

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 Belize Chemicals and Waste Management Project 00089331 (PIMS #5094.)**

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

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	Belize Chemicals and Waste Management Project			
GEF Project ID:	5094		<i>at endorsement</i> <i>(Million US\$)</i>	<i>at completion</i> <i>(Million US\$)</i>
UNDP Project ID:	00089331	GEF financing:	990,000	990,000
Country:	Belize	IA/EA own:		
Region:	LAC	Government:		
Focal Area:	CHEMICALS	Other:	25,000	30,442.21
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):		Total co-financing:	25,000	30,442.1
Executing Agency:	Department of the Environment	Total Project Cost:	1,015,000	1,020,442.21
Other Partners involved:	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		07/22/2014	
	(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed:	Actual:	
		06/31/2017	12/31/2018	

OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The project was designed to: to assist the country in implementing its relevant obligations under the Stockholm Convention, in particular to reduce the releases of Unintentional POPs emissions, as well as to build country's capacity to manage chemicals and waste, in line with the GEF objectives. This will be accomplished through 2 principal project components.

Component 1: Regulatory Strengthening and Environmentally sound management of chemicals and waste, including POPs

Component 2: UOPs release reduction in waste management operations and agriculture

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 method¹ 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 is expected to conduct a field mission to **Belize**, including the following project sites

- **SIRDI**
- **Burrell Boom Transfer Station**
- Mile 24 Landfill (

Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

(list key stakeholders).

Stakeholder List - Chemicals Management Strategy		
	Contact Person	Email
Department of the Environment		
	Martin Alegria	doe.ceo@environment.gov.bz
	Jorge Franco	projects@environment.gov.bz
GEF Operational Focal Point/ Chief Executive Officer		
Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries, Forestry, the Environment and Sustainable Development	Dr. Percival Cho	ceo@environment.gov.bz
Project Board Members		
United Nations Development Programme	Diane Wade-Moore	diane.wade@undp.org

¹ For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](#), Chapter 7, pg. 163

Belize Customs and Excise Department	Lorin Frazer	lorin.frazer@yahoo.com
Fabrigas	Glenford H Baptist	gbaptist@fabrigas.bz
Ministry of Health	John Bodden	jbodden@health.gov.bz
Belize Natural Energy	Albert Roches	aroches@bne.bz
Pesticides Control of Belize	Miriam Serrut	miriam.oserrut@pcb Belize.com
Solid Waste Management Authority	Emmerson Garcia	emmersongarcia_15@yahoo.com or swtech@solidwaste.gov.bz
University of Belize	Juliane Pasos	jpasos@ub.edu.bz
Ministry of Economic Development	Kimberley Westby	Kimberley.Westby@med.gov.bz
Belize Agricultural Health Authority (BAHA)	Kenrick Witty	kenrick.witty@baha.org.bz
Sugar Industry Research Institute (SIRDI)	Marcos Osorio	marcos.sirdi@gmail.com
<u>Technical Working Group Expert</u>	Erasmus Franklin	eifranko@gmail.com
	Mario Fernandez	marfer1605@yahoo.com

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](#) of this Terms of Reference.

EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see [Annex A](#)), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact**. 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	<i>rating</i>	2. IA& EA Execution	<i>rating</i>
M&E design at entry		Quality of UNDP Implementation	
M&E Plan Implementation		Quality of Execution - Executing Agency	
Overall quality of M&E		Overall quality of Implementation / Execution	
3. Assessment of Outcomes	<i>rating</i>	4. Sustainability	<i>rating</i>
Relevance		Financial resources:	
Effectiveness		Socio-political:	
Efficiency		Institutional framework and governance:	
Overall Project Outcome Rating		Environmental :	
		Overall likelihood of sustainability:	

PROJECT FINANCE / COFINANCE

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

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

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 **Belize**. 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.

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](#)

EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the evaluation will be **20** days according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation	3 days	October 5th 2018
Evaluation Mission	9 days	October 22nd to October 31st 2018
Draft Evaluation Report	6 days	November 16th 2018
Final Report	2 days	November 30th 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 consultants 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 Team members must present the following qualifications:

- Minimum 5 years of relevant professional experience
- Knowledge of UNDP and GEF
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
- Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s)

EVALUATOR ETHICS

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

PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

%	Milestone
10%	Upon acceptance and approval of the Inception Report
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

Applicants are requested to apply by **September 21st 2018**. 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 English with indication of the e-mail and phone contact. Shortlisted candidates will be requested to submit a price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs).

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

ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Project Results Framework

<p>This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPAP or CPD: UNDP Country Programme 2013-2017 Outcome 6: Public policies and institutional capacities are strengthened and capacitated to manage Belize’s natural resource base in a sustainable manner, and for a more effective and multi-sectoral preparedness and response to natural disasters and climate-induced events.</p>						
<p>Country Programme Outcome Indicators: 1. National compliance with multi-lateral environmental agreements strengthened. 2. Strengthened policy framework and institutional arrangements for integrated water and land resource management</p>						
<p>Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area (same as that on the cover page, circle one):</p>						
<p>Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program: GEF-5 Chemicals Strategy: Objective 1: Phase out POPs and Reduce POPs Releases.</p>						
<p>Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes: Outcome 1.3 POPs releases to the environment reduced. Outcome 1.4 POPs waste prevented, managed, and disposed of, and POPs contaminated sites managed in an environmentally sound manner. Outcome 1.5 Country capacity built to effectively phase out and reduce releases of POPs.</p>						
<p>Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators: Indicator 1.3.1 Amount of un-intentionally produced POPs releases avoided or reduced from industrial and nonindustrial sectors; measured in grams TEQ against baseline as recorded through the POPs tracking tool. Indicator 1.4.1 Amount of PCBs and PCB-related wastes disposed of, or decontaminated; measured in tons as recorded in the POPs tracking tool. Indicator 1.4.2 Amount of obsolete pesticides, including POPs, disposed of in an environmentally sound manner; measured in tons. Indicator 1.5.1 Progress in developing and implementing a legislative and regulatory framework for environmentally sound management of POPs, and for the sound management of chemicals in general, as recorded in the POPs tracking tool.</p>						
	Indicator	Baseline	Targets		Sources of verification	Risks and assumptions
			Mid-term	End of project		
<p>Project Objective: To protect human health and the environment locally and globally by reducing releases harmful POPs substances and increasing the capacity for hazardous chemicals and waste management.</p>						
	Chemicals Bill legally in force.	Draft National Integrated Chemicals	Chemicals Bill legally adopted.	Coherent legal and Institutional	Official Gazette.	Risk: Delay in adoption as

<p><i>Outcome 1.1: Institutional capacities strengthened through enhanced policies and regulatory framework supporting sound management of chemical life cycle</i></p>	<p>Number of official meetings of National Integrated Management Authority. Target: 3</p>	<p>Management Bill developed.</p>	<p>National Integrated Chemicals Management Authority Secretariat operational</p>	<p>framework for the sound management of chemicals in Belize agreed.</p>	<p>Meeting records of the National Integrated Chemicals Management Authority.</p>	<p>overlapping mandates of ministries not resolved Assumption: Project's multi-stakeholder coordination and frequent meetings will ensure coordination and agreement between the ministries.</p>
	<p>Number of base regulations and POPs specific guidelines adopted.</p>	<p>No specific chemicals and waste regulations or drafts exist.</p>	<p>Draft Industrial and Consumer Chemicals regulations and PCBs specific guidelines adopted.</p>	<p>Target: 5, POPs waste, UPOPs, pharmaceuticals, cosmetics and precursor chemicals regulations and guidelines adopted</p>	<p>Official Gazette. Publications of Ministries of Health and Environment</p>	<p>Assumption. Chemicals Bill adopted</p>
	<p>Number of inspections undertaken to enforce chemicals/POPs regulations. Training days of inspectors and authorities for enforcement of chemicals bill.</p>	<p>No specific Chemicals Bill inspections. Chemicals inspected as a part of inspections of industrial installations</p>	<p>10 chemicals emphasizing industrial inspections a year.</p>	<p>30 chemicals emphasizing industrial inspections a year. Target: 100 training man days in chemicals and POPs regulation enforcement and inspections.</p>	<p>Work records, attendance sheets and reports from Department of Environment</p>	<p>Assumption: Regional Caribbean POPs management project will provide additional capacity building and inspector training.</p>

<p><u>Outcome 1.2: Management and disposal of existing POPs waste</u></p>	<p>Successful export disposal of existing POPs waste.</p>	<p>21 DDT and associated waste packed for disposal at KWCH hospital. 7 tons of PCB contaminated waste in barrels at private entity.</p>	<p>Capacity building undertaken and disposal contract awarded.</p>	<p>Safe disposal of all POPs in Belize undertaken</p>	<p>Project documentation. Disposal Certificate</p>	<p>Risks: Delays caused by difficulties in finding a shipping line for transport.</p>
<p><u>Outcome 2.1: Measureable reduction in dioxin release from formal and informal waste dumps</u></p>	<p>Tonnage of waste being uncontrollably burned at waste sites in the Western Corridor</p>	<p>20,000 tons of waste burnt at waste dumps and households both urban and peri-urban 6 g I-TEQ PCDD/Fs</p>	<p>Less than 10,000 tons burnt < 3 g I-TEQ PCDD/Fs</p>	<p>Less than 2,000 tons burnt < 0.6 I-TEQ PCDD/Fs</p>	<p>Transfer station and final landfill weighted data. Monitoring and evaluation estimates</p>	
	<p>Number of waste dumps closed and transfer centers built and operational</p>	<p>3 dumps closed and transfer station construction commenced</p>	<p>4 dumps closed and transfer operational; 3 Mile, San Ignacio, San Pedro, Caye Caulker</p>	<p>6 dumps closed and transfer operational; 3 Mile, San Ignacio, San Pedro, Caye Caulker, Belmopan, Boom</p>	<p>Solid Waste Management authority documentation. Visual verification of construction and operation.</p>	<p>Assumption: Full government funding allocation assumed and critical.</p>
<p><u>Outcome 2.2: Reduction of UPOPs releases from uncontrolled, open burning of agricultural</u></p>	<p>Sugar Cane area under Green Harvesting (non-burning) among small holding farmers</p>	<p>0 acres</p>	<p>400 acres</p>	<p>6,000 acres</p>	<p>Sugar Cane Producer association reports SIDRI documentation</p>	<p>Assumption: Replication of project demonstration successful.</p>

<i>and other wastes</i>	Tonnage of sugarcane Green Harvested (non-burning)	80,000 tons (BSI) Releases 5.0 g I-TEQ PCDD/Fs	100,000 tons Releases 4,9 g I-TEQ PCDD/Fs	300,000 tons Releases 4,0 g I-TEQ PCDD/Fs	Sugar Cane Producer association reports SIDRI documentation	Assumption: increase from small scale farmers.
	Price of Green Harvested sugarcane	Green Harvested cane does not fetch a higher price.	Proposals for including the green harvesting as requirement for premium price schemes developed	Green harvesting included as requirement for premium price schemes Price premium for green harvested cane > 10 \$ per ton.	Premium price schemes (Fairtrade) production standards. Sugar industry data for purchase price at gate.	Assumption: Premium price schemes, weights environmental over employment benefits in setting standards.
Outcome 3: Monitoring, learning, adaptive feedback, outreach, and evaluation.	M&E and adaptive management applied to project in response to needs, mid-term evaluation findings with lessons learned extracted.	No Monitoring and Evaluation system, nor evaluation of project output and outcomes.	Monitoring and Evaluation system developed during first year. Mid-term evaluation of project output and outcomes conducted with lessons learnt.	Final evaluation carried out.	Inception workshop report. APR/PIR. Independent mid-term evaluation report. Final evaluation report.	None.

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

- 1. Audit Reports**
- 2. Inventory and Assets**
- 3. PEG Meeting Records**
- 4. Stage Plans / End of Stage Reports and Highlight Reports**
- 5. Project Implementation Review Reports (PIRs)**
- 6. Key Project Deliverables**
- 7. Project Logframe**
- 8. Pesticides Control Board Strategy developed by IICA**
- 9. Chemicals Strategy, Action Plan and Disposal**

ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

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

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

ANNEX E: EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT AND AGREEMENT FORM

Evaluators:

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

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form³

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: _____

³www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE⁴

- 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 Manual⁵)
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 rated⁶)
- 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)

⁴The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

⁵ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

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.

- 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: _____