**Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference**

**Job title: International Consultant on Terminal Evaluation of the Project**

**Project title:** **Generate global environmental benefits through environmental education and raising awareness of stakeholders**

**Project: 00091047/00081939**

**Contract modality: Individual Contract (IC)**

**Duration: 25 August – 25 October 2019 (estimated 20 consultancy days)**

**Duty station: Home based and one mission to Armenia**

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**Generate global environmental benefits through environmental education and raising awareness of stakeholders**. (PIMS #5309.)

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

Project Summary Table

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Title: | **Generate global environmental benefits through environmental education and raising awareness of stakeholders**. | | | | |
| GEF Project ID: | 5716 |  | | *at endorsement (US$)* | *at completion (US$)* |
| UNDP Project ID: | PIMS: 5309  Atlas Project: 00091047  Atlas Award: 00081939 | GEF financing: | | 750,000 | 679,647 |
| Country: | Armenia | UNDP financing: | | 30,000 | 20,597 |
|  |  | IA/EA own in-kind: | | 90,000 |  |
| Region: | RBEC | Government in kind: | | 485,500 |  |
|  |  | Other: in-kind | | 118,235 |  |
| Focal Area: | [Multi-focal Areas - Capacity Development](https://www.thegef.org/news/examples-cross-cutting-capacity-development) |  | |  |  |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): | CD2 To generate, access and use information and knowledge  CD4 To strengthen capacities to implement and manage global convention guidelines | Total co-financing: | | 723,735 USD |  |
| Executing Agency: | UNDP | Total Project Cost: | | 1,523,735.00 USD |  |
| Other Partners involved: | Ministry of Nature Protection,  Ministry of Education and Science,  Civil Service Office | ProDoc Signature (date project began): | | | 03 November 2015 |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | Proposed:  03 November 2018 | | Actual:  03 November 2019 |

Objective and Scope

The project was designed to strengthen the capacities of key individuals and institutions to use environmental education and awareness raising as tools to address natural resource management issues

The **goal** of this project is to expand the capacity of Armenia to generate global environmental benefits through environmental education and raising awareness of stakeholders to implement Rio Convention strategies. The **objective** of the project is to strengthen the capacity to use environmental education and awareness raising as tools to address natural resource management issues. This objective will be achieved through three components:

Enhance legal, policy, institutional and strategic frameworks to strengthen environmental education and raising awareness of stakeholder as natural resource management tools.

Improve the capacity of relevant educational entities, organizations offering environmental education to integrate environmental education and awareness raising into programmes and projects as tools for natural resource management.

Developed capacity of community based organizations (CBOs) to use environmental education and awareness raising as tools for natural resource management.

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 Yerevan, Armenia and to hold the interviews with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

* Project Coordination Unit staff;
* UNDP Country Office in Armenia;
* Members of Project Board;
* National government stakeholders, including: Ministry of Nature Protection, Civil Service Office, Ministry of Education and Science;
* National Contractors and partners of the Project, including Public Administration Academy of RA and the American University of Armenia;
* National consultants involved in the project (at least two);
* International organization, implementing similar projects, such as GIZ.

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 |
| Grants | 30,000 | 20,597 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Loans/Concessions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * In-kind support | 90,000 |  | 485,000 |  | 118,235 |  |  |  |
| * Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Mainstreaming

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

Impact

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.[[2]](#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 Armenia. 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 *20* days according to the following plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Timing | Completion Date |
| **Preparation** | *3* days | *5 September* |
| **Evaluation Mission** | *5* days | *17 September* |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | *9* days | *05 October* |
| **Final Report** | *3* days | *25 October* |

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 3 weeks of the evaluation mission | Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs |
| **Final Report\*** | Revised report | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft | Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC. |

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

Team Composition

The evaluation team will be composed of 1 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.

Key qualifications:

* Education: advanced degree in environmental management and policy, public administration.

Minimum 10 years of relevant professional experience (environmental education, public administration, sustainable natural resource management), including minimum 5 years of experience in monitoring and evaluation of similar projects;

* Proven experience and knowledge in UNDP-GEF projects evaluation, UNDP and GEF procedures and requirements;
* Previous experience with results‐based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
* Technical knowledge in the targeted focal areas: Multi-focal areas – Capacity Development, Rio Conventions and MEAs. Experience in CIS countries, Eastern European countries and/or in the Caucasus is an asset;
* Fluency in English is required (written and oral), knowledge of Russian is an asset.

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 |
| *60%* | Following submission and approval of the 1st draft terminal evaluation report |
| *40%* | Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report |

Application process

Interested individual consultants must submit the following documents/information to

demonstrate their qualifications.

1. Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability using the template provided by UNDP;
2. CV and a Personal History Form (P11); indicating all past experience from similar projects; as wellas the contact details (email and telephone number) of the candidate and at least three (3) professional references;
3. Brief description of approach to work/technical proposal of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)
4. Financial Proposal that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc), supported by a breakdown of 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

| **Objectives and Outcomes** | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Targets**  **End of Project** | **Status of implementation** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Objective:** to strengthen the capacity to use environmental education and awareness raising as tools to address natural resource management issues. | * Use of EE and environmental awareness tools to address NRM | * These tools & techniques on EE and EA are rarely used for NRM in Armenia | * Diverse and high-quality EE and EA programmes are available to address NRM | * Ongoing |
| * Citizens involvement in decision-making to address NRM issues | * Few opportunities for stakeholder involvement in NRM decisions at national or community levels | * Stakeholders in selected areas are involved in decision-making to address NRM issues | * Ongoing |
| * Decision-makers and teachers able to use EE as a tool to improve NRM. | * Few key stakeholders have the capacity to use EE as a tool to address NRM issues | * Decision-makers and teachers using EE as a tool to improve NRM | * Ongoing |
| * Capacity development scorecard rating | Capacity for:   * Engagement: 5 of 9 * Generate, access and use information and knowledge: 7 of 15 * Policy and legislation development: 6 of 9 * Management and implementation: 3 of 6 * Monitor and evaluate: 3 of 6   (Total score: 24/45) | Capacity for:   * Engagement: 7 of 9 * Generate, access and use information and knowledge: 11 of 15 * Policy and legislation development: 7 of 9 * Management and implementation: 4 of 6 * Monitor and evaluate: 4 of 6   (Total targeted score: 33/45) | * N/A for this period |
| **OUTCOME 1: Enhanced legal, policy, institutional and strategic frameworks to strengthen environmental education and raising awareness of stakeholder as natural resource management tools.** | | | | |
| **Output 1.1:** Adequate legislation and policy frameworks are in place to implement obligations from the Rio and Aarhus Conventions related to environmental education and public awareness.  **Output 1.2:** Relevant institutions have the necessary mandates to use environmental education and public awareness as tools for environmental management. | * Adequate policies for EE in place integrating Rio and Aarhus Conventions’ obligations | * Current policies are poorly known, weakly implemented and do not include EE as an effective tool to address NRM issues. | * Key policies for EE in place integrating Rio and Aarhus Conventions’ obligations and providing an conducive enabling environment for the development of EE in Armenia | * “National Strategy on development of Ecological Education and Upbringing” was developed and approved by the RoA government. <http://www.irtek.am/views/act.aspx?aid=93900> * The website for Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI) for Armenia was developed (https://www.eiti.am/en/) * 500 copies of Red Book of Animal and Plant of the Republic of Armenia were published * 4 short animations on implementation of Rio Conventions and Aarhus convention in Armenia were developed. |
| * Adequate legislation for EE in place | * Current Law on environmental education as well as related laws are not conducive to the use of EE as a tool for NRM | * EE as a tool for NRM is supported by a conducive legislation framework | * The package on legal instruments/amendments related to Environmental Education (EE) was developed and submitted to the MNP for approval. |
| * Adequate institutional set-up with clear mandate to carry out EE activities | * Weak institutional mandates, weak national coordination and unclear responsibilities for EE | * Institutions with clear mandates and assigned responsibilities to implement EE programmes | * Training materials were developed and one workshop on “Environmental Law” for 20 (9 M and 11 F) representatives of governmental entities was conducted. |
| **OUTCOME 2: Improved capacity of relevant government and educational entities to integrate environmental education and awareness raising into programmes and projects as tools for natural resource management.** | | | | |
| **Output 2.1:** Capacity enhanced of key government and educational entities to integrate environmental education and public awareness into programmes and projects.  **Output 2.2:** Integrated training programmes developed and delivered through training centers for civil servants; training centers for teachers and other existing relevant training mechanisms. | * Strategies and programmes integrating EE and public awareness as tools to improve NRM | * Current strategies and programmes do not include EE as a tool to address NRM issues. | * Key strategies and programmes includes EE as a tool to address NRM issues and solutions, including integration of Rio and Aarhus Conventions’ obligations | * Existing training programs for civil and community servants in Armenia were studied and proposal with practical recommendations for mainstreaming EE into the training programs for Civil and Community servants in Armenia was developed. * The package on recommendation to integrate (EE) into National Strategies was developed. |
| * Number and diversity of organizations and individuals trained (men and women) to deliver EE programmes | * Few key stakeholders are trained to develop and deliver EE programmes in Armenia | * 50 key stakeholders in different organizations are trained to deliver EE programmes with a minimum of 40% women | * 51 (19M and 22F) professors/lecturers from educational institutions and representatives of CBOs were trained to deliver EE programmes. |
| * Quantity and quality of EE materials and delivery mechanisms | * EE training materials for civil servants is very limited * Limited EE training delivery mechanisms targeting civil servants * Existing EE programmes to train teachers in pedagogical universities * Uneven delivery of these EE programmes to teachers, particularly practicing teachers | * EE programmes and delivery mechanisms available to public servants and practicing teachers | * Eleven (11) training modules for decision-makers involved in natural resource management were developed. The training materials are developed with consideration of behavioral science aspects and expert’s recommendations on how to influence the pro-environmental behavior of the public and decision makers. |
| * Number of participants (men and women) trained in EE | * Limited training currently offered | * 1,000 people trained (civil servants and teachers) with a minimum of 40% women | * 228 decision-makers (leaders of local communities, members of elderly councils, staff of local self-governing bodies, 153 M, 75 F) from 62 local communities were trained on introduction of renewable energy sources for energy production and incorporation of innovative models for distribution, as well as mitigation of climate change impacts. * The Public Administration Academy of RoA was identified as key implementing partner for this output and contracted for conducting environmental training for 1000 decision-makers. |
| **OUTCOME 3: Developed capacity of community-based organizations (CBOs) to use environmental education and awareness raising as tools for natural resource management.** | | | | |
| **Output 3.1:** Capacity enhanced of CBOs to implement environmental education and public awareness campaigns.  **Output 3.2:** Environmental education material is developed and delivery mechanisms are identified.  **Output 3.3:** A Communication campaign developed and delivered through community based activities and national media. | * Increased use of environmental awareness techniques in programmes and projects to address NRM and poverty reduction at the community level | * NGOs, CBOs and local governments use very little EE techniques | * NGOs, CBOs and local governments are using EE as a tool to make communities environmentally aware and to involve them in addressing NRM issues | Three (3) regional CBOs were contracted to implement projects under Micro-capital Grant Modality:   * **“Generation of Light” Educational Foundation, “Nature is God’s gift to human: The Lord and steward of nature” Project.**   The Foundation published informative-analytical booklet “Nature is God’s gift to human: the lord and steward of nature” in 1000 copies and disseminated among training participants. Three-day training courses on promotion of pro-environmental behavior and issues of global climate change were organized for:   * 20 clergies (M); * 22 (2 M, 20 F) representatives of Centers for Christian upbringing; * 27 (7 M, 20 F) teachers of educational and youth centers, functioning under the Mother see of Holy Etchmiadzin and AGBU. * **“Third Nature” NGO: “The increasing knowledge on the innovative model of electricity generation and distribution at the community level will bring the opportunity to mitigate climate change” Project.**   Four educational booklets, covering the topics of: i) Energy cooperatives; ii) Local smart networks/Micro-networks; iii) Change in energy and climate change; iv) Introduction of renewable energy sources for energy production and incorporation of innovative models for distribution, as well as mitigation of climate change impacts were developed, distributed among training participants and disseminated through online sources. (  <http://3nature.am/docs/imegdclevel_Third_Nature_NGO_Arm.pdf>).  Informative sessions/meetings/discussions were held in 48 rural communities of Shirak Marz and dissemination of awareness raising materials was conducted. Overall, 299 local residents (104F and 195M) participated in the events.  228 decision-makers (leaders of local communities, members of elderly councils, staff of local self-governing bodies, 153M and 75F) from 62 local communities were trained on introduction of renewable energy sources for energy production and incorporation of innovative models for distribution, as well as mitigation of climate change impacts.   * **“NGO Center” Civil Society Development NGO: “Better informed and responsible community” Project**   “NGO Center” organized 3 movie screenings for 72 representatives of local communities (19M; 53F) and trainings with participation of 106 representatives (21М; 85F) from 6 local communities. 6 environmental proposals were developed and presented to the governmental entities and LSGes seeking support for implementation. The implemented events covered various topics related to environmental issues and natural resources management.  Cooperation was established with Russian Trust Fund and $50,000 was leveraged by the Project for customizing and adapting **“Climate Box” Project** aimed at raising environmental literacy of mid-school aged youngsters. The Project is implemented in 8 counties for the period of 2017-2019. Project budget for Armenia is estimated in the amount of 85,000.00 USD (Russian Trust Fund: 50,000.00 USD, Project co-funding (in-kind & cash): 35,000.00 USD).   * Implementation of the “Climate Box” (CB) Project was launched, including the translation of the manual into Armenian and its adaptation. * Two-phased Training of Trainers (ToT) was organized for around 54 public school teachers and methodologists in 2018-2019. The ToT was facilitated by the team of international trainers from Russian Federation. Best experience and knowledge were shared with the participants, issues and experiences related to the piloting of the CBT at schools were discussed. * First international conference on addressing climate change through education for countries of Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia was organized in Yerevan, on 1-2 November, 2018 in the scope of UNDP “Climate Change Education and Awareness Project – Climate Box” regional project to share experiences and lessons learnt from ongoing projects. More than 50 participants representing 7 beneficiary countries (Armenia, Turkmenistan, Kazakhstan, Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan, Uzbekistan, Moldova) and Russia participated in the regional workshop, which served for UNDP country offices and project as a platform for dialogue, knowledge exchange and peer learning for pro-active teachers and help new country offices develop methodological recommendations for the Climate Box Tool. |
| 1. EE and awareness material developed and use by delivery mechanisms | * Numerous materials on EE exist in Armenia but there is no common approach to deliver EE covering global environmental issues and solutions | * Existence of EE programmes delivered by strengthened delivery mechanisms |
| 1. A communication campaign developed and delivered | * Skills and knowledge to develop such campaign is currently limited in Armenia | * A communication campaign delivered and covering global environmental issues and solutions | Development and facilitation of communication/public awareness campaigns related to implementation of three Rio Conventions and Aarhus convention in Armenia was completed. The campaign included: i) installation of Green Urban Pavilion for 2 weeks on Northern Avenue for public at large; ii) Environmental poster design competition and competition for Journalists for covering environmental issues through mass media; iii) Pechakucha Night Yerevan ‘Living Green; iv) movie screenings; v) development and launch of Recycling.am Website <https://recycling.am/>  Awareness raising materials were developed and disseminates/used during the campaign, as well as distributed among key governmental partners and educational entities:   * 2 quizzes were developed and used during the urban installation; * 10 posters on key environmental issues related to Rio Conventions; * Informative booklets and messages; * Tote bags.   The awareness about campaigns was amplified via media coverage on 5 national TV channels and 10 online outlets.  The Project provided support in implementation of a joint wide-scope public awareness campaign through new technologies and artificial intelligence during the visit of robot Sophia in Armenia. Public talk/discussion on the climate change and pro-environmental behavior was held for mass media and public. |
| 1. Number of journalists (men and women) and diversity of media outlets trained to deliver EE programmes | * Journalists and their media outlets have limited capacity to inform the public on NRM issues, including global environmental issues and solutions | * 100 journalists with a minimum of 40% women linked to a diverse number of media outlets trained in environmental awareness, including global environmental issues and solutions | * Training materials were developed and one workshop on “Environmental Law” for 20 (8 M and 12 F) mass media and CBOs representatives was conducted. * One workshop for 25 environmental professionals and journalists (8M, 17F) was conducted on design thinking, digital content, use of social media platforms and multimedia materials in covering environmental issues, environmental communication and environmental journalism. |

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

*Project Document*

*Quarterly Semimanual and Annual Reports,*

*Annual Project Implementation (APR) Reports*

*Mid Term Review (MTR) Report*

*List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Boards, and other partners to be consulted*

*Minutes of Project Board Meetings*

*Project budget and financial data*

*UNDP Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF)*

*UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD)*

*UNDP Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP)*

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? | | | | | | |
|  | How well does the project align with evolving GEF CCCD focal area priorities through GEF 5 and GEF 6? | Extent to which CCCD and related GEF priorities and areas of work incorporated | Project documents  National policies and strategies  Project partners |  |
|  | Are project outcomes contributing to national development priorities and plans? | Degree to which the project supports objectives of Government. |  |
|  | Have implementation strategies been appropriate (is the logframe logical and complete)? | Adequacy of project design and implementation to national realities and existing capacities |  |
|  | Did the project address the needs of target beneficiaries and other stakeholders? Are beneficiaries and other stakeholders effectively engaged in implementation? | Degree to which the project meets stakeholder expectations |  |
| Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? | | | | | | | |
|  | How well has the project performed against its expected objectives and outcomes, and its indicators and targets? | Extent to which milestones and targets are achieved at mid-term, as laid out in the logframe and monitoring plan | Project reports  Minutes of Project Board and Advisory Committee Meetings  Local partners Capacity Development Scorecards |  | |
|  | Which have been key factors contributing to project success/underachievement? | Evidence of adaptive management and/or early application of lessons learned | Project work plans and reports  Interviews with local partners  Tracking tools |  | |
|  | How has the project contributed to raising capacity of local stakeholders to address aims of the project or of Government? | Extent of support from local stakeholders |  | |
|  | What are the views of stakeholders on the implementation and activities of the project? | Extent to which stakeholders are actively participating in the implementation and monitoring of the project |  | |
| Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards? | | | | | | | |
|  | Implementation efficiency (including monitoring):   * Was the project management effective? * Were there any particular challenges with the management process? * Has project implementation been responsive to issues arising (e.g. from monitoring or from interactions with stakeholders)? * Were progress reports produced accurately and timely, and did they respond to reporting requirements including adaptive management changes? * Did the project management Board provide the anticipated input and support to project management? * Has internal and external communication been effective and efficient? * How efficiently have resources and back-up been provided by donors, including quality assurance by UNDP? | Extent to which project activities were conducted on time  Extent to which project delivery matched the expectation of the ProDoc and the expectations of partners  Level of satisfaction expressed by partners in the responsiveness (adaptive management) of the project | Project work plans and reports  Local partners |  | |
|  | Financial efficiency:   * Are the accounting and financial systems in place adequate for project management and producing accurate and timely financial information? * Have funds been available and transferred efficiently (from donor to project to contractors) to address the project purpose, outputs and planned activities? * Are funds being used correctly? * Are financial resources being utilized efficiently (converted into outcomes)? Could financial resources be used more efficiently? * Was project implementation as cost effective as originally proposed (planned vs. actual) | Extent to which funds have been converted into outcomes as per the expectations of the ProDoc  Level of transparency in the use of funds  Level of satisfaction of partners and beneficiaries in the use of funds  Timely delivery of funds, mitigation of bottlenecks | Project financial records |  | |
|  | Efficiency of partnership arrangements for the project  To what extent were partnerships/linkages between institutions/organizations realized as planned?  Which partnerships/linkages were facilitated? Which ones can be considered sustainable?  What was the level of efficiency of cooperation and collaboration arrangements? | Extent to which project partners committed time and resources to the project  Extent of commitment of partners to take over project activities | Project work plans and reports  Interviews with local partners |  | |
|  | Is the project responsive to threats and opportunities emerging during the course of the project? | Level of adaptive management related to emerging trends | Project work plans and reports |  | |
|  | How well were risks, assumptions and impact drivers managed? What was the quality of risk mitigation strategies developed? Were these sufficient? Are there clear strategies for risk mitigation related to long-term sustainability of the project? | Extent to which project has responded to identified and emerging risks  Level of attention paid to up-dating risks log | Risks log |  | |
|  | Is a communications strategy in place? How well is it implemented and how successful has it been in reaching intended audiences? | Extent to which project information has been disseminated  Level of awareness of beneficiaries and the general public | Communications documents  Press articles |  | |
| Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? | | | | | | | |
|  | Is the social, legal and political environment conducive to sustainability? | Extent of supportive policies | Policy documents  Project board and Advisory Committee minutes  Local partners and beneficiaries |  | |
|  | Are there early signs of activities being taken up by project partners, and plans being developed to sustain them? | Extent to which partners are considering post-project actions | Interviews with local partners |  | |
|  | Have partners and stakeholders successfully enhanced their capacities and do they have the required resources to make use of these capacities? | Extent to which partners and stakeholders are applying new ideas outside of the immediate project context | Interviews with local partners |  | |
| Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward enhancing country capacity to conduct environmental education? | | | | | | | |
|  | Has the project demonstrated progress toward institutionalization of environmental education? |  |  |  | |
|  | Has the project contributed to enhanced capacity of the country on environmental education? |  |  |  | |
|  | Are there any indicators toward introducing sustainable mechanisms for enhanced capacity building at the target community level? |  |  |  | |

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: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Annex F: Evaluation Report Outline[[7]](#footnote-7)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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[[8]](#footnote-8)) |
| **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[[9]](#footnote-9)) |
| **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)
7. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. 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-9)