

# Reduction of Methane Emissions and Utilization of Municipal Waste for Energy in Amman (13180)

## Terms of Reference for Final Evaluation

|                    |  |
|--------------------|--|
| <b>Title:</b>      | Consultants for independent evaluation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• International consultant</li><li>• National consultant</li></ul> |
| <b>Duration</b>    | August – September 2007  |
| <b>Application</b> | 17 June 2007   |
| <b>Deadline</b>    |  |

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

|       |   |    |
|-------|---|----|
| I.    | INTRODUCTION .....  | 1  |
| II.   | OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION .....  | 2  |
| III.  | PRODUCTS EXPECTED FROM THE EVALUATION .....   | 4  |
| IV.   | EVALUATION APPROACH .....   | 5  |
| V.    | EVALUATION TEAM .....   | 5  |
| VI.   | IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS .....   | 6  |
| VII.  | SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION- SPECIFIC ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED .....                            | 7  |
| VIII. | APPLICATION PROCESS .....   | 10 |
| IX.   | ANNEXES .....   | 11 |
|       | Annex 1: Stakeholders Responsibilities within the Project .....                           | 12 |
|       | Annex 2: Minimum List of Documents to be Reviewed by the Evaluators.....                  | 14 |
|       | Annex 3: TOR International / Regional Consultant.....                                     | 15 |
|       | Annex 4: TOR National Consultant.....   | 16 |
|       | Annex 5: Explanation on Terminology Provided in the GEF Guidelines to Final Evaluations.. | 17 |
|       | Annex 6: Financial Planning Cofinancing .....   | 20 |
|       | Annex 7: Ethical Code of Conduct for UNDP Evaluations .....                               | 21 |
|       | Annex 8: Reviewing the Evaluation Report.....   | 22 |
|       | Annex 9: The Evaluation Policy of UNDP .....  | 27 |

### I. INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP-GEF M&E policies and procedures, all regular and medium-sized projects supported by the GEF should undergo a final evaluation upon completion of implementation

#### *UNDP/GEF Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) policy*

The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) policy at the project level in UNDP/GEF has four objectives: i) to monitor and evaluate results and impacts; ii) to provide a basis for decision making on necessary amendments and improvements; iii) to promote accountability for resource use; and iii) to document, provide feedback on, and disseminate lessons learned. A mix of tools is used to ensure effective project M&E. These may be applied continuously throughout the lifetime of the project – e.g. periodic monitoring of indicators, or as specific time-bound exercises such as mid-term reviews, audit reports and final evaluations.

In accordance with UNDP/GEF M&E policies and procedures, all regular and medium-sized projects supported by the GEF should undergo a final evaluation upon completion of implementation. Final evaluations are intended to assess the relevance, performance and success of the project. It looks at

early signs of potential impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental goals. It will also identify/document lessons learned and make recommendations that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP/GEF projects.

*The project objectives and its context within the program country*

The goal of the project is to reduce emissions of greenhouse gases in Jordan by substituting bio-energy produced from anaerobic digestion of industrial and municipal waste in Amman, for fossil fuels. Additional greenhouse gas reduction will be achieved by reducing the uncontrolled release of methane from improperly disposed organic waste and organic fertilizer will be produced. The project's main activities include a combination of a landfill operation and a biogas plant.

The main objective of the capacity building program is to meet the long term objectives of the project which are reduction of GHG to the atmosphere from the accumulation of municipal solid wastes and to convert organic waste as a renewable energy source and to get benefit from other by-products such as composting and recycling. The project outcomes include the following:

- Successful commissioning and continuing operation of the first pilot plant in Jordan.
- An improved basis for an enabling environment, which lends itself to institutional security for the demo biogas plant and to national planning for bioenergy in Jordan and enhanced capacity of the Jordanian people to manage and convert municipal waste to energy in a sustainable manner.

This project is in line with MYFF goal no. 3: energy and environment for sustainable development, service line: 3.3: access to sustainable energy services, core result: Low emissions energy technologies including renewable energy, energy efficiency and/or advanced fossil fuel technologies introduced. Moreover, the project contributes to Jordan's achievement of MDG goal 7: ensure environmental sustainability target 9: Integrate the principles of sustainable development into country policies and programs and reverse the loss of environmental resources.

The project is in line with Jordan Country Program Outcome to reduce methane emissions, and to develop and support a number of pilot and demonstration efforts related to the conventions (desertification, bio-diversity, and climate change). As such, this project contributes to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, where it has a direct impact through the reduction of methane gas emissions, a potent greenhouse gas, and through development of alternative sources to conventional fossil fuel to meet part of energy demand in the country. This project is also in line with the Jordan Common Country Assessment, which recommends maximizing the efficiency of energy use and the use of renewable energy.

## **II. OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION**

This Final Evaluation is initiated by UNDP as the GEF Implementing Agency in agreement with the GEF RCU, in response to UNDP and GEF monitoring and evaluation policy. The evaluation will try to:

- Assess achievements, results and impacts towards the project's objectives and outputs,
- Identify strengths and weaknesses in implementation,
- Identify and distil lessons learned, and
- Provide recommendations on performance and delivery for future projects in the country.

The particular objectives and focus of this evaluation are specified below. The evaluators must note that, according to the march 2005 revised modifications of the GEF M&E guidance (see annex 1), priority emphasis must be put on the first three elements, i.e assessment of the project achievement, sustainability of the project and strength of the project's M&E system.

## **Focus and objectives of the evaluation:**

(R) Evaluate project achievements at the impact level. Annex 1 details the GEF M&E process that should be followed. Monitoring reports of bio-physical indicators, annual progress reports against the indicators of the project, mid term evaluation and other assessments should be looked at for reference. In terms of outcome, The evaluation will have to analyze to what extent the ‘expected situation at the end of the project’ has been reached.

(R) Review the progress made by the project toward achieving its sustainability in terms of the extent to which the benefits of the project will continue, within or outside the project domain, after it has come to an end. Relevant factors include for example: development of a sustainability strategy, establishment of financial and economic instruments and mechanisms, mainstreaming project objectives into the economy or community production activities. Assess the replicability of the project using the same management approach and mechanisms in other areas in the country or region.

(R) Review the Monitoring & Evaluation procedures put in place by the project, in particular examine the selection of indicators, the mechanisms of review and monitoring, and the adaptive management approach that the project would have followed to respond to changes in the context and responses (see also annex 1).

(R) Review the implementation approach, in particular focusing on:  
execution arrangements;

- **institutional arrangements;**
- **coordination arrangements** among the various components (in particular as they provide for sharing and networking, and joint reflection to address common problems);
- **Efficiency of the technical backstopping** of the contractors and partners (i.e. the quality of inputs and performance of the project subcontractors at the national and site levels).

Review the financial management of the project; assess the cost-effectiveness of the activities undertaken and cost-sharing arrangements mobilized by the project. Include an assessment of:

- (i) The actual project cost by objectives at the national level
- (ii) The cost-effectiveness of achievements
- (iii) Financial management (including disbursement issues)
- (iv) Co-financing<sup>1</sup>. Present co-financing figures including both what was planned at the beginning of the project and the actual amount that actually materialized.

(R) Assess the degree of participation of the various stakeholders, including scientific, technical, and non-governmental organizations, and involvement of the general public and public groups in the implementation of the project (see also annex 1). Assess the relevance of the project to the national development priorities and the needs of the direct project stakeholders.

Present and analyze main findings and key lessons, including examples of best practices for future projects in the region or countries. Key lessons should adequately be supported by evidence.

Identify gaps and practical remedial actions directed to the government and entities responsible for the sustainability of the changes achieved by the project.

---

• <sup>1</sup> Please see guidelines at the end of these TORs for reporting of co-financing (*Annex 2*)

Respond to comments received from interested parties and integrate them into the final report as necessary. Include, in an annex, an explanation of any differences or disagreements between the findings of the evaluation team, the IA/EA or the GEF recipient country

The main stakeholders of the evaluation include but are not limited to the following:

- Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation
- Ministry of Energy and Mineral Resources
- Ministry of Environment
- Jordan Biogas Company
- Greater Amman Municipality
- Jordan Electric Power Company (JEPCO)
- National Energy Research Center
- Jordan University for Science and Technology
- Jordan Environment Society

In addition, it is expected that this evaluation will serve to further build capacity in the region for GEF M&E techniques and processes. The international team will be required to devote attention to 'coaching' the national consultant, working with them to define the tools of evaluation and, at the end, evaluating the performance of the national consultants.

**Annex 1** presents the role of the stakeholders during the project implementation.

### III. PRODUCTS EXPECTED FROM THE EVALUATION

As a result of the evaluation exercise the following deliverables should be developed:

- **Inception report**, the inception report will include a review of relevant background material, identification of key stakeholders, and detailed description of the proposed evaluation methodology.
- **Evaluation report**, The **draft** report should be submitted, in electronic form in MS Word Format, to UNDP Jordan Resident Representative within two weeks of completion of the in-country part of the mission. The initial draft report will be circulated to 1) the UNDP/GEF Regional Coordination Unit. Then, upon the UNDP Jordan and UNDP/GEF Regional Coordinator clearance, to 2) the executing agency and the Government coordinating agency, for review and comments. Except for comments correcting factual information, the comments relating to the interpretation and opinion of facts will be inserted as a separate annex to the report. The evaluators will prepare **final** evaluation report in English, fulfilling the evaluation requirements set out in these TORs. The final report is to be cleared and accepted by UNDP before final payment. The final report (including executive summary, but excluding annexes) should not exceed 50 pages.
- **An executive summary of findings**, both in English and in Arabic.
- **A power-point presentation** of the findings of the evaluation: Depending upon the complexity of the evaluation findings, UNDP Jordan could consider organizing a stakeholders meeting at which to make a presentation to the partners and stakeholders. The evaluators should present and analyze main findings and key lessons, including examples of best practices for future projects in the country, region and GEF (technical, political, managerial, etc.). Stakeholders will be invited to comment on the factual accuracy of these findings and provide counter-evidence if necessary. Stakeholders will not comment on the conclusions drawn by the evaluation team from their findings.

Below is a suggested structure for the evaluation report:

1. Executive summary (5 pages)
2. Introduction (4 pages)

3. The project(s) and its development context (5 pages)
4. Findings and Conclusions (30 pages)
  - 4.1. Project Formulation
  - 4.2. Project Implementation
  - 4.3. Results
5. Conclusions and Recommendations (3 pages)
6. Lessons learned (3 pages)
7. Annexes

Details pertaining to each of the above chapters are given in **Section VII** below.

Although the final report must be cleared and accepted by UNDP before being made public, the UNDP Evaluation Policy is clear the evaluation function should be structurally independent from operational management and decision-making functions in the organization. The evaluation team will be free from undue influence and has full authority to submit report directly to appropriate levels of decision-making. UNDP management will not impose restrictions on the scope, content, comments and recommendations of evaluation reports. In the case of unresolved difference of opinions between any of the parties, UNDP may request the evaluation team to set out the differences in an annex to the final report.

#### **IV. EVALUATION APPROACH**

The evaluation team will be responsible to develop a more elaborate evaluation methodology to be described in an “Inception Report”, with the different proposed evaluation techniques including, but not limited to, field visits, interviews, meetings and other techniques, like questionnaire surveys, focus groups, workshops, etc. Any changes should be in-line with international criteria and professional norms and standards, and must be cleared by UNDP before being applied by the evaluation team. The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful, and must be easily understood by project partners. The evaluation should provide as much gender disaggregated data as possible. The “Inception Report” should be cleared by the UNDP Jordan CO. The evaluation should be carried out using, but not limited to, the following:

- **Documentation review (desk study)**; an important requirement is that much of the information on project reporting, results and processes will be available for the evaluation team. The list of minimum documentation to be reviewed is included in **Annex 2**. All of these documents are available from Jordan Biogas Company, National Energy Research Center, and / or UNDP. This information will be presented to the evaluation team upon commencement of the evaluation.
- **Meetings and interviews** with all the involved partners in the project. The evaluation consultants should at least interview the stakeholder organizations identified in **Annex 1**. During these meetings, the evaluators will be able to use the assessment technique such as questionnaires, focus group discussion, checklists, etc ... The team should develop a process for semi-structured interviews with the different interviewees to ensure that the different aspects are covered. Focus group discussions with project beneficiaries will be held as deemed necessary by the evaluation team
- **Field visits** should be made to Jordan Biogas Plant.
- **Participatory techniques** and other approaches for the gathering and analysis of data.

#### **V. EVALUATION TEAM**

- The final evaluation should be conducted by a team of independent consultants (one international consultant and / Team leader, and one national consultant). These consultants should not have participated substantively during project preparation and/or implementation and

should have no conflict of interest with any proposed follow-up phases. The team should be comprised of professionals with a wide range of skills – strong analytical and evaluation experience, expertise in technical aspects of the project, global environmental issues, and experience with economic and social development issues. Consultants should have an updated knowledge of GEF policies and strategies. Below are the sought team qualities:

- Recent knowledge of result-based management evaluation methodologies
  - Recent knowledge of participatory monitoring approaches
  - Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios
  - Recent knowledge of the GEF monitoring and evaluation policy
  - Experience applying UNDP's results-based evaluation policies and procedures
  - Demonstrable analytical skills
  - At least one team member able to speak Arabic fluently
  - Both team members with excellent English communication skills
- The evaluation will be undertaken in-line with GEF principles: Independence, Impartiality, Transparency, Disclosure, Ethical, Partnership, Competencies and Capacities, Credibility, and Utility
  - The evaluators must be independent from both the policy-making process and the delivery and management of assistance. Therefore applications will not be considered from evaluators who have had any direct involvement with the design or implementation of the project. Any previous association with the project, Jordan Biogas Company, University of Jordan, Jordan University for Science and Technology, Jordan Environment Society, National Electricity Production Company, the Ministry of Energy and Mineral Resources, UNDP-Jordan or other partners/stakeholders must be disclosed in the application. This applies equally to firms submitting proposals as it does to individual evaluators.
  - If selected, failure to make the above disclosures will be considered just grounds for immediate contract termination, without recompense. In such circumstances, all notes, reports and other documentation produced by the evaluator will be retained by UNDP.
  - If individual evaluators are selected, UNDP will appoint one Team Leader. The Team Leader will have overall responsibility for the delivery of the evaluation products and is responsible for finalizing the report. Team roles and responsibilities will be reflected in the individual contracts. If a proposal is accepted from a consulting firm, the firm will be held responsible for the delivery of the evaluation products and therefore has responsibility for team management arrangements.
  - The specific role and responsibilities of each consultant, their specific roles and responsibilities within the team, and the required profiles (technical knowledge and experience) are defined in the consultant TORs (**Annex 4** and **Annex 5**).
  - Both consultants will be recruited by UNDP Jordan, in consultation with UNDP-GEF Regional Coordination Unit.
  - Both consultants should have the ability to train and coach and the capacity to transfer knowledge and skills.
  - The Team leader will have overall responsibility and accountability for the organization of the mission and for the production of the output. He/she will report technically and administratively to the UNDP Jordan office, and agree on the timetable and outputs.

## **VI. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS**

## Management Arrangements:

UNDP-Jordan is the main operational point for the evaluation. It will be responsible for liaising with the project team to set up the stakeholder interviews, arrange the field visits, hire national consultants and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team. These Terms of Reference follow the UNDP GEF policies and procedures, and together with the final agenda will be agreed upon by the UNDP/GEF/Regional Coordinating Unit, UNDP Country Office and the Government. These three parties will receive a draft of the final evaluation report and provide comments on it prior to its completion.

## Timeframe:

The timeframe of the evaluation will be from August 2007 to September 2007, with the draft report being available for comment 2 weeks after the completion of the mission. A suggested schedule of activities is set out below:

- **One** working week preparation before field work: to review documents, obtain necessary non-project background or supporting documents, prepare detailed evaluation methodology, prepare learning sessions, surveys etc, develop hypotheses about the project strategies and management and consider methods for testing hypotheses.
- **Two** working weeks field work in Jordan: evaluators are expected to work 6-day weeks when on mission. With the evaluation's emphasis on the project's adaptive management framework, the team is expected to work closely with the project team. The in-country period will include learning sessions with the project team and other adaptive management strengthening measures.
- **Two** weeks after the mission to prepare the first draft of the evaluation report.
- **Two** weeks for comments on the draft report: The draft Evaluation report should be submitted to the Resident Representative of UNDP Jordan. UNDP Jordan should analyze, provide comments and share it with different stakeholders.
- **One** week to integrate the comments and finalize the evaluation report: The evaluation team will incorporate the comments into the final version within one week of receiving the comments. The evaluation team is responsible for ensuring matters of fact are revised in the report, but matters of opinion may be reflected at their discretion. Although the final report must be cleared and accepted by UNDP before being made public, the UNDP Evaluation Policy is clear the evaluation function should be structurally independent from operational management and decision making functions in the organization. The evaluation team will be free from undue influence and has full authority to submit reports directly to appropriate levels of decision-making. UNDP management will not impose restrictions on the scope, content, comments and recommendations of evaluation reports. In the case of unresolved difference of opinions between any of the parties, UNDP may request the evaluation team to set out the differences in an annex to the final report.

## VII. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION- SPECIFIC ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED

This section describes the categories that the evaluation will look into in line with the evaluation report outline included in section III. It also highlights specific issues to be addressed under each broad category. These categories are the minimum required by UNDP and GEF. **Annex 5** provides more detailed guidance on terminology and the GEF Project review Criteria. Please note that some of the categories in the findings and conclusions need to be rated in conformity with the GEF guidelines for final evaluations.

### 1. Executive summary

- Brief description of project
- Context and purpose of the evaluation

- Main conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned

## 2. Introduction

- Purpose of the evaluation
- Key issues addressed
- Methodology of the evaluation
- Structure of the evaluation

## 3. The project and its development context

- Project start and its duration
- Problems that the project seek to address
- Immediate and development objectives of the project
- Main stakeholders
- Results expected

## 4. Findings and Conclusions

In addition to a descriptive assessment, all **criteria marked with (R) should be rated** using the following divisions: Highly Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Marginally Satisfactory, and Unsatisfactory. Evaluators may raise other issues that they identify.

### 4.1. Project Formulation

- Conceptualization/Design (R). This should assess the approach used in design and an appreciation of the appropriateness of problem conceptualization and whether the selected intervention strategy addressed the root causes and principal threats in the project area. It should also include an assessment of the logical framework and whether the different project components and activities proposed to achieve the objective were appropriate, viable and responded to contextual institutional, legal and regulatory settings of the project. It should also assess the indicators defined for guiding implementation and measurement of achievement and whether lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) were incorporated into project design.
- Country-ownership/ Drivenness. Assess the extent to which the project idea/conceptualization had its origin within national, sectoral and development plans and focuses on national environment and development interests.
- Stakeholder participation (R) Assess information dissemination, consultation, and “stakeholder” participation in design stages.
- Replication approach. Determine the ways in which lessons and experiences coming out of the project were/are to be replicated or scaled up in the design and implementation of other projects (this also relates to actual practices undertaken during implementation).
- Other aspects to assess in the review of Project formulation approaches would be UNDP comparative advantage as IA for this project; the consideration of linkages between projects and other interventions within the sector and the definition of clear and appropriate management arrangements at the design stage.

### 4.2. Project Implementation

- Implementation Approach (R). This should include assessments of the following aspects:
  - (i) The use of the logical framework as a management tool during implementation and any changes made to this as a response to changing conditions and/or feedback from M and E activities if required.



- (ii) Other elements that indicate adaptive management such as comprehensive and realistic work plans routinely developed that reflect adaptive management and/or; changes in management arrangements to enhance implementation.
  - (iii) The project's use/establishment of electronic information technologies to support implementation, participation and monitoring, as well as other project activities.
  - (iv) The general operational relationships between the institutions involved and others and how these relationships have contributed to effective implementation and achievement of project objectives.
  - (v) Technical capacities associated with the project and their role in project development, management and achievements.
- Monitoring and evaluation (R). Including an assessment as to whether there has been adequate periodic oversight of activities during implementation to establish the extent to which inputs, work schedules, other required actions and outputs are proceeding according to plan; whether formal evaluations have been held and whether action has been taken on the results of this monitoring oversight and evaluation reports.
  - Stakeholder participation (R). This should include assessments of the mechanisms for information dissemination in project implementation and the extent of stakeholder participation in management, emphasizing the following:
    - (i) The production and dissemination of information generated by the project.
    - (ii) Local resource users and NGOs participation in project implementation and decision making and an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the approach adopted by the project in this arena.
    - (iii) The establishment of partnerships and collaborative relationships developed by the project with local, national and international entities and the effects they have had on project implementation.
    - (iv) Involvement of governmental institutions in project implementation, the extent of governmental support of the project.
  - Financial Planning: Including an assessment of:
    - (i) The actual project cost by objectives, outputs, activities
    - (ii) The cost-effectiveness of achievements
    - (iii) Financial management (including disbursement issues)
    - (iv) Co-financing (see **Annex 6** for reporting of co-financing)
  - Sustainability. Extent to which the benefits of the project will continue, within or outside the project domain, after it has come to an end. Relevant factors include for example: development of a sustainability strategy, establishment of financial and economic instruments and mechanisms, mainstreaming project objectives into the economy or community production activities.

- Execution and implementation modalities. This should consider the effectiveness of the UNDP counterpart and Project Co-ordination Unit participation in selection, recruitment, assignment of experts, consultants and national counterpart staff members and in the definition of tasks and responsibilities; quantity, quality and timeliness of inputs for the project with respect to execution responsibilities, enactment of necessary legislation and budgetary provisions and extent to which these may have affected implementation and sustainability of the Project; quality and timeliness of inputs by UNDP and other parties responsible for providing inputs to the project, and the extent to which this may have affected the smooth implementation of the project.

#### **4.3. Results**

- Attainment of Outcomes/ Achievement of objectives (R): Including a description *and rating* of the extent to which the project's objectives (environmental and developmental) were achieved using Highly Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Marginally Satisfactory, and Unsatisfactory ratings. If the project did not establish a baseline (initial conditions), the evaluators should seek to determine it through the use of special methodologies so that achievements, results and impacts can be properly established.

This section should also include reviews of the following:

- Sustainability: Including an appreciation of the extent to which benefits continue, within or outside the project domain after GEF assistance/external assistance in this phase has come to an end.
- Contribution to upgrading skills of the national staff

#### **5. Recommendations**

- 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

#### **6. Lessons learned**

This should highlight the best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success.

#### **7. Evaluation report Annexes**

- Evaluation TORs
- Itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- Summary of field visits
- List of documents reviewed
- Questionnaire used and summary of results
- Comments by stakeholders (only in case of discrepancies with evaluation findings and conclusions)

### **VIII. APPLICATION PROCESS**

Applicants are requested to send in electronic versions:

1. Current and complete C.V. in English with indication of the e-mail and phone contact.
2. Company profile in case of Firms.
3. An expression of interest
4. Technical Offer: A proposed methodology (no more than 10 pages outlining the approach and methodology they will apply to achieve the assignment).

5. Financial Offer: Price offer indicating the itemized costs (daily fee and estimated travel costs in country and to country/for international) and the total cost of the assignment.

*The total cost of the final evaluation should be estimated as per the following budget lines:*

|  | <i>Price<br/>per Unit</i> | <i>No. of<br/>Units</i> | <i>Total</i> |
|--|---------------------------|-------------------------|--------------|
| <b><i>For the international consultant</i></b>               |                           |                         |              |
| Fee per day  |                           |                         |              |
| Travel Expenses (on round trip, per diem and Terminal fees)  |                           |                         |              |
| <b><i>For the national consultant</i></b>                    |                           |                         |              |
| Fee per day  |                           |                         |              |
| Travel Expenses (local transport for the team)               |                           |                         |              |
| Misc. (office space, internet connections, printing, etc...) |                           |                         |              |

to:

Ms. Helena Naber  
Environment Analyst

UNDP Jordan  
Obadah Ibn Al Samet Street  
Shmeisani

Tel.: +962 6 566 8171 ext. 212

Fax: +962 6 5676 582

[helena.naber@undp.org](mailto:helena.naber@undp.org)

Kindly note that the size of individual email should not exceed 5Mb.

Dateline for applications is **17 June 2007**.

Due to the large number of applicants, UNDP regrets that it is unable to inform unsuccessful candidates about the outcome or status of the recruitment process.

UNDP is an equal opportunity employer and all qualified candidates are encouraged to apply.

## **IX. ANNEXES**

- Annex 1: Stakeholders Responsibilities
- Annex 2: List of Documents to be Reviewed by the Evaluators
- Annex 3: TOR International / Regional Consultant
- Annex 4: TOR National Consultant
- Annex 5: Terminology in the GEF Guidelines to Final Evaluations
- Annex 6: Financial Planning Co-financing
- Annex 7: Ethical Code of Conduct for UNDP Evaluations
- Annex 8: Reviewing the Evaluation Report
- Annex 9: The Evaluation Policy of UNDP

## **Annex 1: Stakeholders Responsibilities within the Project**

The responsibility for the implementation of the activities of this project was allocated to the following parties:

- The Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation (MOPIC)
- The Ministry of Energy and Mineral Resources (MEMR)
- Jordan University for Science and Technology
- Greater Amman Municipality (GAM)
- National Electric Power Company (NEPCO)
- Jordan Biogas Company (JBC)
- Jordan Environment Society (JES)

**Special Consultative Committee (SCC):** A Special Consultative Committee (SCC) was established under this project, chaired by Ministry of Energy and Mineral Resources. The SCC's main responsibility was to assist with the information exchange, coordination and training aspects and to disseminate information regarding this project inside and outside Jordan. Below is a list of members of Special Consultative Committee (SCC) and their areas of responsibility:

- **Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation (MOPIC):** Overall planning in Jordan
- **Ministry of Energy and Mineral Resources (MEMR):** Planning and coordination of new and renewable resources
- **National Energy Research Center:** responsible for training and outreach and development of the waste to energy master plan.
- **Greater Amman Municipality (GAM):** Waste collection and management in Amman
- **Ministry of Environment (MOE):** Protecting the environment
- **Jordan Environment Society (JES):** Enhancing awareness of environmental issues
- **UNDP** also, participated in all SCC meetings.

**National Electric Power Company (NEPCO):** together with the Greater Amman Municipality, were responsible for the construction and operation of the biogas plant. These two institutions formed a joint venture called 'Jordan Biogas Company (JBC)' in order to make this project possible.

**Jordan Biogas Company (JBC),** which is a joint venture between the NEPCO and the GAM, is the institution responsible for the actual construction and day to day operation of the combined biogas and landfill plant.

**Greater Amman Municipality (GAM),** together with the Jordan Electricity Authority (NEPCO), is responsible for the construction and operation of this new form of bioenergy plant for the Middle East. These two institutions have formed a joint venture called 'Jordanian Biogas Company (JBC)' in order to make this project possible. The project Strategy and implementation arrangements will be in coordination with the Ministry of Environment (MOE).

**The Jordanian Environment Society (JES):** The responsibilities of JES focus primarily upon public awareness and dissemination of information concerning environmental preservation. JES will undertake this through its publications and advertisements and the seminars it regularly organizes, and these activities are to be implemented in a concerted plan of action for community outreach.

**The Ministry of Energy and Mineral Resources (MEMR):** The energy sector in Jordan is supervised by the MEMR, which is responsible for carrying out planning, policy formulation, energy conservation, renewable energy development and for the import of crude oil and petroleum products. The MEMR's main responsibility, together with GAM and NEPCO, is the construction and operation of biogas plant, and cooperation with the various governmental bodies involved.

**National Energy Research Center (NERC):** the NERC was responsible for the implementation of the training and outreach programme and developed the biogas master plan.

**Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation (MOPIC):** is responsible for coordinating grant funds in Jordan and is the executing agency for the project.

**Jordan University of Science and Technology (JUST):** was responsible under its contract for integrating concepts of waste to energy and use of biogas for energy generation into their curricula.

**Administrative Director (AD):** The overall implementation of the project will be overseen by an Administrative Director, who will be appointed by the Government in consultation with UNDP.

## **Annex 2: Minimum List of Documents to be Reviewed by the Evaluators**

The list below is the minimum list of documents that the evaluation team should review during the desktop review phase:

- Project Document;
- Project Inception Report;
- Quarterly Progress Reports (QPRs);
- Project audit reports;
- Project combined delivery reports (CDRs);
- Annual Project Report (APR) (1998-2005);
- Project Implementation Review reports (PIRs) (1998-2006);
- Mid-Term Evaluation Report (2002);
- Independent Consultant Report (2004).

### **Annex 3: TOR International / Regional Consultant**

#### Tasks:

- Lead and manage the evaluation mission;
- Design the detailed evaluation scope and methodology (including the methods for data collection and analysis);
- Decide the division of labor within the evaluation team;
- Conduct an analysis of the outcome, outputs and partnership strategy (as per the scope of the evaluation described above);
- Draft related parts of the evaluation report; and
- Finalize the whole evaluation report.

#### Eligibility and Qualifications:

- Solid experience in evaluating internationally funded climate change projects.
- Recent knowledge of result-based management evaluation methodologies
- Recent knowledge of participatory monitoring approaches
- Recent knowledge of the GEF monitoring and evaluation policy, as well as GEF policies and strategies
- Experience applying UNDP's results-based evaluation policies and procedures
- Demonstrable analytical skills
- Experience with multilateral or bilateral supported climate change projects
- Excellent English Communication Skills (oral, aural, written and presentation).
- His/Her focus will primarily be on assessing institutional arrangements and management of projects and governance, as well as policy impacts on stakeholders and institutionalization of the project at the national and local levels.
- He/she will also be responsible for overseeing the preparation and implementation of the evaluation, under the leadership of the UNDP Programme Unit.

#### **Annex 4: TOR National Consultant**

The objectives to recruit a national consultant are:

- 1) Build capacity in the region and identify national evaluators that can be groomed to become international evaluators that would be skilled in GEF M&E techniques;
- 2) Provide the national “reality check” thought the evolution process; and
- 3) Fully contribute to the analysis and preparation of the reports.

Tasks and responsibilities:

The National Consultant will provide input in reviewing all project documentation and will provide the Team Leader with a compilation of information prior to the evaluation mission, including:

- Review documents;
- Prepare a list of the outputs achieved under project;
- Organize the mission programme and provide translation/interpretation when necessary;
- Participate in the design of the evaluation methodology;
- Conduct an analysis of the outcome, outputs and partnership strategy (as per the scope of the evaluation described above);
- Draft related parts of the evaluation report;
- Assist Team Leader in finalizing document through incorporating suggestions received on draft related to his/her assigned sections.

Required qualifications:

- An advanced university degree (MSc or higher) in the field of environment management, energy, or similar field.
- Should have an experience in climate change related issues.
- Experience with GEF and UNDP projects is an advantage.
- Excellent English and Arabic language skills



## **Annex 5: Explanation on Terminology Provided in the GEF Guidelines to Final Evaluations**

**Implementation Approach** includes an analysis of the project's logical framework, adaptation to changing conditions (adaptive management), partnerships in implementation arrangements, changes in project design, and overall project management.

Some elements of an effective implementation approach may include:

- The logical framework used during implementation as a management and M&E tool
- Effective partnerships arrangements established for implementation of the project with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region
- Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project implementation
- Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management.

**Country Ownership/Driveness** is the relevance of the project to national development and environmental agendas, recipient country commitment, and regional and international agreements where applicable. Project Concept has its origin within the national sectoral and development plans

Some elements of effective country ownership/driveness may include:

- Project Concept has its origin within the national sectoral and development plans
- Outcomes (or potential outcomes) from the project have been incorporated into the national sectoral and development plans
- Relevant country representatives (e.g., governmental official, civil society, etc.) are actively involved in project identification, planning and/or implementation
- The recipient government has maintained financial commitment to the project
- The government has approved policies and/or modified regulatory frameworks in line with the project's objectives

For projects whose main focus and actors are in the private-sector rather than public-sector (e.g., IFC projects), elements of effective country ownership/driveness that demonstrate the interest and commitment of the local private sector to the project may include:

- The number of companies that participated in the project by: receiving technical assistance, applying for financing, attending dissemination events, adopting environmental standards promoted by the project, etc.
- Amount contributed by participating companies to achieve the environmental benefits promoted by the project, including: equity invested, guarantees provided, co-funding of project activities, in-kind contributions, etc.
- Project's collaboration with industry associations

**Stakeholder Participation/Public Involvement** consist of three related, and often overlapping processes: information dissemination, consultation, and "stakeholder" participation. Stakeholders are the individuals, groups, institutions, or other bodies that have an interest or stake in the outcome of the GEF-financed project. The term also applies to those potentially adversely affected by a project.

Examples of effective public involvement include:

### Information dissemination

- Implementation of appropriate outreach/public awareness campaigns

### Consultation and stakeholder participation

- Consulting and making use of the skills, experiences and knowledge of NGOs, community and local groups, the private and public sectors, and academic institutions in the design, implementation, and evaluation of project activities

### Stakeholder participation

- Project institutional networks well placed within the overall national or community organizational structures, for example, by building on the local decision making structures, incorporating local knowledge, and devolving project management responsibilities to the local organizations or communities as the project approaches closure
- Building partnerships among different project stakeholders
- Fulfillment of commitments to local stakeholders and stakeholders considered to be adequately involved.

**Sustainability** measures the extent to which benefits continue, within or outside the project domain, from a particular project or program after GEF assistance/external assistance has come to an end. Relevant factors to improve the sustainability of project outcomes include:

- Development and implementation of a sustainability strategy.
- Establishment of the financial and economic instruments and mechanisms to ensure the ongoing flow of benefits once the GEF assistance ends (from the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and market transformations to promote the project's objectives).
- Development of suitable organizational arrangements by public and/or private sector.
- Development of policy and regulatory frameworks that further the project objectives.
- Incorporation of environmental and ecological factors affecting future flow of benefits.
- Development of appropriate institutional capacity (systems, structures, staff, expertise, etc.) .
- Identification and involvement of champions (i.e. individuals in government and civil society who can promote sustainability of project outcomes).
- Achieving social sustainability, for example, by mainstreaming project activities into the economy or community production activities.
- Achieving stakeholders consensus regarding courses of action on project activities.

**Replication approach**, in the context of GEF projects, is defined as lessons and experiences coming out of the project that are replicated or scaled up in the design and implementation of other projects. Replication can have two aspects, replication proper (lessons and experiences are replicated in different geographic area) or scaling up (lessons and experiences are replicated within the same geographic area but funded by other sources). Examples of replication approaches include:

- Knowledge transfer (i.e., dissemination of lessons through project result documents, training workshops, information exchange, a national and regional forum, etc).
- Expansion of demonstration projects.
- Capacity building and training of individuals, and institutions to expand the project's achievements in the country or other regions.
- Use of project-trained individuals, institutions or companies to replicate the project's outcomes in other regions.

**Financial Planning** includes actual project cost by activity, financial management (including disbursement issues), and co-financing. If a financial audit has been conducted the major findings should be presented in the TE.

Effective financial plans include:

- Identification of potential sources of co-financing as well as leveraged and associated financing<sup>2</sup>.
- Strong financial controls, including reporting, and planning that allow the project management to make informed decisions regarding the budget at any time, allows for a proper and timely flow of funds, and for the payment of satisfactory project deliverables
- Due diligence due diligence in the management of funds and financial audits.

---

<sup>2</sup> Please refer to Council documents on co-financing for definitions, such as GEF/C.20/6. The following page presents a table to be used for reporting co-financing.

*Co financing includes:* Grants, Loans/Concessional (compared to market rate), Credits, Equity investments, In-kind support, Other contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector and beneficiaries. Please refer to Council documents on co-financing for definitions, such as GEF/C.20/6.

*Leveraged resources* are additional resources—beyond those committed to the project itself at the time of approval—that are mobilized later as a direct result of the project. Leveraged resources can be financial or in-kind and they may be from other donors, NGO's, foundations, governments, communities or the private sector. Please briefly describe the resources the project has leveraged since inception and indicate how these resources are contributing to the project's ultimate objective.

**Cost-effectiveness** assesses the achievement of the environmental and developmental objectives as well as the project's outputs in relation to the inputs, costs, and implementing time. It also examines the project's compliance with the application of the incremental cost concept. Cost-effective factors include:

- Compliance with the incremental cost criteria (e.g. GEF funds are used to finance a component of a project that would not have taken place without GEF funding.) and securing co-funding and associated funding.
- The project completed the planned activities and met or exceeded the expected outcomes in terms of achievement of Global Environmental and Development Objectives according to schedule, and as cost-effective as initially planned.
- The project used either a benchmark approach or a comparison approach (did not exceed the costs levels of similar projects in similar contexts)

**Monitoring & Evaluation.** Monitoring is the periodic oversight of a process, or the implementation of an activity, which seeks to establish the extent to which inputs, work schedules, other required actions and outputs are proceeding according to plan, so that timely action can be taken to correct the deficiencies detected. Evaluation is a process by which program inputs, activities and results are analyzed and judged explicitly against benchmarks or baseline conditions using performance indicators. This will allow project managers and planners to make decisions based on the evidence of information on the project implementation stage, performance indicators, level of funding still available, etc, building on the project's logical framework.

Monitoring and Evaluation includes activities to measure the project's achievements such as identification of performance indicators, measurement procedures, and determination of baseline conditions. Projects are required to implement plans for monitoring and evaluation with adequate funding and appropriate staff and include activities such as description of data sources and methods for data collection, collection of baseline data, and stakeholder participation. Given the long-term nature of many GEF projects, projects are also encouraged to include long-term monitoring plans that are sustainable after project completion.

## Annex 6: Financial Planning Cofinancing

| Co financing<br>(Type/Source)                  | IA own<br>Financing<br>(mill US\$) |        | Government<br>(mill US\$) |        | Other*<br>(mill US\$) |        | Total<br>(mill US\$) |        | Total<br>Disbursement<br>(mill US\$) |        |
|--|------------------------------------|--------|---------------------------|--------|-----------------------|--------|----------------------|--------|--------------------------------------|--------|
|  | Planned                            | Actual | Planned                   | Actual | Planned               | Actual | Planned              | Actual | Planned                              | Actual |
| - Grants                                       |                                    |        |                           |        |                       |        |                      |        |                                      |        |
| - Loans/Concessional (compared to market rate) |                                    |        |                           |        |                       |        |                      |        |                                      |        |
| - Credits                                      |                                    |        |                           |        |                       |        |                      |        |                                      |        |
| - Equity investments                           |                                    |        |                           |        |                       |        |                      |        |                                      |        |
| - In-kind support                              |                                    |        |                           |        |                       |        |                      |        |                                      |        |
| - Other (*)                                    |                                    |        |                           |        |                       |        |                      |        |                                      |        |
| Totals   |                                    |        |                           |        |                       |        |                      |        |                                      |        |

\* Other is referred to contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector and beneficiaries.

### Leveraged Resources

Leveraged resources are additional resources—beyond those committed to the project itself at the time of approval—that are mobilized later as a direct result of the project. Leveraged resources can be financial or in-kind and they may be from other donors, NGO's, foundations, governments, communities or the private sector. Please briefly describe the resources the project has leveraged since inception and indicate how these resources are contributing to the project's ultimate objective.

## **Annex 7: Ethical Code of Conduct for UNDP Evaluations**

Evaluations of UNDP-supported activities need to be independent, impartial and rigorous. Each evaluation should clearly contribute to learning and accountability. Hence evaluators must have personal and professional integrity and be guided by propriety in the conduct of their business.

### **Evaluators:**

Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded

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.

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.

Evaluations sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing. 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.

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.

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 limitations, findings and recommendations.

Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

## Annex 8: Reviewing the Evaluation Report

### Description of the report

The evaluation report is the key product of the evaluation process. Its purpose is to provide a transparent basis for accountability for results, for decision-making on policies and programmes, for learning, for drawing lessons and for improvement.

This note draws extensively from the [United Nations Evaluation Group Standards for Evaluation in the UN](#) complemented by guiding principles outlined above.

A good evaluation report must be guided by the criteria of utility, credibility, and relevance/appropriateness as defined below.

Utility: An evaluation report is useful when the report is:

- complete in providing information on the context for the evaluation to allow reader to decide on the value it will derive from the evaluation (i.e. evaluability assessment, stakeholder involvement, evaluator or institutional credibility, alignment of evaluators with national institutions, bases for interpretation, budget, timing, national involvement and alignment).
- the presentation of the evaluation process and findings are completed and well structured to provide ease in accessing information needed for decision-making, for assessing how justified conclusions are based on the linkages among the parts of the report.
- the recommendations are clear and actionable
- information is provided on expected plans for follow-through with the evaluation by key stakeholders

Credibility: An evaluation report is credible when there is professional rigor for objectivity, validity and reliability of the procedures and instruments used.

- evaluators are competent professionals and valid in the eyes of the users/stakeholders
- There is accuracy and validity (programme content and contextual factors, instruments, information coverage/sampling, external validity or linkage with other development findings)
- There is reliability or consistency in the information provided
- The bases for making judgements are transparent and based on negotiated agreements

Relevance, appropriateness and added-value: A report is relevant, appropriate and adds value when information provided addressed a need and is not duplicative, addresses priority or strategic information needs, and is appropriate given institutional goals and filters, and that the conduct is aligned with national systems or lenses.

- The purpose and incentives for use are clear
- there is alignment with national and government demands
- Harmonization and coherence within UN
- Organizational lens: human development, human rights
- Addresses organizational mandate
- Advances knowledge or priorities for development (equity, capacity, cooperation and others)

The primary responsibility for preparing the evaluation report rests with the leader of the evaluation team. Those who commission the evaluation and those who are actually evaluated can also contribute with their inputs. Particularly, they should be involved in reviewing the draft report to check if there are any relevant factual errors or omissions, and to highlight any interpretation of the findings that they consider as incorrect. The evaluators should accept

changes related to factual errors, but, in safeguarding the principle of independence, they should be free to draw their own conclusions from the findings.

To ensure compliance with the criteria noted, a quality assurance and enhancement system at country level needs to be established and made operational.

The following passage provides for each criterion, performance indicators which would provide the basis for assessing report quality in an objective and reliable manner.

## **Evaluation Report Quality Criteria**

### 1. Utility – Enhancing use and impact of information provided

#### **1.1 The title page and opening pages provide key basic contextual information**

- Title of the evaluation that includes a clear reference to the project / programme being evaluated
- Links to the evaluation plan (with information on strategic value, national involvement and alignment, timing, resources and financing)
- Links to UNDAF Outcomes and MYFF Goals
- Geographical coverage of the evaluation
- Name and organization of the evaluators and information in annex for assessment of competence and trustworthiness
- Name of the commissioning organization (e.g. UNDP country office X)
- Date when the evaluation report is completed
- Expected actions from the evaluation and dates for action
- Dates for stakeholder meetings and status of meetings
- Name of UNDP contact point for the evaluation (e.g. programme officer, evaluation specialist or focal point)

#### **1.2 For a joint evaluation or for the evaluation of a joint programme, the roles and contributions of the different UN organizations or other partners, are clearly described. The report should describe who is involved, their roles and their contributions to the subject being evaluated, including:**

- financial and in-kind contributions such as technical assistance, training and logistic support;
- participation and staff time;
- leadership advocacy and lobbying;

#### **1.3 For a country-led joint evaluation, the framework for the leadership, governance, conduct, use and capacity development are clearly described and norms and standards for the evaluation are delineated if necessary.**

1.4 The information in the report is complete, well structured and well presented. The report should provide information on

- the purpose of the evaluation;
- exactly what was evaluated;
- how the evaluation was designed and conducted;
- what evidence was used in the evaluation;
- what conclusions were drawn;
- what recommendations were made;
- what lessons were distilled.

**It should contain the following sections:**

- Title Page
- List of acronyms and abbreviations
- Table of contents, including list of annexes
- Executive Summary
- Introduction: background and context of the programme
- Description of the program – its logic theory, results framework and external factors likely to affect success
- Purpose of the evaluation
- Key questions and scope of the evaluation with information on limitations and de-limitations
- Approach and methodology
- Findings
- Summary and explanation of findings and interpretations
- Conclusions
- Recommendations
- Lessons,, generalizations, alternatives
- Annexes

1.5 The report should be clear and easy to read with complementary graphics to enhance understanding

- The report should apply a plain, non-specialist language (see [EO Publication Guide](#)).
- Graphics, tables and illustrations should be used, when applicable, to enhance the presentation of information.
- The report should not exceed 50 pages, excluding annexes.
- In the case of an outcome evaluation, the related projects should be listed in the annex, including timelines, implementation arrangements and budgets.

**1.6 The executive summary of the report should be brief (maximum 2 pages) and contains key information needed by decision-makers. It should contain:**

- Brief description of the programme,
- Evaluation purpose, questions and scope of evaluation.
- Key findings
- Conclusions
- Key recommendations.
- The executive summary should not include information that is not mentioned and substantiated in the main report.

**1.7 The recommendations are relevant and realistic, with clear priorities for action.**

- Recommendations should emerge logically from the evaluation’s findings and conclusions.
- Recommendations should be relevant to the purpose of the evaluation and decisions to be made based on he evaluation
- Recommendation should be formulated in a clear and concise manner and be prioritized to the extent possible.

2. Credibility - accuracy, reliability, and objectivity

**2.1. The subject or programme being evaluated is clearly and accurately described**

- **The goals and objectives of the programme/subject are clearly described and the performance indicators presented**



- **The conceptual linkages or logic theory among programme strategy, the outputs and the outcomes should be described, explaining their relation to national priorities and goals.**
- **The context in which the programme existed is described so its likely influences in the program can be identified**
- **The level of implementation of the programme and major divergences between the original implementation plan or approach should be described and explained.**
- **The recipient / intended beneficiaries, the stake holders, the cost and the financing of the programmes/projects should be described**

## 2.2. **The report provides a clear explanation of the scope of the evaluation**

- The objectives, scope and coverage of the evaluation should be explicit and its limitations should also be acknowledged.
- The original evaluation questions from the TORs should be made explicit as well as those that were added subsequently or during the evaluation and their rationale provided
- The results of an evaluability assessment is noted for its effects on defining the scope of the evaluation. (, evaluability is the extent to which *there is clarity in the intent of the subject to be evaluated, sufficient measurable indicators, assessable reliable information sources and no major factor hindering an impartial evaluation process*<sup>3</sup>.)

## 2.3. **The methodology is fully described for its role in ensuring the validity and reliability of the evaluation**

Any description of the methodology should include the following in addressing the questions of the evaluation:

- The universe of data needed to answer the questions and the sources of this data
- The sampling procedure applied to ensure representativeness in collecting information from these sources (area and population to be represented, rationale for selection, mechanics of selection, numbers selected out of potential subjects, limitations to sampling)
- Procedures applied (including triangulation) to ensure the accuracy and reliability of the information collected
- Bases for making judgements and interpretation of the findings including performance indicators or levels of statistical significance as warranted by available data.
- description of procedures for quantitative and qualitative analyses
- innovations in methodological approach and added value to development evaluation
- How the evaluation addressed equity in its design and in the provision of differentiated information to guide policies and programmes
- how a human development and human rights perspective provided a lens for the evaluation and influenced the scope of the evaluation

## 2.4. The findings of the evaluation address the following in response to the key questions of the evaluation.

- cost efficiency, relevance,
- UNDP partnership strategy and the extent to which it contributed to greater effectiveness,
- -
- external factors influencing progress towards the outcome-
- UNDP contribution to capacity development and institutional strengthening.

## 2.4. Conclusions are firmly based on evidence and analysis.

---

<sup>3</sup> Norms for Evaluation in the United Nations System, para 7.2.

- **Conclusions are the judgement made by the evaluators. They should not repeat the findings but address the key issues that can be abstracted from them.**
- Conclusions are made based on the an agreed basis for making jugments of value of worth relative to relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability
- Conclusions must focus on issues of significance to the subject being evaluated, determined by the evaluation objectives and the key evaluation questions.

#### **2.12. Annexes are complete and relevant**

- the original Terms of Reference for the evaluation
- Details on the programme and its context in development
- Details of data and analyses;
- data collection instruments (copies of questionnaires, surveys, etc.);
- evaluation plan

### **Relevance and Added Value**

#### 3.1. The purpose and context of the evaluation are described

- The reason(s) why the evaluation is being conducted should be explicitly stated.
- The justification for conducting the evaluation at this point in time should be summarised.
- Who requires the evaluative information should be made clear.
- The description of context should provide an understanding of the geographic, socioeconomic, political and cultural settings in which the evaluation took place

#### **3.2. The report includes an assessment of the extent to which issues of equity and gender I particular, and human rights considerations are incorporated in the project or programme**

The evaluation report should include a description of, *inter alia*:

- how a human development and human rights perspective was adopted in design, implementation and monitoring of the projects or programme being evaluated
- how issues of equity, marginalized, vulnerable and hard-to-reach groups were addressed in design, implementation and monitoring of the projects or programme being evaluated
- How the evaluation addressed equity in its design and in the provision of differentiated information to guide policies and programmes
- How the evaluation used the human development and human rights lens in its defining the scope of the evaluation and in the methodology used

#### **3.3 The report presents information on its relationship with other associated evaluations and indicates its added value to already existing information**

## **Annex 9: The Evaluation Policy of UNDP**