Enhancing Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the***Enhancing Wildlife Conservation in the Productive Southern Rangelands through a Landscape Approach***(PIMS4490).

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

Project Summary Table

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Title: |  | | | | | |
| GEF Project ID: | | PIMS 4490 |  | | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | *at completion (Million US$)* |
| UNDP Project ID: | | 00091871 | GEF financing: | | 3,990,909 |  |
| Country: | | Kenya | IA/EA own: | |  |  |
| Region: | | RBA | Government: | | 6,250,000 |  |
| Focal Area: | | Biodiversity | Other: | | 18,820,000 |  |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): | |  | Total co-financing: | | 24,820,000 |  |
| Executing Agency: | | Kenya Wildlife Service | Total Project Cost: | | 28,810,909 |  |
| Other Partners involved: | | African Conservation Centre  Big Life Foundation  Maasai Wilderness Conservation Trust | ProDoc Signature (date project began): | | | January 2015 |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | Proposed:  31 December 2019 | | Actual: |

Objective and Scope

The project was designed to mainstream biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into production lands in the Greater Amboseli landscape and improve the sustainability of Protected Area systems (PAs). It aims to provide a resource governance model that allows communities and conservationists to utilize revitalized skills, and, guided by knowledge-based landscape planning, taking advantage of modified policies and market-based incentives to balance resource use and resource conservation across the greater Amboseli, to secure a broader range of benefits for the onsite and offsite dependents, in a more equitable and sustainable manner.

The project partners (Kenya Wildlife Service, Maasai Wilderness Conservation Trust, the Big Life and African Conservation Centre), in line with their designated roles and responsibilities; support national efforts to secure conservancy management, set up a series of conservancies across the landscape, map out and secure wildlife dispersal areas, secure connectivity corridors between the core PAs of Amboseli, Tsavo and Chyulu Hills, to offer greater protection of selected species (GEF BD SO 1). The partners are expected to catalyze a shift from the current sector-focused planning to a more integrated land use planning system; thus, increasing productivity of livestock and agriculture while protecting environmental services, including the watershed services of the Chyulu Hills (GEF BD SO2). The project comprises three complementary components, which are cost-shared by the GEF and co-financing. Each addresses a different barrier and has discrete outcomes and are defined as follows: -

Component 1: Effective governance framework for multiple use and threat removal outside PAs.

Component 2: Landscape based multiple use/management delivers multiple benefits to the widest range of users, reducing threats to wildlife from outside the ecosystem.

Component 3: Increased benefits from tourism shared more equitably.

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects.

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

Evaluation approach and method

An overall approach and method[[1]](#footnote-1) for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact,** as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR (*fill in* [*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 Kenya, including the Amboseli Landscape*.* Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

* Kenya Wildlife Service
* African Conservation Centre
* Big Life Foundation
* Maasai Wilderness Conservation Trust
* Amboseli Ecosystem Trust
* Local leaders – group ranches
* Local community groups
* Kenya Wildlife Conservancies Association

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in [Annex B](#_TOR_Annex_B:) of this Terms of Reference.

Evaluation Criteria & Ratings

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

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

Project finance / cofinance

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Co-financing  (type/source) | UNDP own financing (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 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Mainstreaming

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

Impact

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

Conclusions, recommendations & lessons

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

Implementation arrangements

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

Evaluation timeframe

The total duration of the evaluation will be *XX* days according to the following plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Timing | Completion Date |
| **Preparation** | 3 days | *21 February 2020* |
| **Evaluation Mission** | 12 days | *7 March 2020* |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | 10 days | *21 March 2020* |
| **Final Report** | 2 days | *28 March 2020* |

Evaluation deliverables

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Deliverable | Content | Timing | Responsibilities |
| **Inception Report** | Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method | No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission. | Evaluator submits to UNDP CO |
| **Presentation** | Initial Findings | End of evaluation mission | To project management, UNDP CO |
| **Draft Final Report** | Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes | Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission | Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs |
| **Final Report\*** | Revised report | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft | Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC. |

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

Team Composition

The evaluation team will be composed of (*1 international evaluator) who will receive support from the Country Office and Implementing Partner.* 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.

The evaluator must present the following qualifications:

* Master’s degree in Environmental Sciences, Natural Resources Management, Water Resources Management or other closely related field (20 points)
* Minimum *7* years of relevant professional experience (20 points)
* Knowledge of UNDP and GEF evaluations (15 points)
* Previous experience with results‐based monitoring and evaluation methodologies (15 points)
* Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s) (10 points)
* Experience working in Africa (10 points).
* Fluency in English and French, both oral and written, is required (10 points).

Evaluator Ethics

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex E) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the [UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'](http://www.unevaluation.org/ethicalguidelines)

Payment modalities and specifications

(*this payment schedule is indicative, to be filled in by the CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on their standard procurement procedures)*

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

Application process

Applicants are requested to apply online (indicate the site, such as http://jobs.undp.org, etc.) by (date). Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions. The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in English with indication of the e‐mail and phone contact. Shortlisted candidates will be requested to submit a price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs).

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

Annex A: Project Logical Framework

| **Objective/Outcome** | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **End of Project target** | **Source of Information** | **Risks and assumptions** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Objective –** To mainstream biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into production landscapes in the Greater Amboseli landscape and improve the sustainability of Protected Area systems. | Increased area of conservancies within the productive landscapes with streamlined management guidelines. | Some buffer zones under biodiversity set-asides but without any systematic management regime for biodiversity conservation. | The 5,500km2 of buffer zones of the core parks under a systematic management framework. | Independent mid-term and final evaluations;  Project reports | Risk: - Lack of cohesion amongst stakeholders  Assumption: Continued interest and support of government and staff in the implementation of policies and programmes to mainstream biodiversity conservation and economic development in national planning |
| METT scores improved in selected PAs:  Amboseli NP  Chyulu Hills NP | 66  52 | 75  65 | METT applied at PPG, Mid-term and Final Evaluation |
| **Component 1 –** Effective governance for multiple use and threat removal outside PAs | Regional and local institutions for facilitating a more inclusive planning and conservation of the Greater Amboseli landscape established and made operational in the ecosystem:  1.1 County level rangeland management committee is emplaced and capacitated, coordinating activities amongst the conservancies at county level.  1.2 Independent, national level Kenya Wildlife Conservation Forum emplaced, with at least 10 active member organisations.  1.3 Stakeholder-led process identifies existing rangeland management organisations and engages interest in the capacitation of a system of Southern Rangelands conservancies, modelled on best practice achieved by the Northern Rangelands Trust and conservancies in southern Africa.  1.4 Development of recommendations for wildlife conservation practices for the greater Amboseli for the longer-term harmonious co-existence of wildlife, livestock and economic development. | | | | Risks: -Complexity in stakeholder collaboration due to differing interests and wide range of stakeholders.  - Slow operationalisation of legislation legalising conservancies as the vehicle for co-management.  - Delays caused by the complexities in establishing the institutions required for the southern rangelands  Assumptions: - governance systems will enable the necessary cohesion and pace of implementation |
| Financial sustainability score (%) for national systems of protected areas:  Component 1: Legal, Regulatory and Institutional frameworks.  Component 2: Business planning and tools for cost effective management.  Component 3: Tools for revenue generation. | 46.67%  52.5%  36.62% | 55%  60%  45% | Financial sustainability scorecard |
| National level institutions formalised for empowerment of local communities | 1  (KWCA) | 2  (CRMC and KWCA) | KWS reports;  Government registration/formalisation documents |
| Number of capacity building and training programmes in place (Eco monitoring, Security & Livelihoods) | 3 in each currently established conservancy (Big Life, ACC & MWCT) | At least 5 with streamlined curriculum | KWS reports;  Training course curriculum |
| **Component 2 –** Landscape based multiple use/management delivers multiple benefits to the widest range of users, reducing threats to wildlife from outside the ecosystem. | An integrated land use plan for the wildlife dispersal areas formulated and implementation initiated, clearly delineating different zones of use, providing specific regulations, standards and codes of practice:  2.1 Establishment/Formalisation of 5 conservancies ensuring key corridors of connectivity between the 2 core Parks (Amboseli and Chyulu) and the surrounding areas (group ranches) are secured through a) identification and mapping key HVBAs and forest fragments in the project landscape; b) elevating the legal status of identified critical biodiversity areas outside PAs; c) rehabilitation/ eco-restoration of critically degraded areas (with co- finance).  2.2 Creation and establishment of the proposed conservancies identified during PPG activities and consultations with local communities and key stakeholders.  2.3 The Southern Rangelands conservancies’ project is implemented at county level, with possible alignment of Tsavo /Chyulu conservancies with the wider landscape; possibly with bordering counties of Narok, Makueni and Taita Taveta.  2.4 Minimum utilisation levels for wildlife corridors particularly for agriculture, livestock, settlements and tourism development areas/zoned in multiple use areas.  2.5 Protection of swamps, river systems and Chyulu hills water catchment stabilises water availability to wildlife and human use.  2.6 Implementation of alternative sustainable livelihoods plans and biodiversity friendly farming practices that include agri-livestock activities by farmers in Kimana Ranch and Chyulu Hills resulting in stabilisation in agriculture fields, increase in volumes and duration of stream flows, no net loss of natural forest blocks in critical corridors.  2.7 Capacitation of KWS for the protection of wildlife within and outside the NPs to cover the Greater Amboseli Ecosystem. | | | | Risks: - Threat of continued subdivision of the Group Ranches accompanied by fencing, overgrazing, extension of agriculture and unplanned human development.  - Climate change could lead to both changed distributions of BD components, and changes in demands on biodiversity-based resources.  - Conservancies are slow to join the project for fear of loss of autonomy.  -Climate change affects ecosystem resilience.  Assumptions: landscape approach understood and bought into by stakeholders |
| Movement of elephants within the greater Amboseli landscape, between the 3 core NPs. | Concentration of elephants in the Amboseli NP irrespective of season | Increased movement of elephant populations within the Amboseli landscape and between the 3 core NPs. | Biodiversity monitoring database;  Monitoring reports;  DRSRS and ACP monitoring reports |
| Proportion of productive land in the Group Ranches under conservancies | 10.8% (approximately 57,700ha) | 20.7% (approximately 101,902) | KWS reports |
| Number of conservancies managed under a landscape level coordinated management programme | 0 | At least 5 conservancies | KWS reports;  MOUs agreed upon by member conservancies |
| Number of operational wildlife conservancies managed by local communities | 1 derelict (Kimana) community wildlife conservancy | At least 5 conservancies with rehabilitation of Kimana sanctuaries. | KWS reports;  Independent mid-term and final evaluations |
| Threats to wildlife from unplanned tourism infrastructure development mitigated | Limited scope of procedures in place to deal with unplanned developments | Protocols for infrastructure development operationalised. | KWS reports;  Approved infrastructure development guidelines |
| **Component 3** – Increased benefits from tourism shared more equitably. | 3.1 A negotiated ecosystem-wide tourism development plan formulated and implementation initiated, to support sustainable tourism development and infrastructure development outside the core PAs.  3.2 Tourism returns to local communities enhanced through formation and operationalisation of finance management mechanisms.  3.3 Partnerships between the private sector and group ranches on tourism outside the core PAs increased and made more equitable through development of new and innovative tourism products and other incentives (such as tax breaks), and renewed branding and marketing.  3.4 PES for green water credits operation and earning money to land users on the Chyulu hills(co-finance); | | | | Risks: -Declining tourism revenue unable to stimulate the necessary paradigm shift from unsustainable to sustainable wildlife management.  -Participation by women in the project is limited by lack of awareness and cultural norms  Assumptions: clear and defined interest in economic engagement by appropriate stakeholders including women |
| Number of leasehold agreements entered into by the local communities with tourism investors for use of conservancies or wildlife zones | 1 (Kuku GR) | At least 5 leasehold/management agreements | KWS reports;  Independent mid-term and final evaluations |
| Proportion of household incomes generated from wildlife-related activities | <3% as determined during PPG activities | Increase to at least 10% | KWS reports and Fiscal monitoring programmes |
| Number of alternative livelihoods engaged in by the local communities | 1 (Bird shooting in Mbirikani Ranch) | At least 4 alternative livelihoods including Beekeeping, Sericulture, Aloe farming and eco-charcoal burning | Reports by ACC, ACP and KWS  Independent mid-term and final evaluations |
| Number of tourists visiting conservancies | Majority of tourists visit the 3 core NPs, few venture to conservancies | Increase by up to 50% of number of visitors to conservancies. | Kenya Tourism Development Board reports  KWS reports |
| Number of PES schemes established and implemented. | 1 PES scheme (Tourism PES) | At least 2 additional PES schemes for watershed conservation and carbon trading. | KWS reports and Fiscal monitoring programmes |

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

UNDP. Evaluation Office. 2012. *Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects.* iii + 53 p.

**Project development documents:**

UNDP-GEF - Government of Kenya. 2015. Project Document.

CEO Endorsement Request (revised).

Project Identification File (PIF).

**Technical Documents developed as part of the project implementation:**

Activity Implementation Reports from the field

**Project Management Documents:**

Inception Workshop Report - 2015

Terms of Reference of the project technical team

Annual Workplans and budgets

Project Budget and financial data

Project internal monitoring and evaluation reports, including GEF tracking tools, at the beginning and end of the project

Annual reviews of the implementation of the project (PIRs 2017 - 2019)

Minutes of the Steering Committee Meetings (…)

Annual Audit Report (2016,2017)

**National Documents**

Country Programme Document and UNDAF Kenya

Wildlife Management and Conservation Act 2013

Report on Wildlife Corridors and Dispersal Areas <https://kwcakenya.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/Report-on-Wildlife-Corridors-and-Dispersal-Areas-Final-July-2017.pdf>

National Wildlife Strategy 2030 <http://www.tourism.go.ke/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/WILDLIFE-STRATEGY2030-ABRIDGED-VERSION-Final-June-12-2018-1.pdf>

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. For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](http://www.undp.org/evaluation/handbook), Chapter 7, pg. 163 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office:  [ROTI Handbook 2009](http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/M2_ROtI%20Handbook.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)