Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP Monitoring and Evaluation policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP 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 *Integrated Climate Change Adaptation Strategies* (PIMS 5020.)

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

Project Summary Table

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Title: | Programme on Integrated Climate Change Adaptation Strategies | | | | | |
| BMUB Project ID: | | 11\_II+\_007 |  | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | | *at completion (Million US$)* |
| UNDP Project ID: | | 00085959 | BMUB financing: | 3,259,167.20 | | 3,040,944.43 |
| Country: | | Grenada | IA/EA own: |  | |  |
| Region: | | RBLAC | Government: |  | |  |
| Focal Area: | | Climate Change | Other: |  | |  |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): | |  | Total co-financing: |  | |  |
| Executing Agency: | | Ministry of Agriculture, Lands, Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment (MoALFFE), Government of Grenada | Total Project Cost: | 3,259167.20 | | 3,040,944.43 |
| Other Partners involved: | |  | ProDoc Signature (date project began): | | | July 15, 2013 |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | | Proposed:  March 30th 2018 | Actual: |

Objective and Scope

The Programme on Integrated Climate Change Adaptation Strategies (ICCAS) is being co-implemented by the United National Development Programme (UNDP) and the German Development Cooperation (GIZ) through the Environment Division of the Ministry of Agriculture, Lands, Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment (MOALFFE) in Grenada. Funding for this project is provided by the German Federal Ministry of the Environment, Nature Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety (BMUB), International Climate Initiative (IKI).

The overarching objective of the ICCAS Programme is to increase resilience of vulnerable communities and ecosystems to climate change risks in Grenada through integrated adaptation approaches. The ICCAS project uses a comprehensive, integrated approach for analyzing and implementing adaptation strategies. This model, it is hoped, can serve as a role model for other countries in the region. ICCAS is divided in several components to pilot adaptation strategies that, when successful, could be scaled up to larger projects and that prepares Grenada to receive grants for larger projects. It also aimed to support the local communities to implement projects to adapt to immediate climate change challenges and raise the awareness of Grenadians about climate change.

**Outputs (specific project goals):**

* Output 1: Strengthened capacity of the Government of Grenada to mainstream adaptation considerations into national development planning (at various scales), supporting inter-sectoral mechanisms for climate change adaptation also including the private sector. (GIZ)
* Output 2: Improved planning, management and efficient use of the water and coastal zone resources thought the establishment of integrated water resource management approaches and the formulation of CZM policies and management plans. (GIZ)
* Output 3: Increase adaptive capacity of communities through the implementation of concrete community-based adaptation activities and incentives in the islands of Grenada, Carriacou and Petit Martinique (UNDP)
* Output 4:
  + 1) Enable access to public (bilateral and multilateral) and private funding for climate change measures (GIZ)
  + 2) Strengthen understanding and awareness of climate change risks and adaptation measures (adaptation plan) and disseminate lessons learned and best practices at the local, national, regional and international levels. (UNDP)

**Target group(s):**

The Programme targets both government, including its sectoral agencies, and communities already being impacted by climate change. These sectors and communities suffer from droughts and other extreme events associated with climate change. Communities will also benefit from improved services associated with stronger national institutions and service providers.

Intermediaries are ministries, NGOs and private sector actors including landholders.

Specific UNDP activities are designed around work packages which correspond to their respective Outputs as stated above. These are:

Work package 3 (corresponds to output 3): Implementing concrete adaptation and climate resilience activities on the ground supporting communities to improve livelihoods. The community-based adaptation initiatives were implemented through a small-grants mechanism oriented to projects principally related to agriculture and land use, fisheries and marine resources, coastal protection and water resources management. 27community projects were implemented by the fund throughout Grenada, Carriacou and Petite Martinique.

Implementation: Ministry of Agriculture, Lands, Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment (MOALFFE); Ministry of Carriacou and Petite Martinique Affairs; Ministry of Finances; Ministry of Education and Human Development; Ministry of Communication and works in close cooperation with local NGOs and CBOs.

Anticipated period: 4 years

1. Design, establish and operationalize a ‘Community Climate Change Adaptation Fund’ that responds to the needs of vulnerable communities and that links cli-mate risks and adaption measures
2. Design, establish and operationalize capacity development and awareness campaigns at community level. The awareness campaigns should include relevant information and tools centered on the following main topics:
3. UNDP will establish agreements with OECS Secretariat and CARICOM Secretariat, to find dissemination spaces for knowledge products (manuals, journals, booklets, videos, etc.) produced during the Programme in the region. A Caribbean/Grenada portal under UNDP´s Adaptation Learning Mechanism is foreseen working together with OECS and CARICOM, which is cost-efficient given that no new infrastructure will be required
4. Develop and operationalize incentives for climate resilient management practices for private landowners.
5. Monitor and reduce invasive species that threaten to undermine the climate resilience of Grenada’s forest and agricultural ecosystems and replacement of these species with climate resilient productive species.
6. For the longer-term institutionalization and sustainability of CCCAF, the project will support the realization of an institutional study and feasibility assessment, attached to a resource mobilization plan to support continuity of ICCAS interventions and longer-term fund operation.

Work package 4.2 (corresponds to output 4): *Strengthened understanding and awareness of climate change risks and adaptation measures (adaptation plan) and disseminate lessons learned and best practices at the local, national, regional and international levels.*

Implementation: Ministry of Agriculture, Lands, Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment (MOALFFE); Ministry of Carriacou and Petite Martinique Affairs; Ministry of Education; GIZ and UNDP ICCAS, and National Climate Change Committee (NCCC), Community Climate Change Adaptation Fund (CCCAF) groups, Other Divisions within Ministry of Agriculture, other government agencies, media outlets, regional environmental and climate change organizations i.e. OECS, 5Cs and stakeholders of the ICCAS project.

Anticipated period: 4 years

1. Establish and operationalize a platform for inter-sectoral knowledge management relating to climate risk, resilience and adaptation planning and implementation and relevant knowledge management tools.
2. Disseminate lessons learned and best practices nationally, regionally and internationally through a range of different modalities e.g. publications, media, and relevant awareness material.

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

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

Evaluation approach and method

An overall approach and method[[1]](#footnote-1) for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported 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. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR (*fill in* [*Annex C*](#_TOR_Annex_C:)) The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence‐based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP Technical Adviser based in the region; Project Implementing partner including NGOs and CBOs and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Grenada, including the following project sites *(list) See potential sites attached from which the consultant and UNDP Staff will decide from the list.*  Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: (*list key stakeholders*).

Agriculture:

* PS Merina Jessamy – Head of Mission: Project Director of the ICCAS project and interface with the Cabinet of Ministers for the Grenada Climate Change Fund set up.
* Trevor Thompson – Land Use Division
* Chief Extension Officer – Randolph Shears
* Daniel Lewis – Chief Technical Officer
* GIZ ICCAS Team
* Ms. Marion Geiss, Technical Officer, the GIZ ICCAS Team,
* Dieter **Rothenberger -** Head of German-Grenadian Pilot Programme
* Magali Bongrand, GIZ ICCAS
* Ntaba Francis, GIZ ICCAS
* UNDP ICCAS Team
* Mr. Martin Barriteau, Project Coordinator,
* Ms. Dawne Mark, Technical Officer,
* Mrs. Nazaria Williams, Finance Officer, Community Liaison Coordinator,
* Community Liaison Officers
* Environment Division:
* Mrs. Aria St. Louis, Head of the Environment Unit
* Andre Witzig – Coastal Zone Officer
* Ministry of Finance
* Fitzroy James Head of the Department of Economic Affairs, Ministry of Finance
* Titus Antoine, Economic Affairs, Ministry of Finance
* Government Project Accounts:
* senior account officer: Rajkrishna Naraine, the Ministry of Finance who can liaise with the Accounts Department in Antigua
* Kim Julien – Accounts Manager
* Carriacou Ministry
* Bernadette Sylvester-Lendore – Permanent Secretary
* NCCC
* Spencer Thomas and Lyon Charles
* UNEP Project
* Kerricia Hopkin – Coordinator
* Ridge to Reef project
* Joseph Noel
* Community Project Heads – see list attached.
* UNDP Barbados
* Lorenzo Harewood
* Chisa Mikami
* Danielle Evanson

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, , project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in [Annex B](#_TOR_Annex_B:) of this Terms of Reference.

Evaluation Criteria & Ratings

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

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Ratings:** | | | |
| **1. Monitoring and Evaluation** | ***rating*** | **2. IA& EA Execution** | ***rating*** |
| M&E design at entry |  | Quality of UNDP Implementation |  |
| M&E Plan Implementation |  | Quality of Execution - Executing Agency |  |
| Overall quality of M&E |  | Overall quality of Implementation / Execution |  |
| **3. Assessment of Outcomes** | **rating** | **4. Sustainability** | **rating** |
| Relevance |  | Financial resources: |  |
| Effectiveness |  | Socio-political: |  |
| Efficiency |  | Institutional framework and governance: |  |
| Overall Project Outcome Rating |  | Environmental: |  |
|  |  | Overall likelihood of sustainability: |  |

Project finance / cofinance

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Co-financing  (type/source) | UNDP own financing (mill. US$) | | Government  (mill. US$) | | Partner Agency  (mill. US$) | | Total  (mill. US$) | |
|  | |  | |  | |  | |
| Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Actual | Actual |
| Grants |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Loans/Concessions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * In-kind support |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Mainstreaming

. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender.

Impact

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

Conclusions, recommendations & lessons

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

Implementation arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Barbados. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

Evaluation timeframe

The total duration of the evaluation will be *26* days over a time period of *4* weeks according to the following plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Timing | Completion Date |
| **Preparation** | 4 days | *May 1, 2018* |
| **Evaluation Mission** | 7 days | *May 8, 2018* |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | 10 days | *May 18, 2018* |
| **Final Report** | 5 days | *May 23, 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 | April 29, 2018 | Evaluator submits to UNDP CO |
| **Presentation** | Initial Findings | May 9, 2018 | To project management, UNDP CO |
| **Draft Final Report** | Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes | May 18, 2018 | Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs |
| **Final Report\*** | Revised report | May 23, 2018 | Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC. |

\*When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluator is required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report.

Team Composition

The evaluation team will be composed of *(1 international /national evaluator).* The consultant shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with BMUB or GEF financed projects is an advantage. (*The evaluator will be responsible for finalizing the report).* 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 *10* years of relevant professional experience
* Knowledge of UNDP, GEF and BMUB.
* 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'](http://www.unevaluation.org/ethicalguidelines)

Payment modalities and specifications

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| % | Milestone |
| *10%* | At contract signing |
| *40%* | Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report |
| *50%* | Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report |

Application process

Applicants are requested to apply as per instructions in procurement notice. 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).

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **INTENDED OUTPUTS** | **INDICATOR OUTPUTS** | **INDICATIVE ACTIVITIES** | **RESPONSIBLE PARTIES** | **INPUTS** |
| **Outcome: To increase resilience of vulnerable communities and ecosystems to climate change risks in Grenada through integrated adaptation approaches.** | | | | |
| **Output 3** - Increase adaptive capacity of communities through the implementation of concrete community-based adaptation activities and incentives in the islands of Grenada, Carriacou and Petit Martinique | Indicators output 3:  • Percentage (5%) of the targeted population (communities in Grenada, Carriacou and Petit Martinique) implementing community-based adaptation measures supported by the Programme by 2015 (disaggregated by gender).  [Baseline: 0 Source: List of community-based adaptation projects funded by the programme, inception workshop memoirs, agreements between Steering Committee and COBs (community-based organizations), Project reports: annual reports, mid-term and final evaluations]  • Percentage (5%) of targeted population participating in adaptation and risk reduction awareness activities by 2015. (disaggregated by gender)  [Baseline: 0, Source: Field visits, semi-structured interviews, Project reports: annual re-ports, mid-term and final evaluations] | 1. Community Climate Change Adaptation Fund (CCCAF) designed    * Mapping of community climate-related issues and risks    * Develop proposal evaluation criteria and grant request format    * Analysis and incorporation of lessons and good practices from GEF SGP    * Design and implement community awareness campaigns on climate change risks and impacts 2. CCCAF operationalised    * Capacity building for CBOs/NGOs on proposal writing and project implementation    * Issue Calls for Proposals and screen applications    * Select awardees and provide support to CBOs    * Monitor and evaluate sub-projects using the UNDP VRA | MoALFFE  MoALFFE | 82,714.47  1,529.290.22 |
| **Output 4 (Output 4.2) -** Strengthen understanding and awareness of climate change risks and adaptation measures (adaptation plan) and disseminate lessons learned and best practices at the local, national, regional and international levels | *•* Number (10) of lessons learned and best practices on climate change adaptation measures generated and disseminated by the Programme (UNDP) by 2016. [Baseline: Caribbean Planning for Adaptation to Climate Change (CPACC) project under CARICOM website. Source: Government and Adaptation Learning Mechanism (ALM) web pages and other electronic registries / Number of visits to web pages] | 1. Establish local knowledge management platform for CCA    * Creation of online platform    * Facilitate stakeholder discussion and exchange fora 2. Disseminate lessons and good practices    * Compile information from implementing partners and executing entity    * Manage online discussion fora    * Develop knowledge sharing materials and media    * Create secure Documentation System | MoALFFE  MoALFFE | 114,952.80  130,378.10 |

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**

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

*ICCAS 2016 Audit Report*

*Midterm Evaluation Report*

*Project Progress Reports*

*Annual Project CDRs (2013 – 2017)*

*ICCAS Institutionalization Report*

*Relevant Government Publications and Reports of relevance*

*Project Document*

*BMUB Interim Reports*

*Monitoring and Evaluations Reports*

*Knowledge Management products (Fact sheets* [*http://www.iccas.gd/?q=resources/community-climate-change-adapation-fund-projects-factsheets*](http://www.iccas.gd/?q=resources/community-climate-change-adapation-fund-projects-factsheets)*)*

Annex C: Evaluation Questions

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

| **Evaluative Criteria Questions** | | **Indicators** | **Sources** | **Methodology** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels? | | | | |
|  | * Is the project relevant to UNDAF Output 1: Energy, Environment, Climate Change and Disaster Risk Reduction? |  |  |  |
|  | * Is the project relevant to Grenada’s environment and sustainable Development objectives? |  |  |  |
|  | * To what extend does the project contribute to the UNs Sustainable Development Goals? |  |  |  |
|  | * Is the project addressing the needs of target beneficiaries at the local level? |  |  |  |
|  | * Is the project internally coherent in its design? |  |  |  |
|  | * How is the project relevant with respect to other donor-supported activities? |  |  |  |
|  | * Does the project provide relevant lessons and experiences for other similar projects in the future? |  |  |  |
| * Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? | | | | |
|  | * Has the project been effective in achieving the expected outcomes and objectives? |  |  |  |
|  | * How is risk and risk mitigation being managed? |  |  |  |
|  | * What lessons can be drawn regarding effectiveness for other similar projects in the future? |  |  |  |
| * Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards? | | | | |
|  | * Was project support provided in an efficient way? |  |  |  |
|  | * How efficient are partnership arrangements for the project |  |  |  |
|  | * Did the project efficiently utilize local capacity in implementation? |  |  |  |
|  | * What lessons can be drawn regarding efficiency for other similar projects in the future? |  |  |  |
|  | * Effectiveness: To what extent have/ will the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been/be achieved? |  |  |  |
|  | * Has the project been effective in achieving the expected outcomes and objectives? |  |  |  |
|  | 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? | | | | |
|  | * Were interventions designed to have sustainable results given the identifiable risks? |  |  |  |
|  | * What issues emerged during implementation as a threat to sustainability? |  |  |  |
|  | * Are there social or political risks that may threaten the sustainability of project outcomes? |  |  |  |
|  | * Are there ongoing activities that pose an environmental threat to the sustainability of project outcomes? |  |  |  |
|  | * Have the entities/people that will carry on the project been identified and prepared? |  |  |  |
|  | * Is there evidence financial resources are committed to support project results after the project has closed? |  |  |  |
| * **Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?** | | | | |
|  | * Has the project made verifiable improvements on the adaptive capacity of persons impacted? |  |  |  |
|  | * Has the project made verifiable reductions in the vulnerability of other ecosystems in which it impacted? |  |  |  |
|  | * Has the project demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements? |  |  |  |

Annex D: Rating Scales

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

Annex E: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form

**Evaluators:**

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

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form[[3]](#footnote-3)**

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

**Name of Consultant:** \_\_     \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Name of Consultancy Organization** (where relevant)**:** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

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

Signed at *place* on *date*

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

Annex F: Evaluation Report Outline[[4]](#footnote-4)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **i.** | Opening page:   * Title of UNDP supported BMUB financed project * UNDP and BMUBs project ID#s. * Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report * Region and countries included in the project * Implementing Partner and other project partners * Evaluation team members * Acknowledgements |
| **ii.** | Executive Summary   * Project Summary Table * Project Description (brief) * Evaluation Rating Table * Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons |
| **iii.** | Acronyms and Abbreviations  (See: UNDP Editorial Manual[[5]](#footnote-5)) |
| **1.** | Introduction   * Purpose of the evaluation * Scope & Methodology * Structure of the evaluation report |
| **2.** | Project description and development context   * Project start and duration * Problems that the project sought to address * Immediate and development objectives of the project * Baseline Indicators established * Main stakeholders * Expected Results |
| **3.** | Findings  (In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) must be rated[[6]](#footnote-6)) |
| **3.1** | Project Design / Formulation   * Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators) * Assumptions and Risks * Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design * Planned stakeholder participation * Replication approach * UNDP comparative advantage * Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector * Management arrangements |
| **3.2** | Project Implementation   * Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation) * Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region) * Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management * Project Finance: * Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (\*) * UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (\*) coordination, and operational issues |
| **3.3** | Project Results   * Overall results (attainment of objectives) (\*) * Relevance (\*) * Effectiveness & Efficiency (\*) * Country ownership * Mainstreaming * Sustainability (\*) * Impact |
| **4.** | Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons   * Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project * Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project * Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives * Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success |
| **5.** | Annexes   * ToR * Itinerary * List of persons interviewed * Summary of field visits * List of documents reviewed * Evaluation Question Matrix * Questionnaire used and summary of results * Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form |

Annex G: Evaluation Report Clearance Form

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

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

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

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

UNDP GEF RTA

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

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

1. For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](http://www.undp.org/evaluation/handbook), Chapter 7, pg. 163 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office:  [ROTI Handbook 2009](http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/M2_ROtI%20Handbook.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)