# Section 5. Terms of Reference

**Provision of EIMPA Project Evaluation Under Livelihood and Resilience Unit**

# Background Information and Rationale, Project Description

## UNDP Global Mission Statement:

UNDP is the UN’s global development network, an organization advocating for change and connecting countries to knowledge, experience and resources to help people build a better life. We are on the ground in 166 countries, working with national counterparts on their own solutions to global and national development challenges.

## UNDP Afghanistan Mission Statement:

UNDP supports stabilization, state-building, governance and development priorities in Afghanistan. UNDP support, in partnership with the Government, the United Nations system, the donor community and other development stakeholders, has contributed to institutional development efforts leading to positive impact on the lives of Afghan citizens. Over the years UNDP support has spanned such milestone efforts as the adoption of the Constitution; Presidential, Parliamentary and Provincial Council elections; institutional development through capacity-building to the legislative, the judicial and executive arms of the state, and key ministries, Government agencies and commissions at the national and subnational levels. UNDP has played a key role in the management of the Law and Order Trust Fund, which supports the Government in developing and maintaining the national police force and in efforts to stabilize the internal security environment.

## UNDP Livelihoods and Resilience Unit:

The UNDP Livelihoods and Resilience Unit supports the Government of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan to create livelihood opportunities and reduce poverty, especially among the most vulnerable groups. It works work with businesses to create jobs and economic growth, and with the government to build infrastructure, link rural areas to markets and develop new forms of employment, including in the sustainable mining sector. Since most people depend on the land for an income, the Unit’s work on livelihoods is closely linked with efforts to protect the environment, bring sustainable energy to rural areas, and prepare for natural disasters. The Unit works closely with the Global Environment Facility (GEF) that finances environment projects focusing on climate change induced risks, climate change adaptation, and biodiversity.

# Projects Description – Context:

As part of the UNDP programming standards and principles, the projects need to complete an independent mid-term and final evaluation in order to focus on expected and achieved accomplishments, critically examining the presumed causal chains, processes and attainments of results as well as the contextual factors that may enhance or impede the achievements of results. Each project should have at least two evaluations during project lifetime i.e. a mid-term evaluation and a terminal evaluation.

Currently, UNDP CO in Afghanistan plans to conduct the terminal evaluation for “Establishing Integrated models of protected areas in Afghanistan (EIMPA)”. Usually, UNDP would hire individual independent consultants to conduct the evaluations. However, since both projects work in remote and inaccessible locations for UNDP, UNDP plans to hire a firm with two different evaluation team for each project through this RFP.

The information about both projects is provided below:

## Establishing Integrated Models of Protected Areas System in Afghanistan (EIMPA)

The project with financing from the GEF has been designed to strengthen the Protected Area (PA) system by creating a legally and institutionally empowered PA authority, gazetting three new protected areas (total 1,098,190 ha), operationalizing management at four PA sites, and developing replicable sustainable livelihood and rangeland management solutions. The project will support the National Protected Area System Plan by making a major contribution towards achievement of its long-term objective, taking critical first steps in this regard and building strong foundations for the future. The project has three outcomes that directly address barriers to sustainable ecosystem management:

1. A National PA system is established with legal, planning, policy and institutional frameworks for expansion and management for the PA estate in the country;
2. Protected area coverage and protection status is improved to increase biodiversity representativeness and ecological resilience, and;
3. Management effectiveness is enhanced within existing and new Protected Areas and climate resilient SLM applied to reduce threats in and around PAs.

Project expected results include the creation of a centralized parks and wildlife agency, increasing the protected area system by a further 1,098,190 hectares by facilitating the creation of the Big Pamir and Teggermansu Wildlife Reserves and the Wakhan Conservation Area, and building successful and replicable PA and SLM co-management models.

Project Summary Table

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Title: |  | | | | | |
| GEF Project ID: | | PIMS5038 |  | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | | *at completion (Million US$)* |
| UNDP Project ID: | | 00088001 | GEF financing: | 6,441,819 | | 6,441,819 |
| Country: | | Afghanistan | IA/EA own: | 1,000,000 | | 1,000,000 |
| Region: | | Asia | Government: |  | |  |
| Focal Area: | | MFA Biodiversity and Land Degradaation | Other: | 52,300,000 | | 52,300,000 |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): | |  | Total co-financing: | 53,300,000 | | 53,300,000 |
| Executing Agency: | | UNDP | Total Project Cost: | 59,741,819 | | 59,741,819 |
| Other Partners involved: | | Wildlife Conservation Society, National Environmental Protection Agency, Ministry of Agriculture, Irrigation and Livestock | ProDoc Signature (date project began): | | | 27 April 2014 |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | | Proposed: | Actual: |

# Specific Objectives

UNDP is looking to procure services of a firm for conducting the Terminal Evaluation (TE) of EIMPA project. The TE for EIMPA project 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.

The objectives of the both evaluations are to:

1. Assist the recipient Government, beneficiaries, UNDP and, as appropriate, the concerned partners and stakeholders, to improve the efficiency, effectiveness, relevance, sustainability and impact of the project;
2. Provide feedback to all parties to improve the policy, planning, appraisal and implementation phases; and
3. Ensure accountability for results to the project’s financial backers, stakeholders and beneficiaries.

# Evaluation Scope

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized GEF financed projects that are implemented by UNDP are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation.

The TE will assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document and assess early signs of project success or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made to set the project on-track to help achieve its intended results. The TE will also review the project’s strategy, its risks to sustainability and make recommendations on how to improve in future. Since both project target areas (Wakhan, Badakhshan and Band-e-Amir, Bamyan) are in-accessible and located in remote areas, the MTR is being assigned to an independent evaluation firm.

The EIMPA projects works in Band-e-Amir National Park in Bamyan province and the Wakhan district of Badakhshan. The evaluation team is expected to visit both target locations.

# Approach and Methodology

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 Afghanistan, including the following project sites Wakhan, Badakhshan and Bamyan. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS), National Environmental Protection Agency (NEPA) and Ministry of Agriculture, Irrigation and Livestock (MAIL).

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 / Co-finance

The TE 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 | $3,000,000 | $1,000,000 | $29,000,000 | $11,000,000 | $15,360,800 | $360,800 | $47,360,800 | $12,360,800 |
| Loans/Concessions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * In-kind support |  |  | $6,000,000 | $6,000,000 |  |  | $6,000,000 | $6,000,000 |
| * Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals | $3,000,000 | $1,000,000 | $35,000,000 | $17,000,000 | $15,360,800 | $360,800 | $53,360,800 | $18,360,800 |

### 

### Mainstreaming

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 firm and evaluation team 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.

# Deliverables and Schedules/Expected Outputs

The following four key deliverables are expected from this assignment:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Deliverable** | **Content** | **Timing** | **Responsibilities** |
| **Submission and Acceptance of Inception Report (20%)** | Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method | No later than 4 weeks after the contract signature. | Evaluator submits to UNDP CO |
| **Submission and Acceptance of Initial Findings (20%)** | Initial Findings presented on the last day of the Missions to target areas | End of Evaluation mission (10 weeks after the contract signature). | To project management, UNDP CO |
| **Submission and Acceptance of Draft Final Report (20%)** | Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes | Within 3 weeks of the evaluation missions (13 weeks after the contract signature) | Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs |
| **Submission and Acceptance of Final Report \* (40%)** | Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final report | Within 5 weeks of evaluation mission (18 weeks after the contract signature) | Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC. |

\*EIMPA: 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.

# Key Performance Indicators and Service Level

* + **The Inception Report:** The firm will provide inception reports separately; (20%)
  + **The Submission and Acceptance of initial findings:** A debriefing presentation at the end of the mission; (20%);
  + **The Final Draft Report:** The firm will provide draft final report soon after the mission takes place; (20%);
  + **The final report:** The firm will provide final report after finalization of feedback from stakeholders (40%).

# Governance and Accountability

**UNDP’s responsibility:** The firm and evaluation team will be supervised by the relevant Programme Officer and Program Unit head as required. The program unit will assess the quality and performance of the firm and evaluation team. **UNDP and projects will not provide facilities such as office space, transport, computers, stationery, communications equipment, etc.**

The Programme Officer will be responsible for reviewing and addressing firm and evaluation team’ requests for information and support on a timely basis. The Programme Officer, Project Manager in collaboration with the Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist will be available to provide guidance to the firm during their work and for in-depth review sessions. UNDP will facilitate initial contact with implementing partners including contact address, physical location address and names of focal points. The project will also provide key documents that include Annual Progress Reports (APRs), Quarterly Progress Reports (QPRs), Monthly Progress Reports and M&E documents that include the M&E Strategy, Results and Resources Framework and M&E Operating Manual for the Project.

**The Firm and Evaluation Team’s responsibility:** The firm and evaluation team shall designate a focal point (Team Leader for communication related to submission of all reports. The designated focal point shall be responsible for communication with UNDP regarding submission of draft reports, receipt and incorporation of comments/suggestions from UNDP, and submission of final version of the reports. The designated firm focal point shall also be responsible to coordinate with UNDP regarding the organization of review meetings for the reports. The focal point will ensure that the contract is performed in an efficient and effective manner in accordance with the Terms of Reference. The firm and evaluation team will need to provide in the proposal a description and cost estimate for all the facilities required to perform the services.

# Facilities to be provided by UNDP

The firm will ensure they have regional and district level access, to ensure coverage of all relevant project supported provinces, District Development Assemblies (DDAs) and Community Development Councils (CDCs). The firm and evaluation team will conduct meetings with the relevant Project Manager, Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist and UNDP relevant Unit staff (where necessary) in Kabul at the start of to address issues of concern and provide actionable recommendations for solutions, including resolution of issues identified by the firm and evaluation team.

The firm will have sole responsibility for all logistical, administrative and maintenance support necessary to its personnel for the duration of the contract with no responsibility on the part of UNDP. This shall include the following:

* The welfare of its staff including payment of salaries, medical insurance, medical and casualty evacuation in the event of a security breakdown.
* Arrangements for logistics across all aspects of the assignment including in-country transportation for its operations, accommodation and any visa requirements.
* Security for all its personnel and assets. Neither the UNDP nor its national partners shall provide security facilities or be liable for any individual and material damage.
* Ensure adequate communication with UNDP.

Overall, the firm will be entrusted with the duty of care of all its personnel in Afghanistan.

Depending on the scope of monitoring activities, the firm may need to liaise with the relevant Project Manager, Component Leads and M&E Specialist and in project locations may liaise with technical specialist embedded in the provinces/ districts; Provincial Governor’s Offices; DDAs; CDCs as necessary. In certain instances, the firm and evaluation team could liaise with collaborating partners such as MAIL projects, USAID relevant projects, and FAO relevant projects. In addition, the firm and evaluation team could also liaise with respective local citizens who would have benefited from services provided with support from relevant.

# Expected duration of the contract/assignment

The total duration of the assignment will be a total of 18 weeks from signing of the contract. The tentative assignment for both tasks is as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **TIMEFRAME** | **ACTIVITY** |
| 4th week after signing the Contract | Document review and preparing TE Inception Report within 5 weeks of start of assignment  Telephone Interviews with key project stakeholders  Teleconference call with Project Manager, and UNDP Regional Technical Advisor on Ecosystem & Biodiversity (Bangkok Regional Hub) |
| End of 12th Week | Mission to Afghanistan to conduct meetings and interviews with Project stakeholders including governmental and non-governmental organizations and communities at national-level in Kabul and at project target areas in Wakhan and Bamyan. |
| End of 13th Week | Analyzed the data and present Draft MTR submitted to UNDP Afghanistan, Project Manager and UNDP Bangkok Regional Hub |
| End of 15th Week | Detailed comment to the draft TE report sent to the TE Team by Governmental representatives, UNDP, Project Manager, and UNDP Bangkok Regional Hub.  Conference Call on the Draft TE with the TE Team and UNDP |
| End of 18th Week | Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report  Finalization of TE report following all revised comments |

# Duty Station

The EIMPA project works in three provinces: Kabul, Wakhan in Badakhshan and Band-e-Amir in Bamyan. The consultant will be guided by the reporting requirements of this assignment. Options for site visits to Badakhshan and Bamyan should be provided in the Inception Report, following discussions with UNDP Afghanistan and the Project Manager.

The firm and evaluation team is expected to be in Afghanistan for a period of three weeks (15 working days) on a single visit and the remainder of the time will be home-based for desk review, report writing and editing of the final Terminal Evaluation report.

# Professional Qualifications of the Successful Contractor and its key personnel

***Qualifications of the Successful Service Provider at Various Levels***

* A successful proposer must have minimum 5 years of previous experience in the field of evaluation and biodiversity; working experience in Afghanistan is an added advantage;
* Please provide a narrative of your organization’s history and describe previous experience along with organization’s location, length of time in business, experience with evaluations;
* Submit a valid business registration document of the company along with previous registration document which dates back to 5 years or older;
* Provide copies of your previous contracts including the scope of work for at least TWO similar projects within the last 5 years along with Value of the contract, Duration of assignment, Project owner name, address and contact details; Cumulative yearly contract value of such previous work should be more than or equal to USD 100,000.
* A successful proposer shall provide technical proposal ensuring that they understand and meet the technical requirements of the assignment, able to conduct the works within the stipulated deadline, according to required quality;
* A successful bidder shall provide CVs of their key personnel who meet the minimum qualification and experience requirement;

The proposers need to propose two different evaluation team for each specific evaluation.

The evaluation team will be composed of *(1 international and 1 national evaluators).* The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. (*If the team has more than 1 evaluator, one 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; should not have conflict of interest with project related activities; and preferably have not undertaken the Mid-term review of the project process.

| **Position** | **General Qualifications and Experience** |
| --- | --- |
| Key Professional Staff | |
| International Team Leader | **Academic Qualifications:**  Master’s degree in in fields related to environment, natural resources, or other closely related field from an accredited college or university.  **Experience:**   * Minimum 7 years of relevant experience * Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies * Experience in undertaking evaluations for UNDP or for GEF * Experience working in Asian Countries (incl. Afghanistan) in the area of biodiversity and natural resource management including protected areas will be desirable; * Work experience related specifically to mobilizing investment for Biodiversity and Natural Resource Management projects * Excellent communication and analytical skills;   **Language:**   * Excellent written and oral English skills a necessary requirement |
| National Team Expert | **Academic Qualifications:**  Bachelor’s degree in in fields related to Environment, Natural resources, or other closely related field from an accredited college or university.  **Experience:**   * Minimum 5 years of relevant experience * Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies * Experience in undertaking evaluations for UNDP or for GEF * Experience working in the area of Biodiversity and Natural Resource Management) * Work experience related specifically to mobilizing investment for Biodiversity and Natural Resource Management projects * Excellent communication and analytical skills;   **Language:**  Excellent written and oral English skills a necessary requirement |

# Price and Schedule of Payments

The contractor shall submit a price proposal as below:

1. Daily Fee – The contractor shall propose a daily fee for each team member which should be inclusive of professional fees, local communication costs and insurance (inclusive of medical evacuation) and the number of working days for each team member.

2. Travel and Visa – The contractor shall propose an estimated lump sum for home-Kabul-home travel and Afghanistan visa expenses for international team members.

The total contract price, inclusive of the above elements, shall be converted into a lump sum contract and payments under the contract shall be made on submission and acceptance of deliverables under the contract in accordance with the above-mentioned schedule of payment.

# Evaluator Ethics

The Evaluation/Study/Survey will follow UNDP and UN Evaluation Group (UNEG) guidelines on the ethical participation of beneficiaries and children. In addition, all participants in the study will be fully informed about the nature and purpose of the research and their requested involvement. Only participants who have given their written or verbal consent (documented) will be included in the research. Specific mechanisms for feeding back results of the evaluation to stakeholders will be included in the elaborated methodology. All the documents, including data collection, entry and analysis tools, and all the data developed or collected for this study/consultancy are the intellectual property of UNDP and relevant partners. The Evaluation/Study/Survey team members may not publish or disseminate the Evaluation/Study/Survey Report, data collection tools, collected data or any other documents produced from this consultancy without the express permission of and acknowledgement of UNDP.

# Additional References or Resources

* EIMPA Project Document.

# Annex 1: Project Logical Framework[[3]](#footnote-3)

| **Objective/Outcome** | **Indicators** | **Baseline** | **End of projects Target** | **Info Source** | **Risks/assumptions** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Objective –**To Establish a national system of PAs to conserve biodiversity & mitigate land degradation pressures on habitats in key biodiversity areas, initially centred in Bamyan and Wakhan. | Increase in institutional capacity of following agencies as measured by CD scorecard for MAIL/NEPA, BACC, and WPA | * MAIL/NEPA: 42% * BACC: 24% * WPA: 24% | * MAIL/NEPA: 55% * BACC: 35% * WPA: 35% | Laws, regs, mgt plan, capacity & fin sustainability scorecards | **Risks:** Increased insecurity and fighting, political crisis  **Assumption:** the security situation  will remain as it is or slightly degrade but not in the pilot project areas. Elections will be relatively uneventful and not cause a major political crisis. |
| Coverage of managed PA estate | 60,616 ha | 1,155,682 ha | Government decrees, mgt plans |
| Area of rangeland effectively co-managed. | 60,616 ha | 1,169,647 ha | M&E reps, METT scores, LD scorecard |
| **Outcome 1.** National PA system is established with legal, planning, policy and institutional frameworks for expansion and management | Number of laws/regs relating to PAs approved | 0 | 2\* | Government Journals | **Risk:** Political gridlock delays decisions on laws and regulations.  **Assumption:** continued support of government and absence of major conflict escalation |
| No. of strategy/Ops plans developed and implemented by MAIL/NEPA. | 0 | 1 | NRM Strategy Document |
| PA system revenue | 9.62% | 30% | UNDP Financial Sustainability Scorecard – final evaluation |
| **Outcome 2**  Protected area coverage and management effectiveness is improved to increase biodiversity representativeness and ecological resilience | Co-management legislation adopted | 0 | 1 | Government regulations, official records | **Risks:** Conflicts with mining, warlords, decreasing security situation in areas, political crisis following elections could lead to inability to access pilot areas.  **Assumptions:** continued status quo and collaboration with key partners including NEPA, MAIL, BACA and WPA  Assumption: the PA regulation is passed by government and the BANP management plan revenue allocation is implemented. |
| Rangeland habitat condition within PA core zones | BANP: Erosion: 94% moderate to high  Intensive Grazing; 70%  Shrub Harvesting Impact: 53%  WNP:  Erosion: 72% moderate to high  Intensive Grazing; 88%  Shrub Harvesting Impact: 25% | No statistically significant deterioration from the baseline | Rangeland assessment 2006-8 |
| Number of PA management plans being implemented | 1 | 4 | Mgt plans + PAC mins |
| Number & coverage (ha) of PAs   |  | | --- | | BANP | | BPWR | | TWR | | WNP | | Total | | |  | | --- | | 1 PA  60,616 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 60,616 | | 4 PAs   |  | | --- | | 60,616 | | 57,664 | | 24,851 | | 1,095,066 | | 1,155,682 | | Official government records |
| PA mgt effectiveness (METT) score for::  Band-e-Amir  Wakhan | 60.6%  53.8% | 70%  70% | METT Scorecards |
| Extent of new hillside farming in Lalmi and Control (Non-Lalmi) indicator areas of BANP | *2,091 Hectares* | No increase | Satellite image interpretation/surveys |
| Designation of a new PA connecting BANP to Bamyan Plateau | 1) Strategy document prepared for establishing Bamyan Plateau as a new PA  2) Community INRM institution established [which shall include rangers’ team, capacity building, etc.]  3) METT baseline for Bamyan Plateau (if applicable). | 1) Document prepared;  2) Community INRM institution  3) METT Target | Existence of Document;  Presence of Rangers;  Statue and registration documents of Institution  METT Scorecard |
| **Outcome 3**: Conservation in the targeted PAs enhanced to reduce threats to key species and improve climate resilient livelihoods of the community. | Status of SL monitoring (based on NSLEP) | Basic prog | Comp prog | Annual M&E reports | **Risks:** deterioration of security in pilot areas, lack of local technical capacity, lack of engagement by communities, climate change impacts  **Assumption:** current collaborative relationships with communities are maintained, initial successes increase community and individual interest. |
| Number of MPS in Big Pamir | *340 (+/- 122)* | *340 (+/- 122)* | Annual Surveys, M&E system |
| No. of hectares under SLM | 0 | 1,169,647 | Mgt Plan, Annual PA reports |
| Plant cover in target areas | 1) BANP: mean vegetation cover = 20% (5-32%).  2) WNP: mean vegetation cover = 29% (2%-100%). | *No Change* | Sample plots/surveys/remote sensing |
| Community Socio-Economic well-being indices in BANP and WNP | Baseline well-being indices established.  41.27%  60.88% | 15% increase from the baseline | Determined by Basic Necessity Survey (BNS) |
| Female participation in SLM and PA management committees. | WPA: 12.5%  BACC: 0% | >20% | Minutes from committee meetings |
| Proportion of PA tourism revenue returned to communities rather than retained by govt. | 0% | 30% | CMA, BAPAC, and WPA records |

\* Legislation required incl: penalty regs, APWA leg, revised Tarzulamal, revenue sharing regulations.

# Annex 2: List of Documents to be reviewed by the evaluators

*The evaluation will review following documents:*

1. Project Implementation Review (PIR)-to GEF
   1. 2016
      1. 5038-Biodiversity-2016 PIR Report
   2. 2017
      1. 5038-Biodiversity-2017 PIR Report
2. Project Progress reports-to UNDP
   1. 2014
      1. Annual Report for Y2014-Establishing Integrated Models for Protected areas and their Co-management in Afghanistan
   2. 2015
      1. Annual Report for Y2015-Establishing Integrated Models for Protected areas and their Co-management in Afghanistan
      2. Q1Y15 Progress Report
   3. 2016
      1. Annual Report for Y2016-Establishing Integrated Models for Protected areas and their Co-management in Afghanistan
   4. 2017
      1. Q1Y17 Progress Report
      2. Q2Y17 Progress Report
3. Annual workplans
   1. Annual Work Plan 2016
   2. Annual Work Plan\_2017\_Approved
   3. Final WCS AWP 2015
4. Audit reports
   1. Auditor Report for year 2015
   2. Auditor Report year 2016
5. PSC minutes
   1. BDLD PSC meeting minutes 04Dec16
   2. BDLD PSC Meeting minutes 16Dec15
6. Ecological studies and baselines:
   1. Bamyan:
      1. Bamyan Willife and Camera traps
      2. BANP Tourism
         1. Tourist demographic survey report in BANP-2016
         2. Tourist demography database\_2015
         3. مجموع توریستها ی سال 1395
      3. BANP-Lalmi
         1. Dry land farming (lalmi) in BANP-2016
         2. Dry land farming (lalmi) in BANP-Dari-2017
      4. BNS for BANP
         1. Band-e-Amir\_BNS Database
         2. BNS Raw Data
         3. BNS\_Bam\_WellBeingIIndex\_Analysis\_Stephane\_27Nov15
         4. Pasroya\_BNS Database\_Outside
      5. Livestock-Ailoqs in BANP
         1. Livestock & ailoq surveys in BANP-2016
         2. Raw data of livestock & ailaq report
      6. Rangeland Study
         1. Band\_e\_Amir\_Report\_highres
         2. Band\_e\_Amir\_Report\_lowres
         3. Protocol\_satellite\_data\_usage\_oct\_2016
         4. Zandler\_june\_approach\_outline
         5. Zandler\_preliminary\_short\_report\_sept\_2016
   2. Wakhan:
      1. Glacier monitoring data
         1. Glaciers\_2016
         2. Glaciers\_2016
      2. Livestock Monitoring
         1. Autumn Livestock Survey report-2015
         2. Autumn Livestock Survey report-2016-2017
         3. FMD Vaccination
         4. livestock census in BP-2015
         5. Livestock census\_Big Pamir-2015
         6. Livestock\_summer\_grazing
         7. Livestock\_winter\_grazing
         8. Mapping livestock grazing in WNP-2016
         9. Spring Livestock Survey 2016-2017
         10. Spring Livestock Survey-2015
         11. Wakhan Livestock Predation Survey-2016
         12. Wakhi Livestock Death and Predation -2016
      3. Rangeland Studies
         1. chinese\_short\_report\_sept\_2016
         2. no\_title\_chinese\_short\_report\_sept\_2016
         3. Protocol\_satellite\_data\_usage\_oct\_2016
         4. Wakhan\_Report\_highres-2016
         5. Wakhan\_Report\_lowres-2016
         6. Wakhan\_report-2016
         7. Zandler\_june\_approach-2016
      4. Snow Leopard monitoring
         1. Identification of individual snow leopards-2015
         2. SL modelling brief report
         3. SL\_Habitat\_Modelling\_presentation
         4. Snow Leopard collaring data
      5. Wild Ungulate Monitoring
         1. Initial data\_Wild Ungulate Survey in Wakhan, 2015
         2. MPS SURVEY DATA-2015
         3. MPS Survey in Wakhan-2015
         4. PPt\_Wild Ungulate Survey in Wakhan-2015
         5. Wild Ungulate Group Size-2015
      6. WNP Tourism
         1. Tourism Data-2016
7. Products and Publications
   1. 2014
      1. BPWR Management Plan
   2. 2014
      1. Afghanistan Woment Rangers
      2. Autumn Livestock Survey report\_Ali\_Final
      3. BANP - Operational Plan - 2015
      4. BPWR and TWR - Operational Plans - 2015
      5. International Snow Leopard Day in Afghanistan-2016
      6. Livestock\_Count\_BP\_autumn\_2015
      7. MPS Survey in Wakhan-Final
      8. Nation Input Document (NID) for Snow Leopard Conservation in Afghanistan (Bishkek) 1st Dec. 2015
      9. Persian leopard camera-trapping in Bamyan Pleatu-2015
      10. Prot.Wild.Spp.Afgh Booklet
      11. Public Awareness Materials
      12. Ranger Manual
      13. Report on TV and radion round table
      14. Report\_Ulamas\_Train
      15. SL Habitat Modelling
      16. SL modelling final raddendum
      17. Snow Lepard\_camera trap work
      18. Spring Livestock Survey-2015
      19. Summary results from the Bamyan Plateau aerial reconnaissance survey
      20. Tourist demographic survey report in BANP during 2015\_Final\_01.06.16
      21. Ungulate group size-Ostrowski&Strindberg (2015)
      22. WCS M&E manual
      23. WCS M&E Presentation
      24. wcs-af\_m&e-manual\_25jan2015
      25. Wild Ungulate Survey in Wakhan-2015
      26. Women tailor training-2015
   3. 2016
      1. 1-2016-002
      2. Ag-Fair Report 2016\_TEO
      3. Autumn Livestock Survey report\_2016\_3 April 2017
      4. BANP Operational Plan 2016
      5. Dry land farming (lalmi) in BANP\_English\_Final
      6. EEP Bamyan-DARI- 2016
      7. Joint patrol in BANP-DARI
      8. Livestock & ailoq surveys in BANP\_English\_Final
      9. Livestock & ailoq surveys in BANP-2016
      10. Persian leopard CT in Bamyan Plateau-2016
      11. Ranger training 2016 BANP&NP\_final\_English
      12. Ranger Training Report-Bamyan 2016
      13. Report on Ailaqs settlements of BANP-2016
      14. Report on EEP in Wakhan-2016
      15. Spring Livestock Survey 2016\_FINAL\_Feb2017
      16. Summary report on WNP BNS-2016
      17. Tracking a Collared Snow Leopard in the Afghan Pamirs-2016
      18. Training materials on environmental, NRM, protected areas asnd wildlife conservation
      19. Wakhan Livestock Predation Survey-2016
      20. Watershed (tree planting) in WNP-2015
   4. 2017
      1. Children Story Book
      2. Livetsock counts in Big Pamir of Wakhan
      3. Onehealth Global Report Wakhan
      4. Police and Customs Train Report-2017

# Annex 3: 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/criteria** | | **Data 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?** | | | | | | |
| **Project Design** | | | | | | |
| Are the assumptions identified in the ProDoc relevant and comprehensive? | | * Validity of assumptions in ProDoc * Completeness/gaps in assumptions in ProDoc | | * ProDoc * Progress reports/PIRs * NEPA staff * MAIL staff * WCS staff | | * Document review * Interviews |
| Is the project building on and enhancing results and lessons from other, especially earlier projects supporting PA establishment? | | * Continuity in support provided for for PA establishment * Continuation and refinement approaches initiated under earlier projects. | | * ProDoc * Progress reports/PIRs * NEPA staff * MAIL staff * WCS staff * UNDP staff * Communities | | * Document review * Interviews * Field visits |
| Is the project concept in line with the national priorities for biodiversity conservation and development? | | * Alignment with NEPA, MAIL, and GoIRA strategies and policies * Progress in/feasibility of policy and institutional reforms vis-à-vis project design | | * NEPA, MAIL, GoIRA strategies (e.g. NPPs) * ProDoc * NEPA staff * MAIL staff * UNDP staff | | * Document review * Interviews |
| Were the perspectives of stakeholders and decision-makers taken adequately into account in the project design? | | * Stakeholders were consulted during design and work plan development * Stakeholders find that the project responds to their priorities and views | | * ProDoc * Progress Reports/PIRs * NEPA staff (HQ and local) * MAIL staff (HQ and local) * Community organizations * Community members | | * Document review * Interviews * Field visits |
| Is gender (including women’s vulnerability) adequately mainstreamed and addressed in the project design? | | * Plans for addressing gender issues and inclusion of women included in ProDoc * Gender disaggregated indicators and baseline data | | * ProDoc * Progress Reports/PIRs * NEPA staff (HQ and local) * MAIL staff (HQ and local) * WCS staff * Community organizations * Community members | | * Document review * Interviews * Guidance in Annex 9 of *Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* |
| Is the project design taking the future impacts of climate change into consideration? | | * Climate risks have been identified and taken into consideration in the planning of project activities | | * Progress reports/PIRs * WCS staff * Community members | | * Document review * Interviews * Field visits |
| Is the rationale/theory of change (ToC) consistent and are the project outputs and activities sufficient and comprehensive vis-à-vis the intended outcomes? | | * Major gaps in activities design vis-à-vis intended results * Areas of limited progress | | * ProDoc * Progress Reports/PIRs * NEPA staff (HQ and local) * MAIL staff (HQ and local) * WCS staff * Community organizations * Community members | | * Document review * Interviews * Field visits |
| **Results Framework/Logframe** | | | | | | |
| Are the project indicators and targets SMART (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound) and adequately capturing results (outcomes, impacts)? | | Outcome and impact indicators are in place and monitored | | * ProDoc * Progress reports/PIRs * Monitoring/indicator tracking tools * WCS staff | | * Document review * Interviews * Field visits |
| Are the project’s objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within its time frame? | | * Changes were made to the logframe during implementation to address shortcomings * Level of progress on delivery of outcomes and objectives | | * ProDoc * Progress reports/PIRs * Products and publications * NEPA staff (HQ and local) * MAIL staff (HQ and local) * WCS staff * UNDP staff * Community organizations * Community members | | * Document review * Interviews * Field visits |
| Are there any benefits of the project, which are not reflected in the logframe or captured by the indicators and in the progress reporting? | | Presence of unexpected positive outcomes and impacts | | * Progress reports/PIRs * NEPA staff (HQ and local) * MAIL staff (HQ and local) * WCS staff * UNDP staff * Community organizations * Community members | | * Document review * Interviews * Field visits |
| Is the project monitoring adequately capturing gender aspects (including vulnerability) and the effect on women? | | Availability of gender disaggregated data for indicators and baseline | | * ProDoc * Progress Reports/PIRs * Monitoring/indicator tracking tools * WCS staff | | * Document review * Interviews |
| **Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?** | | | | | | |
| **Progress Towards Outcomes Analysis** | | | | | | |
| What has been the progress against the outcome and objective indicators (in the logframe)? | | Indicator achievement versus milestones and targets (mid-term and completion) | | * ProDoc * Progress Reports/PIRs * Monitoring/indicator tracking tools | | * Document review * Use the *Progress Towards Results Matrix* and follow the *Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* |
| What is the current status compared to the baseline scenario? | | Current status compared to baseline | | * GEF tracking tool at baseline and mid-term | | * Document review |
| Has the project changed patterns of human-wildlife conflict (positively and negatively)? | | * Project interventions have improved the protection of livestock from predation * The hunting ban has not led to increased predation on livestock | | * Progress reports/PIRs * WCS staff * Community members | | * Document review * Interviews * Field visits |
| How has the project impacted on vulnerability and human security (positive and negative impacts)? | | * Economic security: Employment and income opportunities created or lost * Food (and economic) security: Livestock and agricultural productivity increased/decreased * Environmental security:   + Environmental degradation reduced   + Vulnerability to natural disasters reduced   + Enhanced resilience to the impacts of climate change * Community security:   + The project has engaged women and contributed to reducing their vulnerability   + The project addressed community-level conflicts | | * Progress reports/PIRs * MAIL staff (local) * WCS staff * Community members | | * Document review * Interviews * Field visits |
| What are the main barriers affecting the ability to achieving the intended results (outcomes and impacts)? | | Stakeholders can identify major obstacles that hamper the delivery of results that are significantly below target | | * Progress reports/PIRs * NEPA staff (HQ and local) * MAIL staff (HQ and local) * WCS staff * UNDP staff * Community organizations * Community members | | * Document review * Interviews * Field visits |
| What are the main successes and achievements of the project, and how can they be expanded? | | * Outcomes and results, which are at or above targets * Stakeholders can identify important results which are not reflected in the logframe * Stakeholders can identify the main enablers for the results that have been significantly achieved | | * Progress reports/PIRs * NEPA staff (HQ and local) * MAIL staff (HQ and local) * WCS staff * UNDP staff * Community organizations * Community members | | * Document review * Interviews * Field visits |
| **Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?** | | | | | | |
| **Management Arrangements** | | | | | | |
| How effective and efficient has project management and execution by WCS, NEPA and MAIL been? | | * Changes been made and their effectiveness * Clarity of responsibilities and reporting lines * Transparency and timeliness of decision-making | | * Progress reports/PIRs * PSC meeting minutes * WCS staff * NEPA staff * MAIL staff * UNDP staff | | * Document review * Interviews |
| How effective has UNDP been at providing support and guidance to WCS, NEPA and MAIL? | | * Clarity of the guidance provided * Responsiveness to requests | | * WCS staff * NEPA staff * MAIL staff * UNDP staff | | * Interviews |
| Is the cooperation with WCS enabling UNDP to reach insecure areas in Afghanistan? | | * WCS is operating in areas, which UNDP cannot operate in directly | | * WCS staff * UNDP staff | | * Interviews |
| Are UNDP rules and regulations conducive for project implementation? | | * UNDP rules and regulations have enabled WCS to implement the project in a flexible manner, responding to emerging needs and changes in the context * UNDP rules and regulations have not created significant barriers to implementation | | * WCS staff * UNDP staff | | * Interviews |
| **Work Planning** | | | | | | |
| Has implementation been timely? | | * Occurrence of delays in start-up and implementation * Justification/reason for delays * Activity implementation status vs milestones and plans | | * ProDoc * Work plans and budgets * Progress reports/PIRs * WCS staff | | * Document review * Interviews |
| Are work-planning processes results-based? | | Work plans contain clear milestones vis-à-vis outcomes | | Work plans and budgets | | * Document review |
| Examine the use of the project’s results framework/ logframe as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start. | | * The logframe has been reviewed * Alignment between logframe and work plans | | * ProDoc * Work plans and budgets * WCS staff | | * Document review * Interviews |
| **Finance and Co-finance** | | | | | | |
| Are the activities implemented in a cost-effective manner? | | * Use of implementing partners and stakeholder’s own resources and capacities * Costs of a sample of expenses * Appropriateness of changes to fund allocations and budget revisions | | * Financial statements * Work plans and budgets * Audit reports * Progress reports/PIRs * WCS staff | | * Document review * Interviews |
| Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for timely flow of funds? | | * Audit findings on the financial management and expenditures are unqualified * Budgets are clear and easy to understand * Budgets are output based | | * Work plans and budgets * Audit reports * WCS staff * UNDP staff | | * Document review * Interviews |
| Is co-financing being used strategically to help the objectives of the project? | | * Co-financing builds on existing processes and priorities of the partners * Regular meetings with co-financing partners regularly to align financing priorities and work plans | | * Financial statements * Work plans and budgets * Progress reports/PIRs * NEPA staff * MAIL staff * WCS staff * UNDP staff | | * Document review * Interviews * Fill out *co-financing monitoring table* |
| **Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems** | | | | | | |
| Is the monitoring system appropriate and effective? | | * Necessary information on outputs, outcomes and impact is provided * Key partners are involved in monitoring * The monitoring system is aligned with and utilising national systems * Existing information is utilised when available | | * Monitoring/indicator tracking tools * Progress reports/PIRs * Baseline information * NEPA staff * MAIL staff * WCS staff * Community organizations | | * Document review * Interviews |
| Is the financial allocation and management M&E budget sufficient and appropriate? | | * Sufficiency of the resources allocated to M&E * Adequacy of the management of the resources allocated to M&E | | * Financial statements * Work plans and budgets * WCS staff | | * Document review * Interviews |
| **Stakeholder Engagement** | | | | | | |
| Are stakeholders sufficiently involved and supportive of the project? | | * Existence of necessary and appropriate partnerships with stakeholders * Local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project * Stakeholders have an active role in project decision-making * Contribution of stakeholder involvement and public awareness towards the achievement of project objectives | | * Progress reports/PIRs * PSC meeting minutes * NEPA staff (HQ and local) * MAIL staff (HQ and local) * WCS staff * UNDP staff * Community organizations * Community members | | * Document review * Interviews * Field visits |
| **Reporting** | | | | | | |
| Is the reporting sufficient, appropriate and adding value to project delivery? | | * Reporting of adaptive management changes by the PMU to the PSC * Fulfilment of GEF reporting requirement and rating of PIRs * Documentation, sharing and use of lessons learned | | * Progress reports/PIRs * PSC meeting minutes * NEPA staff * MAIL staff * WCS staff * UNDP staff | | * Document review * Interviews |
| **Communications** | | | | | | |
| Is internal project communication with stakeholders effective? | | * Regularity and clarity of communication * Level of inclusion of key stakeholders in communication * Existence of feedback mechanisms for communication received * Contribution of communication with stakeholders to their awareness of project outcomes and activities and their investment in the sustainability of project results | | * Progress reports/PIRs * PSC meeting minutes * Products and publications * NEPA staff (HQ and local) * MAIL staff (HQ and local) * WCS staff * UNDP staff * Community organizations * Community members | | * Document review * Interviews |
| Is external project communication effective in terms of raising awareness? | | * External communication channels, such as a website, presence on social media * Outreach and public awareness campaigns | | * Progress reports/PIRs * PSC meeting minutes * Products and publications * NEPA staff (HQ and local) * MAIL staff (HQ and local) * WCS staff * UNDP staff * Community organizations * Community members | | * Document review * Interviews |
| **Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?** | | | | | | |
| Is an adequate risk management system in place? | | * Relevance, importance and comprehensiveness of the risks identified and accuracy the risk rating | | * ProDoc * PIRs * Risk log from ATLAS Risk Management Module * WCS staff * UNDP staff | | * Document review * Interviews |
| **Financial risks to sustainability** | | | | | | |
| Are sufficient financial resources likely to be in place to finance the post-project continuation of the results achieved and systems and process put in place? | | * Post-project availability of sufficient GoIRA (NEPA, MAIL) resources * Ability of income-generating activities established to generate sufficient funding * Likelihood of attracting private sector resources * Presence of ongoing or planned other projects that will support the post-project continuation of processes | | * Progress reports/PIRs * PSC meeting minutes * NEPA staff * MAIL staff * WCS staff * UNDP staff * Community organizations * Community members | | * Document review * Interviews |
| **Socio-economic risks to sustainability** | | | | | | |
| Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? | | * Level of stakeholder awareness, ownership and commitment to post-project continuation * Level of public awareness and support to the long-term objectives of the project * Presence of vested interests that work against the project objectives * Extent to which the PMU is documenting lessons and sharing with partners to promote upscaling and replication | | * Progress reports/PIRs * PSC meeting minutes * NEPA staff (HQ and local) * MAIL staff (HQ and local) * WCS staff * UNDP staff * Community organizations * Community members | | * Document review * Interviews |
| **Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability** | | | | | | |
| Is the institutional and governance framework conducive for, and supportive of, post-project continuation of the results achieved, processes initiated, and systems put in place? | | * Supportiveness of the legal framework * Appropriateness, supportiveness and capacity of institutions and governance structures * Presence of adequate systems/mechanisms for accountability and transparency * Existence of mechanisms for transfer of technical knowledge | | * Progress reports/PIRs * PSC meeting minutes * NEPA staff (HQ and local) * MAIL staff (HQ and local) * WCS staff * UNDP staff * Community organizations * Community members | | * Document review * Interviews |
| **Environmental risks to sustainability** | | | | | | |
| Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes? | | * Likeliness of natural hazards (drought, floods, earthquakes) destroying SLM investments and practices * Anticipated future impacts of climate change | | * Progress reports/PIRs * PSC meeting minutes * NEPA staff (HQ and local) * MAIL staff (HQ and local) * WCS staff * UNDP staff * Community organizations * Community members | | * Document review * Interviews |
| **Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?** | | | | | | |
|  |  | |  | |  | |
|  |  | |  | |  | |
|  |  | |  | |  | |

# Annex 4: 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 5: 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[[4]](#footnote-4)**

**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 6: Evaluation Report Outline[[5]](#footnote-5)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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[[6]](#footnote-6)) |
| **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[[7]](#footnote-7)) |
| **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 7: 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. PRF has been revised in 2017 after the MTR [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. 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-7)