

## Terms of Reference

### UNDP-GEF: TERMINAL EVALUATION FOR THE SCORE PROJECT

#### INTRODUCTION

These are the Terms of Reference (TOR) for the UNDP-GEF Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the full-sized project titled “Scaling up community resilience to climate variability and climate change in Northern Namibia, with a special focus on women and children” (**SCORE Project**) (PIMS 4711) implemented through the *Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET)* and the *Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry (MAWF)*, which is to be undertaken in 2019. The project started in March 2015 and is in its final year of implementation. 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 TE upon completion of implementation. These TOR sets out the expectations for a TE of the SCORE Project.

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

#### PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	Scaling up community resilience to climate variability and climate change in Northern Namibia, with special focus on women and children (Score Project)			
GEF Project ID:	5343 PIMS 4711		<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)	<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$)
UNDP Project ID:	00083204 00091803	GEF financing:	3, 050, 000.00	
Country:	Namibia	IA/EA own:	860, 000.00	
Region:	Africa	Government:	19, 157, 263.00	
Focal Area:	Climate Change Adaptation	Other:	500,000	
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	1: Reduce vulnerability to the adverse impacts of climate change; including variability, at local, national, regional and global levels.  2. Increase the adaptive capacity to respond to the impacts of climate change, including variability, at local, national, regional and global levels	Total co-financing:	20,017,263.00	
Executing Agency:	MET	Total Project Cost:	23,067,263.00	



Councils, Namibia University of Science and Technology (NUST), Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources (MFMR), Agro-Marketing and Trade Association (AMTA), senior officials and task team/ component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Steering Committee members, project stakeholders and community members/beneficiaries, among others.

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](#) 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 / CO-FINANCE

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	500,000		18,757,263					
Loans/Concessions								

• In-kind support	360,000		500,000					
• Other								
Totals	860,000		20,017,263.00					

## 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 achieved 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.<sup>2</sup>

## CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions**, **recommendations** and **lessons**. Conclusions should build on findings and be based in evidence. Recommendations should be prioritized, specific, relevant and targeted, with suggested implementers of the recommendations. Lessons should have wider applicability to other initiatives across the region, the area of intervention, and for the future.

## IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Namibia. 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 over a period of 8 weeks starting immediately after signing the contract, and shall not exceed four months from when the consultant(s) are hired, and should be executed according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation	3 days	21/10/19
Evaluation Mission	15 days	28/10/19 – 15/11/19
Draft Evaluation Report	7 days	27/11/19
Final Report	5 days	5/12/19

<sup>2</sup> 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](#)

## EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

---

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
<b>Inception Report</b>	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and methods	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission.	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
<b>Presentation</b>	Initial findings	End of evaluation mission	To project management, UNDP CO
<b>Draft Final Report</b>	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs
<b>Final Report*</b>	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 two evaluators: one international and another national. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. One 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.

The selection of consultants will be aimed at maximizing the overall “team” qualities in the following areas: The overall assessment rating is out of 100.

- Minimum 10 years of relevant professional experience; (8 points)
- Knowledge of UNDP and GEF; (5 points)
- Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s) and evaluating of CCA projects (6 points)
- Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies (8 points)
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios (6 points)
- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to Climate Change Adaptation (8 points)
- Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations (8 points)
- Experience working in Southern Africa (8 points)
- Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years (8 points)
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and Climate Change Adaptation; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis (10 points)
- Excellent English communication skills (5 points)
- Demonstrable analytical skills (5 points)
- Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset (8 points)

- A Master's degree in Biodiversity Management, Climate Change, Environmental Sciences, Natural Resources Management, Agriculture, Land Management, Water Resources Management or other closely related field (7 points)

## 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

---

%	Milestone
10%	At contract signing and subsequent submission of the inception report
40%	Following submission and approval of the 1st draft terminal evaluation report
50%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report

## APPLICATION PROCESS

---

Applicants are requested to apply online (<http://jobs.undp.org>, etc.) by (10 October 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 Results Framework

<p><b>This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPAP:</b></p> <p><b>Outcome 12:</b> By 2018, institutional frameworks and policies needed to implement the Environmental Management Act (2007); National Climate Change Policy (2011); Tourism Bill and Strategy; and Protected Areas and Wildlife Management Bill; and International Conventions, are in place and are being implemented effectively. <b>Outcome indicator:</b> Number of environmental institutions fully equipped with standards, guidelines and specialized skills.</p>
<p><b>Country Programme Outcome indicator:</b></p> <p><b>Outcome 2:</b> Citizen expectations for voice, development, the rule of law and accountability are met by stronger systems of democratic governance.</p> <p><b>Output 2.5</b> Legal and regulatory frameworks, policies and institutions enabled to ensure the conservation, sustainable use, and access and benefit sharing of natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystems, in line with international conservations and national legislation.</p>
<p><b>Primary Applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area (same as that on the cover page, circle one):</b> Promote climate change adaptation</p>
<p><b>Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program:</b></p> <p>Objective CCA-1: Reduce vulnerability to the adverse impacts of climate change, including variability, at local, national, regional and global level</p> <p>Objective CCA-3: Promote transfer and adoption of adaptation technology</p>
<p><b>Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes:</b></p> <p>Outcome 1.1: Mainstreamed adaptation in broader development frameworks in targeted vulnerable areas</p> <p>Outcome 1.2: Reduced vulnerability in development sectors</p> <p>Outcome 1.3.: Diversified and strengthened livelihoods and sources of income for vulnerable people in targeted areas</p> <p>Outcome 2.1: Increased knowledge and understanding of climate variability and change-induced risks in targeted vulnerable areas</p> <p>Outcome 2.2: Strengthened adaptive capacity to reduce risks to climate-induced economic losses</p>
<p><b>Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators:</b></p> <p>Indicator 1.1.1: Adaptation action implemented in national/sub-regional development framework</p> <p>Indicator 1.1.1.2: Sectoral strategies that include specific budgets for adaptation actions</p> <p>Indicator 1.2.8 80 % change in projected food production in targeted area given existing and projected climate change</p> <p>Indicator 1.2.11: % of populations with access to improved flood and drought management</p>

	Indicator (AMAT)	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
<b>Project Objective<sup>18</sup></b> To strengthen the adaptive capacity to reduce vulnerability of rural communities in responding to droughts and floods in Northern Namibia, with a special focus on women and children.	Vulnerability and risk perception index (Score) - Disaggregated by gender	Initial survey conducted during PPG. Score = 1. Extreme Vulnerability (men and women in all sites/six regions)	Target Scores = 3. Medium Vulnerability (both men and women in all sites / five project intervention regions) At least 4000 hh, of which 80% are women and children beneficiaries targeted under this objective to reduce vulnerability to floods and drought (Project implementation took place in seven regions, reduced to five after mid-term review)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Vulnerability Assessment carried out by UNAM and OPM</li> <li>- Baseline data of targeted communities established, household surveys done yearly</li> </ul>	<b>Assumption:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The implementing partner and communities are willing and efficiently implement the project</li> <li>- Risks of floods and droughts sufficiently mitigated in project zones</li> </ul>
<b>Outcome 1:</b> Strengthened capacity of Smallholder farms to implement climate resilient agricultural practices.	Climate resilient agricultural practices introduced to promote food security and diversified livelihoods.  % of households that have more secure access to livelihood assets (5 point score) – Disaggregated by gender	Farmers (women and men) currently constrained by limited access to CCA knowledge and resilient agricultural practices  10 % of households hold assets that can be used to	By the end of the project 4000 hh of small-holders farmers, 80% (3200 hh) of which are women and children have been trained and are applying climate resilient agricultural production practices.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Gender disaggregated community survey; community level vulnerability reduction assessment</li> <li>- Household survey</li> </ul>	<b>Assumption:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 4000 beneficiaries are willing to participate in the project</li> <li>- Farmers participation in the advisory and mentorship programme and SHG are formed and fully functioning for</li> </ul>



		buffer pressure during periods of climate shocks.	4000 households have more secured assets and livelihoods diversified away from traditional crop production, promoting food security	conducted annually CCA Capacity assessment, evidence of training and demonstration of knowledge transfers	<p>implementation of activities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Govt is functioning and project implementation efficient and well-coordinated</li> </ul> <p><b>Risks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support services such as land preparation, seed availability, etc, on a timely basis</li> <li>- Low and variable organisational capacities for the implementation of the activities</li> </ul>
<p><b>Outcome 2:</b> Small scale agricultural infrastructure introducing to reduce vulnerability to floods and droughts e.g. through restoration of wells and harvesting of floodwater for food security.</p>	<p>Percentage of area covered by flood and drought infrastructure. Population with access to improved flood and drought management (disaggregated by gender)</p>	<p>Currently less than 10% of the targeted land area is covered by effective flood management infrastructure.</p>	<p>80% of targeted land area is covered by efficient flood management infrastructure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Impact assessment survey report produced</li> </ul>	<p><b>Assumptions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Adequate equipment and support services are available</li> <li>- The implementing partner is capable of delivering the project activities</li> </ul> <p><b>Risk</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Maladaptive practices e.g. traditional wells are not properly restored and maintained and farmers harvesting</li> </ul>

					fingerlings before maturity
<b>Outcome 3:</b> Mainstream climate change into national agricultural strategy/sector policy, including adjustments to budgets for replication and up-scaling.	Number of comprehensive adaptation actions - policies, programmes and budgets – included in development frameworks to support climate resilient agricultural practices	Within the agriculture sector climate change adaptation is, to varying degrees, hinted at but not explicitly or comprehensively addressed, and nor are effective budgets allocated	sector strategies/ for agriculture are integrating and budgeting adaptation measures such as: -Conservation agriculture -Contingency plans for DRM at regional levels?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Impact assessment survey report produced</li> <li>- Result based management planned for climate smart agriculture developed and monitored</li> </ul>	<b>Assumptions:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Govt is willing and internal political complexities allow for the inclusion of CCA in planning and budgeting of development frameworks.</li> </ul> Risks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lack of political will to mainstream climate change into budgets</li> </ul>

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

---

1. PIF
2. UNDP Initiation Plan
3. UNDP Project Document
4. UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results
5. Project Inception Report
6. All Project Implementation Reports (PIR's)
7. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
8. Audit reports
9. Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools at CEO endorsement and midterm (GEF Climate Change Adaptation Tracking Tool)
10. Oversight mission reports
11. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
12. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team

The following documents will also be available:

13. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
14. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
15. Minutes of the SCORE Project Steering Committee Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
16. Project site location maps

## ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

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

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
<b>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?</b>			
a. How does the project support the GEF focal area and strategic priorities?	•	•	•
b. How does the project support community resilience to climate variability and climate change in northern Namibia?	•	•	•
c. What was the level of stakeholder participation and ownership in project design and implementation?	•	•	•
d. How does the project support the needs of relevant stakeholders, and has the implementation of the project been inclusive of all relevant stakeholders?	•	•	•
e. Were local beneficiaries and stakeholders adequately involved in project design and implementation?	•	•	•
f. Are there logical linkages between expected results of the project (log frame) and the project design (in terms of project components, choice of partners, structure, delivery mechanism, scope, budget, use of resources etc.)?	•	•	•
g. Was the length of the project sufficient to achieve project outcomes?	•	•	•
h. Are the GEF funded activities and project objectives supported by other donors? How do GEF-funds help to fill gaps (or give additional stimulus) that are necessary but are not covered by other donors?	•	•	•
i. Is there coordination and complementarity between donors?	•	•	•
<b>Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?</b>			

a. Has the project been effective in achieving its expected outcomes? ➤ Outcome 1: Scaling up climate resilient livelihoods. ➤ Outcome 2: Community level flood and drought management ➤ Outcome 3: Climate change mainstreaming into agricultural strategy	•	•	•
b. What lessons have been learned from the project regarding achievement of outcomes?		•	•
c. What changes could have been made (if any) to the design of the project in order to improve the achievement of the project's expected results?		•	•
<b>Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?</b>			
a. Were the project logical framework and work plans (and any changes made to them) used as management tools during implementation?	•	•	•
b. Were the accounting and financial systems in place adequate for project management and producing accurate and timely financial information?	•	•	•
c. Were progress reports produced accurately, timely and did they respond to the reporting requirements?	•	•	•
d. Was project implementation as cost effective as originally proposed (planned vs. actual)?	•	•	•
e. Did the leveraging of funds (co-financing) happen as planned? Were financial resources utilized efficiently? Could financial resources have been used more efficiently?	•	•	•
f. Was procurement carried out in a manner making efficient use of project resources?	•	•	•
g. To what extent were partnerships/linkages between institutions/organizations encouraged and supported?	•	•	•

h. What was the level of efficiency of cooperation and collaboration arrangements?	•	•	•
i. Was an appropriate balance struck between utilization of international expertise as well as local capacity?	•	•	•
j. Did the project take into account local capacity in design and implementation of the project?	•	•	•
<b>Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?</b>			
a. How well are the risks, assumptions and impact drivers for financial, institutional, social and economic being managed?	•	•	•
b. What was the quality of the risk mitigation strategies developed? Were they sufficient?	•	•	•
c. Are there clear strategies for risk mitigation related with the long-term sustainability of the project?	•	•	•
d. Has the experience of the project provided relevant lessons for other future projects targeted at similar objectives?	•	•	•
e. What lessons can be learnt from the project regarding climate resilience?	•	•	•
f. How could the project have more efficiently carried out implementation (in terms of management structures and procedures, partnerships arrangements etc)?	•	•	•
g. What changes could have been made (if any) to the project in order to improve its efficiency?	•	•	•
<b>Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or adaptation to climate change?</b>			
a. Does the project adequately take into account the national realities, both in terms of institutional and policy framework towards adaptation to climate change in vulnerable areas in its design and its implementation?	•	•	•
b. Are there any indicators that the project have contributed towards reduced vulnerabilities in development sectors?	•	•	•
c. Are there any indicators that the project has contributed towards diversified and strengthened livelihoods and sources of income for vulnerable people in targeted areas?	•	•	•

## ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

<b><i>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&amp;E, I&amp;E Execution</i></b> 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	<b><i>Sustainability ratings:</i></b> 4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks	<b><i>Relevance ratings</i></b> 2. Relevant (R) 1. Not relevant (NR)  <b><i>Impact Ratings:</i></b> 3. Significant (S) 2. Minimal (M) 1. Negligible (N)
<b><i>Additional ratings where relevant:</i></b> 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<sup>3</sup>

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

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

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

---

<sup>3</sup>[www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct](http://www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct)



**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<sup>4</sup>

---

- 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<sup>5</sup>)
- 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<sup>6</sup>)
- 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)

---

<sup>4</sup>The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

<sup>5</sup> UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

<sup>6</sup> 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.

- 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: \_\_\_\_\_

## ANNEX H: TE REPORT AUDIT TRAIL TEMPLATE

---

The following is a template for the evaluator to show how the received comments on the draft TE report have (or have not) been incorporated into the final TE report. This audit trail should be included as an annex in the final TE report.

**To the comments received on (*date*) from the Terminal Evaluation of (*project name*) (UNDP *PIMS* #)**

*The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft Terminal Evaluation report; they are referenced by institution ("Author" column) and track change comment number ("#" column):*

Author	#	Para No./ comment location	Comment/Feedback on the draft TE report	TE response and action taken