

**TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE TERMINAL EVALUATION OF THE
ENHANCING RESILIENCE OF TOURISM-RELIANT COMMUNITIES TO
CLIMATE CHANGE RISKS IN SAMOA (ICCRITS) PROJECT**

A. Introduction:

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Terminal evaluation (TE) of the full-sized project titled *Enhancing Resilience of Tourism-reliant Communities to Climate Change risks in Samoa (ICCRITS) project* (PIMS 4858) implemented through the Samoa Tourism Authority, which is to be undertaken in 2017. The project started on 29th May 2013 and is in its final year of implementation. In line with the UNDP-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. This ToR sets out the expectations for this TE. The TE process must follow the guidance outlined in the document [Guidance for conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-Financed Projects](#)

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	Enhancing Resilience of Tourism-reliant Communities to Climate Change risks in Samoa			
GEF Project ID:	00064910			<i>at completion (Million US\$)</i>
UNDP Project ID:	00086465 4858	GEF financing:	1,950,000.00	
Country:	Samoa	IA/EA own:	3,600,000	
Region:	Pacific	Government:	13,688,500	
Focal Area:	Climate Change Adaptation	Other:		
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):		Total co-financing:	17,288,500	
Executing Agency:	Samoa Tourism Authority (STA)	Total Project Cost:	19,238,500	
Other Partners involved:	Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MNRE)	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		29 th May 2013
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: 31 January 2017	Actual: 31 December 2017

B. Project Description or Context and Background:

The project was designed to enhance the resilience of tourism-reliant communities to climate change risks. This will be achieved by integrating climate change into development policy and instruments, and investing in adaptation actions supporting tourism reliant communities. These are priorities identified under Samoa's National Adaptation Programme of Action (NAPA). LDCF resources will be used to integrate climate change aspects into the Samoa Tourism Development Plan and management of Tourism Development Areas (TDAs).

Resources will be used to establish financial support schemes and risk transfer mechanisms, develop a sector-tailored early warning system, and implement concrete adaptation measures in high priority tourism-reliant communities and tourism sites targeting the management of coastal infrastructure, water resources, shore line and tourism resources including recreational activities. Project outcomes are as follows:

1. Climate change adaptation mainstreamed into tourism-related policy instruments and public-private partnerships
2. Increased adaptive capacity to climate change and disaster risks of tourism-reliant communities

The total grant funding for this project is US\$1,950,000 from the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) with in kind and parallel co-financing of US\$17,288,500. The project document was signed on the 29th May 2013. The executing agency for this project is the Samoa Tourism Authority.

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

C. Scope of Work:

The objective of this consultancy is to undertake the Terminal Evaluation of the ICCRITS project.

EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

An overall approach and method 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



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

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 Samoa, including the following project sites Manase beach replenishment, Laloifi Beach Fales, Manusina Beach Fales, Faofao Beach Fales, Gogosiva Beach Fales, Jaymy Beach Fales, Taufua Beach Fales, Litia Sini Resort Sunset View Fales, Saleaula Lava Ruin, Reginas Beach Fales, Vacations Beach Fales, Janes Beach Fales, Falealupo Canopy Walkway, Falealupo Beach Fales, Satuiatua Beach Fales, Alofaaga Blowholes, Afu Aau Waterfall, Aganoa Lodge, Sweet Escape Fales, and Joelan Beach Fales. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: Samoa Tourism Authority, Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment and selected/all small tourism operators from 21 project sites mentioned above

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – incl. Annual APR/PIR and other Reports, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other material 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.

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

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	6 point scale	Quality of UNDP Implementation	6 point scale



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

M&E Plan Implementation	6 point scale	Quality of Execution - Executing Agency	6 point scale
Overall quality of M&E	6 point scale	Overall quality of Implementation / Execution	6 point scale
3. Assessment of Outcomes	rating	4. Sustainability	rating
Relevance	2 point scale	Financial resources:	4 point scale
Effectiveness	6 point scale	Socio-political:	4 point scale
Efficiency	6 point scale	Institutional framework and governance:	4 point scale
Overall Project Outcome Rating	6 point scale	Environmental :	4 point scale
		Overall likelihood of sustainability:	4 point scale

PROJECT FINANCE/ CO FINANCE

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator will receive assistance from the Multi-Country Office (MCO) 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	Planned	Actual
Grants								
Loans/Concessions								
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In-kind support 								



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

• 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 evaluator will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.¹

CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

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

Conclusions should build on findings and 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.

D. Expected Outcomes and Deliverables:

The evaluation consultant 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

¹A 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](#)



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

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, AF/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. (see [Annex H](#))

E. Institutional Arrangement:

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP MCO in Samoa. The UNDP Samoa MCO will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluator. 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.

F. Duration of the Work:

The total duration of the evaluation will be 25 days over a two-month period* according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation	4 working days	30 th November 2017
Evaluation Mission Draft	10 working days	19 th December 2017
Evaluation Report Final	9 working days	2 nd January 2018
Report	2 working days	4 th January 2018

* The indicated max duration takes into account consultant's initial desk review and quality check of the final report from UNDP MCO, as well as potential delays due to unforeseen circumstances, not included as deliverables in the table above

G. Duty Station:



*Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.*

Home-based with travel to Samoa. It is expected that the consultant will spend 10 (working) days on mission in Samoa.

H. Competencies:

- Demonstrates commitment to the Gov. of Samoa mission, vision and values.
- Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability
- Focuses on result for the client and responds positively to feedback
- Consistently approaches work with energy and a positive, constructive attitude
- Demonstrates openness to change and ability to manage complexities
- Good inter-personal and teamwork skills, networking aptitude, ability to work in multicultural environment

I. Qualifications of the Successful Contractor:

The evaluation team will be composed of 1 independent evaluator. The consultant shall have prior experience in evaluating GEF or GEF/LDCF projects. 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 selected candidate must be equipped with his/her own computing equipment.

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'](#).

- Post-graduate degree in environmental/climate science, tourism or other closely related field
- Minimum 8 years of relevant professional experience in climate change adaptation and sustainable tourism
- Minimum of 5 years' experience with evaluations, results-based monitoring, and/or evaluation methodologies
- Experience working with the GEF/ programs and in the targeted focal areas: Climate Change Adaptation
- Experience working in the Pacific region
- Fluency in English (oral and written) is a requirement

Evaluation criteria: 70% Technical, 30% financial combined weight:



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

Technical Evaluation Criteria (based on the information provided in the CV and the relevant documents must be submitted as evidence to support possession of below required criteria):

- Post-graduate degree in environmental/climate science, tourism sciences, or other closely related field (25%)
- Minimum 8 years of relevant professional experience in climate change adaptation and sustainable tourism (30%)
- Minimum of 5 years' experience with evaluations, results-based monitoring, and/or evaluation methodologies (30%)
- Experience working with the GEF/GEF-LDCF programs and in the targeted focal areas: climate change adaptation (5%)
- Experience working in the Pacific region (5%)
- Fluency in English (oral and written) is a requirement (5%)

J. Scope of Bid Price & Schedule of Payments:

DELIVERABLES	DUE DATE (%)	AMOUNT IN USD TO BE PAID AFTER CERTIFICATION BY UNDP OF SATISFACTORY PERFORMANCE OF DELIVERABLES
At contract signing – <u>Cover Travel Costs</u>	30 th November 2017 (10%)	\$xxx
Upon submission and approval of the 1 st draft terminal evaluation report	19 th December 2017 (40%)	\$xxx
Upon submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report	4 th January 2017 (50%)	\$xxx
TOTAL		\$xxx



*Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.*

K. Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

Given below is the recommended format for submitting your proposal. The following headings with the required details are important. Please use the template available (Letter of Offer to complete financial proposal)

CVs with a proposed methodology addressing the elements mentioned under deliverables must be submitted by **17th Nov 2017** electronically via email: procurement.ws@undp.org. Incomplete applications will not be considered and only candidates for whom there is further interest will be contacted. Proposals must include:

- **CV** or P11 form addressing the evaluation criteria and why you consider yourself the most suitable for this assignment. The selected candidate must submit a signed P11 prior to contract award.
- **3 professional references most recent**
- **A brief methodology** on how you will approach and conduct the work,
- **Financial Proposal** specifying the daily rate and other expenses, if any
- **Letter of interest and availability specifying the available date to start and other details**

Queries about the consultancy can be directed to the UNDP Procurement Unit
procurement.ws@undp.org



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

ToR ANNEX A: Project Logical Framework

Project Objective: Increase the resilience of the tourism sector of Samoa through mainstreaming climate risks into tourism-related policy processes which guide the implementation of adaptation actions by tourism operators and tourism reliant communities.

Indicator description	Baseline	Target	Source of verification	Risks and Assumption
Capacity perception index of STA disaggregated by gender; AMAT 2.2.2) (1=no capacity built 2=initial awareness raised 3=substantial training in practical application 4=knowledge effectively transferred 5=ability to apply or disseminate knowledge demonstrated)	Capacity of STA is currently rated at 2-3.	By the end of the project the capacity is 4-5.	Self-assessment Mid-term and final evaluations	Conducive policy or regulatory measures and incentives are provided within STA and MNRE Government decision-makers and Stakeholders continue support & recognize the importance of climate change adaptation in the tourism sector and the political will facilitate the necessary policy changes remains strong. Tourism operators recognize the economic benefits of adaptation measures and willing to invest in changing their current resource management practices
% of tourism operators who invest and implement sustainable adaptation measures to enhance their resilience.	Tourism operators are not investing in sustainable adaptation measures, but instead in quick and unsustainable measures to cope with climate risks	At least 75% of all tourism operators in the 6 targeted TDAs have invested and implemented sustainable adaptation measures	Field survey with tourism operators Mid-term and final evaluations	Tourism operators react positively to the provisions of the Management Plans and Guidelines. Tourism operators and tourism reliant communities are willing to undertake joint planning and assessments shared climate risks to produce cost effective and efficient options for adaptation. Political stability is maintained

Component 1: Revising planning processes, regulations and financial instruments relating to tourism operators in Samoa

Outcome 1: Climate change adaptation mainstreamed into tourism-related policy instruments and public- private partnerships

Indicator description	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
# of Management Plans developed and operationalized	Climate resilient management plans are currently not in place	By the end of the project, at least 6 climate resilient management plans have been developed and operationalized per TDA, involving at least 20 villages in total	Endorsed management plans Including implementation arrangements Progress reports Mid-term and final evaluation	Key Government representatives and stakeholders from the Tourism industry recognize the value of project-related 'learn by doing' training initiatives and are willing to engage in discussions and regular debate about climate risks in the tourism sector Senior planners and decision-makers continue to recognize the importance of climate change adaptation and are committed to support necessary policy changes
% of tourism operators in targeted TDAs apply new guidelines for climate resilient actions	No guidelines exist for effective no-regrets adaptation measures to increase resilience of tourism operators and there is a history of little application of guidelines is commonly low	By the end of the project, at least 75% of the targeted tourism operators apply the issued guidelines	Training reports attendance lists Training feedback Progress reports	Tourism operators are willing to engage in the review, revision and adoption of new planning approaches and building standards. Providers of financial products are willing and able to accommodate (poor) operators with accessing financial products for climate resilient actions
# of tourism operators that gain access to financial products for climate resilient	Tourism operators do not access financial products for climate resilient actions	By the end of the project, at least 15 operators have successfully gained access to financial products for	Reports provided by providers of financial institutions Mid-term and final Evaluations	



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

actions		climate resilient actions		
---------	--	---------------------------	--	--

Component 2: Implementation of Climate Change Adaptation measures in nationally demarcated Tourism Development Areas (TDAs)

Outcome 2: Increased adaptive capacity to climate change and disaster risks of tourism-reliant communities

Indicator description	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
Number and type of risk reduction activities introduced in tourism reliant communities (AMAT 2.3.1.1)	No Operators with Business plans which incorporate climate smart risk assessment & planning	At least five risk reduction activities have been introduced across the 9 villages in the 6 TDAs	Project Progress Reports Midterm and final Evaluation	Tourism operators find reduced costs associated with the proposed adaptation measures sufficiently attractive to invest in changes to existing setups and practices Tourism operators react to improved incentives and enforcement of environmental legislation in the tourism sector.
% of women and men in tourism reliant communities trained in climate risk reduction	Initial awareness raising activities have taken place in the project area under the PPG phase, but no systematic training has been provided on ????	By the end of the project at least 50% of the women and 50% of the men of the targeted communities has been trained in climate risk reduction.	Project Progress Reports Midterm and final Evaluations	Guidelines developed by the project are considered practical, locally appropriate, innovative, sustainable and cost effective – and assist with



*Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.*

% of targeted tourism reliant communities that have adopted climate resilient livelihoods	Apart from some ad- hoc measures individuals are taking, none of the targeted communities have climate resilient livelihoods	By the end of the project at least 80% of the targeted communities have adopted climate resilient livelihoods	Field survey Final Evaluation	implementation Key Government representatives and stakeholders from the Tourism industry recognize the value of project-related 'learn by doing' training initiatives
---	--	---	-------------------------------	--



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

ToR ANNEX B: List of Documents to be reviewed by the TE evaluator

1. PIF
2. UNDP Initiation Plan
3. UNDP Project Document
4. Project Inception Report
5. All Project Implementation Reports (PIR's)
6. Quarterly progress reports
7. Mid-term Review (MTR) Report
8. Mid-term Review (MTR) Report Management Response
9. All AWP's (annual work plans);
10. All annual financial project reports (CDRs);
11. Consultancy products (report, technical studies, etc.);
12. Board Meeting minutes;
13. All communication products;
14. Community consultations minutes, if available
15. Audit reports
16. Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools at CEO endorsement, midterm and at end of project (*fill in specific TTs for this project's focal area*)
17. Oversight mission reports
18. All monitoring reports prepared by the project

The following documents will also be available:

19. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
20. Minutes of the (*Project Title*) Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
21. Project site location maps
22. Any other relevant documents



*Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.*

ToR ANNEX C: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report²

Evaluation 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?			

² The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

ToR ANNEX D: Ratings

Ratings Scales		
Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution	Sustainability ratings:	Relevance ratings
6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): The project had no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency 5: Satisfactory (S): There were only minor shortcomings 4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS): there were moderate shortcomings 3: Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): the project had significant shortcomings 2: Unsatisfactory (U): there were major shortcomings in the achievement of project objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency 1: Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): The project had severe shortcomings	4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks	2. Relevant (R) 1.. Not relevant (NR) Impact Ratings: 3. Significant (S) 2. Minimal (M) 1. Negligible (N)
Additional ratings where relevant: Not Applicable (N/A) Unable to Assess (U/A)		

ToR ANNEX E: EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT AGREEMENT FORM

Evaluators/Consultants:

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



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

- 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: _____

TOR 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)

³ www.undp.org/unegcodeofconduct

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

- 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

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: Marginal Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations.

- 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



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

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 County 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 track change comment number ("#" column):

Author	#	Para No./ comment location	Comment/Feedback on the draft TE report	TE team response and actions taken



*Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.*
