

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 “Reducing Pressures on Natural Resources from Competing Land Use in Non-Irrigated Arid Mountain, Semi-Desert and Desert Landscapes of Uzbekistan” (PIMS #4649.)

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

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	<i>Reducing Pressures on Natural Resources from Competing Land Use in Non-Irrigated Arid Mountain, Semi-Desert and Desert Landscapes of Uzbekistan</i>			
GEF Project ID:	4649		<i>at endorsement</i> <i>(Million US\$)</i>	<i>at completion</i> <i>(Million US\$)</i>
UNDP Project ID:	UZB10, 00087414	GEF financing:	US\$ 2,313,600	TBC at completion
Country:	<i>Uzbekistan</i>	IA/EA own:	US\$ 1,200,000	TBC at completion
Region:	Central Asia	Government:	US\$ 6,700,000 (parallel)	TBC at completion
Focal Area:	GEF/ Land Degradation	Other:	US\$ 1,980,000 (parallel)	TBC at completion
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):		Total co-financing:	US\$ 9,880,000	TBC at completion
Executing Agency:	UNDP	Total Project Cost:	US\$ 12,193,600	TBC at completion
Other Partners involved:	State Committee on Land Resources, Geodesy, Cartography and State Cadaster	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		01.02.2014
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: 31.12.2018	Actual: 31.08.2019

OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

“Reducing Pressures on Natural Resources from Competing Land Use in Non-Irrigated Arid Mountain, Semi-Desert and Desert Landscapes of Uzbekistan” Project is designed to support the improved, more sustainable and more resilient land use management of non- irrigated arid desert, steppe and mountain landscapes of Uzbekistan, which constitute the vast majority of its territory, and reduce competitive pressures between different land uses, particularly pasture use and forestry. Practical solutions of how this can be done will be demonstrated on the two ecologically and socio-economically representative districts (Zaamin and Karakul) and provide a model for undertaking district level integrated land use planning. The project components are (1) Field level investment to transform the baseline approach -Promising best practices on sustainable rangeland and forestry management and INRM planning up-scaled in target districts, and (2) Policy, legal and institutional mechanisms- An enabling cross-

sector environment and in-country capacity (at system, institutional and individual levels) for applying integrated landscape management in arid mountain, semi-desert and desert areas of Uzbekistan.

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 method¹ 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 (see Annex C) The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to (Zaamin and Karakul), including the following project sites:

- Karakul District
 - Bukhara regional association of “Karakul”
 - Cattle Breeding Farm limited liability company (LLC) “Karakul” and its compact cattle-breeding complex;
 - "Ozodbek Husniddin Balikchi" LLC;
 - Karakul state forestry and Navoi state forestry;
 - Karakul College of Agriculture Production;
 - Sevara-Sabina pilot farms;
 - Abdulla Juma zur Chorva farms;
 - Women entrepreneurs - Mamirova Gulchehra (mahalla Yangi Turmush of Mirhuja village) and Ravshanova Dilorom (mahalla Tajikent of Tajikent village);
 - Householder - Zamira Gaibullaeva;
- Zaamin District
 - Zaamin State Forestry;
 - Zaamin College of Agriculture and Service and The Center for the Implementation of Innovative and resource-saving technologies in rainfed agriculture;
 - Farovonlik shukronasi, Rustamnoma, Tutak Karim Dalasi, Hulkar Pistasi, Tulkin Mirzo and Chopon pilot farms;
 - Women entrepreneurs – Abdullaeva Nodira (mahalla Katta bog), Akbutaeva Shahnoza (Istiqlol mahalla of Chaparashli village) and Bekmurodova Saodat (mahalla Gallakor of Hulkar village)
 - Householder – Yuldasheva Saodat

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

- Research Institute for Karakul Sheep Breeding and Desert Ecology in Samarkand city

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

#	Organization
1	UNDP Uzbekistan, Country Office, SDC
2	Project team of UNDP/GEF project Reducing Pressures on Natural Resources from Competing Land Use in Non-Irrigated Arid Mountain, Semi-Desert and Desert Landscapes of Uzbekistan
3	GEF Operational Focal Point, State Committee on Ecology and Environmental Protection of the Republic of Uzbekistan
4	Coordination Council for land monitoring at the State Committee on Land Resources, Geodesy, Cartography and State Cadaster (Goskomzemgeodezkadastr)
5	Ministry of Agriculture
6	Center of Hydrometeorological Service under the Ministry of Emergency Situations of the Republic of Uzbekistan (Uzhydromet)
7	Subsidiary Enterprise Soil Evaluation under Goskomzemgeodezkadastr
8	Research Institute of Soil and Agrochemistry
9	Information resource center on the ecology of desert and foothill areas of rain-fed regions at Tashkent State Agrarian University
10	Information and Resource Center "Soils and Landscapes" at the laboratory "Agrobiotechnology" of the National University of Uzbekistan
11	Center for Remote Methods of Studying Properties of Land Resources of Various Landscapes in Uzbekistan At the Tashkent Institute of Agricultural Irrigation and Mechanization
12	Uzgiprozem Research-Design State Institute under Goskomzemgeodezkadastr

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, in particular evaluator shall validate the data in the GEF CCM Tracking tool (how the tool is filed in and confirmed the figures there filled in by the project team), 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	
M&E Plan Implementation		Quality of Execution - Executing Agency	
Overall quality of M&E		Overall quality of Implementation / Execution	
3. Assessment of Outcomes	Rating	4. Sustainability	rating
Relevance		Financial resources:	
Effectiveness		Socio-political:	
Efficiency		Institutional framework and governance:	
Overall Project Outcome Rating		Environmental:	
		Overall likelihood of sustainability:	

PROJECT FINANCE / COFINANCE

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

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

MAINSTREAMING

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

IMPACT

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. 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

CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

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](#)

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 Uzbekistan. 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 30 days according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation	5 days	1-5 April, 2019
Evaluation Mission	10 days	8-20 April, 2019
Draft Evaluation Report	10 days	22 April -3 May, 2019
Final Report	5 days	6-10 May, 2019

EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluator is expected to deliver the following:

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

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

QUALIFICATIONS

The evaluation team will be composed of 1 international evaluator and 1 national evaluator. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The international evaluator will be designated as the Team Leader and will be responsible for finalizing the report. The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

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'](#)

PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

This is a lump sum contract that should include costs of consultancy and international travel costs (in-country travel cost will be covered by the project), accommodation and meal (DSA or per diems in Tashkent and provinces) and visas costs required to produce the above deliverables. This payment schedule is indicative, and is filled in accordance with UNDP's standard procurement procedures)

%	Milestone
50%	Following submission of mission report and mission travel plan as well as 1ST draft terminal evaluation report
50%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report

APPLICATION PROCESS

Qualified candidates are requested to apply online via this website. The application should contain:

- **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the template provided by UNDP.
CV with indication of the e-mail and phone contact, but successful consultant will be requested to submit filled in and signed a **Personal History Form** (P11 form) before contract issuance.
- **Financial Proposal*** - Total lump sum amount in USD for tasks specified in this announcement should include costs of consultancy and international travel costs. Mission related costs in the country must NOT be included in the price offer as they will be covered separately as per UNDP rules and regulations. The financial proposal shall include a breakdown of this lump sum amount (number of anticipated working days, travel, daily subsistence allowance and any other possible costs), using template provided.
- **Brief description of approach to work/technical proposal** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page);
- **Incomplete applications will not be considered. Please make sure you have provided all requested materials. Please combine all your documents into one (1) single PDF document.**

** Please note that the financial proposal is all-inclusive and shall take into account various expenses incurred by the consultant/contractor during the contract period (e.g. fee, health insurance, vaccination, personal security needs and any other relevant expenses related to the performance of services...).*

Payments will be made only upon confirmation of UNDP on delivering on the contract obligations in a satisfactory manner.

Individual Consultants are responsible for ensuring they have **vaccinations/inoculations** when travelling to certain countries, as designated by the UN Medical Director. Consultants are also required to comply with the UN **security directives** set forth under dss.un.org

General Terms and conditions as well as other related documents can be found under: <http://on.undp.org/t7fJs>.

Qualified women and members of minorities are encouraged to apply.

Due to large number of applications we receive, we are able to inform only the successful candidate about the outcome or status of the selection process.

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in the CPAP: Outcome 2.1: Increased availability of institutional products and services for the conservation and sustainable and equitable use of natural resources
Country Programme Outcome Indicators: Number of such products and services available
Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area: Mainstreaming Environment and Energy
Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program: LD-3: Integrated Landscapes: Reduce pressures on natural resources from competing land uses in the wider landscape
Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes: Outcome 3.1: Enhanced cross-sector enabling environment for integrated landscape management; Outcome 3.2: Good management practices in the wider landscape demonstrated and adopted by local communities
Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators: Indicator 3.1 Policies support integration of agriculture, rangeland, forest, and other land uses; Indicator 3.2 Application of integrated natural resource management (INRM) practices in wider landscapes

Project Strategy	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Risks
Objective ³ : To promote integrated management of rangeland and forests at the landscape level (focus on non-irrigated, arid mountain, semi-desert, and desert landscapes) to reduce pressures on natural resources from	Number of hectares of pastures, forest and rain-fed arable land in two target districts that are under improved management.	Zero	11,000 ha of forest; 26,000 ha of pasture; and 2,000 ha of rain-fed lands (Long-term targets: Over 10 years, at 2% replication rate, 0.6 million ha of forest cover land, 4 million ha of pastures, and	Project AWP/PIR, Independent Evaluation, periodic field surveys/field visits	Weak political or institutional will to make necessary changes and support reform will prevent the application of good land use practices on the ground Engaging local stakeholders contains

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

Project Strategy	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Risks
competing land uses and improve the socio-economic stability of communities.			150,000 ha of rain-fed area under improved management.)		some risk in the context of existing mainly centralized approaches Building of sufficient capacity and practical know-how within essential state institutions and local authorities will take too long to allow project sustainability
Outcome 1 ⁴ . Promising best practices on sustainable rangeland and forestry management and INRM planning up-scaled in target districts of Uzbekistan.	Improvement or maintenance of vegetative cover in pilot sites in target districts	Forest administration land: 142,000 ha is with forest cover; Pastureland: 175,000 ha with good vegetation cover; Rain-fed areas: 25,000 ha can sustain good vegetation cover	Maintenance in vegetative cover or improvement in cover over baseline by: 8% for pastureland; 6% for forestry; and 6% for rain-fed areas	District ILUMPs, pasture use plans, reports of pasture user groups, project monitoring reports	Extreme seasonal variations/drought will negatively impact land conditions in project sites New threats could emerge (such as insect infestations, disease caused by climate change, reduced water availability, etc.), or existing threats could increase beyond the projected levels (such as rate of population increase).
	Area of pasture classified as “degraded” in project sites	280,000 ha (95,000 ha Zaamin, 185,000 ha Karakul)	254,000 ha or less by year 5 (84,000 or less in Zaamin; 170,000 or less in Karakul)	Reports from State Cadastre, project reports	
	Area of pasture used by dekhans (households) under collaborative management (pasture user groups)	Zero	300 ha by year 5	Reports from District Authorities, project reports	
	Number of dekhans with formal legal rights (and obligations) for areas used as pasture	Zero	Not less than 600 by year 5 (100 in Karakul, 500 in Zaamin)	Reports from District Authorities, project reports	

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

Project Strategy	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Risks
	Area of forest planted or managed through state and community collaborative mechanisms (JFM, community forests, collaborative moving sand fixation)	Zero	Not less than 100 ha by year 5 (60 Zaamin, 40 Karakul)	Annual reports of Main Forestry Department under MAWR, project reports	
	Humus content of rain-fed arable land in plough layer	Average 16.7 t/ha	Improvement in humus content of 100 ha rain-fed arable in Zaamin district (>16.7 t/ha) by year 5	Field measurements by State Cadastre and project	
	Local small businesses involved in production or application of appropriate technologies	None	> 5 businesses involved in production/services related to appropriate technology for reducing fuel wood demand, cost effective well pumping or renewable energy production by year 5	Reports of District Authorities and project	
	Number of livestock wells rehabilitated and adequately maintained in project sites	Not more than 10	> than 100 by year 5	Reports of shirkats and District Authorities, project field survey	
Component 2. An enabling cross-sector environment and in-country capacity (at system, institutional and individual levels) for applying integrated landscape management in arid mountain, semi-desert and desert areas	National pasture use strategic policy/plan incorporating long term integrated sustainable pasture use objectives	No mid/long term strategic development policy for pasture use in Uzbekistan	A mid/long term strategic policy for sustainable pasture use which provides a basis for legal and institutional reform	Approval by MAWM	Consensus on long term strategic objectives for pasture, forestry and rain-fed arable agriculture cannot be reached within the project time frame. Legal and institutional changes required to realize the project objective will not be agreed to or carried
	An up-to-date national forestry programme / plan supported by government that incorporates long term integrated sustainable use objectives	National forestry programme prepared but lacks key components and full government commitment for implementation.	An updated national forestry programme/plan approved by government and has an allocated budget by year 5	Approved by Main Administration of Forestry	

Project Strategy	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Risks
of Uzbekistan	A strategic policy/plan on rain-fed agriculture that incorporates long term integrated sustainable use objectives	No such strategic plan	A strategic plan for the long term development of rain-fed arable agriculture and role in overall agricultural system by year 5	Approval by MAWM	through during or after the project
	Inter-ministerial mechanism for ensuring coordination of land use policies operating effectively	Mechanism exists in principle	Inter-ministerial Coordinating Council has a clear mandate and method of operation to ensure coordination of different land use sectors by year 4	Minutes of Coordinating Council, Project PIRs, Terminal report	
	Pasture legislation and tenure arrangements allow more effective pasture use and fully recognize household/dekhan pasture users	No specific pasture use legislation, other legislation such as Land Code inadequate	Either a Pasture Law for Uzbekistan or adequate revisions to Land Code and other relevant legislation and normative documents completed by year 5	Parliamentary records, Cabinet of Ministers decisions, Project reports	Specific contents of legal revisions cannot be agreed by various stakeholders or that process of enacting legal revisions is impeded and does not become law.
	National and regional training institutions producing graduates with sound understanding of integrated land use concepts and approaches	Current national and regional training institutions have outdated courses which poorly address sustainable land use issues, particularly of non-irrigated landscapes	At least 1 training institution at national level and 1 at regional level have strengthened curriculum that addresses sustainable land use planning, including in non-irrigated areas by year 5.	Curriculums, survey of students and graduates, PIR, terminal report.	Graduates, despite better knowledge of good land use principles and practices, will not be able to apply knowledge due to continued existence of inappropriate institutional context or employment opportunities are better in other sectors

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

1. Project Document endorsed by GEF CEO
2. UNDP/GEF Project Document signed by UNDP and National Implementing Agency
3. Project Inception Report
4. Mid-Term Evaluation Report
5. Management Response to recommendations of Mid-Term Evaluation
6. Project quarterly (QORs and QPRs) and annual reporting (PIRs and APRs)
7. Minutes of Project Board meetings
8. Reports on monitoring of project office and pilot sites
9. ROARs
10. Project briefs and success stories
11. Project knowledge products
12. Government documentation (as an evidence of project outcomes achieved)

Annex C: Evaluation Questions

This is a generic list, to be further detailed with more specific questions by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on the particulars of the project.

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the Project relevant to UNCBD, RAMSAR convention, ICPDR and GEF objectives? • Is the Project relevant to UNDP objectives? • Is the Project relevant to Uzbekistan’s environmental objectives? • Does the Project address the needs of target beneficiaries? • How is the Project complementary to activities of other stakeholders and donors active in the region? • How could the Project better target and address the priorities and development challenges of targeted beneficiaries? • What would you say has been the most significant change you have seen due to the project activities? • • Does the project’s objective fit GEF strategic priorities and operational principles? 	•	•	•
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent have implemented outputs produced or contributed to attaining the expected outcomes? • What lessons have been learnt for the Project to achieve its outcomes? • How could the Project be more effective in achieving its results? • In your opinion, which activities have been the most effective? • Which have been less effective? • How efficient is the project at using resources? • Is the project objective likely to be met? To what extent and in what timeframe? • What are the key factors contributing to project success or underachievement? 	•	•	•

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is adaptive management being applied to ensure effectiveness? • Is monitoring and evaluation used to ensure effective decision-making? 			
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was adaptive management used or needed to ensure efficient resource use? • Were the accounting and financial systems in place adequate for Project management and producing accurate and timely financial information? • Were progress reports produced accurately, timely and respond to reporting requirements including adaptive management changes? • Was Project implementation as cost effective as originally proposed (planned vs. actual) • Was the leveraging of funds (co-financing) happening as planned? • Did the Project mainstream gender considerations into its implementation? • Which partnerships/linkages were facilitated? Can be considered sustainable? • What have been the biggest difficulties in implementing the part of the project in which you have been involved? • Is the project cost-effective? • Are management and implementation arrangements efficient in delivering the outputs necessary to achieve outcomes? • Was the project implementation delayed? If so, did that affect cost-effectiveness? 	•	•	•
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did the Project adequately address financial and economic sustainability issues? 	•	•	•

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there evidence that Project partners will continue their activities beyond Project support? • Are laws, policies and frameworks being addressed through the Project, in order to address sustainability of key initiatives and reforms? • Is the capacity in place at the national and local levels adequate to ensure sustainability of the results achieved to date? • Are Project activities and results being replicated elsewhere and/or scaled up? • What are the main challenges that may hinder sustainability of results? • Can you identify any long-term sustainable benefits from the project already? • Do relevant stakeholders have or are likely to achieve an adequate level of “ownership” of results, to have the interest in ensuring that project benefits are maintained? 			
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the level of sensitization and awareness about the integrated ecosystem management approach. • What is the impact of the demonstrated approach in private, public and/or at individual levels? • What would you say is a “good practice” that you have seen from the project? 	•	•	•

ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

<p><i>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution</i></p> <p>6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings</p> <p>5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings</p> <p>4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</p> <p>3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings</p> <p>2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems</p> <p>1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems</p>	<p><i>Sustainability ratings:</i></p> <p>4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability</p> <p>3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks</p> <p>2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks</p> <p>1. Unlikely (U): severe risks</p>	<p><i>Relevance ratings</i></p> <p>2. Relevant (R)</p> <p>1.. Not relevant (NR)</p> <p><i>Impact Ratings:</i></p> <p>3. Significant (S)</p> <p>2. Minimal (M)</p> <p>1. Negligible (N)</p>
<p><i>Additional ratings where relevant:</i></p> <p>Not Applicable (N/A)</p> <p>Unable to Assess (U/A)</p>		

ANNEX E: EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT AND AGREEMENT FORM

Evaluators:

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form⁵

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System

Name of Consultant: _____

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.

Signed at *place* on *date*

Signature: _____

⁵www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE⁶

i. Opening page:

- Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
- UNDP and GEF project ID#s.
- Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report
- Region and countries included in the project
- GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program
- Implementing Partner and other project partners
- Evaluation team members
- Acknowledgements

ii. Executive Summary

- Project Summary Table
- Project Description (brief)
- Evaluation Rating Table
- Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons

iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations

(See: UNDP Editorial Manual⁷)

1. Introduction

- Purpose of the evaluation
- Scope & Methodology
- Structure of the evaluation report

2. Project description and development context

- Project start and duration
- Problems that the project sought to address
- Immediate and development objectives of the project
- Baseline Indicators established
- Main stakeholders
- Expected Results

3. Findings

(In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (*) must be rated⁸)

3.1 Project Design / Formulation

- Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)
- Assumptions and Risks
- Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design
- Planned stakeholder participation
- Replication approach
- UNDP comparative advantage

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

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

⁸ Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations.

- Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
- Management arrangements

3.2 Project Implementation

- Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
- Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)
- Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management
- Project Finance:
- Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (*)
- UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (*) coordination, and operational issues

3.3 Project Results

- Overall results (attainment of objectives) (*)
- Relevance (*)
- Effectiveness & Efficiency (*)
- Country ownership
- Mainstreaming
- Sustainability (*)
- Impact

4. Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons

- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
- Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
- Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
- Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success

5. Annexes

- ToR
- Itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- Summary of field visits
- List of documents reviewed
- Evaluation Question Matrix
- Questionnaire used and summary of results
- Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

ANNEX G: EVALUATION REPORT CLEARANCE FORM

(to be completed by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and included in the final document)

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

UNDP GEF RTA

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____