

26/03/2018

## ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

*This list is to be further detailed with more specific questions by the Evaluation Team in collaboration with the UNDP Country Office and UNDP GEF Regional Technical Adviser during the Inception Meeting.*

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
<b>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?</b>			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
<b>Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?</b>			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
<b>Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?</b>			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
<b>Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?</b>			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
<b>Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?</b>			
•	•	•	•



## ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

<b><i>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&amp;E, I&amp;E Execution</i></b> 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	<b><i>Sustainability ratings:</i></b> 4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks	<b><i>Relevance ratings</i></b> 2. Relevant (R) 1.. Not relevant (NR)  <b><i>Impact Ratings:</i></b> 3. Significant (S) 2. Minimal (M) 1. Negligible (N)
<b><i>Additional ratings where relevant:</i></b> 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<sup>11</sup>

#### 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*

<sup>11</sup>[www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct](http://www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct)

26/03/2018

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

## ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE<sup>12</sup>

---

- i. Opening page:
  - Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
  - UNDP and GEF project ID#s.
  - Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report
  - Region and countries included in the project
  - GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program
  - Implementing Partner and other project partners
  - Evaluation team members
  - Acknowledgements
- ii. Executive Summary
  - Project Summary Table
  - Project Description (brief)
  - Evaluation Rating Table
  - Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons
- iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations  
(See: UNDP Editorial Manual<sup>13</sup>)
- 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<sup>14</sup>)
- 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 (\*)

---

<sup>12</sup>The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

<sup>13</sup> UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

<sup>14</sup> 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.

- 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: Methodological approach

---

### ❖ Evaluation principles

The consultants will use a participatory and consultative approach. It will ensure constant and effective exchange of information with the project's main stakeholders.

Several basic principles will be used to carry out the evaluation:

- **Effective participation** of all stakeholders (government, agencies, donors, final beneficiaries)
- **Crosschecking** of gathered information
- Emphasis on **consensus and agreement** on the recommendations by the stakeholders.
- **Transparency** of debriefing

### ❖ Methodology

The consultants will elaborate an evaluation matrix of topics/questions per evaluation criteria to be investigated during the field mission and prepare questionnaires as required (see annexe 3).

#### The evaluation matrix structures the in-country mission:

1. **Which** information to gather?
2. **Where** to get it (from whom? which different sources of information for cross reference),
3. **How** to gather it (which appropriate tools? Interview, report, focus group, individual interviews, government data, etc.)?

*Field mission check-list objectives*

### ❖ Evaluation questions and criteria's

The consultant will use the 5 DAC evaluation criteria to review the project.

Prospective key areas to review as per evaluation criteria's:

#### Project design

- Adequacy of project design in relation to identified objectives
- Project design re. other donor funded-interventions
- Design changes over time according to changing conditions

#### Relevance

- Adequacy of thematic & sectors in relation to issues / national priorities
- Relevance re. final beneficiaries
- Level of consulting / participation of other stakeholders

#### Effectiveness

- Degree of progress towards achieving project's results
- Level of streamlining with UNDP Country Programme/GEF priorities
- How were risks and assumptions taken into account during implementation
- Communication and visibility including towards donor/external stakeholders

- Lessons learned on implementation modalities/mechanisms

### **Efficiency**

Project’s results delivery:

- Effective operational & financial management of the project/RBM
- M&E system and mechanisms to discuss progress
- Quality of communication between stakeholders
- Promotion of joint activities for improved efficiency/partnerships

Adaptive management:

- Log frame changes and analysis of indicators
- Review of procurement plan
- Responsiveness according to changing conditions/ability to adjust to change

### **Impact**

- Visible change re. final beneficiaries/Lao PDR
- Contribution to change as per outcomes
- Partnerships/synergies to enhance the impact
- Added value of project for beneficiaries
- Communicating on project’s results

### **Sustainability**

- Level of participation of national stakeholders
- UNDP exit strategy options and appropriation of results by beneficiaries/Lao PDR
- Level of ownership & empowerment of (institutional) beneficiaries to follow-up/ upscale/ replicate

The evaluation matrix is under Annex 5.

### **❖ Evaluation delivery**

#### **Evaluation methodology**

For a TE, the consultants will use a mix of tools that will enable them to gather data for the project’s overview, its potential impact and progress towards the global environmental benefits of the project:

- Semi-structured interviews with Lao PDR/institutional beneficiaries/ external stakeholders (donors, NGOs)
- Focus group for gender-based final beneficiaries (communities)
- Survey of benefits for communities
- Bilateral interviews with project’s staff and local project staff
- In-situ review of infrastructures and assessment of new mechanisms put in place

**The evaluation matrix structures the field mission:**

- **What** information to gather?
- **Where** to get it (from whom? which different sources of information for cross reference),

**How** to gather it (which appropriate tools? Interview, report, focus group, individual interviews, government data, etc.)?

### Evaluation delivery

A classical 4-step approach is to be adopted to carry out the evaluation: 1. *Preparatory phase* (passive data acquisition), 2. *Data collection phase* (active data acquisition), 3. *Data analysis and interpretation* of relevant information & preliminary findings and 4. *Draft and Final Reporting*:

#### **Step 1: Passive data acquisition and inception report (4 Working Days - WD)**

Documentary analysis: review of PRODOC documents, results' matrix, UNDAF & UNDP's country Project Document / Plan, relevant Lao PDR policies & strategies on forest conservation/management, M&E reports / GEF TT, minutes of steering committees, periodic narrative and financial project reports, etc.

During this phase, the consultants will (i) identify the key stakeholders, (ii) propose selected project's sites and (iii) draft the questionnaires from the evaluation matrix detailing for each evaluation topic/question (using the 5 evaluation criteria).

Results: basic knowledge about the project, proposed site visits, field checklist and interviews prepared

**Deliverable: inception report**

#### **Step 2: Active data acquisition (12 WD)**

Interviews of all stakeholders<sup>15</sup> through individual/group interviews, institutional beneficiaries, implementation stakeholders, external stakeholders; the interviews (number, target, duration) are to be derived from the checklist.

- Briefing at Vientiane - discussion on inception report/ fine-tuning evaluation questions and list of stakeholders to be met (½ WD)
- 1<sup>st</sup> round of interviews (1 ½ days)
  - o Institutions:
    - UNDP, MoNRE (DWR, DPC), MoHA, GEF focal point
  - o Project team (national PSU staff)
  - o Other national stakeholders (to be determined [ADB, WB, IFAD])
- Field trips to project areas (project implementing partners, institutional/final beneficiaries): discussions with provincial PSU, district authorities, communities on project's achievements, potential benefits, bottlenecks and vision / next steps for sustainability (±7 WD)

Ideally: (i) reviews of physical achievements (infrastructures), interviews of (ii) provincial PSU, (iii) provincial staff (Governor, planning, home affairs, selected Steering Committee members...) (iii) district department heads (planning, irrigation, agriculture, environment...), (iv) district development plan team and committee

---

<sup>15</sup> List in **Erreur ! Source du renvoi introuvable.**

members, (v) community representatives, (v) district representatives, (vi) other donor-supported/complementary project staff

The team would review the following:

- Assessment of behaviour change of district staff in climate risks planning and ecosystem-based management linked to infrastructures provision
  - Review of infrastructures project (preferably 1st phase)
  - Assessment of climate resilience mainstreaming into local planning processes
  - Effective implementation of development management plans and effects of participatory land use planning
  - Review of activities on ecosystem areas
- 
- 2nd round of interviews at Vientiane (1 WD)  
Additional info requests/unfinished 1<sup>st</sup> round of interviews
  - Preliminary findings/debriefing preparation (1 ½ WD)
  - Debriefing (½ WD)  
To be held at the end of the mission

**Deliverable: PPT presentation and/or mission brief**

**Step 3: Data analysis and interpretation/preliminary findings and draft report preparation (8WD)**

Conversion of data into relevant information to assess the project status and for decision making by relevant stakeholders, Lao PDR institutions; inclusion of the information into the evaluation report – proposal for recommendations; draft report preparation.

**Deliverable: draft report**

**Step 4: Final report preparation (2 WD)** (date as per reception of UNDP’s comments)

Inclusion of stakeholders’ comments / completing the audit trail.

Review of UNDP’s comments and integration into the final report.

**Deliverable: final report**

(Date of comments’ reception + 2-3 days)

## Annex 3: Interview Guides and Questionnaires

---

### 1. Project team

#### Relevance:

- Did the project address the main issues on climate resilient planning and managing climate risks?
- Were the planned activities in line with the actual sector needs?
- Were there differences from project’s start-up until now re. the relevance of activities to be delivered?
- How relevant were/still are the identified assumptions and risks / what was done to mitigate these risks? Was there a risk/mitigation strategy set up at the beginning of the project?

#### Efficiency:

- What have been the major implementation issues/hurdles of the project? Internal and external contributing factors and measures taken to reduce their impact?
- Timeliness of activities?
- How did eventual discontinuities/shortages in funding or donor agendas affect the overall implementation of the project?
- Were the financial resources for the planned activities in place before they were implemented – i.e. how smooth was the implementation process in relation to financial resources availability -?
- Were the roles and responsibilities of each stakeholder clearly spelt out in terms of planning, implementation, reporting (data collection and information transmission), M&E tools? What could be improved for future interventions?
- What type of support did you receive from UNDP / MoNRE (at central level)? How effective was it?
- Were there mechanisms in place for the coordination of the project’s activities with other donors’ interventions?
- What project governance system and M&E system is in place? How effective has it been?
- How SMART are the (results/impact) indicators and easy to track?
- Was the contribution of national partners timely and effective for a smooth project implementation / what were the main constraining factors?

#### Effectiveness:

- What results have (not) been achieved? Why?
- What were the main constraints for the project implementation?
- Review in detail each activity
- What were the main factors for success/failure for each result?
- Was the implementation strategy flexible enough to take into account changing conditions? Was it adapted to ensure maximum effectiveness?
- How effective is the planning process currently (weaknesses and strengths)

#### Impact:

- Are there intended or unintended, positive or negative (long-term) effects of the project in the districts?

- Did the project contribute to the empowerment/capacity building of institutions / final beneficiaries through one or more results and to which goal/s?
- Did the project result in activities upscaling / innovation by stakeholders for enhanced impact?

**Sustainability:**

- What results/achievements are most/least sustainable?
- Which results are most likely owned by the (institutional) beneficiaries; how likely will they be sustained / what is required for enhancing sustainability?
- Is there an interest and support to implement similar initiatives in the future / how differently should they be implemented?
- What has been the project’s exit strategy?

## **2. Institutional stakeholders**

**Relevance:**

- What are the responsibilities of your institution in the project
- Were the planned activities in line with the actual sector/institution needs? (give examples)
- Was the project design based on (i) contextual analysis, (ii) participatory needs assessment?
- Did it respond to local demands?

**Efficiency:**

- Did delays (explain) affect significantly or not the project implementation and achievement of results (give examples)?
- Based on your experience, are there more efficient types of activities that could have achieved the same results?

**Effectiveness:**

- What was your actual involvement/contribution in the project (as an implementer/beneficiary) / own or project financial resources?
- Were the planned activities effective enough to achieve the outcomes or were there additional unplanned activities needed?
- What support did you benefit from the project?

**Impact:**

- What + and/or - change has come up with the project’s implementation to date in the sector/your institution
- What actual/visible change did the project achieve and that benefit final/institutional stakeholders?

**Sustainability:**

- Can the changes be maintained on a long-term basis
- Are there mechanisms (not) in place to adjust to change and maintain benefits of results?

## **3. Partners / collaborating institutions / subcontracted institutions**

**Relevance:**

- What is your role in the project
- What has been your contribution to the project
- Did you contribute to the project design/formulation (including indirectly) / enhancing (in)directly its implementation

Efficiency:

- Did you receive financial/ technical support/resources to conduct your activities
- What limitations/issues did you encounter in the delivery of planned activities?

Effectiveness

- Did the implemented activities contribute to the overall objective of the project
- How complementary were these activities to the project?
- Has there been a need for additional support (from your institution/other institutions) to improve the effectiveness of the activities that you carried out?
- What achievements did this project do?
- What are the main issues of this project?

Impact:

- What change has resulted from the support you provided in relation to the beneficiaries
- Is there more need for support in the future?
- In your view, what change did the project bring to the participatory institutions and final beneficiaries?
- Ownership of project's results

Sustainability:

- What is the likelihood that the beneficiaries will take advantage of the changes/initial support (with) without additional activities (need for follow-up, another type of support to complement/consolidate) - empowerment level?

#### **4. District stakeholders (technical departments)**

Relevance:

- What are the limitations of the sector/you activity so as to achieve your objectives (technical, environmental, legal, infrastructures, planning, financial...)?

Effectiveness:

- Support received
- Timeliness of support
- What adaptations were made during implementation?
- What issues/needs were not being addressed by the project?

Impact:

- What change did the project support bring on the population?
  - ☐ Directly (direct effect on improved living conditions)
  - ☐ Indirectly (Increased income, better working conditions, added free time...)
- What change did the project bring in your departments? (give example before/after)