

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR PROJECT FINAL EVALUATION

Job Title: International consultant for Project Evaluation

Location: São Tomé and Príncipe

Activity: Final Evaluation of Project – PIMS 5103 Strengthening climate information and early warning systems in São Tomé and Príncipe for climate resilient development and adaptation to climate change

Application Deadline: 04/01/2019

Type of Contract: Individual Contractor

Starting Date: 09/01/2019

Expected Duration of Assignment: 30 days

1. 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 Strengthening climate information and early warning systems in São Tomé and Príncipe for climate resilient development and adaptation to climate change (PIMS 5103)

2. PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

| Project Title: Strengthening climate information and early warning systems in São Tomé and Príncipe for climate resilient development and adaptation to climate change | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|---|
| GEF Project ID: | 5004 | | <i>at endorsement (Million US\$)</i> | <i>at completion (Million US\$)</i> |
| UNDP Project ID: | 5103 | GEF financing: | 3,600,000.00 | |
| Country: | Sao Tome & Principe | IA/EA own: | | |
| Region: | Africa | Government: | | |
| Focal Area: | Climate Change Adaptation | Other: | | |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): | | Total co-financing: | 40,295,000.00 | |
| Executing Agency: | Ministry of Public Works, Infrastructure, Natural Resources and Environment | Total Project Cost: | 43,895,000.00 | |
| Other Partners involved: | | ProDoc Signature (date project began): | | 8-Nov-13 |
| | | (Operational) Closing Date: | Proposed: | Actual: 30-Dec-18 |

3. BACKGROUND

Project

The title of the project to be evaluated is Strengthening climate information and early warning systems in São Tomé and Príncipe for climate resilient development and adaptation to climate change. The objective of this project is to strengthen STP's climate-related monitoring capabilities, early warning systems to ensure the availability of information for responding to climate shocks and planning adaptation strategies for climate change. The funding targets some areas of supports, namely, the establishment of an early warning system for the dissemination and communication of extreme weather warnings, seasonal outlooks and decreased risks due to climate change supporting by strengthening the capacities of coverage the national territories with the AWS (Automatic warning system) and AHS (Automatic hydrological system) equipment's.

The project implementing partner is the Ministry of Public Works, Infrastructures and Environment through the National Institute of Meteorology (INM) and General Department of Natural Resources and Energy (DGRNE).

4. EVALUATION PURPOSE

The project evaluation will assess the performance of the project in achieving its results and draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming. It should 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.

5. EVALUATION SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES

The evaluation must address the entire project from inception to completion and should embody a strong results-based orientation.

Based on a desk review of all documents produced by the project and other relevant knowledge products, interviews, focus groups, site visits and other research conducted, the Evaluator will produce an evaluation that will:

- Identify outputs produced by the project
- Elaborate on how outputs have or have not contributed to outcomes, and
- Identify results and transformation changes, if any, that have been produced by the project
- Give recommendations regarding changes to be made, if any

The evaluation should assess:

- Whether stated outputs were achieved

- What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving outputs:
- What factors contributed to effectiveness or ineffectiveness of the project, in particular the added value of the consultative/multi-stakeholder process and synergies with other projects/programmes.
- The effectiveness of the partnership strategy
- The sustainability of the project impact/s
- How effective equality and gender mainstreaming have been incorporated in the design and execution

6. DELIVERABLES

The Evaluator will produce for approval by UNDP:

- An evaluation inception report
- A draft evaluation report, and
- A final evaluation report with lessons learned and recommendations

The Evaluator will also produce an evaluation brief and facilitate at least one briefing event for UNDP and relevant stakeholders. The logistic expenses of this event will be on the account of UNDP.

7. EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

An overall approach and method¹ 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 São Tome and Príncipe to visit the following project sites.

¹ For additional information on methods, see the Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results, Chapter 7, pg. 163

- Malanza
- Santa Catarina
- Neves
- Ribeira Afonso
- Praia das Burras (Island of Príncipe)

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

- National Institute of Meteorology- INM
- General Directorate of Natural Resource and Energy- DGRNE
- National Council for Preparedness and Response to Disasters -CONPREC
- Local Committees for Catastrophe Risk Management
- Civil Protection and Fire Brigade (SPCB)
- STP Coastal Guards
- General Director for the Environment - DGE

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.

8. EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS

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

| Evaluation Ratings: | | | |
|------------------------------|--------|---|--------|
| 1. Monitoring and Evaluation | rating | 2. M&E 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: | |

9. 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 | | | | | | | | |

10. 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.

11. 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

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](#)

12. CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

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

13. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in São Tome and Principe. 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.

14. EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the evaluation will be 30 days according to the following plan:

| Activity | Timing | Completion Date |
|-------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|
| Preparation | 3 days (recommended: 2-4) | 09/01/2019 - 12/01/2019 |
| Evaluation Mission | 15 days (r: 7-15) | 13/01/2019 - 28/01/2019 |
| Draft Evaluation Report | 10 days (r: 5-10) | 29/02/2019- 04/02/2019 |
| Final Report | 2 days (r: 1-2) | 06/02/2019 |

15. EVALUATION OF DELIVERABLES

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

| Deliverable | Content | Timing | Responsibilities |
|---------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| Inception Report | Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method | 12/01/2019 | Evaluator submits to UNDP CO |
| Presentation to UNDP and stakeholders | Initial Findings | 28/01/2019 | To project management, UNDP CO |
| Draft Final Report | Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes | 04/02/2019 | 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.

16. TEAM COMPOSITION

The evaluation team will be composed of *1 international consultant and 1 national consultant*. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The *international evaluator 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.

17. RECRUITMENT CRITERIA (Team Leader)

| | | |
|----------------------------------|--|---------|
| Education: | Advanced degree, preferably in environmental sciences, agriculture, business management, meteorology, public policy, rural development or other closely related field. | 150 Pts |
| Experience: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Minimum 5 years demonstrated professional experience fields related to Early Warning Systems within the climate change context. | 300Pts |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies. | 250 Pts |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Experience in GEF/UNDP project evaluation is an asset | 150 Pts |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Experience working in Africa or in similar island contexts | 150Pts |
| Mandatory language Requirements: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Demonstrated proficiency in written and spoken English. Selected candidates will be requested to submit evidence of writing skills ▪ Working knowledge of Portuguese. | |

18. 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'

19. 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 |
|-----|---|
| 15% | Upon the signature of Contract |
| 25% | Upon submission and approval of the Inception Report and workplan |

| | |
|-----|--|
| 30% | Upon submission and approval of the draft final evaluation report |
| 30% | Upon submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final evaluation report |

20. SUBMISSIONS

Interested applicants (Team Consultancy) are required to submit:

- Evidence of qualifications including resumes and references
- A technical proposal explaining the methodology for conducting the evaluation and containing a detailed work-plan with timelines
- A separate financial proposal including all costs for conducting the evaluation and producing the deliverables (including daily fee, daily sustainable and travel costs).

Applicants are requested to apply online through the email rfq-st06.2018@undp.org by 04/01/2019.

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

| | | | |
|---|-----------|----------|---------------------------|
| <p>This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPAP or CPD: By 2016, the Government and districts, as well as the population, adopt techniques and behaviours that promote a sustainable environment and ensure better prevention and management of risks and natural disasters</p> | | | |
| <p>Country Programme Outcome Indicators: Number of monitoring systems in place for pollution and disaster risk management</p> | | | |
| <p>Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area (same as that on the cover page, circle one):</p> | | | |
| <p>3. Promote climate change adaptation</p> | | | |
| <p>Applicable SOF (e.g. GEF) Strategic Objective and Program: Objective 2 "Increase adaptive capacity to respond to the impacts of climate change, including variability, at local, national, regional and global level".</p> | | | |
| <p>Applicable SOF (e.g. GEF) Expected Outcomes: Outcome 2.1 "Increased knowledge and understanding of climate variability and change-induced risks at country level and in targeted vulnerable areas"; and Outcome 2.2 "Strengthened adaptive capacity to reduce risks to climate-induced economic losses".</p> | | | |
| <p>Applicable SOF (e.g. GEF) Outcome Indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevant risk information disseminated to stakeholders • Type and no. monitoring systems in place • % of population covered by climate change risk measures | | | |
| | Indicator | Baseline | Targets End of Project |
| | | | Source of verification |
| | | | Risks and Assumptions |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| <p>Project Objective³</p> <p>To strengthen the climate monitoring capabilities, early warning systems and available information for responding to climate shocks and planning adaptation to climate change in São Tomé and Príncipe</p> | <p>1.Capacity as per capacity assessment scorecard (BASELINE: 22; TARGET: 161)</p> | <p>1.Limited capacity to generate EWS and CI on a national scale for extreme hydro-meteorological phenomena</p> <p>Limited disaster risk prevention capacity on local levels within CONPREC - CP</p> <p>No Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) for alert communication by CONPREC - CP with the support of NGOs/CSOs</p> <p>Current score: 22</p> | <p>1. Capacity assessment TARGET score 161 for all combined EWS agencies</p> | <p>1. Capacity assessment scores</p> | <p>There is no political will to invest in monitor extreme weather and climate change.</p> <p>GoSTP institutions and other key stakeholders would keep the same level of interest and willingness to support NIM</p> |
| | <p>2.Domestic finance committed to the relevant institutions to monitor extreme weather and climate change</p> | <p>2.Existing budget plans do not have sufficient funds to maintain and operate environmental monitoring infrastructure</p> <p>Current budget: \$500,000</p> | <p>2. TARGET: 30% increase in domestic financing for equipment operation and maintenance across all institutions</p> | <p>2. Ministry budget lines for recurring costs</p> | |
| | <p>Indicator</p> | <p>Baseline</p> | <p>Targets</p> <p>End of Project</p> | <p>Source of verification</p> | |

³Objective (Atlas output) monitored quarterly ERBM and annually in APR/PIR

| | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|--|
| <p>Outcome 1⁴</p> <p>Enhanced capacity of national hydro-meteorological (NHMS) and environmental institutions to monitor extreme weather and climate change.</p> | <p>1. % national coverage of climate/weather and hydrological monitoring infrastructure</p> | <p>1. Currently, there is <20 % national coverage for climate/weather monitoring with respect to the optimal arrangements defined in NIM/DGRNE feasibility reports and WMO standards.</p> <p><u>Baseline</u> is 7 AWS, 2 Automatic water level stations and 58 manual synoptic/agro/hydrometric stations needing upgrades.</p> | <p>1. Increase to 60 % national coverage to take steps in achieving NHMS optimal monitoring arrangements as defined in feasibility studies</p> <p>Target: 31 AWS, 14 automatic water level stations and 58 manual synoptic/agro/hydrometric stations upgraded</p> | <p>1. Review of budget spent on equipment procurement and rehabilitation and data held on servers to show that new equipment is operational</p> | <p>Procurement and installation of equipment is delayed due to slow release of funds, lengthy processes and deficient data transmission systems locally.</p> <p>Funds are released on time for speedy procurement processes and technical assistance in place for equipment installation and operationalisation.</p> |
| | <p>2. Frequency and timeliness of climate-related data availability (BASELINE: monthly);</p> | <p>2. Data from manual weather and hydrological stations is collected monthly and transmitted by post.</p> | <p>2. TARGET for data transmission frequency: daily</p> | <p>2. Analysis of data frequency transmission using storage servers within each information production agency</p> | |

⁴All outcomes monitored annually in the APR/PIR. It is highly recommended not to have more than 4 outcomes.

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|--|---|
| <p>Outcome 2</p> <p>Efficient and effective use of hydro-meteorological and environmental information for making early warnings and long-term development plans.</p> | <p>1. % of population with access to improved climate information and flood, drought, strong wind and coastal warnings (disaggregated by gender)</p> | <p>1. There are existing EWS initiatives for regional drought and famine alerts; however, a national alert system concerned with extreme hydro-meteorological phenomena is not available.</p> <p>There is a limited understanding of technical alert jargon (alerts are not translated into national languages). No mechanism exists for most vulnerable populations to be involved in the alert process to ensure its sustainability.</p> <p>Current access to warnings: 30% men, 20% women</p> | <p>1. Increase to 50% for both men and women who have access to improved EWS/CI</p> <p>Target: 50% men; 50% women</p> | <p>1. a) Gender disaggregated survey on receipt of alerts</p> <p>b) Record of debriefings by NIM/DGRNE post extreme weather events</p> <p>c) NIM/DGRNE record of end-user feedback</p> | <p>Early Warnings do to not reach local radios in the communities. Local Radios are not capacitated to receive and broadcast early warning.</p> <p>The project foreseen capacitance and support to local radios and they are willing to cooperate. Communities are able to receive warnings through CONPREC dissemination set up.</p> |
| <p>2. GoSTP Development Plans and land-use plans at National/District that integrate climate information in their formulation of poverty reduction strategies and links</p> | <p>2. Development frameworks do not incorporate any EWS/CI products such as risk maps or climate change predictions into long-term planning</p> <p>Current score: 0</p> | <p>2. At least 2 of the PRSP policy briefs incorporate analyses of risk maps and/or climate change projections influencing long-term planning proposals</p> <p>Target score: 2</p> | <p>2. Review of GoSTP Development Plans and land-use plans at National/District to validate incorporation of risk, weather and/or climate information</p> | <p>GoSTP is not interested nor have the capacity to analyse vulnerability and incorporate climate change risks into the design of development Plans and land-use</p> | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|--|
| <p>between poverty and the environment at local levels (BASELINE: No integration; TARGET Integration of at least 1 National and 1 district development Plan and land-use Plan incorporates climate change risks into their design into the revised in 2015)</p> | <p>3. Sector-specific EW products and strategies that integrate climate risks in fisheries, tourism, and land management sectors)</p> | <p>3. Sector specific strategies do not include EWS/CI because the quality of weather forecasts and climate predictions are poor and not tailored for specific uses, particularly seasonal forecasts. Current score: 0</p> | <p>3. Development of at least 2 tailored climate products and presentation of market research plan on how to implement mobile phone based fishing and agricultural advisories, both supporting targeted weather/climate service delivery Target score: 2</p> | <p>3.a) Partnerships formed between information producers and the DGRNE, DGA and CIAT, private sectors, NGOs and women organizations to support weather/climate service delivery; b) Sector specific products delivered by Met and disaster management.</p> | <p>Plans. The partnership between DGA and NIM for development of systematic streamlining of digital information will help GoSTP to address this issue. Vulnerability and Risk Maps will be produced. Government is not committed to integrate climate change risk and adaptation needs in these elected sector-specific strategic plans;</p> |
| <p>3. Sector-specific EW products and strategies that integrate climate risks in fisheries, tourism, and land management sectors)</p> | <p>3. Sector specific strategies do not include EWS/CI because the quality of weather forecasts and climate predictions are poor and not tailored for specific uses, particularly seasonal forecasts. Current score: 0</p> | <p>3. Development of at least 2 tailored climate products and presentation of market research plan on how to implement mobile phone based fishing and agricultural advisories, both supporting targeted weather/climate service delivery Target score: 2</p> | <p>3.a) Partnerships formed between information producers and the DGRNE, DGA and CIAT, private sectors, NGOs and women organizations to support weather/climate service delivery; b) Sector specific products delivered by Met and disaster management.</p> | <p>3.a) Partnerships formed between information producers and the DGRNE, DGA and CIAT, private sectors, NGOs and women organizations to support weather/climate service delivery; b) Sector specific products delivered by Met and disaster management.</p> | <p>Plans. The partnership between DGA and NIM for development of systematic streamlining of digital information will help GoSTP to address this issue. Vulnerability and Risk Maps will be produced. Government is not committed to integrate climate change risk and adaptation needs in these elected sector-specific strategic plans;</p> |

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

1. PIF
2. UNDP Initiation Plan
3. UNDP Project Document
4. UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results
5. Project Inception Report
6. All Project Implementation Reports (PIR's)
7. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
8. MTR Report
9. Audit reports
10. Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools at CEO endorsement and midterm (*fill in specific TTs for this project's focal area*)
11. Oversight mission reports
12. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
13. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team

The following documents will also be available:

14. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
15. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
16. Minutes of the *Project* Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
17. Project site location maps

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? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • • |
| Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • • |
| Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • • |
| 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"> • • • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • • |
| 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"> • • • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • • |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • |

ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| <p><i>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution</i></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><i>Sustainability ratings:</i></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><i>Relevance ratings</i></p> <p>2. Relevant (R) 1.. Not relevant (NR)</p> <p><i>Impact Ratings:</i></p> <p>3. Significant (S) 2. Minimal (M) 1. Negligible (N)</p> |
| <p><i>Additional ratings where relevant:</i> 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 Form⁵

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: _____

⁵www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE⁶

- 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 Manual⁷)
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 rated⁸)
- 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

⁶The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

⁷ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

⁸ 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.

- 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

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

