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 *Strengthening Capacities to Measure, Report and Verify Indicators of Global Environment Benefits* (PIMS # 4930.)

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

Project Summary Table

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Title: |  | | | | | |
| GEF Project ID: | | 5178 |  | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | | *at completion (Million US$)* |
| UNDP Project ID: | | 4930 (PIMS+)  00090395 (Atlas Output ID) | GEF financing: | 0.5 | | 0.5 |
| Country: | | Papua New Guinea | IA/EA own: | 0.05 (grant) | | 0.03 (grant) |
| Region: | | Asia and the Pacific | Government: | 0.3 (grant)  0.3 (in-kind) | | 0.0 (grant)  0.4 (in-kind) |
| Focal Area: | | Multi Focal | Other: |  | |  |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): | | CD2 To generate, access and use information and knowledge  CD5 To enhance capacities to monitor and evaluate environmental impacts and trends | Total co-financing: | 1.15 | | 0.0 |
| Executing Agency: | | UNDP | Total Project Cost: | 1.15 | | 0.93 |
| Other Partners involved: | | CEPA | ProDoc Signature (date project began): | | | 7-Oct-2014 |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | | Proposed:  7-Oct-2017 | Actual:  7-Apr-2019 |

Objective and Scope

The project was designed to strengthen targeted capacities to establish and use an integrated Environmental Management Information System. In addition to the installation of the integrated EMIS and training on its use, the project aimed to help institutionalize the EMIS by demonstrating its value and financial sustainability to stakeholders, as well as facilitating the appropriate legislative and institutional reforms.

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects.

The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

Evaluation approach and method

An overall approach and method[[1]](#footnote-1) for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact,** as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR ([*Annex C*](#_TOR_Annex_C:)) The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence‐based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Port Moresby, Papua New Guinea*.* Interviews will be held with national project director from, Conservation and Environment Protection Authority; the UNDP CO project manager and other relevant stakeholders involved in the project.

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in [Annex B](#_TOR_Annex_B:) of this Terms of Reference.

Evaluation Criteria & Ratings

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

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Ratings:** | | | |
| **1. Monitoring and Evaluation** | ***rating*** | **2. IA& EA Execution** | ***rating*** |
| M&E design at entry |  | Quality of UNDP Implementation |  |
| M&E Plan Implementation |  | Quality of Execution - Executing Agency |  |
| Overall quality of M&E |  | Overall quality of Implementation / Execution |  |
| **3. Assessment of Outcomes** | **rating** | **4. Sustainability** | **rating** |
| Relevance |  | Financial resources: |  |
| Effectiveness |  | Socio-political: |  |
| Efficiency |  | Institutional framework and governance: |  |
| Overall Project Outcome Rating |  | Environmental : |  |
|  |  | Overall likelihood of sustainability: |  |

Project finance / cofinance

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(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 (US$) | | Government  (US$) | | Partner Agency  (US$) | | Total  (US$) | |
| Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual |
| UNDP (Grant) | 50,000.00 | 35,935.52 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 50,000. | 35,935.52 |
| GEF (Grant) | 500,000.00 | 439,242.71 |  |  |  |  | 500,000 | 439,242.71 |
| Loans/Concessions |  |  |  |  |  |  | - | - |
| * In-kind support |  |  | 300,000 | 400,000 |  |  | 300,000 | 400,000 |
| * DEC (Grant) |  |  | 300,000 |  |  |  | 300,000 | 0 |
| * Other | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  | - | - |
| Totals | 550,000.00 | 475,178.23 | 600,000 | 400,000 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1,150,000 | 875,178.23 |

Mainstreaming

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

Impact

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.[[2]](#footnote-2)

Conclusions, recommendations & lessons

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

Implementation arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Papua New Guinea. 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 26 days according to the following plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Timing | Completion Date |
| **Preparation** | 4 days | 1-Mar-2019 |
| **Evaluation Mission** | 10 days | 18-Mar-2019 |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | 10 days | 1-Apr-2019 |
| **Final Report** | 2 days | 10-Apr-2019 |

Evaluation deliverables

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Deliverable | Content | Timing | Responsibilities |
| **Inception Report** | Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method | No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission. | 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 10days of the evaluation mission | Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs |
| **Final Report\*** | Revised report | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft | Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC. |

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

Team Composition

The evaluation team will be composed of one international evaluator. The consultant shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The evaluator selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The evaluator must present the following qualifications:

* A Master’s degree in natural resource management / environmental management / business/public administration other related disciplines
* Minimum 6 years of relevant professional experience in the field of environmental management
* Knowledge of UNDP and GEF monitoring and evaluation policies and guidelines – at least 2 GEF funded project evaluation experiences preferably with focus on multi-focal area capacity development project, e.g. on the three thematic areas of the 3Rio convention namely Climate Change, Biodiversity, and Land Degradation
* Previous experience with results‐based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
* Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s) – multi-focal area capacity development
* Proficiency in oral and written English

Evaluator Ethics

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex E) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the [UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'](http://www.unevaluation.org/ethicalguidelines)

Payment modalities and specifications

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| % | Milestone |
| *10%* | Submission and acceptance of inception report |
| *40%* | Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report |
| *50%* | Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report |

Application process

The applicants will be sought from a roster with recommendations from the regional hub. Applicants are requested to apply by February 22, 2019. Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions. The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in English with indication of the e‐mail and phone contact. Shortlisted candidates will be requested to submit a price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs).

UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

Annex A: Project Logical Framework

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Strategy** | **An integrated Environment Information Management System (EMIS)** | | | | | | | | | | | **Sources of verification** | | | **Risks and Assumptions** |
| **Indicator** | | **Baseline value** | | | | | | | **Target value and date** | |
| **Long-term goal: To develop and manage information for better planning decisions that help protect the global environment** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Project objectives**:  To strengthen national capacities to measure, report and verify internationally agreed targets and indicators of global environment benefits | **Outcome indicators:**   An integrated environmental information management system for monitoring and reporting of PNG’s MEA targets and indicators   Capacity to use the information management system for monitoring and reporting of PNG’s MEA targets and indicators | | **Baseline:**   Absence of a system for managing data and information for reporting   Limited capacity for handling data and information for reporting on MEA including the Rio Conventions | | | | | | | **By the end of the project:**   Rio Convention obligations are being better implemented through an integrated system of data and information managements system.   Future reports will not be data deficient   Increased capacity within relevant stakeholder groups to handle data and information relevant to the Rio Convention | | **Sources of verification:**   Strategic documents within the DEC will indicate that the new system is institutionalized.   The physical infrastructure for data management   The increased reports produced by relevant staff using scientifically credible data and information | | | **Risks and assumptions:**   This project will receive full government support   Involvement of the UNDP will ensure, the lack of absorptive capacity does not undermine project |
| **Project Strategy** | **Objectively verifiable indicators** | | | | | | | | | | | **Sources of verification** | | | **Risks and Assumptions** |
| **Indicator** | | **Baseline value** | | | | | | | **Target value and date** | |
| **Outcome 1: A capacity to manage and use integrated information systems for Rio Convention implementation** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Output 1.1**  **A data storage and management system for all MEAs monitoring and reporting** |  In-depth baseline assessment of current management information system.   A review of best practice tools for environmental data and metadata sharing and storage management at all levels as part of the design of an integrated EMIS   An integrated EMIS infrastructure | |  Reports from PNG have been shown to have either data that cannot be used or no data at all or the data is outdated. There is limited capacity to identify the right targets to measure for the Rio Agenda. There is limited capacity to analyze data. These limitations render environmental information inadequate to support environmental decision-making processes. Furthermore, information on environmental issues is technical and this may discourage decision makers to consult them.   Very rudimentary tools for data storage and sharing | | | | | | |  Baseline assessment of current management information system to be completed by month 4 of the project.   Targeted study of best practice web-based tools for environmental data and metadata sharing and storage management at all levels as part of the design of an integrated EMIS, completed by month 8.   Design and feasibility study of an integrated EMIS completed by month 8 and approved for implementation by month 12.   EMIS infrastructure installation begins by month 12 and completed by month 18 | |  Meeting Minutes   Working Group meeting reports   Independent evaluation reports   Independent reports on EMIS   Rio Convention National reports and Communications   GEF Cross-Cutting Capacity Development Scorecard   Statistical analyses of surveys | | |  The various government authorities maintain commitment to negotiate and agree on differential enforcement of the EMIS to effectively meet Rio Convention obligations   The project will be executed in a transparent, holistic, adaptive, and collaborative manner |
| **Project Strategy** | **Objectively verifiable indicators** | | | | | | | | | | | **Sources of verification** | | | **Risks and Assumptions** |
| **Indicator** | | | | | **Baseline value** | | | | **Target value and date** | |  | |  | |
| **Output 1.2:**  **Strengthened Technical capacity to manage and use integrated information systems for Rio Convention implementation** |  Expert working groups will be established under each of the Rio Conventions   A collection of the best practices for collecting technical data and information for the Rio Conventions.   Lead agencies identified who will collect the required data and information for Rio Reporting.   A training course module for all technical government staff that have responsibilities related to the collection and use of environmental data participate in all training courses. | | | | |  Limited data and information relevant to the Rio Conventions exists.   MEA reports are done by individual experts   Data collected is not done in a standardized manner resulting in difficulties in compiling data for a country-wide report.   Limited technical capacity to analyze data and information | | | |  Expert working groups will be established under each of the Rio Conventions to review data and information needs for decision-making by month 2   Identified best practices for collecting technical data and information by month 6.   Best practice materials and training modules are collected and prepared by month 10 of the project.   Training courses begin by month 12. All technical government staff that have responsibilities related to the collection and use of environmental data will participate in all training courses. A minimum of 100 government staff have participated in training courses, with the average score of all attendees no lower than 80% test score. Training courses end by month 30.   At the beginning and ending of each course, each participant will be evaluated, to determine knowledge gained. This will be analyzed to determine incremental learning. This will be undertaken for each course. | |  Meeting minutes   Reports by the expert working group   Survey analysis   Tracking and progress reports   Final report on the lessons learnt | | |  Members of the MEA technical committees will be comprised of proactive experts and project champions   Survey results will show an increased awareness and understanding of the Rio Conventions’ implementation through standardized data and information collection method.   Lead agencies will allow their staff to attend all trainings |
| **Outcome 2: Institutional strengthening for improved monitoring of the global environment and capacity to replicate successful environmental information management and integration practices** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Project Strategy** | **Objectively verifiable indicators** | | | | | | | | | | **Sources of verification** | | **Risks and Assumptions** | | |
|  | **Indicator** | | | | | **Baseline value** | | | **Target value and date** | |  | |  | | |
| **Output 2.1:**  **Institutional and organizational reforms to enable incorporation of global environment commitments into planning and monitoring processes** | Agreement on recommendations of institutional reforms.  Parliamentary brief for approval on appropriate, institutional reforms  Parliament’s approval on proposed institutional reforms  Institutional reforms initiated in target institutions   Resource mobilization plan is prepared, peer reviewed and approved by Project Steering Committee.   Memorandum of agreement among key partner agencies to pilot the sharing of data and information during the.   New Memorandum of agreement is signed among key partner agencies to share data and information per institutional reforms. | | | | |  Data for MEA reporting is collected on an ad-hoc manner that is also not standardized across the relevant agencies responsible for implementing the Rio Conventions   Resources are not utilized best to serve the Rio Convention agenda   Key partner agencies have no obligation to report to each other as well as share data and information | | |  Convene expert working group and stakeholder meetings to agree on recommendations of institutional reforms. Expert working group presents a consensus agreement on prioritized recommendations by month 12.   Prepare parliamentary brief to recommend and approve, as appropriate, institutional reforms by month 14.   Ministers and parliamentary members discuss parliamentary brief and approve appropriate decision by month 18.  Institutional reforms are initiated by target institutions by month 20. Over 67% of institutional reforms are completed by month 32.  Resource mobilization plan is prepared, peer reviewed and approved by Project Steering Committee by month 12.  Resource mobilization plan is under early implementation by month 14.  Memorandum of agreement among key partner agencies to pilot the sharing of data and information during the project is signed by month 3. New Memorandum of agreement is signed among key partner agencies to share data and information per institutional reforms signed by month 32*.*   | |  Formal communications   Meeting minutes, including list of participants   Analytical reports   Tracking and progress reports   A government gazette that shows parliament approval of the reform | | Best practices and lessons learned from other countries are appropriately used  The PNG parliament approves the institutional reforms  Enabling policy and legislation in place to support the signing of any MOA. | | |
| **Project Strategy** | **Objectively verifiable indicators** | | | | | | | | | | **Sources of verification** | | **Risks and Assumptions** | | |
|  | **Indicator** | | | | **Baseline value** | | | **Target value and date** | | |  | |  | | |
| **Output 2.2:**  **Data flow system and tracking** | A collection of best practices and software for collecting and sharing data and information, including their use to prepare complex models.   An architecture for the storage and transformation of data and information   A mechanism for monitoring the use of data and information for policy formulation and development planning   Using the EMIS for the preparation of national reports under the Rio Conventions and other MEAs. | | | | There is limited capacity to identify, assess and manage environmental information for national reporting MEA obligations  Monitoring reports are internal documents that have unclear value to planners and decision-makers  Monitoring and compliance guidelines and tools are not widely known among planners and decision-makers  Inter-Ministerial Council focuses on climate change, but there is no equivalent policy decision-making mechanism that is as effective on biodiversity or land degradation  Trainings to take place on environment-related issues, however these remain targeted to focal area issues, with inadequate attention to environmental legislative reforms | | | An independent assessment of best practices and software for collecting and sharing data and information, including their use to prepare complex models. This study should be completed by month 8.   An institutional architecture will be constructed for the storage and transformation of data and information by month 10.   A tracking mechanism to monitor the use of data and information for policy formulation and development planning by month 10.   Contribution of the EMIS to the preparation of national reports under the Rio Conventions and other MEAs. | | | Formal communications  Meeting minutes, including list of participants  Analytical reports   Tracking and progress reports   Inter-Ministerial Council decisions | | The relevant government agencies and stakeholders will participate fully in the program.  All stakeholders will have access in one way or another to the information that is stored in the system. | | |
| **Project Strategy** | **Objectively verifiable indicators** | | | | | | | | | | **Sources of verification** | | **Risks and Assumptions** | | |
| **Indicator** | | | | **Baseline value** | | | **Target value and date** | | | |  | |  | | |
| **Output 2.3:**  **EMIS Demonstration** | | A high value development plan  A collection of data and information requirements for their potential impacts on the global environment  methodology that integrates the new best practice methodologies and EMIS.  A peer review of the draft EIA | | There has been a lack of a system that allows data flow in national government agencies concerned with the MEAs – and especially the Rio Conventions. | | | The Project Steering Committee will select a high value development plan by month 20.  Each Rio Convention expert working will review this same plan to identify the data and information requirements to evaluate it for its potential impacts on the global environment by month 21.  Develop an expanded EIA methodology that integrates the new best practice methodologies and EMIS by month 24.  Initiate the conduct of the new and improved EIA by month 25. Conduct a peer review of the draft EIA by month 27, and finalize the EIA by month 29.  Prepare lessons learned report between months 30 and 33. | | | |  Meeting minutes   Tracking and progress reports   Survey results   Peer review reports | | All relevant stakeholders are amendable to the reform to allow data to flow in the system. | | |

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

The project will make available the necessary documents to be reviewed by the evaluator, these include but are not limited to the following;

1. Project document,
2. Annual progress reports,
3. Annual work plans,
4. Signed CDRs
5. Budget revision documents,
6. Technical reports produced during the project implementation

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? | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? | | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
| Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards? | | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
| Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? | | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
| **Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?** | | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |

Annex D: Rating Scales

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

Annex E: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form

**Evaluators:**

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

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form[[3]](#footnote-3)**

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

**Name of Consultant:** \_\_     \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Name of Consultancy Organization** (where relevant)**:** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

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

Signed at *place* on *date*

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Annex F: Evaluation Report Outline[[4]](#footnote-4)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **i.** | Opening page:   * Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project * UNDP and GEF project ID#s. * Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report * Region and countries included in the project * GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program * Implementing Partner and other project partners * Evaluation team members * Acknowledgements |
| **ii.** | Executive Summary   * Project Summary Table * Project Description (brief) * Evaluation Rating Table * Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons |
| **iii.** | Acronyms and Abbreviations  (See: UNDP Editorial Manual[[5]](#footnote-5)) |
| **1.** | Introduction   * Purpose of the evaluation * Scope & Methodology * Structure of the evaluation report |
| **2.** | Project description and development context   * Project start and duration * Problems that the project sought to address * Immediate and development objectives of the project * Baseline Indicators established * Main stakeholders * Expected Results |
| **3.** | Findings  (In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) must be rated[[6]](#footnote-6)) |
| **3.1** | Project Design / Formulation   * Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators) * Assumptions and Risks * Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design * Planned stakeholder participation * Replication approach * UNDP comparative advantage * Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector * Management arrangements |
| **3.2** | Project Implementation   * Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation) * Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region) * Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management * Project Finance: * Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (\*) * UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (\*) coordination, and operational issues |
| **3.3** | Project Results   * Overall results (attainment of objectives) (\*) * Relevance(\*) * Effectiveness & Efficiency (\*) * Country ownership * Mainstreaming * Sustainability (\*) * Impact |
| **4.** | Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons   * Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project * Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project * Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives * Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success |
| **5.** | Annexes   * ToR * Itinerary * List of persons interviewed * Summary of field visits * List of documents reviewed * Evaluation Question Matrix * Questionnaire used and summary of results * Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form |

Annex G: Evaluation Report Clearance Form

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

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

UNDP GEF RTA

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](http://www.undp.org/evaluation/handbook), Chapter 7, pg. 163 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office:  [ROTI Handbook 2009](http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/M2_ROtI%20Handbook.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)