangered and 16 vulnerable animal species in project areas supported previously by SGP in Cerrado and 0 plant and animal species in Caatinga  | 50 plant species and 25 animal species, including Cerrado and Caatinga  | Projects submissions, monitoring and final reports, final independent evaluation |
| Number of families participating in Caatinga and Cerrado bio-products marketing networks  | 6,000 families currently participate | 8,000 additional families participate | Project submissions, monitoring and final reports, final independent evaluation |
| Number of hectares with forest cover under regeneration in community lands  | 612 hectares currently under regeneration  | 1000 additional hectares under natural regeneration practices | Projects submissions, monitoring and final reports, final independent evaluation |
| Carbon stocks maintained through avoiding land use change and improved agriculture and forest management at the community level | Number of hectares under sustainable forest management in community lands  | 36,190 ha under sustainable forest management (in projects supported in OP4) | 40,000 additional hectares under sustainable forest management | Project submissions, monitoring and final reports, final independent evaluation | Tools for monitoring carbon stocks will be applicable at the community level Communities are open to adopting sustainable land use practicesTechnical assistance will be available at the local level through NGOs or government agencies  |
| Area under ecological agriculture management | 250 hectares (est.) | 15,000 hectares under ecological agriculture management | Project submissions, monitoring and final reports, final independent evaluation | Communities are open to adopting sustainable land and water management practicesTechnical assistance will be available at the local level through NGOs or government agencies Sustainable management techniques are tailored to the livelihoods needs and contexts of communities  |
| Area on which smallholders apply fire control techniques or avoid use of fire  | Smallholders do not currently apply fire control techniques or avoid the use of fire  | Smallholders apply fire control techniques or avoid the use of fire on at least 25,000 hectares  | Projects submissions, monitoring and final reports, final independent evaluation |
| Number of families adopting sustainable water management techniques and sustainable land management techniques  | 517 families have adopted sustainable water management techniques and SLM techniques as a result of SGP support in OP4. | 1200 additional families have adopted sustainable water management techniques and SLM techniques | Project submissions, monitoring and final reports, final independent evaluation |
| Sustainable land management techniques preventing land degradation, restoring agro-ecosystem services, and improving livelihoods of local communities implemented | Area with erosion in grantee farmlands | 2400 ha of grantee farmland undergoing erosion, to be confirmed through project submissions | Reduction of erosion in 1200 ha as a result of SGP interventions  | Projects submissions, monitoring and final reports, final independent evaluation | Communities are open to adopting sustainable land and water management practicesTechnical assistance will be available at the local level through NGOs or government agencies Sustainable management techniques are tailored to the livelihoods needs and contexts of communities  |
| Area under sustainable water and soil management  | 1,200 ha in Cerrado  | 2000 ha (including Caatinga and Cerrado)  | Projects submissions, monitoring and final reports, final independent evaluation |
| Communities deliver global environmental benefits through capacity development and knowledge management | Percentage of project reports that receive a “very good” score, according to SGP Brazil project assessment method  | 51% very good  | 70% of project reports “very good” | Project monitoring reports  | Grantee project teams have or acquire sufficient capacity to manage projectsProject teams establish strategic partnerships at the local level that enable effective project implementation and knowledge management SGP Brazil staff will continue to have an influence on key policymaking processes |
| Number of community leaders aware of global environmental issues  | 30 community leaders | 150 additional community leaders | Training activity reports |
| Number of policy inputs or recommendations provided to policymakers based on lessons learned | 10 inputs or recommendations as a result of SGP support in OP4  | 10 additional inputs or recommendations  | Documents, reports, emails, personal communications  |

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

Project Document (PRODOC) and budget revisions

Annual PIRs and other reports

Steering Committee’s reports and minutes;

Mid-Term Evaluation

Project files

Financial data including co-funding data and audit reports, whenever applicable

Annex C: Evaluation Questions

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

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

Annex D: Rating Scales

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution*** | ***Sustainability ratings:***  | ***Relevance ratings*** |
| 6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings 5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS)3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems | 4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability | 2. Relevant (R) |
| 3. Moderately Likely (ML):moderate risks | 1.. Not relevant (NR) |
| 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks1. Unlikely (U): severe risks | ***Impact Ratings:***3. Significant (S)2. Minimal (M)1. Negligible (N) |
| *Additional ratings where relevant:*Not Applicable (N/A) Unable to Assess (U/A |

Annex E: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form

**Evaluators:**

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

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form[[2]](#footnote-2)**

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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[[4]](#footnote-4)) |
| **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[[5]](#footnote-5))  |
| **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
* Report Clearance Form
* Annexed in a separate file: TE audit trail
 |

Annex G: Evaluation Report Clearance Form

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

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

UNDP GEF RTA

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Annex H: TE Report audit trail

The following is a template for the evaluator to show how the received comments on the draft TE report have (or have not) been incorporated into the final TE report. This audit trail should be included as an annex in the final TE report.

**To the comments received on (*date*) from the Terminal Evaluation of (*project name*) (UNDP *PIMS #)***

*The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft Terminal Evaluation report; they are referenced by institution (“Author” column) and by comment number (“#” column):*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author** | **#** | **Para No./ comment location**  | **Comment/Feedback on the draft TE report** | **Evaluator response and actions taken** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

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. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
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. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)