

TERMINAL EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE (INTERNATIONAL CONSULTANT)

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 medium-sized project titled Sustainable Management Models for Local Government Organisations to Enhance Biodiversity Protection and Utilization in Selected Eco-regions of Thailand (PIMS#5271),**

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

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	Sustainable Management Models for Local Government Organisations to Enhance Biodiversity Protection and Utilization in Selected Eco-regions of Thailand (PIMS#5271),			
GEF Project ID:	#5726		<i>at endorsement</i> <i>(Million US\$)</i>	<i>at completion</i> <i>(Million US\$)</i>
UNDP GEF Project ID:	#5726			
UNDP Award ID:	00086180	GEF financing:	1,758,904	1,758,904
UNDP Project ID:	00093511			
Country:	Thailand	IA/EA own:	30,000	30,000
Region:	Asia	Government:	7,530,000	7,530,000
Focal Area:	Biodiversity	Other:		
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	BD2: Reduce Threats to Globally Significant Biodiversity	Total co-financing:	7,560,000	7,560,000
Executing Agency:	Biodiversity-Based Economy Development Office (BEDO)	Total Project Cost:	9,318,904	9,318,904
Other Partners involved:		ProDoc Signature (date project began):		19 Feb 2016
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: 18 Feb 2020	Actual: 18 Feb 2020

OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The objective of the project is to mainstream biodiversity conservation priorities into the performance management, development planning and budgeting systems of local government in Thailand.

Thailand is one of the most biodiverse countries in the world containing over 15,000 species of plants and 4,722 species of vertebrates. However, many of these species are threatened with over 555 species of vertebrates listed as endangered domestically and 231 classified as endangered by the IUCN. These species and the diversity they represent are being threatened by on-going urban, agricultural and infrastructure development that is resulting in

extensive habitat destruction or degradation as well as increasing demand for natural resources which is resulting in their unsustainable use.

Thailand has taken steps to protect its biodiversity and has an extensive protected areas network covering over 20% of the country's terrestrial and marine area. However, much of the country's biodiversity exists within areas that are not protected and will, if its survival is to be assured along with national development, need to coexist with on-going human development.

This project will support the realization of this by providing a framework for the inclusion of biodiversity into the development planning, management and performance assessment mechanisms of local government organisations (LGOs). This will be achieved through working on the development of a national level framework to guide LGOs as well as developing the tools (including a Biodiversity Health Index) and capacity to implement them.

The project will also demonstrate how this approach can be achieved within the two pilot locations of Don Hoi Lord (Ramsar No 1099) in Samut Songkram Province and Bang Krachao, an "urban oasis", within Samut Prakarn Province. In doing so the project will enhance conservation management of 69,618 ha of land and marine area, as well as supporting the conservation of the habitats of a number of threatened species including the Great Knot (*Calidris tenuirostris*) (IUCN – VU), Bar-tailed Godwit (*Limosa lapponica*) (IUCN – NT), Eurasian Curlew (*Numenius arquata*) (IUCN – NT) and Asian Dowitcher (*Limnodromus semipalmatus*) (IUCN – NT), as well as a locally endemic earthworm (*Glyphidrilus* sp).

EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

An overall approach and method¹ for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact**, as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR ([Annex C](#)). 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 Thailand including the following project sites

Don Hoi Lord (Ramsar No 1099) in Samut Songkram Province and Bang Krachao an "urban oasis" within Samut Prakarn Province.

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

- Project Director (BEDO)
- Project Manager and Project Coordinator
- Field Coordinators
- Representatives from pilot areas
- Project Administrative/Financial Officer
- Members of Project Board
- King Prajadhipok's Institute
- Department of Local Administration (DLA)
- Project experts from Thailand Environment Institute (TEI) and Mahidol University

¹ For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](#), Chapter 7, pg. 163

- Thammasat University
- Suan Dusit University
- es Department of Fisheries
- Office of the Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Interior
- Other project consultants as appropriate
- UNDP Thailand Country Office in Bangkok

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](#) of this Terms of Reference.

EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS

An assessment of project performance will be carried out against the expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework ([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:	

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

CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions, recommendations and lessons**. Conclusion should build on findings and be based in evidence. Recommendations should be prioritized, specific, relevant, and targeted, with suggested implementers of the recommendations. Lessons should have wider applicability to other initiatives across the region, the area of intervention, and for the future.

IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP Country Office in **Thailand**. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators and ensure 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 23 days according to the following plan from 27 January – 30 April 2020:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation	4 days	31 January 2020
Evaluation Mission	8 days	12 February 2020
Draft Evaluation Report	10 days	28 February 2020
Final Report	3 days	20 March 2020

EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities

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](#)

Inception Report	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method	31 January 2020	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
Presentation	Initial Findings	12 February 2020	To project management, UNDP CO, GEF RTA
Draft Final Report	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	28 February 2020	Sent to CO, reviewed by GEF RTA, PCU, BEDO
Final Report*	Revised report	20 March 2020	Sent to CO for uploading to ERC and send to UNDP-GEF for uploading to PIMS.

*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.

Institutional Arrangement:

The Consultant will report to the assigned UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor Ecosystems and Biodiversity for Asia and the Pacific and Team Leader of the Inclusive Green Growth and Sustainable Development (IGSD) Unit of UNDP Thailand Country Office.

Duration of the Assignment

The total duration of the contract will be approximately **23 working days from 27 January to 30 April 2020:**

Duty Station: home-based with one mission to Bangkok and two domestic missions to project sites in Don Hoi Lord (Ramsar No 1099) in Samut Songkram Province and Bang Krachao, Samut Prakarn Province and series of meetings with project counterparts in Bangkok. The tentative TE timeframe is as follows:

TIMEFRAME	ACTIVITY
27 November – 10 December 2019	Advertisement
10 December 2019	Application Closed
11-25 December 2019	Select TE Team/contract issuance process
27 January 2020	Contract begins Prep the TE Team (handover of Project Documents)
27-30 January 2020 (4 working days)	Project Document Review Document Review, preparing TE inception Report
31 January 2020	Finalization and Validation of the TE Inception Report and re-submit to UNDP.
3 February 2020	TE Mission: Arrival in Bangkok of International Evaluation Team Lead
4-7 February 2020 (4 working days)	Inception meeting at UNDP Country Office Meeting with Project Director, BEDO and PMU team. TE mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews and field visits.
8-10 February 2020 (2 working days)	Preparation of presentations for wrap-up meeting.
11 February 2020 (1 working day)	Meeting with stakeholder meetings, interviews and field visits (cont.)
12 February 2020 (1 working day)	Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings-earliest end of TE mission.
17-27 February 2020 (10 working days)	Preparing draft TE report and Tracking tool.
28 February 2020 (0 working days for consultant)	Circulation of draft report with draft management response template and Tracking tool for comments and completion.
1-18 March 2020 (3 working days)	Incorporating audit trail from feedbacks on draft report/Finalization of TE report including Management

	Responses. Note: Within one week of receiving UNDP comments on draft report.
20 March 2020	Submission of final TE report
30 April 2020	Contract ends

Competencies:**Corporate Competencies:**

- Demonstrates integrity by modeling the UN's values and ethical standards;
- Promotes the vision, mission and strategic goals of UNDP;
- Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability;
- Treats all people fairly without favouritism.

Technical Competencies:

- Analytic Capacity and demonstrated ability to process, analyse and synthesize complex, technical information.
- Proven ability to support the development of high quality knowledge and training materials, and to train technical teams;
- Proven experience in the developing country context and working in different cultural settings.

Communication:

- Communicate effectively in writing and speaking to a varied and board audience.

Professionalism:

- Capable of working in a high-pressure environment with sharp and frequent deadlines, managing many tasks simultaneously;
- Excellent analytical and organisational skills

Teamwork:

- Project a positive image and is ready to take on a wide range of tasks;
- Focuses on results for the client;
- Welcomes constructive feedback

TEAM COMPOSITION

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

The International Lead Evaluator must present the following qualifications:

- A Master's degree in Natural Science, Environmental Management, Environmental Studies, Development Studies, Social Sciences and/or other related fields.
- Minimum of 8 years of accumulated and recognized experience in biodiversity conservation and management, local administration, and sustainable livelihoods.

- Minimum of 5 years of project evaluation and/or implementation experience in the result-based management framework, adaptive management and UNDP or GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy. Some experience working with GEF or GEF-evaluation will be an advantage.
- Very good report writing and speaking skills in English.
- Familiarity with the issues concerning the evaluated project in Thailand or in Asia Region is an advantage.
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and biodiversity, youth, and interlinkages with the Sustainable Development Goals.
- Very good in data analytic and visualization techniques.

Responsibilities:

- Documentation and review
- Leading the TE team in planning, conducting and reporting on the evaluation
- Deciding on division of labour within the Team and ensuring timeliness of reports
- Use of best practice evaluation methodologies in conducting the evaluation
- Leading the drafting and finalization of the Inception Report for the Terminal Evaluation
- Leading presentation of the draft evaluation findings and recommendations in-country
- Conducting the de-briefing for the UNDP Country Office in Thailand and Core Project Management Team
- Leading the drafting and finalisation of the Terminal Evaluation report

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'

PRICE PROPOSAL AND SCHEDULE OF PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

Consultant must send a financial proposal based on Lump Sum Amount. The total amount quoted shall be all-inclusive and include all costs components required to perform the deliverables identified in the TOR, including professional fee, travel costs, living allowance (if any work is to be done outside the IC’s duty station) and any other applicable cost to be incurred by the IC in completing the assignment. The contract price will be fixed output-based price regardless of extension of the herein specified duration. Payments will be done upon completion of the deliverables/outputs and as per below percentages:

%	Milestone
10%	Upon submission of 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

In general, UNDP shall not accept travel costs exceeding those of an economy class ticket. Should the IC wish to travel on a higher class he/she should do so using their own resources

In the event of unforeseeable travel not anticipated in this TOR, payment of travel costs including tickets, lodging and terminal expenses should be agreed upon, between the respective business unit and the Individual Consultant, prior to travel and will be reimbursed. Travel costs shall be reimbursed at actual but not exceeding the quotation from UNDP approved travel agent. The provided living allowance will not be exceeding UNDP Living Allowance rates.

Application process

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.

Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 70% of the total technical points would be considered for the Financial Evaluation. 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.

Document to be included when Submitting the Proposals:

Interested individual consultants must submit the following document's information to demonstrate their qualifications; Please group them into one1) single PDF document as the application only allows to upload maximum on document:

a) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability and Financial Proposal using the template provided by UNDP**

b) **CV** indicating all past experiences from similar projects, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the Candidate and at least three (3) professional references.

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) **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.

Evaluation criteria:

Criteria	Weight	Max. Point
Technical	70%	700
A Master's degree in Natural Sciences, Environmental Management, Environmental Studies, Development studies, Social Sciences and/or other related fields.	20%	200
Minimum of 8 years of accumulated and recognized experience in biodiversity conservation and management, local administration, and sustainable livelihoods.	15%	150
Minimum of 5 years of project evaluation and/or implementation experience in the result-based management framework, adaptive management and UNDP or GEF	15%	150

Monitoring and Evaluation Policy. Some experience working with GEF or GEF-evaluation will be an advantage.		
Competence in data analytic and visualization techniques	10%	100
Competency in Brief description of approach to work/technical proposal.	10%	100
Financial	30%	300

All application materials should be submitted to UNDP by 10 December 2019. The short-listed candidates may be contacted, and the successful candidate will be notified.

ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

(to be added)

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

1. PIF
2. UNDP Initiation Plan
3. UNDP Project Document
4. UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results
5. Project Inception Report
6. All Project Implementation Reports (PIR's)
7. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
8. Audit reports
9. Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools at CEO endorsement and midterm (SFM/REDD-Plus, BD and CC Mitigation areas)
10. Oversight mission reports
11. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
12. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team

The following documents will also be available:

13. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
14. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
15. Minutes of the Project Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
16. Project site location maps

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>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution</p> <p>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</p>	<p>Sustainability ratings:</p> <p>4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks</p>	<p>Relevance ratings</p> <p>2. Relevant (R) 1.. Not relevant (NR)</p> <p>Impact Ratings:</p> <p>3. Significant (S) 2. Minimal (M) 1. Negligible (N)</p>
<p><i>Additional ratings where relevant:</i> Not Applicable (N/A) 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 Form³

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: _____

³www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE⁴

- 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 Manual⁵)
 - 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 rated⁶)
 - 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)

⁴The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

⁵ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

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.

- 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: _____

