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 theproject on***Sustainable Management of the Mbé River Forested Watershed through the Development of a Payments for Ecosystem Services (PES) Mechanism***(PIMS 4183.)The essentials of the project to be evaluated are as follows:

Project Summary Table

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Project Title:  |  **Sustainable Management of the Mbé River Forested Watershed through the Development of a Payments for Ecosystem Services (PES) Mechanism** |
| GEF Project ID: | PIMS 4183 |   | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | *at completion (Million US$)* |
| UNDP Project ID: | 00079015 | GEF financing:  | 859,090.00 | 859,090 |
| Country: | Gabon  | IA/EA own: |       |       |
| Region: | RBA | Government: | 1,400,000 | 1,400,000 |
| Focal Area: | Biodiversity  | Other: UNDP WCS | 100,000480,000 | 100,000480,000 |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): | Design a sustainable financing mechanism for long-term protection of the Mbé River forested watershed, while strengthening the legal, policy and institutional framework necessary to ensure its adoption and successful implementation  | Total co-financing: | 1,980,000 | 1,980,000 |
| Executing Agency: | Ministry of Environment | Total Project Cost: |  2,839,090.00  |  2,839,090.00  |
| Other Partners involved: | WCS | ProDoc Signature (date project began):  | 07/05/2012 |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | Proposed:31/10/2017 | Actual:31/12/2017 |

Objective and Scope

The project was designed to *develop a sustainable funding mechanism to secure the long-term protection of the forest ecosystems in the Mbé River watershed - one of the most biologically diverse sites in Central Africa. Specifically, the Project was designed tol remove barriers to funding mechanism by strengthening the enabling environment in Gabon for payments for ecological services (PES) and testing a PES scheme(s).*

*The Mbé River watershed is of substantial economic importance for Gabon, providing electricity for 60% of the country’s population and providing ecosystem services such as regulating water flows, carbon sequestration, and biodiversity. These services are presently provided free of charge. The long-term solution for the conservation of the Mbé watershed’s biodiversity and ecosystem services is to ensure that sufficient financial resources are available to cover PA (Monte Cristal National Park, for instance) management costs, support sustainable resource use in the watershed area and remunerate the various actors (including local communities) that help in maintaining environmental services and preserving biodiversity.*

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 method[[1]](#footnote-1) 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. 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, 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 Gabon, including project sites in the Mbé River catchment including Medouneu (Woleu ntem) and Kango (Estuaire).

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

**Government of Gabon**

* The Ministry of Environment, nature protection and sustainable development (Focal point: Monsieur Louis Léandre Ebobola Tsiba Directeur Général de l’Environnement)
* The Ministry of Forest Economy, Waters and Fishing
* Ministry of Mines and Hydrocarbons
* The Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Husbandry, Food Security and Rural Development
* The National Parks Agency (ANPN), under the Ministry of Tourism and National Parks
* Ministry of Energy, Hydraulic Resources and New Energies
* Ministry of Economy, Finance, Budgets and Privatization
* Local Authorities

**Private Sector**

* SEEG **(** Monsieur Désiré Meba, Directeur Hygiène sante environnement)
* Forestry Companies
* Mining Companies

**Civil Society**

* Local communities
* Local leaders
* Local associations
* International NGOs (WCS: Monsieur Gaspard Abeti - Directeur; Monsieur Martin Ega - chef de projet; and TNC Madame Marie Claire Paiz; Wild consulting: Madame Biana Bouroubou)
* Research Institutes/Universities (Centre de recherche en études sociologiques du Gabon : Madame Claudine Amboué)

**Other**

* UNDP-Gabon Country Office
* Unité de gestion du projet (Monsieur Ondomba Faustin; Monsieur Alfred Mouity coordonnateur adjoint ; Monsieur Rodric Mba, Assistant administratif et financier)

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](#_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  | 100,000 | 100,000 |  |  |  |  | 100,000 |  |
| Loans/Concessions  |  |  |  |  | 480,000 | 480,000 | 480,000 |  |
| * In-kind support
 |  |  | 1,400,000 | 1,400,000 |  |  | 1,400,000 |  |
| * Other
 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals | 100,000 | 100,000 | 1,400,000 | 1,400,000 | 480,000 | 480,000 | 1,980,000 |  |

Mainstreaming

UNDP supported GEF financed projects are key components in UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programmes. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender.

Impact

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

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.

Implementation arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Gabon. 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 according to the following plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Timing | Completion Date |
| **Preparation** | 2 days  | 20 November 2017 |
| **Evaluation Mission** | 12 days  | 05 December 2017 |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | 10 days  | 22 December 2017 |
| **Final Report** | 2 days  | 22 December 2017 |

Evaluation deliverables

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Deliverable | Content  | Timing | Responsibilities |
| **Inception Report** | Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method  | No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission.  | Evaluator submits to UNDP CO  |
| **Presentation** | Initial Findings  | End of evaluation mission | To project management, UNDP CO |
| **Draft Final Report**  | Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes | Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission | Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs |
| **Final Report\*** | Revised report  | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft  | Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC.  |

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

Team Composition

The evaluation team will be composed of 1 international evaluator who will receive support from the Country Office and IP. The consultant shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The evaluator selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The Team members must present the following qualifications:

* Master’s degree in Environmental Sciences, Natural Resources Management, Water Resources Management or other closely related field (20 points)
* Minimum *7* years of relevant professional experience (20 points)
* Knowledge of UNDP and GEF evaluations (15 points)
* Previous experience with results‐based monitoring and evaluation methodologies (15 points)
* Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s) (10 points)
* Experience working in Africa (10 points).
* Fluency in English and French, both oral and written, is required (10 points).

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| % | 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

Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions. The application should contain a current and complete C.V. with indication of the e‐mail and phone contact. Shortlisted candidates will be requested to submit a price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs).

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

Annex A: Project Logical Framework

| **Project Strategy** | **Objectively verifiable indicators** |
| --- | --- |
| **Goal** | Biodiversity and environmental services of Mbé watershed enhanced and livelihood of dependent communities improved through an increased awareness and valorisation of the environmental services provided by the watershed |
| **Objective/ Outcome** | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **End of Project target** | **Source of Information** | **Risks and assumptions** |
| **Objective –**  Design a sustainable financing mechanism for long-term protection of the Mbé River forested watershed, while strengthening the legal, policy and institutional framework necessary to ensure its adoption and successful implementation  | A collaborative framework proposed and initiated  | None | Collaboration between key institutions involved in PES exists by EOP | Meeting reportsAnnual reports | Risks:There may be political pressure to shape the PES system to achieve non environmental goals, such as assisting politically-favored groups irrespective of likely environmental impact.Assumption:Project will receive high-level government support |
| Establish a baseline for populations of selected biodiversity indicators and conservation target species in the watershed and control areas | None | Baseline exists for watershed and control site at end of project | Survey reports |
| % of watershed with management plan taking into account watershed protection and biodiversity conservation | None | 30% | Report |
| Revenue distribution (sharing) mechanism proposed with guidelines to orient funds to watershed protection | None | Mechanism and guidelines exist | Report on mechanisms and guidelines |
| **Outcome 1 –** Legal, policy and institutional framework provide enabling support for—and key institutions have improved capacity to design, manage, implement, monitor and learn lessons from—a PES scheme for the MBÉ watershed | Inter-ministerial coordination in proposed collaborative framework, biannual meetings | None | 2 inter-ministerial meetings per year beginning PY2 | Framework and meetings | Risks:Lack of capacity of national institutions, NGOs, and academic institutions to support long-term development of environmental service markets in Gabon.Lack of political will or economic/ financial incentives on the part of key stakeholders to help develop and participate in efforts to replicate and/or scale up the project’s piloted PES markets to a national levelAssumption:PES will gradually become a national priority for Gabon as knowledge and information is made available. |
| At the end of project (EOP), a national policy is drafted | None | Proposal for harmonizing sectoral policies agreed by EOP | Drafted policy |
| Central government training needs assessed and implemented  | None | Training needs assessment completed by end of PY1 | Needs assessment, certificate/ attained, trip and progress reports |
| Number of staff of key agencies trained in PES best practices | None | 60-100% of relevant central government staff have received training necessary to design, manage and monitor and replicate PES scheme by EOP (short courses, study tours, fieldwork etc.)  | Training and progress reports |
| Number of people who know about PES as a means of watershed protection for the Congo basin expanded | None | At least 3 articles reporting on the design of the PES scheme | Publications and annual reports |
| **Outcome 2 –**  A pilot PES scheme that rewards the maintenance, improvement or adoption of conservation-friendly land uses, together with an associated monitoring plan, are designed | PES mechanisms designed and contract developed between buyers and sellers;  | None | Detailed proposal for PES scheme is drafted by EOP | Reports  | Risks:Low participation rate of land users - ES providers are reluctant to bear the opportunity costs of mitigating current destructive activities such as forest destruction and bush meat trade.Unwillingness of service buyers to participate due to free rider behaviorClimate change is threatening the sustainability of the established PES scheme.Difficulty in identifying changes in land use that would have the desired effect, particularly with regard to hydrological regulation.Assumptions:Increased awareness and as incentives will lead to a change in behaviour with respect to watershed protection and land use planning decisions.Baseline conditions in the selected areas can be extrapolated with high confidence level to other forested watershed areas and lessons learnt can be successfully disseminated. |
| Major beneficiaries engaged by the end of Year 2  | None | Contract for PES between SEEG and Government signed by EOP | Contract  |
| Management plans of land units include provisions for watershed protection and biodiversity conservation | None | At the end of project, management plans exist for 100% of target area | Management plans and contracts |
| Mechanisms for law enforcement in place | None | Law enforcement operational in key hotspots | Report |
| Reported bush meat or frequency of bush meat sale through the Mbé | None | At EOP hunting for bush meat has decreased by 30% | Monitoring Report |
| Monitoring and evaluation plan for PES in the Mbé watershed developed  | None  | Monitoring and evaluation plan developed by Y-3 with methodologies peer reviewed and baselines established | Monitoring and evaluation plan |

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

A Dropbox folder will be created though which relevant background documents will be shared by the CO and RTA, including the following:

* GEF Project Information Form (PIF)
* CEO Endorsement request
* Project Document
* Inception Report
* Annual Work Plans
* List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Boards, and other partners to be consulted
* Project budget and financial data
* Audit reports
* National strategic and legal documents
* Mission reports and lessons learnt studies
* Monitoring and Evaluation Reports
* Minutes of Steering Committee meetings
* Annual Project Implementation Review (PIR) Reports
* Any studies prepared with project funds or related to the project
* Country Programme Document, UNDAF and other related documents

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution*** | ***Sustainability ratings:***  | ***Relevance ratings*** |
| 6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings 5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS)3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems1. 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 risks1. 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:** \_\_Dominique Roby

**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 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[[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
* *Annexed in a separate file:* TE Audit Trail
* *Annexed in a separate file:* Terminal GEF Tracking Tool (if applicable)
 |

Annex G: Evaluation Report Clearance Form

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Célestin Tsassa\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

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

UNDP GEF RTA

Name: \_\_\_\_\_Saskia Marijnissen\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

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 by comment number (“#” column):*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author** | **#** | **Para No./ comment location**  | **Comment/Feedback on the draft TE report** | **Evaluator response and actions taken** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

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)