

ANNEX 1. EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

Terms of Reference

Terminal Evaluation of the GEF-financed Full-Size Projects for the Fifth Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme in Bolivia

This projects was approved in GEF OP5 as upgrading country programme projects financed by the GEF. Upgrading SGP Country Programme projects are products of the policy approved by GEF Council at the November Council of 2008. Under this policy, countries were encouraged to finance their SGP Country Programmes with a higher amount from their STAR allocations. The average GEF financing per upgrading country programme is USD 4.6 million.

Upgrading Country Programmes follow SGP Operational Guidelines, in particular in regard to the composition of the National Steering Committee and the role of the National Coordinator. The four-year standard Country Programme Strategies have been substituted by UNDP-GEF Project Documents in which a logical framework delineates the expected outputs and outcomes to be produced as a consequence of a focused grant making scheme. In the case of the five UCPs listed here, UNOPS remains the executing agency.

UNDP-GEF supplies standard TORs for Terminal Evaluations which can be found below. The project evaluation will require assessment, against the outcomes and outputs of each project, of the impacts achieved or in progress, identification of lessons learned, identification of bottlenecks and obstacles to further implementation and development of the Country Programmes for the future.

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 Programme in Bolivia*

The essentials of the project to be evaluated are as follows: *(fully complete the table below)*.

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:				
GEF Project ID:			<u>at endorsement</u> <i>(Million US\$)</i>	<u>at completion</u> <i>(Million US\$)</i>
UNDP Project ID:	4519	GEF financing:		
Country:	Bolivia	IA/EA own:	UNDP	
Region:	LAC	Government:		
Focal Area:	MFA	Other:		

FA Objectives, (OP/SP):		Total co-financing:		
Executing Agency:	UNOPS	Total Project Cost:		
Other Partners involved:		ProDoc Signature (date project began):		
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed:	Actual:

OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The project was designed to: *(provide a project summary including project goal and outcomes. Also, in cases where the GEF funded project forms part of a larger programme, specify if the TE is to cover the entire programme or only the GEF component).*

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 method⁷ for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact**, as defined and explained in the [UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects](#). A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR *(fill in Annex C)*. 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 *(location)*, including the following project sites *(list)*. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: *(list key stakeholders)*.

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

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

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.⁸

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 global manager for the SGP Upgrading Country Projects, assisted by UNOPS, as the executing agency for these projects. UNOPS 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 **XX** days according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation	03	date
Evaluation Mission	08	date
Draft Evaluation Report	07	date
Final Report	02	date

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 global manager for SGP Upgrading Country Programmes, UNOPS, UNDP CO, and National Coordinator
Presentation	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission	To National Coordinator, UNDP CO
Draft Final Report	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission	To global manager UCPs, CO, NC, NSC
Final Report*	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Sent to global manager UCPs, UNDP CO, NC, NSC

⁸ 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](#)

*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 *(1-2 international /national evaluators)*. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. *(If the team has more than 1 evaluator, one will be designated as the team leader and will be responsible for finalizing the report)*. The evaluators 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 **XX** 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)
- *(additional skills based on project particulars)*

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

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

%	Milestone
10%	At contract signing
40%	Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report
50%	Following submission and approval (global manager UCPs, UNDP-CO) of the final terminal evaluation report

ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

(to be added)

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

(to be added)

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

<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>Additional ratings where relevant: 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 Form⁹

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 OUTLINE¹⁰

- 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 Manual¹¹)
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 rated¹²)
- 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

⁹www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

¹⁰The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

¹¹ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

¹² 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.

- project design
 - Planned stakeholder participation
 - Replication approach
 - UNDP comparative advantage
 - Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
 - Management arrangements
- 3.2 Project Implementation
- Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
 - Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/ region)
 - Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management
 - Project Finance:
 - Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (*)
 - UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (*) coordination, and operational issues
- 3.3 Project Results
- Overall results (attainment of objectives) (*)
 - Relevance(*)
 - Effectiveness & Efficiency (*)
 - Country ownership
 - Mainstreaming
 - Sustainability (*)
 - Impact
4. Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons
- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
 - Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
 - Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
 - Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success
5. Annexes
- ToR
 - Itinerary
 - List of persons interviewed
 - Summary of field visits
 - List of documents reviewed
 - Evaluation Question Matrix
 - Questionnaire used and summary of results
 - Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

ANNEX G: EVALUATION REPORT CLEARANCE FORM

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

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by	
UNDP Country Office	
Name: _____	
Signature: _____	Date: _____
UNDP GEF RTA	
Name: _____	
Signature: _____	Date: _____

ANNEX 2. Itinerary

The field visit was conducted during October 2014. The Itinerary of the visit to the field projects was coordinated and implemented with the SGP National Coordination as follows.

October 19, 2014
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air Travel Costa Rica - Bolivia. Arrival and accommodation in Santa Cruz • Review of SGP documents
October 20
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air trip Santa Cruz - Sucre • Initial meeting in Sucre with the Bolivia SGP National Coordination team (Ruben Salas and Maria Ines Santos), the SGP consultant on M&E (Mario Tapia) and the SGP consultant on Climate Change (Jaime Quispe) • Meeting with the Director of the El Palmar NAIM Natural Area for Integrated Management (Juan Carlos Sanchez) and his team.
October 21
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visit the El Palmar Natural Area and communities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Road trip to the area ○ Visit to the Central Campament of El Palmar NAIM in Presto ○ Visit to El Rodeo community and projects of the El Palmar Organic Beekeepers Association (AAOEP) ○ Visit to farmer families with photovoltaic (PV) projects ○ Visit to the Aramasi community and the project of water capture, storage and use for horticultural production with drip irrigation in the local school. Visit to the reforestation project. ○ Road trip and night in Villa Serrano
October 22
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visit to the Serrania del Iñaño National Park and NAIM in Villa Serrano <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Visit to the Pampas del Tigre community and the projects of Ecological Beekeepers Association (AEPSIMS): honey gathering, processing, packing and marketing and building of the gathering and processing center. ○ Visit to the Cieneguillas community and their silvopastoral projects, integrated farms and organic honey production. ○ Road trip and night in Monteagudo
October 23
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Visit to the Zapallar community and their silvopastoral and silage projects to improve cattle feeding in the dry season. ○ Visit to the Guarani natives community of Ity and their Project on water supply for 16 families to secure land rights of the comunal lands. ○ Road trip and night in Sucre
October 24
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brief closing meeting with Bolivia SGP National Coordination Team • Air trip to Santa Cruz • Night in Santa Cruz de la Sierra, Bolivia
October 25, 2014
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air travel from Santa Cruz de la Sierra to Costa Rica

ANNEX 3. List of persons interviewed

The list of persons interviewed includes:

Organizations and persons at the community level

Rodeo del Palmar Community

1. Familia Víctor Arancibia, farmers
2. Familia Froilán y Toribia Martínez, farmers
3. Emiliano Flores, El Palmar Organic Beekeepers Association (AAOEP)
4. Don Víctor (AAOEP)
5. Anastasio Cros (AAOEP)
6. Cristóbal (AAOEP)
7. Emiliana Isco (AAOEP)
8. Osvaldo Yale (AAOEP)
9. Félix Cavas (AAOEP)
10. Florencio Flores (AAOEP)

Aramasi Community

1. Don Marcelino

Pampa del Tigre Community

1. César Nogales, AEPSIMS (Ecological Beekeepers Association from PN Serranía del Iñao, Municipio de Serrano)
2. Guido García (Director, del PN ANMI Serranía del Iñao) AEPSIMS
3. Pedro Cairoma, President, PN y ANMI Iñao Management Committee

Cieneguillas Community

1. Segundino Escobar
2. Ms. Dunia
3. Don Alejandro

Zapallar Community

1. Jorge González
2. Frida Gonzalez
3. Ariel Salazar

Ity Community

1. Isaac Real
2. Félix Flores

Organizaciones acompañantes de comunidades

1. Marta Leitón, LIDER
2. Gilber Céspedes, LIDER
3. Alfonso Herrera, LIDER
4. Marcelo Arze, HUELLAS
5. Federico López, WUAYNA WASI
6. Fortunato Huaylla, ASOPOAGRO
7. Max Cuba, CEPAC
8. Gerardo García, CEPAC
9. Mauro Hurtado, CIPCA
10. Juan Carlos Altamirano, CIPCA

Governmental Officers

1. Juan Carlos Sánchez, Director ANMI El Palmar
2. Isabel Orozco, ANMI El Palmar
3. Jimena Gómez, ANMI El Palmar
4. José Luis Conchari, ANMI El Palmar
5. Marilú Betancur, ANMI El Palmar
6. Roberto Aguilar, ANMI El Palmar
7. Bernardino, ANMI El Palmar
8. Beatriz Martínez, ANMI El Palmar
9. Guido García, Director PN y ANMI Serranía del Iñao
10. Carlos Vázquez, PN y ANMI Serranía del Iñao
11. Rosa Leny Cuellar, Directora del PN y ANMI Kaa Iya del Gran Chaco
12. Eduardo Durán, Director of Planning, SERNAP (Protected Areas National Service)

UNDP Bolivia Country Office

1. Rocío Chain, PNUD, Environment and Disasters Risk reduction Areas

Bolivia SGP National Coordination (NC)

1. Rubén Salas, National Coordinator
2. María Inés Santos, Program Assistant
3. Mario Tapia, M&E Consultant
4. Jaime Quispe, Climate Change Consultant

Bolivia SGP National Steering Committee (NSC)

1. Oscar Aguilar, President
2. Mario Baudoin
3. Beatriz Zapata
4. Eduardo Durán, Director of Planning, SERNAP (Protected Areas National Service)

Global Coordination of the GEF-UNDP Small Grants Program (SGP)

1. Nick Remple, UNDP Global Technical Advisor for SGP Upgrading Programs

ANNEX 4. List of documents reviewed

1. Bolivia SGP Project Document (PRODOC)
2. 2014 Project Implementation Report (PIR)
3. Bolivia SGP Project Summary Cards from all Projects approved in OP5 in the first 3 calls
4. Grant Project proposals
5. Grant Project Reports
6. M&E aggregation instruments
7. Summary of Projects and Lessons Learned from SGP Projects in OP5 - Year 1
8. Co-financing tracking tools
9. Quispe, J. 2014. Protocolo de Monitoreo de Medición de Biomasa aérea y del suelo de los Proyectos PPD/GEF-PNUD
10. Quispe, J. 2014. Cuantificación de Biomasa aérea y del suelo de los Proyectos PPD/GEF-PNUD en cuatro ANMI de la región del Chaco de Bolivia.
11. Pacheco, L.; Tapia, M. 2014. Memoria de Proyectos y lecciones aprendidas. Programa de Pequeñas Donaciones Bolivia. Fase Operacional V. Año 1
12. Kaa Iya del Gran Chaco National Park-NAIM Management Plan 2013-2022
13. United Nations Development Assistance Framework Bolivia (UNDAF)
14. UNDP Country Program Document Bolivia (CPD)
15. UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects
16. UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results
17. GEF Evaluation Office. The ROTI Handbook: Towards enhancing the Impacts of Environmental Projects
18. UNEG. UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation

ANNEX 5. Evaluation Questions Matrix

As defined in the Inception Report and the TOR, the Evaluation Questions Matrix is as follows:

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?			
• What are the objectives of the GEF focal area?	• List of GEF Objectives for the FA	• GEF Documents	• DR + I
• What are the priorities of UNDP development environment?	• List of UNDP priorities	• UNDP Documents	• DR + I
• What are the objectives and indicators of the project?	• Projects Objectives & indicators	• PRODOC & Reports	• DR + I
• What is the level of correspondence between the above? Why? What can be improved?	• Level of correspondence	• Evaluator's criteria	• Comparison analysis
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
• What are the Project Objectives and Outcomes?	• Proposed Objectives and outcomes	• PRODOC	• DR + I
• What are the achievements of the project?	• Achieved Objectives and outcomes	• Project Reports • Partners & beneficiaries • Field observation	• DR + I + O
• What is the level of correspondence between proposals and accomplishments achieved? Is it satisfying? Why? What can be improved?	• Level of correspondence	• Evaluator's criteria	• Comparison analysis
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?			
• What are the project implementation costs? How are they structured? Why?	• Project costs and costs structure	• Project information	DR + I
• How many people staff members (permanent and temporary) have the project? Why? What proportions of costs are involved? What human resources were mobilized outside the project?	• Project Staff • Staff from other organizations • Staff from beneficiary organizations	• Project information	DR + I
• What was the cost of the project? What other resources were mobilized? What results achieved?	• Project total cost (GEF + co-financing) • Project direct and indirect benefits	• Project information	DR + I
• In what areas the project was efficient and what can be improved?	• Evaluator's criterion on efficiency level based on other experiences	• Evaluator's criteria	• Evaluative analysis

Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the different types of risks to the sustainability of the project results? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List of financial, institutional, economic and environmental risks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project information • Partners and beneficiaries perceptions • Field observation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DR + I + O
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the likelihood that these risks actually happen? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Probability of occurrence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project information • Partners and beneficiaries perceptions • Field observation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DR + I + O
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How far the most likely risks endanger the permanence of the results? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential impact of the risks on the results 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project information • Partners and beneficiaries perceptions • Field observation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DR + I + O
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What measures have been taken to prevent or mitigate these risks? Are they adequate? What can be improved? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existence of prevention and mitigation measures and their degree of relevance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project information • Partners and beneficiaries perceptions • Evaluator's criteria 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DR + I + Evaluative analysis
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the major pressures on the environment related to the themes of the project in the region? What are being reduced? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List of environmental pressures and trends 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project information • Partners and beneficiaries perceptions • Field observation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DR + I + O
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What aspects of the project have improved the ecological situation in the region? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List of aspects in which the ecological situation has improved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project information • Partners and beneficiaries perceptions • Field observation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DR + I + O
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How the project has helped to reduce pressures and / or improve the ecological situation? What could have been improved? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List of achievements and results of the project on related environmental, ecological and socio-economic issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project information • Partners and beneficiaries perceptions • Evaluator's criteria 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DR + I + Evaluative analysis

ANNEX 6. Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System

Name of Consultant: Alejandro Carlos IMBACH

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): Not relevant

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.

Signed at *Turrialba, Costa Rica* on *July 1st, 2015*

Signature:  _____

ANNEX 7. Terminal Evaluation Report Clearance Form

Terminal Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared By:	
Commissioning Unit	
Name: _____	
Signature: _____	Date: _____
UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor	
Name: _____	
Signature: _____	Date: _____