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# TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR CONSULTANCY SERVICES TO CARRY OUT TERMINAL EVALUATION FOR ADAPT PLAN PROJECT

***(Formatted to be entered in UNDP Jobs website)***

**BASIC CONTRACT INFORMATION**

|  |
| --- |
| **Location:** Malawi  **Application Deadline**: 6th September, 2019  **Category:** Energy and Environment  **Type of Contract:** Individual Contract  **Assignment Type**: National Consultant  **Reports to:** UNDP Malawi,RSG Portfolio Manager  **Duty Station:** Lilongwe  **Languages Required:** English  **Starting Date:**  22 September 2019  **Duration of Initial Contract**: 22nd September 2019 – 31st October 2019  **Expected Duration of Assignment:** 19 working days |

1. **INTRODUCTION**

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the full -sized project titled *Implementing urgent adaptation priorities through strengthened decentralised and national development plans-ADAPT PLAN* (PIMS#4958). The project is implemented by the Government of Malawi, through the Ministry of Natural Resources Energy and Mining with support from Global Environment Facility (GEF)-Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) and United Nation Development Programme (UNDP). This ToR sets out the expectations for this TE. The essentials of the project to be evaluated are as follows:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project title | Implementing urgent adaptation priorities through strengthened decentralised and national development plans-ADAPT PLAN | | | |
| GEF Project ID: | *5015* |  | at endorsement (Million US$) | at completion (Million US$) |
| UNDP Project ID & *(PIMS#)* | *Project ID 00090986*  *PIMS# 4958* | GEF financing: | *$4,500,000* | - |
| Country: | *Malawi* | IA/EA own: |  | - |
| Region: | *Africa* | Government: | $4,161,341 in kind |  |
| Focal Area: | *Climate Change* | Other: UNDP | - | - |
| Operational Program |  | Prodoc signature (date project begun) | | *19 Dec 2014* |
| Executing Agency | Ministry of Natural Resources, Energy and Environment | Operational) Closing Date: | *31 Dec 2019* | *Actual: 31 Dec 2019* |

## OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

*The project was designed to:*

1. Respond to barriers to the effective implementation of the policy and mainstreaming of adaptation into development planning.
2. To establish and then demonstrate the institutional framework required to mainstream adaptation into development planning at national and local levels, beginning with 3 line ministries (Agriculture, Water and Forestry) and 3 case study districts (Nkhata Bay, Ntcheu and Zomba).
3. To establish adaptation indicators that will be used by the appropriate parties at local and national level to determine the level of finances to be allocated to planned activities, thereby incentivizing active incorporation of adaptation and climate proofing and enabling implementation of MGDSII/III.

Project goals are realized through three (3) interlinked components that address barriers to the effective implementation of the policy and mainstreaming of adaptation into development planning, which are:

1. *Outcome 1*: Strengthened awareness and ownership of adaptation and climate risk reduction processes at local level
2. *Outcome 2*: Diversified and strengthened livelihoods for vulnerable people in target areas
3. *Outcome 3*: Mainstreamed adaptation in broader development frameworks at country level and in targeted vulnerable areas

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects. The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

## EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

An overall approach and method 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](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/UNDP-GEF-TE-Guide.pdf) of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with the guidance (*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 Nkhatabay, Ntcheu and Zomba district councils, including the project hotspot sites in the 3 districts. Interviews will be held with stakeholder organizations and individuals.

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual Progress Reports (APR) and Project Implementation Reports (PIR), Community Based Adaptation (CBA) interventions reports, project budget revisions, midterm review, quarterly progress reports, project tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, technical studies and any other material that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. The project team will share a list of documents with the evaluator for review.

## EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results, 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 the guidance note (Annex D).

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

## PROJECT FINANCE /COFINANCE

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table, 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 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Loans/Concessions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * In-kind support |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1. **MAINSTREAMING**

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

## IMPACT

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.

## CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

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

## IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Malawi. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators (1 International Consultant and 1 National Consultant) and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluators. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the evaluators to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

## EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the assignment for National Consultant will be 19 days according to the following plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Timing** | **Completion Date** |
| Starting Date |  | 22nd September 2019 |
| Preparation | 3 days | 26th September 2019 |
| Evaluation Mission | 10 days | 10th October 2019 |
| Draft Evaluation Report | 5 days | 24th October 2019 |
| Final Report | 1 day | 30th October 2019 |

## EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The National Consultant is expected to deliver the following:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Deliverable** | **Content** | **Timing** | **Responsibilities** |
| Inception Report | Drafting of Inception Report, support in arranging logistics and liaising with local stakeholders | No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission. | National Consultant submits to International Consultant |
| Presentation | Recordings and findings from the field mission and stakeholder meetings, including translation where necessary, drafting of Draft Final Report | Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission | National Consultant submits to International Consultant |
| Draft Final Report | Support in revising the final report | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft | National Consultant submits to International Consultant |
| Final Report\* | Drafting of Inception Report, support in arranging logistics and liaising with local stakeholders | No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission. | National Consultant submits to International Consultant |

\**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.*

## REQUIREMENTS FOR NATIONAL CONSULTANT

## Under this assignment, there will be two evaluators and the National Consultant will work closely with the International Consultant. The consultant shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The National Consultant will support the International Consultant who will have the overall responsibility for the conduct of the evaluation exercise as well as quality and timely submission of reports (inception, draft, final etc). The International Consultant will be accountable to UNDP for the delivery results on this assignment. The evaluator selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

## Academic Qualifications and experience requirements for National Consultant:

## • Minimum five (5) years of relevant professional experience in conducting evaluations of development programmes and projects supported by the UN or other similar international organizations;

## • Experience in evaluations in environment and natural resources

## • Minimum five (5) years of work experience in climate change adaptation;

## • Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and climate change vulnerability and adaptation; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis;

## • A Master’s degree in Climate Change, Natural Resource Management, Agriculture, Geography, Environment, Social Sciences, Development Studies, or other closely related field;

## • Fluency in local languages of Malawi is required

## EVALUATOR ETHICS

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'.

## PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

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

## APPLICATION PROCESS

1. Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability using the template provided by UNDP;
2. CV including at least 3 references and a Personal History Form (P11 form);
3. Brief description of approach to work/technical proposal of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)
4. Financial Proposal that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc), supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the Letter of Confirmation of Interest template. If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.
5. Travel: All envisaged travel costs must be included in the financial proposal. UNDP does not accept travel costs exceeding those of an economy class ticket. Should the International Consultant wish to travel on a higher class he/she should do so using their own resources. In the case of unforeseeable travel, payment of travel costs including tickets, lodging and terminal expenses will be agreed upon, between the respective business unit and Individual Consultant, prior to travel and will be reimbursed

All application materials should be submitted in English by email to [procurement.mw@undp.org](mailto:procurement.mw@undp.org) by 6th September, 2019. Please include “ADAPT PLAN UNDP-GEF Terminal Evaluation 2019” in the subject line of the email. The UNDP will not accept proposals via printed hardcopy.

1. **CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF PROPOSAL:**

Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated. Offers will be evaluated according to the Combined Scoring method – where the educational background and experience on similar assignments will be weighted at 70% and the price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring. The applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score that has also accepted UNDP’s General Terms and Conditions will be awarded the contract.

UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/ skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Selection Criteria** | **Max Points** |
| **Qualifications and Methodology** | **70%** |
| Minimum five (5) years of relevant professional experience in conducting evaluations of development programmes and projects supported by the UN or other similar international organizations | 15 |
| Experience in conducting evaluations in environment and natural resources sector | 15 |
| Minimum five (5) years of work experience in climate change adaptation | 10 |
| Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and climate change vulnerability and adaptation; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis | 10 |
| A Master’s degree in Climate Change, Natural Resource Management, Agriculture, Geography, Environment, Social Sciences, Development Studies, or other closely related field | 10 |
| Fluency in local languages of Malawi | 10 |
| Technical proposal/approach to work | 15 |
| Interview | 15 |
| **Financial Proposal** | **30%** |
| **TOTAL** | **100%** |

Annex A: Project Logical Framework

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in the UNDAF Action Plan:**  **UNDAF Outcome 1.3 - Targeted population in selected districts benefit from effective management of environment, natural resources, climate change and disaster risk by 2016.** | | | | | |
| **Country Programme Outcome Indicators:**  **CP/UNDAF Outcome Indicator 1 - Proportion of land covered by forest (Baseline36.2%; Target 32%).** | | | | | |
| **Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area**  **3. Promote climate change adaptation** | | | | | |
| **Applicable SOF (e.g. GEF) Strategic Objective and Program:**  **Objective 1 - Reduce vulnerability to the adverse impacts of climate change, including variability, at local, national, regional and global level**  **Objective 2 – Increase adaptive capacity to respond to the impacts of climate change, including variability, at local, national, regional and global level** | | | | | |
| **Applicable SOF (e.g. GEF) Expected outcomes**  **Outcome 2.2: Strengthened adaptive capacity to reduce risks to climate-induced economic losses** | | | | | |
| **Outcome 2.3: Strengthened awareness and ownership of adaptation and climate risk reduction processes at local level**  **And**  **Outcome 1.2: Reduced vulnerability to climate change in development sectors**  **And**  **Outcome 1.3: Diversified and strengthened livelihoods and sources of income for vulnerable people in targeted areas**  **Outcome 1.1: Mainstreamed adaptation in broader development frameworks at country level and in targeted vulnerable areas** | | | | | |
|  | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Targets**  **End of Project** | **Source of verification** | **Risks and Assumptions** |
| Project Objective[[1]](#footnote-1)  To strengthen consideration of climate change adaptation needs in decentralised and national development plans. | Adaptation actions implemented in national/sub-regional development frameworks (Outcome 1.1 and 2.2, AMAT 2.2.1) | Communities are highly vulnerable to climate change and adaptive capacity is not supported within the development planning framework at national or local level | Development frameworks that include specific budgets for adaptation actions - 3 ministries and 3 DDPs | Spending plans in three ministries and the three DDPs. | Risks:   * Problems related to involvement and co-operation of stakeholders * Conflicts among stakeholders as regards roles in the project. * Poor co-ordination among implementing and Responsible Parties * Lack of commitment from target communities. * Climate hazards disrupting tangible adaptation activities * Extraneous factors, such as political change, disrupting institutional framework   Assumptions:   * National and local authorities whose involvement is essential remain keen and committed to active participation * Ministries want to collaborate on the project for enhanced socio economic development; * Other projects and programmes do not displace interest and willingness to collaborate on the project; * Local communities see value in the project and actively engage in the identification and implementation of adaptation measures |
| Outcome 1[[2]](#footnote-2)  Strengthened awareness and ownership of adaptation and climate risk reduction processes at local level | Stakeholder-driven adaptations are specified and budgeted within District Development Plans and Village Actions Plans Plans (Outcome 2.3 AMAT 2.3.1)    Number and type of targeted institution with increased adaptive capacity to minimise exposure to climate variability. . (Outcome 2.3 AMAT 2.3.1.1) | Adaptation does not feature in appropriate development frameworks and thus is not owned by the population | At least 3 DDPs and 3 Village Action Plans | District Development Plans for Nkhata Bay, Ntcheu and Zomba; Village Actions Plans for targeted communities in each district; qualitative interviews with custodians of development frameworks and relevant community members  60 District and Sub-District officers in each of the 3 Districts (180 in total) trained on adaptation technical themes. | Risks:   * Problems related to involvement and co-operation of stakeholders (including turnover of staff and loss of staff who actively embrace the project) * Conflicts among stakeholders as regards roles in the project. * Lack of commitment from target communities. * Extraneous factors, such as political change, disrupting institutional framework (for example further changes to the decentralisation framework)   Assumptions:   * District Executive Committees and Village Development Committees whose involvement is essential remain keen and committed to active participation * Other projects and programmes do not displace interest and willingness to collaborate on the project; * Local communities see value in the project and actively engage in the Village Action Plan development process |
| Outcome 2  Diversified and strengthened livelihoods and sources of income for vulnerable people in target areas. | Livelihoods of 5,800 people strengthened and made climate-resilient following training in, and tangible support for, risk-resilient livelihood activities according to their particular geographical locations (Outcome 1.2 and 1.3 AMAT 1.2.10 and 1.3.1.1)  Relevant risk information disseminated to stakeholders (Outcome 2.3 AMAT 2.3.1.1) | Indicator score = 1  Climate risk information (1 day through to seasonal forecasts) exists and is communicated at national level but rarely makes it through to local level | Indicator score = 3  Risk reduction and awareness activities implemented for 5800 households in Nkhata Bay, Ntcheu and Zomba:   * agricultural diversification, * sustainable forest management, * erosion control/sustainable land and water management, * resilient livelihoods   70% of the 5,800 households regularly receiving climate risk information | End of project evaluation survey with project beneficiaries  End of project evaluation survey with project beneficiaries | Risks:   * Problems related to involvement and co-operation of stakeholders (Village leaders and community members) * Staff change among key positions at district level (impeding effective coordination with Village Development Committees) * Conflicts among stakeholders as regards roles in the project. * Lack of commitment from communities in their chosen resilient livelihood activities * Climate hazards disrupting tangible adaptation activities * Poor co-ordination between DCCMS and the Ministry of Agriculture * Difficulties for the project manager in coordinating the improved communication of climate information   Assumptions:   * Local government staff collaborates effectively to implement resilient livelihood activities. * Other projects and programmes do not displace interest and willingness to collaborate on the project; * Local communities see value in the project and actively engage in the identification and implementation of resilient livelihoods * Met Services and the Ministry of Agriculture play a proactive role in translating and then communicating climate information down to local level |
| Outcome 3  Mainstreamed adaptation in broader development frameworks at country level and in targeted vulnerable areas | Number of development frameworks and sector strategies that include budget allocation targets for adaptation (Outcome 1.1 AMAT 1.1.1 and 1.1.1.1)  Number and type of targeted institution with increased adaptive capacity to minimise exposure to climate variability. (Outcome 1.1 AMAT 1.1.1 and 1.1.1.1) | Within the three priority sectors (forestry, water and agriculture) adaptation is, to varying degrees, hinted at but not explicitly or comprehensively addressed, and nor are effective budgets allocated | 3 sector strategies/ for water, forestry and agriculture and appropriately budgeted adaptation measures | Water sector strategy, forestry sector working group strategy, agriculture SWAp documents and Ministry of Finance disbursement records  60 Sector officers in ministries of agriculture, water and forestry trained on CCA technical themes. | Risks:   * Problems related to involvement and co-operation of sector staff * Conflicts among stakeholders as regards roles in the project. * The Ministry of Finance does not release funds as anticipated * Turnover of key staff may impede progress * Political change (e.g. ministry restructuring or other institutional change) may affect the decision-making process   Assumptions:   * Sector stakeholders see the value of incorporating adaptation and are willing to work to do so * Other projects and programmes do not displace interest and willingness to collaborate on the project; * The Ministry of Economic Planning and Development and Ministry of Finance undertake their supporting roles * There is no significant delay from a change to how each sector undertakes its development planning and budgeting (e.g. one may switch from a sector working group to SWAp, which would require a likely overhaul and therefore take the team’s time before adaptation could be included) |

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

1. Project Identification Form (PIF)
2. CEO Endorsement request
3. Project Document
4. Minutes of Inception workshop
5. Project annual workplans and periodic reports
6. Project mid-term evaluation and other relevant evaluations and assessments
7. Project best practice documents
8. List and contact details of project staff, key project stakeholders including project boards and other partners

9. Project sites, highlighting suggested visits

10. Annual Project Implementation Reports (PIR)

11. Project Tracking tools

12. Financial Data

[Audit reports]

13. UNDP Development Assistant Framework (UNDAF)

14. UNDP Monitoring and Evaluation Frameworks

15. UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD)

16. GEF focal area strategic program objectives

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

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

Annex E: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form

**Evaluators:**

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

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form[[3]](#footnote-3)**

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

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

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

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

Signed at *place* on *date*

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

Annex F: Evaluation Report Outline[[4]](#footnote-4)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **i.** | Opening page:   * Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project * UNDP and GEF project ID#s. * Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report * Region and countries included in the project * GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program * Implementing Partner and other project partners * Evaluation team members * Acknowledgements |
| **ii.** | Executive Summary   * Project Summary Table * Project Description (brief) * Evaluation Rating Table * Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons |
| **iii.** | Acronyms and Abbreviations  (See: UNDP Editorial Manual[[5]](#footnote-5)) |
| **1.** | Introduction   * Purpose of the evaluation * Scope & Methodology * Structure of the evaluation report |
| **2.** | Project description and development context   * Project start and duration * Problems that the project sought to address * Immediate and development objectives of the project * Baseline Indicators established * Main stakeholders * Expected Results |
| **3.** | Findings  (In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) must be rated[[6]](#footnote-6)) |
| **3.1** | Project Design / Formulation   * Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators) * Assumptions and Risks * Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design * Planned stakeholder participation * Replication approach * UNDP comparative advantage * Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector * Management arrangements |
| **3.2** | Project Implementation   * Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation) * Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region) * Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management * Project Finance: * Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (\*) * UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (\*) coordination, and operational issues |
| **3.3** | Project Results   * Overall results (attainment of objectives) (\*) * Relevance (\*) * Effectiveness & Efficiency (\*) * Country ownership * Mainstreaming * Sustainability (\*) * Impact |
| **4.** | Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons   * Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project * Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project * Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives * Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success |
| **5.** | Annexes   * ToR * Itinerary * List of persons interviewed * Summary of field visits * List of documents reviewed * Evaluation Question Matrix * Questionnaire used and summary of results * Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form |

Annex G: Evaluation Report Clearance Form

*(to be completed by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and included in the final document)*

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

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

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

UNDP GEF RTA

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

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

1. *Objective (Atlas output) monitored quarterly ERBM and annually in APR/PIR* [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. *All outcomes monitored annually in the APR/PIR. It is highly recommended not to have more than 4 outcomes.* [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)