**CONSULTANT TERMS OF REFERENCE **

**GENERAL INFORMAION**

**Services/Work Description: To undertake Project Terminal Evaluation (TE)**

**Project/Program Title:** Mainstreaming Incentives for Biodiversity Conservation in CRGE

**Post Title:** **International Individual Consultant to** **undertake Project Terminal Evaluation (TE)**

**Duty Station:** Addis Ababa with some travel to regional states

**Expected Places of Travel:** SNNP, Somali, Amhara and Oromia (if any )

**Duration:** 34 days

**Expected Start Date:** July 24, 2019 immediately after the Contract Agreement is concluded

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 full-size project “ Mainstreaming Incentives for Biodiversity Conservation in the Climate Resilient Green Economy Strategy” implemented by Environment Forest and Climate Change Commission (EFCC) - PIMS 4644

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

Project Summary Table

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Title: | : Mainstreaming Incentives for Biodiversity Conservation in the Climate Resilient Green Economy Strategy | | | | | |
| GEF Project ID: | | 4464 |  | | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | *at completion (Million US$)* |
| UNDP Project ID: | | 00087290 | GEF financing: | | 3,316,453 | 3,316,453 |
| Country: | | Ethiopia | IA/EA own: | | 0 | 0 |
| Region: | | Africa | Government (in kind): | | 14,200,000 | 14,200,000 |
| Focal Area: | | Biodiversity | Government in cash: | | 1,600,00 | 0 |
|  | |  | UNDP in cash | | 200,000 | 200,000 |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): | | Conservation and sustainable utilization of biodiversity and ecosystems | Total co-financing: | | 16,000,000 | 14,200,000 |
| Executing Agency: | | Environment Forest and Climate Change Commission | Total Project Cost: | | 19,316,453 | 17,716,453 |
| Other Partners involved: | | Regional Bureaus of Amhara, Oromia Somali and SNNP | ProDoc Signature (date project began): | | | 06/03/2015 |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | December 31,2019 | | Actual:  December 31, 2019 |

Objective and Scope

The project was designed to ensure that the biodiversity of Ethiopia is better protected from current and future threats by ensuring development and investment decisions do not impact negatively on biodiversity. This project is designed to address the prevailing rampant biodiversity loss due to various driving factors, hence this need to put in place safeguards to, ensure that the current high level of growth and planned investments do not impact negatively on biodiversity. The fundamental thought of the project is that Ethiopia’s long term development ambition can only be attained through green and climate resilient path where biodiversity and ecosystems are the green cushioning mechanism that safeguards the wellbeing of Ethiopian society and the GDP. The project has two interrelated outcomes: Outcome 1: The enabling framework for mainstreaming incentives for biodiversity conservation into the CRGE is strengthened and Outcome 2: At least 20,000 hectares of the highly threatened Afromontane ecoregion are under PES resulting in improved stewardship by community land managers and reduced pressure on biodiversity. The project highly contributes for wider objectives and targets of Ethiopia’s NBSAP (2016-2020), SDGs 1,2 ,13,14,15 and pillar II of UNDP Ethiopia CPD. The *Terminal Evaluation will cover the entire MIBC project.*.

**Scope of the Terminal Evaluation:**

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 Amhara, Oromia, SNNP and Somali regional states including the following project sites Choke in Amhara, Diga-Arjo in Oromia, Kulfo in SNNP and Hadew in Somali regional states*.* Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: UNDP CO, RTA, EFCCC, National and Woreda Project steering Committee, PMSU staff, project beneficiaries at the four project sites, Arbamich University, Debremarkos University and Wolega University.

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 ( [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 Implementation |  |
| M&E Plan Implementation |  | Quality of Execution - Executing Agency |  |
| Overall quality of M&E |  | Overall quality of Project Implementation / Execution |  |
| **3. Assessment of Outcomes** | **rating** | **4. Sustainability** | **rating** |
| Relevance |  | Financial resources: |  |
| Effectiveness |  | Socio-political/economic: |  |
| 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. The International consultant will be team leader of the assignment.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Co-financing  (type/source) | UNDP own financing ( US$) | | Government  (mill. US$) | | Partner Agency  (mill. US$) | | Total  (mill. US$) | |
| Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Actual | Actual |
| Grants | 200,000 | 200,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Loans/Concessions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * In-kind support |  |  | 14,200,000 | 14,200,000 |  |  |  |  |
| * Other (Cash) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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. In addition, the evaluation will be included in the Country Office Evaluation Plan.

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 Ethiopia CO*.* 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 *34* days according to the following plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Timing | Completion Date |
| **Preparation** | *4 days* | *July 25, 2019* |
| **Evaluation Mission** | 15 days | *August 15, 2019* |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | **10 days** | *August 20, 2019* |
| **Final Report** | *5 days* | *August 29,2019* |

Evaluation deliverables

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the followings:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Deliverable | Content | Timing | Responsibilities |
| **Inception Report** | Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method | August 2, 2019. | Evaluator submits to UNDP CO |
| **Presentation** | Initial Findings | August 16,2019 | To project management, UNDP CO |
| **Draft Final Report** | Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes | August 23, | Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs |
| **Final Report\*** | Revised report | August 29, 2019 | 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.

Qualification and Team Composition

The evaluation team will be composed of one *international and one national evaluators.* The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The international Consultant will be the team leader of the evaluation team. And will be responsible for *finalizing the Terminal Evaluation report..* The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The consultant must present the following qualifications/ credentials:

• At least a Masters degree in a relevant field such as biodiversity conservation, climate change, environment sciences, natural resources management, land management, water resources management, or a related field;

• Minimum of ten (10) years relevant work experience (e.g. conducting project/ programme evaluations) in the environment;

• Competencies in result-based management evaluation, application of SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios, including adaptive management are essential;

• Demonstrable analytical skills;

• Excellent English communication skills;

• Excellent interpersonal skills and the ability to engage and motivate a wide range of stakeholders;

• Evidence of previous work; and experience working in the East African region.

* Knowledge of conducting evaluations for UNDP / GEF supported projects / programmes is an advantage;

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (in 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).

**SUMMARY OF CRITERIA FOR SELECTING THE BEST OFFER**

Individual Consultants will be evaluated based on Cumulative Analysis as per the following criteria:

* Responsive/compliant/acceptable, and
* Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation. In this regard, the respective weight of the proposals are:
  1. Technical Criteria weight is **70%**
  2. Financial Criteria weight is **30%**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | | **Weight** | **Max. Point** |
| **Technical Competence (based on CV, Proposal and interview (if required))** | | **70%** | 100 |
| * **Criteria a.** Understanding the Scope of Work (SoW); comprehensiveness of the methodology/approach; and organization & completeness of the proposal | | **35** | 50 |
| * **Criteria b.** Interview or Desk Review of Previous experience with similar assignment | | **25** | 35 |
| * **Criteria c.** Years of experience | | **5** | 7.5 |
| * **Criteria d.** Individual competence | | **5** | 7.5 |
| **Financial (Lower Offer/Offer\*100)** | | **30%** | 30 |
| **Total Score** | **Technical Score \* 70% + Financial Score \* 30%** | | |

**LOGISTICS AND ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT TO PROSPECT IC (if any)**

The Consultant will be responsible for providing her/his own working station (i.e. laptop, internet, phone, scanner/printer, etc.) and must have access to a reliable internet connection.

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 |
| *20%* | During submission of the Inception Report |
| *30%* | 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

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. Candidates will be requested to submit a price offer (all inclusive) indicating the total cost of the assignment (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs).

Offers will be evaluated on the basis of specific criteria and may be done in the following manner:

A Combined Scoring method – where the qualifications and methodology will be weighted a maximum of 70%, and combined with the price offer which will be weighted a maximum of 30%.

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**    **This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPAP or CPD: Support the establishment of a financing facility to enhance access to new and additional financial flows** | | | | | |
| **Country Programme Outcome Indicators:** By 2015, the governance systems, use of technologies and practices and financing mechanisms that promote a low carbon climate resilient economy and society have improved at all levels. Outcome indicator: No. institutions that have mainstreamed climate change adaptation and mitigation; % of incremental finance mobilized; national CC financial mechanism established. Related Strategic Plan focus areas: Env. and Sust. Dev. | | | | | |
| **Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area (same as that on the cover page, circle one): 1. Mainstreaming environment and energy OR**  **2. Catalyzing environmental finance OR 3. Promote climate change adaptation OR 4. Expanding access to environmental and energy services for the poor.** | | | | | |
| **Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program: Biodiversity Focal Area Objective 2: Mainstream Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use into Production Landscapes, Seascapes and Sectors** | | | | | |
| **Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes: Outcome 2.2: Measures to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity incorporated in policy and regulatory frameworks.** | | | | | |
| **Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators: Indicator 2.2: Polices and regulations governing sectoral activities that integrate biodiversity conservation as recorded by the GEF tracking tool as a score.** | | | | | |
|  | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Targets**  **End of Project** | **Source of verification** | **Risks and Assumptions** |
| **Project Objective**[[3]](#footnote-3) | (i) A comprehensive GRCE that recognize conservation and sustainable use of BD as a major contributor to its goal of increasing GDP; and delivers a coherent response to BD loss, and CC. [the baseline and target in current PRF does somehow tackle this but as the title of the project is “mainstreaming incentives for BD conservation in the GRCE strategy” I suggest that the objective indicator is focused on the CRGE;  (ii) At least 20,000 ha of the highly threatened afro-montane forests [wording needs to change due to forests not targeted but rather ecoregion] are under improved stewardship by community land managers, as a result of a PES scheme piloted, indicated by no not loss of habitat in BD sensitive areas (from clearance for agriculture). | The importance of biodiversity conservation not adequately appreciated across sectors – or the budget process in Ethiopia | The importance of biodiversity conservation is better recognised at all levels in Ethiopia – including in the federal budget process, investment in the environment is increased and decision makers in the planning system are better able to make decisions to protect biodiversity and ecosystem services.  Pilot PES operational in four sites.  At least 20,000 ha of the highly threatened afromontane ecoregion are under improved stewardship by community land managers, as a result of the PES scheme piloted, indicated by no loss of habitat in BD sensitive areas (from clearance for agriculture, deforestation for fuel / building wood or grazing). | Project M & E  MOFED reports  MEF reports | Assumption –  national SH remain supportive&willing to fund PES  Risk – economic development objectives overtake commitments to biodiversity and protection of ecosystem services |
| **Outcome 1**[[4]](#footnote-4)**: The enabling framework for mainstreaming incentives for biodiversity conservation into the CRGE at national level strengthened** | Improved recognition of conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity as a major contributor to the CGRE strategy of increasing GDP; and delivers a coherent response to biodiversity loss, and climate change.  Requisite staff capacitated and well positioned to use desicison support tools and the results from BPER, and other relevant studies regularly in their decision-making  Better cooperation and interaction of institutions involved in managing the response to biodiversity loss and climate change | GoE budget not coded for environment  No BDER  Importance of biodiversity conservation is in planning and EIA systems, but staff have limited capacity to implement systems | Biodiversity Expenditure review completed  GoE budget coded for biodiversity expenditure  Decision makers more aware of the importance of Biodiversity to national and local economies and willing to redirect greater financial support to the Biodiversity sector  6 regional level large scale digital maps of critical biodiversity areas developed;  Biodiversity score cards in place to determine a) no go areas (b) areas where developments may be allowed but with certain minimum conditions - target 6 (by end PY 2)  Spatial data, decision support tools and training provided to staff in all regions to better equip them to implement systems to support protection of biodiversity and ecosystem services in sustainable development  Key staff trained in all relevant sectors at all levels on how to use the maps and scorecards for better land use planning and investments - – target 24 (by end PY2), 16 more (by end PY3), 24 more (by end PY4) | Project M & E  MOFED reports  MEF reports | Assumption –  national stakeholders remain supportive |

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

1. Project Document

2. Project periodic reports

3. Project Midterm evaluation and other relevant evaluations and assessments

4. Project best practice Documents

5. List and contact details of project staff, key project stakeholders including project boards and other partners

6. Project sites, highlighting suggested visits

7. Annual Project Implementation Reports (PIR)

8. Project Tracking tools

9. Financial Data

10. UNDP Development Assistant Framework (UNDAF)

11. UNDP Monitoring and Evaluation Frameworks

12. UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD)

13. GEF focal area strategic program objectives

ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

| **Evaluative Criteria Questions** | | **Indicators** | **Sources** | **Methodology** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | |  |  |  |
| Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels? | | | | |
|  | * How the project has contributed to GEF-5 strategic objective, which is conservation and sustainable utilization of biodiversity and ecosystems | * Ethiopia’s CRGE strategy recognize contribution of biodiversity | * Revised, modified or new national strategy due to the project | * Interview and Focal Group Discussions |
|  | * How far the project designing process has considered participation of counter parts from national and local government as well as project beneficiaries at the community level | * Number of agencies or peoples participated | * Minutes kept during LPAC meeting and inception reports | * Meetings, FGDs, personal interview |
|  | * How do you weigh the project strategies and objectives? Are these sufficient to reverse degradation of ecosystem conditions and loss of biodiversity in the selected project areas, do you think sites selected by the project are fairly representative? | * Competent objectives in conformity with GEF focal area objectives and national objectives * Achievability of indicators | * Prodoc, Project MTR report, Success stories, annual reports | * Desk review |
| Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? | | | | | |
|  | * To what extent the project has strengthened the enabling framework for biodiversity conservation at all levels | * National system that appreciate values of biodiversity * Number of institutions strengthened * Number of biodiversity PER study | * Annual report * National PER study document for the biodiversity sector | * Desk review | |
|  | * What are the practical show cases and objective evidences for the effectiveness of the project in terms of improving ecological condition of land under conservation in the project sites | * % of pressure reduction on the land resource * Area of land put under community stewardship via PES system | * Quarter and Annual * Project MTR * Physical observation to selected project sites | * Desk review * Interview * Observation * FGDS | |
|  | * How much the project has created/strengthened local and/ national institutions that can sustain the project gains | * Number of newly created institutions * Number of strengthened institutions | * Quarter and Annual reports * Project MTR | * Desk review * Interview * Meetings * FGDs | |
| Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards? | | | | | |
|  | * Has the project timely launched and completed all the deliverables as originally planned | * Timeliness | * Project annual reports and MTR | * Desk review | |
|  | * Have the project personnel and finance dully utilized in-line with the intended international and national standards | * In Conformity with GEF priorities and national plan | * GEF-5 strategic objective * Ethiopia’s national plan during 2016-2019 | * Desk review * Interviews | |
|  | * Has the project resource efficiently utilized to address the needs/problems identified during the project design? | * Time disaggregated (quarter, year) fund utilization track | * PIR report | * Desk review | |
| Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? | | | | | |
|  | * Has the project sufficiently forecasted institutional, socio-economic and environmental risks to sustain the project gains? What about risk mitigation strategies | * Number of Risk analysis and mitigation plan | * Project document | * Desk Review | |
|  | * Has the project sufficiently linked its results to existing government system | * Number and level of arrangements | * Government Commitment letters * Project reports | * Desk Review * Interviews | |
|  | * Is the project strategy sufficiently owned by national and local government? | * Level of Government ownership | * Government Commitment letters | * Desk Review * Interviews | |
| **Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?** | | | | | |
|  | * What are the project progress tracks across the project regions in reducing environmental stress and biodiversity loss | * % reduction in biodiversity loss in the project conservation areas * % of ecological restoration in the project sites | * Project reports * Project MTR | * Desk review * Interview * Physical observation | |
|  | * What is the overall progress rate of the project to its original targets /to improve ecological status? | * Overall environmental trend of the project conservation sites(inclining, declining or no change) | * Project tracking tools * Project Digital maps | * Desk review * Physical observation in selected project sites | |

Annex D: Rating Scales

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

Annex E: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form

**Evaluators:**

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

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form[[5]](#footnote-5)**

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

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

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

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

Signed at *place* on *date*

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

Annex F: Evaluation Report Outline[[6]](#footnote-6)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **i.** | Opening page:   * Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project * UNDP and GEF project ID#s. * Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report * Region and countries included in the project * GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program * Implementing Partner and other project partners * Evaluation team members * Acknowledgements |
| **ii.** | Executive Summary   * Project Summary Table * Project Description (brief) * Evaluation Rating Table * Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons |
| **iii.** | Acronyms and Abbreviations  (See: UNDP Editorial Manual[[7]](#footnote-7)) |
| **1.** | Introduction   * Purpose of the evaluation * Scope & Methodology * Structure of the evaluation report |
| **2.** | Project description and development context   * Project start and duration * Problems that the project sought to address * Immediate and development objectives of the project * Baseline Indicators established * Main stakeholders * Expected Results |
| **3.** | Findings  (In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) must be rated[[8]](#footnote-8)) |
| **3.1** | Project Design / Formulation   * Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators) * Assumptions and Risks * Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design * Planned stakeholder participation * Replication approach * UNDP comparative advantage * Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector * Management arrangements |
| **3.2** | Project Implementation   * Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation) * Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region) * Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management * Project Finance: * Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (\*) * UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (\*) coordination, and operational issues |
| **3.3** | Project Results   * Overall results (attainment of objectives) (\*) * Relevance (\*) * Effectiveness & Efficiency (\*) * Country ownership * Mainstreaming * Sustainability (\*) * Impact |
| **4.** | Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons   * Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project * Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project * Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives * Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success |
| **5.** | Annexes   * ToR * Itinerary * List of persons interviewed * Summary of field visits * List of documents reviewed * Evaluation Question Matrix * Questionnaire used and summary of results * Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form |

Annex G: Evaluation Report Clearance Form

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

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

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
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1. For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](http://www.undp.org/evaluation/handbook), Chapter 7, pg. 163 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office:  [ROTI Handbook 2009](http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/M2_ROtI%20Handbook.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Objective (Atlas output) monitored quarterly ERBM and annually in APR/PIR [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. All outcomes monitored annually in the APR/PIR. It is highly recommended not to have more than 4 outcomes. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)