Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference FOR AN INTERNATIONAL CONSULTANT: UNDP/GEF project on “ GAMBIA PROTECTED AREAS (PA) NETWORK, NRM & COMMUNITY LIVELIHOOD PROJECT IN THE GAMBIA”. undp pims#5000

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 *project* “ Gambia Protected Areas (PAs) Network and community Livelihood Project***”*** (UNDP PIMS# 5000).

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

Project Summary Table

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Title: |  | | | | | |
| GEF Project ID: | | 0005529 |  | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | | *at completion (Million US$)* |
| UNDP Project ID: | | 0005000 | GEF financing: | US$1.5 million | |  |
| Country: | | The Gambia | IA/EA own: | US$120,000 | |  |
| Region: | | West Africa | Government: | US$4,570,909 (Grant) | |  |
| Focal Area: | | Climate Change Adaptation | Other: |  | |  |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): | |  | Total co-financing: | US$4,690,909 | |  |
| Executing Agency: | | Ministry of Environment, Climate Change and Natural Resources | Total Project Cost: | US$ 6,018,219 | |  |
| Other Partners involved: | | Ministry of Environment, Department of Agriculture, Community Development, NDMA, NEA , EU, UNDP , | ProDoc Signature (date project began): | | | 27/7/2015 |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | | Proposed:  27/7/2018 | Actual:  31/12/2019 |

Objective and Scope

The **Goal of the project** is to To expand and strengthen the management of priority protected areas in The Gambia, including through enhanced community-based natural resource management .

The project will work to (a) expand and better connect the cluster of three target PAs (BBWR, JNP, KWNP) and emplace effective management to provide a refuge for national and globally relevant biodiversity and natural ecosystems; and (b) introduce biodiversity-friendly natural resource and land management practices in communities around the three target PAs, to begin restoring vital natural resources into productive landscapes and thereby reduce the pressures local communities exert on the PA system

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 (See 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 the regions where field activities have been conducted including the following project sites: Kiang West National Park, Baobolong Wetland Reserve and Niumi National Park, including their extensions Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: (Project beneficiary communities, government Departments of Agriculture, Community Development, Forestry, Fisheries, Parks & Wildlife etc.)

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 will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

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

Mainstreaming

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

Impact

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts as per the objectives set. 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, c) adoption of sustainable land management (SLM) best practices 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**. The evaluators will also follow and provide response according to the “management response template” at Annex (??). 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 The Gambia**. 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 **25 working days** according to the following plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Timing | Completion Date |
| **Preparation** | 4 days *(recommended: 2-4)* | *25th June -28th June 2019* |
| **Evaluation Mission** | 14 days (*r: 7-15)* | *1st July- 18th July 2019* |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | 6 days (*r: 5-10*) | *19th July – 26th July 2019* |
| **Final Report** | 2 days *(r;: 1-2*) | *29th July-30th July 2019* |

Evaluation deliverables

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Deliverable | Content | Timing | Responsibilities |
| **Detail 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 **one international evaluator/consultant***.* The consultant shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. (*If the team has more than 1 evaluator, one will be designated as the team leader and will be responsible for finalizing the report).* The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The Team members/individual consultant must present the following qualifications:

* Minimum 10 years of relevant professional experience in the Terminal Evaluation of GEF and environment related projects
* Knowledge of UNDP and GEF
* Previous experience with results‐based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
* Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s)
* (*additional skills based on project particulars*)

* At least an Honours Degree in natural resource management, forestry, biodiversity, environment, agriculture, development studies and related fields,
* A minimum of 10 years of relevant experience in conducting TEs in developing countries, particularly Africa with soecial focus in West Africa
* Must have undertaken at least 2 Final Evaluations, including one in the field of biodiversity, SLM/agriculture, forestry, Protected Areas and related fields.
* Demonstrated ability to assess complex situations, succinctly distils critical issues, and draw forward-looking conclusions and recommendations;
* Experience in conducting knowledge sharing workshop on monitoring and evaluation
* Fluency in English is a prerequisite
* Highly knowledgeable of GEF and UNDP-GEF monitoring and evaluation policies procedures an advantage;
* Familiarity with Gambia is essential

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 |
| *15%* | Submission of TE inception report and approval of workplan |
| *35%* | 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 online <http://jobs.undp.org>; [**www.gm.undp.org**](http://www.gm.undp.org) during the period 12th -24th June 2019. Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for this position . 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).

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

**STRATEGIC RESULTS FRAMEWORK**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **UN Development Assistance Framework Outcome(s)/Indicator(s):**  Pillar 1, Outcome 3 – Environmental sustainability and disaster risk reduction systems and services operationalized  **Expected UNDP Country Programme Action Plan Outcome(s) & Output(s):**  Outcome 2 – Sustainable livelihood security enhanced for the disadvantaged groups through the promotion of income diversification opportunities and better management of environmental resources  Output 2.3 – Sustainable use of environmental resources enhanced | | | | | |
| **UNDP Ecosystems and Biodiversity Strategy:**  Signature Programme 2 - Unlocking the potential of protected areas (PAs), including indigenous and community conserved areas, to protect biodiversity while contributing to sustainable development.  Key Action Area: Strengthen PA systems and their ability to conserve biodiversity and maintain and enhance ecosystem services | | | | | |
| **Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program:**  BD-1: Improve Sustainability of Protected Area Systems; BD-2: Mainstream Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use into Production Landscapes, Seascapes and Sectors | | | | | |
| **Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes:**  **Outcome 1.1:** Improved management effectiveness of existing and new protected areas. **Outcome 2.1:** Increase in sustainably managed landscapes and seascapes that integrate biodiversity conservation. | | | | | |
| **Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators:**  **Indicator 1.1:** Protected area management effectiveness score as recorded by Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool.  **Indicator 2.1:** Landscapes and seascapes certified by internationally or nationally recognized environmental standards that incorporate biodiversity considerations (e.g. FSC, MSC) measured in hectares and recorded by GEF tracking tool. | | | | | |
|  | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Targets**  **End of Project** | **Source of verification** | **Assumptions and Risks** |
| **Project Objective[[3]](#footnote-3)**  ***To expand and strengthen the management of priority protected areas in The Gambia, including through enhanced community-based natural resource management*** | **Impact 0.1**  Extent of protected estate | Current overall protected estate is 64,276 ha. At the project locality, KWNP is 11,526 ha, BBWR is 22,000 ha, and JNP is 15,028 ha | Extension of the protected estate by an additional 15,000 ha (5,000 in JNP and 10,000 ha in KWNP) making a total of some 74,276 ha protected | Formal notification of protected status | **Assumptions:** The Objective assumes that the expansion and strengthening of the protected estate can be carried out, and that this can be done through co-management with communities practicing sustainable land management.  **Risks:**  There is a risk that landowners will assert their traditional ownership rights and there could be a reluctance at community level to cooperate with the project if this is seen as an abrogation of ownership rights. The project will protect itself from this risk by gaining the confidence of communities and their Village Councils through its genuine recognition of ownership rights and its efforts to safeguard them. |
| **Impact 0.2**  Number of people in target area who feel that they have a significant role in managing natural resources | Current level to be confirmed by survey at inception phase. Expected to be 0% | Relative increase by 20% by mid-term and 50% by end of project | Survey of a representative sample of community members at inception and repeated at MTR and TE |
| **UNDP IRRF Outcome and Outputs Indicators** | **IRRF Sub-indicator 1.5.A.1.1**  Number of hectares of land managed under an in-situ conservation regime | To be defined at project astart | To be defined at project start | Project reports |
| **IRRF Sub-indicator 1.5.A.2.1:**  Number of hectares of land managed under a sustainable use regime | To be defined at project start | To be defined at project start | Project reports |
| **IRRF Sub-indicator 1.1.3.A.1.1:**  Number of additional demonstration schemes which expand and diversify the productive base based on the use of sustainable production technologies | To be defined at project start | To be defined at project start | Project reports |
| **IRRF Sub-indicator 1.3.2.A.3.1**:  Total number of additional people benefitting from strengthened livelihoods through solutions for management of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste | To be defined at project start | To be defined at project start | Project reports |
| **IRRF Sub-indicator 2.5.1.C.1.1:**  Extent to which institutional frameworks are in place for conservation, sustainable use, and/or access and benefit sharing of natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystems | To be defined at project start | To be defined at project start | Project reports |
| **Process Indicators of effective implementation and mainstreaming of UNDP strategic goals** | **Process Indicator 01**  Participation at village level | Some opportunities for participation at village level do exist and these will be maximised. | | Project reports |  |
| **Process Indicator 02**  Cost-effectiveness | Government co-finance will be utilized to keep costs to a minimum. Likewise, preference will be given to local expertise who will be engaged at a lower cost. These actions will be taken without placing the project’s success in jeopardy. | | Co-financing will be tracked and recorded and reported. |
| **Process Indicator 03**  Involvement of women and youth | Implementation of the Gender and Youth Strategy as in Section 2.6 with gender considerations mainstreamed and embedded in the project implementation process. | | Measured by the ratio of women and youth participating according to AWPs and PIRs |
| **Process Indicator 04**  Human rights | Recognition and respect of customary rights, including the rights of traditional use | | To be measured by survey of community representatives |
| **Process Indicator 05**  Governance | Institutional capacity strengthening at central government and local village level leading to enhanced governance of natural resources management | | Covered by various capacity building activities under the mainstream Outputs and Activities |
| **Outcome 1[[4]](#footnote-4)**  ***Gazettement of a c. 5000 ha expansion of JNP to connect to BBWR, and of a c. 10,000 ha expansion of KWNP*** | **Impact 1.1**  Formal confirmation of protected status of existing PAs and declaration of extensions | Currently KWNP has surveyed and demarcated boundaries and it is formally declared; BBWR is formally declared but boundaries not well demarcated; JNP only recently declared but boundaries need to be surveyed and PA properly established.  Proposed expansion yet to be surveyed, demarcated and declared | By end of project, the three PAs together with the extensions, will have boundaries properly surveyed and demarcated and formally declared through gazettement | Formal notification of protected status | **Assumptions:** There is an expectation that there will be an appreciation of the intrinsic value to Gambia of the protected estate, hence the desire to extend the protective/managed status. Likewise there will be an acceptance that species at risk are valuable and that action needs to be taken to ensure their sustainability.  **Risks:** The risk is that the project timescale is somewhat short for some of the project benefits to manifest themselves, resulting in a lack of appreciation. The project will mitigate against this by putting in place a robust information and participatory strategy whereby stakeholders will share the project challenges as well as its benefits.  The selected Indicators will serve to record beneficial results from project activities or confirm whether a good enough foundation has been laid for such results. |
| **Outputs:**  **Output 1.1 –** *Revised PA Programme of Work and Action Plan*  **Output 1.2 –** *Gazettement of the two PA expansions (JNP expansion to connect with BBWR and expansion of KWNP)* | | | | |
| **Outcome 2**  ***Enhanced management effectiveness in both existing and added PA areas*** | **Impact 2.1**  Enhanced level of management effectiveness in established PAs, namely KWNP and BBWR | Latest METT scores are: KWNP - 56; BBWR - 47 | Increase in METT scores by 10% for KWNP and BBWR | GEF BD Tracking Tools applied at MTR and TE | **Assumptions:** It is assumed that training and capacity building coupled with the provision of equipment and other support, will enhance management effectiveness.  **Risks:** However, management effectiveness also requires the appropriate policy framework and political commitment and these are beyond the brief of the project. |
| **Impact 2.2**  Effective management established in JNP | JNP only recently established and METT score is a nominal 5 | By project end expected to reach around a score of 45 | GEF BD Tracking Tools applied at MTR and TE |
| **Outputs:**  **Output 2.1 –** *Strengthened institutional and technical capacities in the target PAs to address existing and emerging threats* | | | | |
| **Outcome 3**  ***Improved forest cover, habitat integrity and connectivity across the targeted PA cluster and surrounding landscapes (c. 60,000 ha)*** | **Impact 3.1**  Turn-around and/or maintenance of the conservation status of key indicator species; two animal and two plant indicator species will be selected in each of the three project sites at project start | The baseline will be established at project start | Recovery or maintenance of the conservation status (as measured by viable populations) of selected key indicator species | Scientifically designed ecological survey recording population, sex ratios, age cohorts, recruitment rate, etc | **Assumptions:** The Outcome seeks the reversal of negative trends and assumes that this can be achieved by mainstreaming a conservation ethic into land use and by the embracing of SLM approaches by communities living in the vicinity of PAs.  **Risks:** There is a risk that although SLMand conservation efforts will create benefits in the long term, in the short term some changes need to be made and these could be unpopular. The project will guard against this risk by proposing and supporting eco-friendly enterprises which provide benefits at community level while reducing the impacts on species and ecosystems. |
| **Outputs:**  **Output 3.1 –** *Biodiversity as well as PA Aspects as well as sustainable land and natural resources management effectively mainstreamed into the large-scale National Agricultural Land and Water Management Development Project (NEMA)*  **Output 3.2 –** *Recommended NRM and SLM practices implemented by local communities under the community-based management agreements, with extension support provided*  **Output 3.3 –** *A monitoring system in place in the target areas* | | | | |
| **Outcome 4**  ***Enhanced diversity, sustainability and reliability of community livelihoods*** | **Impact 4.1**  Number of producers organizations, women’s groups, trade and farmers’ associations and CBOs that apply improved technologies or management practices as a result of project assistance | The baseline will be established through survey work at the Inception Phase of the project. Expected to be low, in the region of 0-5% | An increase in the numbers using improved technologies and management practices leading to at least 50% uptake | Survey to be carried out at Inception, MTR and TE | **Assumptions:** The Outcome assumes that results at the community level can be attained through which livelihoods will be enhanced.  **Risks:** The risk that SLM may not lead to the desired results is low and the likelihood is reduced further through the support for eco-friendly enterprises that will be provided by the project. |
| **Impact 4.2**  Level of awareness, sensitivity and understanding of the value and vulnerability of natural resources | There is a certain level of awareness but it is not deep. The baseline will be established through survey at the Inception Phase | An improvement of 20-50% in awareness and understanding as measured by a repeat survey. | Survey to be carried out at Inception, MTR and TE |
| **Outputs:**  **Output 4.1 –** *Agreements with local communities secured for community-based sustainable land and natural resources management, and related plans, developed* | | | | |

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

* Project Document;
* Project implementation reports (PIRs);
* Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams;
* Audits reports
* Annual Review Reports
* Mid Term Evaluation Report
* M & E Operational Guidelines, all monitoring reports prepared by the project;
* Financial and Administration guidelines;

The following documents will also be available:

* The project M&E framework
* Knowledge products from service providers
* Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems;
* Minutes of the Project Board Meetings, task teams and other project management meetings;
* Maps

The GEF Implementation Completion Report guidelinesAnnex 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? | | | | |
|  | * How relevant is the project to GEF focal area objectives? |  |  |  |
|  | * Is the project relevant to government (national , regional and local ) priorities? |  |  |  |
|  | * Has the project met overall GEF design and implementation requirements? |  |  |  |
| Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? | | | | | |
|  | * Have the project outcomes been met and to what extent? |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
| 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 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[[5]](#footnote-5)**

**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[[6]](#footnote-6)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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[[7]](#footnote-7)) |
| **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[[8]](#footnote-8)) |
| **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. *Objective (Atlas output) monitored quarterly ERBM and annually in APR/PIR* [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. *All outcomes monitored annually in the APR/PIR.* [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
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. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)