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 the *Project “Enhancing Capacity for Implementing Rio Conventions*” (PIMS #.5099)

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

Project Summary Table

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Title: | *Enhancing Capacity for Implementing Rio Conventions* | | | | | |
| GEF Project ID: | | 5097 |  | | *at endorsement (US$)* | *at completion (US$)* |
| UNDP Project ID: | | 00089760 | GEF financing: | | 975,000 | 975,000 |
| Country: | | Vietnam | IA/EA own: | | 725,000 | 725,000 |
| Region: | | Asia and the Pacific | Government: | | 440,000 | (TBC) |
| Focal Area: | | Multi-Focal Areas | Other: | | 179,646 | 179,646 |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): | | CD2 to generate, access and use information and knowledge  CD3 To strengthen capacities to develop policy and legislative frameworks | Total co-financing: | | 1,344,646 | (TBC) |
| Executing Agency: | | Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MONRE) | Total Project Cost: | | 2,579,646 | (TBC) |
| Other Partners involved: | | Institute of Strategy and Policy on Natural resources and environment (ISPONRE)  Viet Nam Environment Administration (VEA), Rio Convention Focal Points, The General Directorate of Land Administration (GDLA) Ha Giang and Ha Tinh’s DONREs | Pro Doc Signature (date project began): | | | 18th August, 2015 |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | Proposed:       18 August, 2018 | | Actual:        September,2018 |

Objective and Scope

The National Capacity Self-Assessment set out the barriers to implementing the Rio Conventions and the capacity needs. This project builds directly on the NCSA findings and recommendations, addressing many of the important capacity needs identified therein. Capacity development, notably at the provincial level, will be a key force running through all Outputs of the following two Outcomes:

* **Outcome 1: Viet Nam has the environmental management tools that fully address global environmental concerns**.
* **Outcome 2: Viet Nam is integrating global environmental concerns into its national strategic planning and development processes**.

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-2) for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects have 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 ( *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 Ha Giang province. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

- The RIO Project Management Board

- The Institute for Strategy and Policies on Natural Resources and Environment

- The Department of Climate Change (UNFCCC Focal Point)

- The Viet Nam Environnent Administration (VEA)

- The Biodiversity Conservation Agency (UNCBD Focal Point)

- Department of International Cooperation – Vietnam Administration of Forestry (UNCCD Focal Point)

- The Ha Giang DONRE

- The General Directorate of Land Administration (GDLA) : Land Planning Agency and Land Registration and Inventory Agency

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, 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.

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. IA& EA Execution** | ***rating*** |
| M&E design at entry |  | Quality of UNDP Implementation – Implementing Agency (IA) |  |
| M&E Plan Implementation |  | Quality of Execution - Executing Agency (EA) |  |
| 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 | Planned | Actual |
| Grants | 725,000 | 725,000 | 440,000 | (TBC) | 179,646 | (TBC) | 1,344,646 | (TBC) |
| Loans/Concessions | - |  | - |  | - |  | - | - |
| * In-kind support |  |  | 150,000 | TBC |  |  | 150,000 | TBC |
| * Other | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |
| Totals | 725,000 | 725,000 | 590,000 | TBC | 179,646 | (TBC) | 1,494,646 | (TBC) |

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-3)

Conclusions, recommendations & lessons

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

Implementation arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in *Viet Nam.* 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 over a time period of *10* weeks (25 days for IC and 25 for NC) according to the following plan:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Timing | | Completion Date |
|  | *International consultant (Team leader)* | *National consultant* |  |
| **Preparation** | *2* days | *2 days* | *15 September, 2018* |
| **Evaluation Mission** | *12* days | *12 days* | *30 September, 2018* |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | *8* days | *8 days* | *10 October, 2018* |
| **Final Report** | *3* days | *3 days* | *30 October, 2018* |

Evaluation deliverables

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Deliverable | Content | Timing | Responsibilities |
| **Inception Report** | Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method | No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission:  *15 September, 2018* | Evaluator submits to UNDP CO |
| **Presentation** | Initial Findings | End of evaluation mission:  *30 September , 2018* | To project management, UNDP CO |
| **Draft Final Report** | Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes | Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission:  *10 October, 2018* | Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs |
| **Final Report[[3]](#footnote-4)** | Revised report | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft:  *30 October, 2018* | Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC. |

Team Composition

The evaluation team will be composed of 01 international consultant (team leader) for 25 days and 01 national consultant for 25 days. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. 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.

1. The Team members must present the following qualifications:

* At least Master’s Degree in Climate and Environment, Natural Resources, Land Administration or relevant areas.
* Minimum *10* years of relevant professional experience
* Knowledge of UNDP and GEF and
* Knowledge of Rio conventions related areas.
* Previous experience with results‐based monitoring and evaluation methodologies
* Technical knowledge in the targeted multi- focal area(s) of climate change, land degradation, and biodiversity conservation
* Experience in environmental/biodiversity strategic/land use planning
* Experience with the IUCN Red List and plant and animal taxonomy in Viet Nam desired
* Excellent command of the English language (oral and written)

1. Selection criteria:

International Consultant

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Se** | **Criteria** | **Score** |
|  | Minimum 10 years of relevant professional experience in programme monitoring and evaluation | 100 |
|  | Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies as a team leader | 100 |
|  | Knowledge of UNDP and GEF and Rio conventions related areas | 100 |
|  | Experience working with the GEF project review/monitoring and evaluations | 200 |
|  | Experience working in Vietnam | 20 |
|  | Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s) of biodiversity conservation, protected areas | 80 |
|  | Experience in climate change and environmental/land degradation/biodiversity conservation related areas | 100 |
|  | Demonstrable analytical skills | 100 |
|  | Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset; | 100 |
|  | Master’s Degree in Climate and Environment, Natural Resources, Land Administration or relevant areas | 100 |
|  |  | 1000 |

National Consultant

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Se** | **Criteria** | **Score** |
|  | Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies | 150 |
|  | Experience working with the GEF project review/monitoring and evaluations | 150 |
| 3. | Experience in climate change and environmental/land degradation/biodiversity conservation related areas | 200 |
| 4. | Fluent in written and verbal English | 200 |
| 5. | Demonstrable analytical skills and communication skills | 100 |
| 6. | Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset; | 100 |
| 7. | A Master’s degree in environmental sciences/economics, biodiversity conservation, or other closely related field | 100 |
|  |  | 1000 |

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

Application process

Applicants are requested to apply online ([www.jobs.undp.org](http://www.jobs.undp.org); [www.vn.undp.org](http://www.vn.undp.org)) 01 September 2018. Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions. The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in English (with indication of the e‐mail and phone contact. Shortlisted candidates will be requested to submit a price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs).

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

| **Objective / Outcome** | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **End-of-project target** | **Source of information** | **Risk** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Objective** | | | | | |
| To enhance the capacity for implementing the Rio Conventions by developing and applying tools that will lead to global environmental benefits. | *Quality National Reporting to Rio Conventions and SDG, with adequate representation of global environmental concerns* | *Reports for Rio Conventions submitted, but at times lacking quality and appropriate inclusion of global environmental concerns;*  *No SDG reporting* | *National reports timely submitted, taking all relevant data into account* | *Project Reports*  *National Reports (Rio, SDGs*) | * Inadequate Government and other stakeholder commitment to the process; * Inadequate coordination mechanisms; * Inadequate quality and quantity of data and information; |
| Capacity Development Scorecard | 23 | Increase by 30% to 30. | Project reports. |
|  | | | | | |
| **Component 1 - Develop and pilot innovative tools for global benefits** | | | | | |
| Outcome 1: Vietnam has the environmental management tools that fully address global environmental concerns. | Set of indicators covering the Rio Conventions *and relevant SDGs* | *National Environmental Indicator set* does not cover all parameters *that are necessary for Rio and SDG reporting* | New set of indicators fully covers RCs *and relevant SDG* reporting requirements. | Project reports.  *Proposed indicator sets*  *National Rio and SDG reports* |  |
|  | *No manual* | *manual approved, available and used in MONRE and other relevant trainings*  *Core group of trainers established and training for all relevant staff held*  *Ecosystems valuation used in reporting and planning* | Project reports.  *Training Reports*  *Guidelines* |
| *EPI piloted and introduced* | *Feasibility study on Provincial EPI undertaken* | *EPI piloted and introduced widely available* | Project reports.  *EPI reports;* |
| **Component 1: Outputs** | | | | | |
| *1.1 A set of national indicators to monitor environmental status and pressure proposed, in line with SDG and Rio Conventions Indicators* | | | | | * Gaps on the availability and quality of information; * Gaps in local capacity conditions (such as the requirement of computers, copyright of software, IT knowledge …). |
| 1.2. Economic valuation of environmental and natural resources, and capacity to undertake this valuation | | | | | * Availability of adequate data/information (quality and quantity); * High need for technical capacity. |
| 1.3: Continue support the development and monitoring of Environmental Performance Indices, in line with international standards | | | | | * *EPI may not be accepted by national or provincial authorities* * *Quality and up-to-date data not available.* |
| **Component 2 - National decision-making and planning for global benefits** | | | | | |
| Outcome 2: Vietnam is integrating global environmental concerns into its national strategic planning and development processes. | *Guidelines for improved environment and natural resources planning introduced* | Not applicable | *Technical guideline on Environmental Protection plans developed, approved, and used at national level*  *Core group of trainers established and planners from MONRE, MPI and other relevant organizations engaged in planning trained in Environmental Planning* | ***New****:*  *Project Reports*  *Technical guideline*  *Environmental Planning Documents* |  |
| ***New****: Integrated Land Use Plan in 1 Province* | ***New****: Provincial Land Use and other Plans available, but without environmental concerns* | ***New****: Land Use Plan integrating environmental concerns in 1 Province, to be used as example for other provinces* | *Project reports*  *Province X Land Use Plan* |
| **Component 2: Outputs** | | | | | |
| 2.1: Increased *planning* capacity ~~to~~ undertake *effective environmental and natural resources management* | | | | | * *Planning frameworks remain unclear* |
| 2.2: Increased capacity to undertake integrated land-use- *and environmental-*planning | | | | | * *Tool for integrating environmental concerns in national and provincial planning not ready on time or sufficiently tailored to local conditions* |

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

*GEF Project Information Form (PIF), Project Document*

*Project document*

*Annual Workplans of 2016, 2017, 2018,*

*Implementing/Executing partner arrangements*

*Project reports:*

*List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Boards, and other partners to be consulted*

*RIO Project Board:*

* *Mr. Nguyen Trung Thang, National Project Director, Phone: 0912030361 , Email:* ntthang@isponre.gov.vn
* *Ms. Kim Thi Thuy Ngoc, Project Manager, Phone: 0912021606, Email:* kimthuyngoc@gmail.com
* *Ms. Huynh Thi Bich Hang, Project Accountant, Phone: 0914243938, Email:* huynhbichhang.dn@gmail.com

*- Stakeholders:*

* *ISPONRE*
* *Vietnam Environment Administration (VEA/BCA)*
* *Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MONRE)*
* *Department of Climate Change*
* *Department of International Cooperation – Vietnam Administration of Forestry*
* *Ha Giang DONRE*
* *Ha Tinh DONRE*

*Annual Project Implementation (APR/PIR) Reports*

*Project budget and financial data*

*Project Tracking Tool, at the baseline and at the mid-term*

*One UN Plan II 2011-2016*

*UNDP Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP)*

*GEF focal area strategic program objectives*

Annex C: Evaluation Questions

This Evaluation Criteria Matrix must be fully completed by the consultant and included as an Annex to the TE report.

| **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? | | | | | | |  | |
|  | * To what extent is the principle of the project in line with the national priorities | * Level of participation of the concerned agencies in project activities * Consistency with national strategies and policies | * Project documents * National policies and strategies | | * Desk review * Interviews with project team, UNDP and other partners | |  | |
|  | * To what extent is the Project aligned to the main objectives of the GEF focal area? | * Consistency with GEF strategic objectives | * Project documents * GEF focal areas strategies and documents | | * Desk review * GEF website * Interviews with project team and UNDP | |  | |
| Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? | | | | | | | |
|  | * Has the project been effective in achieving its expected outcomes? | * See indicators in project document results framework | * Project document * Project team and stakeholder * Data reported in project annual and quarterly reports | | * Desk review * Interviews with project team and relevant stakeholders | | |
|  | * What lessons have been learned from the project regarding achievement of outcomes? |  | Data collected throughout evaluation | | * Desk review | | |
| Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards? | | | | | | | |
|  | * Were the accounting and financial system in place adequate for project management and producing accurate and timely financial information? * Was the Project efficient with respect to incremental cost criteria? * Were progress reports produced accurately, timely and responded to reporting requirements including adaptive management changes? * Was project implementation as cost effective as originally proposed (planned vs. actual)? * Was procurement carried out in a manner making efficient use of project resources? | * Availability and quality of financial and progress reports * Timeliness and adequacy of reporting provided * Level of discrepancy between planned and utilized financial expenditures * Planned vs. actual funds leveraged * Quality of results-based management reporting (progress reporting, monitoring and evaluation) | * Project documents and evaluations * UNDP * Project team | | * Document analysis * Key interview | | |
|  | * To what extent partnerships/linkages between institutions/organizations were encouraged and supported? * What was the level of efficiency of cooperation and collaboration arrangements? | * Specific activities conducted to support the development of cooperative arrangements between partners * Examples of supported partnerships * Evidence that particular partnership/linkages will be sustained * Types/quality of partnership cooperation methods utilized | * Project documents and evaluations * Project partners and relevant stakeholders | | * Document analysis * Interviews | | |
| Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? | | | | | | | |
|  | * How does the project support resource mobilization for the RIO Conventions implementation? | * Amount of national budget allocation | * Legal regulation | | | * Document analysis | |
|  | * How does the project support personnel allocation for the RIO Conventions implementation? | * Personnel allocation | Legal regulation | | | * Document analysis | |
|  | * To what extent is biodiversity conservation, land degradation, and environment and climate change related issues consideration mainstreamed into land use planning? | * Government agencies aware of and committed to Rio Conventions related areas * Legislation, planning documents show evidence of mainstreaming | * Legal regulation * Project documents/reports | | | * Document analysis * Interview with stakeholders | |
|  | * Are there any political risks that may threaten the sustainability of the project outcomes? | * Government agencies aware of and committed to Rio conventions | * Government policies | | | * Analysis | |
| **Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?** | | | | | | | |
|  | * Has the project strengthened local capacity in the RIO conventions implementation? | * Awareness and understanding of the Rio conventions at the provincial level | * Interviews * Provincial level plans/strategies | * Interviews * Document analysis | | | |
|  | * Has the project develop tools to support mainstreaming process? | * Evidence of development of different tools to support mainstreaming processes | * Interviews * Provincial level plans/strategies | * Interview * Document analysis | | | |
|  | * Has the project supported mainstreaming of global environmental concerns in to planning processes? | * Evidence of incorporation of biodiversity, climate change and land degradation in to planning processes | * Interviews * Provincial level plans/strategies | * Interview * Document analysis | | | |

Annex D: Rating Scales

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, IA&EA 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[[4]](#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[[5]](#footnote-6) (maximum 40 pages excluding annexes)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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) |
| **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) |
| **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

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-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](http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/M2_ROtI%252520Handbook.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. 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. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-6)