
TERMS OF REFERENCE

Position:	01 international consultant and 01 national consultant to conduct a terminal evaluation of the <i>Viet Nam POPs and Sound Harmful Chemicals Management Project</i>
Duty Station:	Hanoi and provinces (if travel is required)
Type of appointment:	Individual contract
Duration:	International consultant: 23 days (completed by 1 June 2020) National consultant: 15 days (completed by 1 June 2020)
Reporting to:	UNDP Viet Nam & PMU
Application deadline:	10 th February 2020

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

GEF Project ID:	PIMS5154		<i>At endorsement (Million US\$)</i>	<i>At completion (Million US\$)</i>
UNDP Project ID:	00091381	GEF financing:	USD 2,550,000	
Country:	Vietnam	IA/EA own:		
Region:		Government:	USD 8,050,000	
Focal Area:	Inclusive, Equitable and Sustainable Growth	Other (JICA):	USD 3,000,000	
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):		Total co-financing:	USD 11,050,000	
Executing Agency:	VEA/MONRE	Total project cost:	USD 13,600,000	
Other Partners involved:	VINACHEMIA/MOIT	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		January 29, 2016
		(Operational) Closing Date:	<i>Proposed:</i> Dec. 2018	<i>Actual:</i> July 29, 2020

1 INTRODUCTION

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the full-sized project titled **Viet Nam POPs and Sound Harmful Chemicals Management Project**, implemented through the Vietnam Environment Administration (VEA)/Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MONRE) as the UNDP's National Implementing Partner (NIP) and the Vietnam Chemicals Agency (VINACHEMIA)/Ministry of Industry and Trade (MOIT) as the UNDP's Co-Implementing Partner (CIP), which has been undertaken from 2016-2020.

This ToR sets out the expectations for this TE. The TE process must follow the guidance outlined in the document *Guidance For Conducting Terminal Evaluation of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*.¹

The project was designed to continue the reduction of environmental and health risks through the reduction of POPs and harmful chemicals being released, achieved by (1) **provision of an integrated institutional and regulatory**

¹ <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/UNDP-GEF-TE-Guide.pdf>

framework covering the management and reporting of POPs and harmful chemicals within a national sound chemicals management framework, and (2) **targeted development of POPs-contaminated site management capacity**, building on experience from GEF-4 projects and specifically a management plan at the provincial level to assess risk and implement release reduction measures at all the POPs-contaminated sites in two provinces.

The **specific project objectives** are:

1. Strengthen national capacity on the safe management of POPs and harmful chemicals;
2. Control and reduce the release of POPs/PTS into the environment from POPs/PTS-contaminated sites; and
3. Perform a preliminary inventory of mercury sources and draft a roadmap on mercury reduction.

In order to achieve the project objectives, **four project components** are envisaged:

- **Component 1.** Policy framework for sound chemicals management, including POPs/PTS, developed and implemented.
- **Component 2.** Monitoring and reporting of POPs and PTS.
- **Component 3.** Management of POPs-contaminated sites
- **Component 4.** National mercury baseline inventory and release reduction.

1.1 PROJECT ARRANGEMENT

- **The project is financed with funding from the GEF and UNDP acts as the GEF Implementing Agency.** In the context of the UNDP, the project will be executed by MONRE, which will assume the overall responsibility for the achievement of project results as the UNDP's National Implementing Partner (NIP). This NIP will be subject to the micro-assessment and subsequent quality assurance activities as per the Harmonized Approach to Cash Transfers to Implementing Partners (HACT) framework. UNDP will provide overall management and guidance from its Country Office in Hanoi and the Bangkok Regional Hub (BRH), and will be responsible for monitoring and evaluation of the project as per normal GEF and UNDP requirements.
- **MONRE will designate a senior official as the National Project Director (NPD) for the project.** The NPD will be responsible for overall guidance to project management, including adherence to the Annual Work Plan (AWP) and achievement of planned results as outlined in the ProDoc, and for the use of UNDP funds through effective management and well-established project review and oversight mechanisms. The NPD also will ensure coordination with various ministries and agencies provide guidance to the project team to coordinate with UNDP, review reports and look after administrative arrangements as required by the Government of Viet Nam and UNDP. The project will be executed according to UNDP's National Implementation Modality (NIM), as per the NIM project management implementation guidelines agreed by UNDP and the Government of Viet Nam.
- **The Project Steering Committee (PSC) will have oversight of the Project Management Unit (PMU).** The PSC will consist of a Chairperson (MONRE Vice Minister) with PSC members from MOIT, UNDP Viet Nam, MARD, MOH. The primary functions of the PSC will be to provide the necessary direction that allows the Project to function and achieve its policy and technical objectives, and to approve the annual Project plans and M&E reports.
- **The PMU staff will report to the National Project Director (NPD).** The NPD assigned by the National Implementing Partner (MONRE) will be responsible to MONRE, MOIT, the PSC, and UNDP for implementing the Project, planning activities and budgets, recruiting specialists, conducting training workshops, and other activities to ensure the Project is executed as per approved work plans.

- **As a senior supplier, UNDP also has a role of project assurance.** This role will be exercised by the UNDP Programme Officer responsible for the project, based in the UNDP Country Office (CO), and a Visiting International Technical Advisor (VSTA), funded by the project.
- **PMU will implement mechanisms to ensure ongoing stakeholder participation and effectiveness** with the commencement of the Project by conducting regular stakeholder meetings, issuing a regular project electronic newsletter, conducting feedback surveys, implementing strong project management practices, and having close involvement with UNDP Viet Nam as the GEF Implementing Agency.

2 TE OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE

The objectives of the evaluation are (1) to assess the achievement of project results, and (2) to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules, and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the *UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*.

3 TE APPROACH & METHOD

An overall approach and method² for conducting project terminal evaluations for 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 has been drafted and is included with this TOR (see [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 in Viet Nam, including the following project sites: **Binh Duong** province, **Nghe An** province, and **Quang Binh** province.

Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

- Department of Environmental Quality Management (DoEQM)/Vietnam Environment Administration (VEA)/Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MONRE);
- Vietnam Chemicals Agency (VINACHEMIA)/Ministry of Industry and Trade (MOIT);
- Senior officials, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Steering Committee (PSC), and Project Management Unit (PMU);
- DoNREs in Binh Duong and Nghe An provinces;
- Local people in Quang Binh province; and
- Industries in Binh Duong province.

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

² For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](#), Chapter 7, pg. 163.

files, and national strategic and legal documents), and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in [Annex B](#) of this Terms of Reference.

3.1 EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS

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

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

4 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's own financing (mill. US\$)		Government (mill. US\$)		Partner Agency (mill. US\$)		Total (mill. US\$)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Actual	Actual
Grants	2.55		8.05		3.0		13.6	
Loans/Concessions								

• In-kind support								
• Other								
Totals								

5 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.

6 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.³

7 CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

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

8 IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Vietnam. 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.

The selected consultants will work closely with UNDP programme Officer and Project Management Unit (PMU) under the guidance of the Head of Climate Change and Environment Unit at UNDP Viet Nam.

With the exception of a 8-day field mission including Hanoi, Binh Duong, Nghe An, and Quang Binh province, the members of the Evaluators team are expected to work mostly from their home based offices and communicate among themselves and with UNDP, PMU and other stakeholders electronically. The Evaluators team can seek out both UNDP and PMU for reasonable assistance and support that they may require to fulfill their responsibilities.

9 EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the evaluation will be **38 days**, divided according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
----------	--------	-----------------

³ 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](#)

Preparation	4 days: International consultant: 2 days National consultant: 2 days	1 April 2020
Evaluation Mission	16 days: International consultant: 8 days National consultant: 8 days	1 May 2020
Draft Final Report	15 days: International consultant: 10 days National consultant: 5 days	20 May 2020
Final Report	3 days (International consultant)	1 June 2020

10 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 and 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.

11 TEAM COMPOSITION, QUALIFICATIONS & RESPONSIBILITIES

The evaluation team will be composed of **1 international evaluator** and **1 national evaluator** (the international evaluator will be the team leader and will be responsible for finalizing the report). The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF-financed projects is an advantage. The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project-related activities.

11.1 INTERNATIONAL CONSULTANT

QUALIFICATIONS

- Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to POPs and chemical management;
- Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations;
- Experience working in Asia is an advantage;
- Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years;

- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and POPs and chemical management; experience in gender-sensitive evaluation and analysis;
- Excellent communication skills;
- Demonstrable analytical and report-writing skills;
- Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset;
- A Master’s degree in chemical engineering, environment, or other closely related field.

RESPONSIBILITIES

- Lead and manage the evaluation mission;
- Design the detailed evaluation scope and methodology (including the methods for data collection and analysis);
- Decide the division of labor within the evaluation team;
- Conduct an analysis of the outcome, outputs and partnership strategy (as per the scope of the evaluation described above);
- Draft related parts of the evaluation report; and
- Finalize the entire evaluation report.

INTERNATIONAL CONSULTANT EVALUATION

	Consultant’s experiences/qualification related to the service	Points
1	Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies	150
2	Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios	100
3	Competence in adaptive management, as applied to POPs and chemical management	100
4	Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations is an advantage	50
5	Experience working in Asia is an advantage	100
6	Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years	100
7	Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and POPs and chemical management; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis.	100
8	Demonstrable analytical and report-writing skills	100
9	Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset	100
10	A Master’s degree in chemical engineering, environment, or other closely related field	100
TOTAL		1,000

11.2 NATIONAL CONSULTANT

QUALIFICATIONS

- Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to POPs and chemical management;
- Experience working with the GEF or GEF evaluations;

- Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years;
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and POPs and chemical management; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis;
- Excellent communication skills;
- Excellent English language abilities, written and spoken;
- Demonstrable analytical skills;
- Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset;
- A Master’s degree in chemical engineering, environment, or other closely related field.

RESPONSIBILITIES

- Documentation of evaluation and data gathering and consultation meetings;
- Contributing to the development of evaluation plan and methodology;
- Conducting specific elements of the evaluation determined by the International Lead Consultant;
- Contributing to presentation of the evaluation findings and recommendations at the evaluation wrap-up meeting;
- Contributing to the drafting and finalization of the MTR reports, notes of the meetings and other related documents prepared by the international consultant; and
- Performing translation for the international consultants during meetings with various stakeholders and necessary documents discussed during the international consultant’s mission.

NATIONAL CONSULTANT EVALUATION

	Consultant’s experiences/qualification related to the service	Points
1	Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies	150
2	Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios	100
3	Competence in adaptive management, as applied to POPs and chemical management	100
4	Experience working with the GEF or GEF evaluations as an asset	50
5	Excellent English language abilities, written with two writing samples submitted	100
6	Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years	100
7	Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and POPs and chemical management; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis.	100
9	Demonstrable analytical skills	100
10	Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset	100
11	A Master’s degree in chemical engineering, environment, or other closely related field	100
TOTAL		1,000

12 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.⁴

13 PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

%	Milestone
10%	Final TE Inception report
40%	Following submission and approval of the 1 st draft terminal evaluation report
50%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report

13.1 RECOMMENDED PRESENTATION OF PROPOSAL

- a) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the template⁵ provided by UNDP;
- b) **Current and complete CV** in English
- c) **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)
- d) Two writing samples (for National consultant only)

⁴ <http://www.unevaluation.org/ethicalguidelines>

⁵ http://procurement-notice.undp.org/view_file.cfm?doc_id=45780

ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

See in the Project Inception Report.

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

The following documents will be reviewed:

1. Project Document
2. Project Initiation Plan
3. Project Inception Report
4. All Project Implementation Reports (PIR's)
5. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
6. Audit reports
7. Midterm Evaluation report
8. Oversight mission reports
9. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
10. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team
11. All deliverables of all packages under the project

The following documents will also be available:

- Project operational guidelines, manuals, and systems
- UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
- Minutes of the *Viet Nam POPS and Sound Harmful Chemicals Management Project* Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)

ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

This is a generic list, to be further detailed with more specific questions by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on the particulars of the project.

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?			
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?			

Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			

ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

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

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 Form⁶
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 _____ on _____
Signature: _____

⁶www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE⁷

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 Manual⁸)

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 rated⁹)

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

⁷The Report length should not exceed **40** pages in total (not including annexes).

⁸ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

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.

- 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: _____