Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference

**Project name**: Towards Carbon Neutral Tourism in Montenegro

**Post title:** International Consultant for the Final Evaluation (FE) of full-sized UNDP-GEF project

**Type of contract:** Individual Contract (IC)

**Assignment type:** International Consultant

**Country / Duty Station**: Home Based with one mission of 10 working days (not including travel days) to Montenegro

**Expected places of travel (if applicable)**: Podgorica, Montenegro and day trips to pilot projects in other parts of Montenegro (with return to Podgorica by evening)

**Languages required**: English

**Starting date of assignment**: 6th January 2020 to 31st March 2020

**Duration of Contract**: 25 working days spread over a three months period from 1st January 2020 to 31st March 2020

**Duration of Assignment**: 25 working days of which a minimum of 10 working days (not including weekends) which must be spent in Montenegro

**Payment arrangements**: Lump-sum contract (payments linked to satisfactory performance and delivery of results)

**Administrative arrangements:** UNDP Montenegro will arrange travel to Podgorica, Montenegro and transport for day trips within Montenegro. The international consultant shall be paid for the travel by UNDP Montenegro in accordance with UNDP rules and regulations.

Evaluation method: Desk review with validation interviews

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 Towards Carbon Neutral Tourism (PIMS 5149)

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

Project Summary Table

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Title: |  | | | | | |
| GEF Project ID: | | 5098 |  | | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | *at completion (Million US$)* |
| UNDP Project ID: | | 5149 | GEF financing: | | 3.090 |  |
| Country: | | Montenegro | IA/EA own: | | 1.658 |  |
| Region: | | Europe and CIS | Government: | | 117.929 |  |
| Focal Area: | | Climate change mitigation | Other: | | 2.321 |  |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): | | FA Objecive #4 for GEF 5: Promoting energy efficient low carbon, transport and urban systems | Total co-financing: | | 121.908 |  |
| Executing Agency: | | Ministry of Sustainable Development and Tourism (MoSDT) | Total Project Cost: | |  |  |
| Other Partners involved: | |  | ProDoc Signature (date project began): | | | August 4, 2014 |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | Proposed:  August 31, 2019 | | Actual:  May 4, 2020 |

Objective and Scope

The project was designed to reduce GHG emissions from Montenegro’s tourism sector by promoting country’s transition towards a carbon neutral travel & tourism, minimizing energy use and transport in and around new green field development projects, helping tourism industry to identify and implement cost-effective mitigation options in travel and accommodation sectors, as well as introducing carbon offset scheme and other innovative financial mechanisms to compensate for the residual emissions and generate additional revenues for climate mitigation and adaptation actions in tourism. The project constitutes of four components, as follows: Component 1: Legal and regulatory framework supporting low carbon tourism and low carbon spatial development, including increased certification of both existing and new tourist accommodation facilities and related services by internationally recognized environmental certification scheme(s); Component 2: Improved low carbon and carbon neutral transport infrastructure to support tourism sector related public and non-motorized transport.; Component 3: Pilot investments to support low carbon tourism development implemented, followed up by the establishment of a sustainable financing mechanism to support climate change mitigation and adaptation actions in the tourism sector; Component 4: GHG emission monitoring system and increased public awareness about the carbon footprint of the tourism sector, its GHG reduction potential and measures

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 assignment will consist of 25 working days spread out over a period of some 3 months from 6th January 2020 to 31st March 2020. A 10 working days (12 days in total if including one full weekend) mission will be undertaken to Montenegro as part of the assignment which means that the assignment is broken down into 10 days in Montenegro, 2 travel days, and 13 home based working days.

The objectives of the final 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 Montenegro including to visit all of the following project sites: Podgorica, Budva, Tivat, Cetinje, Kolašin and others subject to the topics discussed and dynamics of the visit*.* Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

* Ministry of Sustainable Development and Tourism
* Ministry of Economy
* Ministry of Transport and Maritime Affairs
* Chamber of Economy of Montenegro
* Municipalities Podgorica, Tivat, Cetinje, Kolašin, Budva
* National Parks of Montenegro
* Nature Park Piva
* International Grants and Consulting – Bella Boka
* RTV CG
* NGOs: Ozon, BK Perun, Centar za podršku
* Eco Fund personnel
* All co-financing partners listed in the project document

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 Montenegro. 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. In accordance with UNDP guidance for evaluations, that UNDP CO will appoint an evaluation team manager and make sure that meetings are set up for the evaluators free from any possible conflicts of interest.

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 25 days. The 25 days includes one mission of 10 working days (not including weekends) to Montenegro, in accordance with the following plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Timing | Completion Date |
| **Preparation** | 3 days | *End of January 2020* |
| **Evaluation Mission** | 10 days | *End of February 2020* |
| **Travel Days** | 2 | *End of February 2020* |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | 8 days | *March 9, 2020* |
| **Final Report** | 2 days | *End of March 2020* |
| **Total** | 25 working days |  |

Evaluation deliverables

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following deliverables and be paid in three instalments as follows:

Deliverable #1: Inception Report 10%

Deliverable #2: Draft Final Evaluation Report 50%

Deliverable #3: Final Evaluation Report: 40%

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Deliverable | Content | Timing | Responsibilities | Payment Amount |
| **Inception Report** | Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method | No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission. | Evaluator submits to UNDP CO | 10% |
| **Presentation** | Initial Findings | End of evaluation mission | To project management, UNDP CO | n/a |
| **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 | 50% |
| **Final Report\*** | Revised report | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP and Government comments on draft | Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC. | 40% |

\*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 and 1 national evaluator).* The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. International International *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 Evaluator - Team Leader must present the following qualifications:

* Previous experience with result-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
* Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
* Competence in adaptive management, as applied to climate change / environment / tourism;
* Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations;
* Experience working in Montenegro, Western Balkans, CIS countries;
* Work experience related to climate change and/or energyfor at least 7 years;
* Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and climate change/environment experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis.
* Excellent communication skills;
* Demonstrable analytical skills;
* Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system;
* A University degree in technical sciences (civil engineering, mechanical engineering, technical engineering) and/or natural sciences (biology, environment, sustainable development…) or other closely related field. Master’s degree will be considered as an asset.

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%* | Following submission of methodology and proposed work plan, prior to mission to Montenegro |
| *50%* | Following submission and approval of the 1st draft terminal evaluation report, following completion of mission to Montenegro |
| *40%* | Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report, and taking into account all comments received on the draft report from all stakeholders |

Annex A: Project Logical Framework

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Targets - End of Project** | **Source of verification** | **Risks and Assumptions** |
| **Project Objective[[3]](#footnote-3)**  Reduce GHG emissions from Montenegro’s tourism sector and maintain the overall tourism sector related GHG emissions at the 2013 level or lower despite the rapidly growing number of visitors | The tourism sector related GHG emissions compared to the estimated level in 2013  Amount of reduced CO2 emissions by the investments facilitated by the project  Extent to which climate finance is being accessed to support low-carbon tourism:   * 1. Not adequately   2. Very partially   3. Partially   4. Largely   Extent to which there is a system in place to access, deliver, monitor, report on and verify climate finance in tourism sector:   1. Not adequately 2. Very partially 3. Partially 4. Largely | 2013: 70-100 ktCO2  2020: 170 ktCO2  0  0  a. Not adequately  a. Not adequately | 2020: 70-100 ktCO2  The tourism sector related total GHG emissions in Montenegro not exceeding the level in 2013.  Direct GHG emission reduction impact: 77 ktons CO2eq over the 20-years default lifetime of the investments made during project implementation with direct GEF support.  Indirect GHG emission reduction impact: Cumulative indirect GHG reduction impact of 173,7 ktons of CO2eq by the end of 2023 or over 360 ktons by the end of 2028.  d. Largely  d. Largely | Project monitoring reports and final evaluation.  GHG accounting and climate finance system for the tourism sector to be established during project and, as applicable, post-project market monitoring and evaluations. | Adoption of a supportive regulatory framework, related financial mechanisms and/or financial/fiscal incentives |
| **Outcome 1[[4]](#footnote-4):** Legal and regulatory framework supporting low carbon tourism and low carbon spatial development, including increased certification of both existing and new tourist accommodation facilities and related services by internationally recognized environmental certification scheme(s) | Status of suggested amendments to the Law on Tourism, Tourism Sector Development Strategy, Law on Spatial Planning and, as applicable, other related documents  Share from all registered tourist accommodation facilities constructed and operated in accordance with the EU Ecolabel or similar internationally recognized certification scheme.  Number of low carbon spatial plans developed | Low carbon tourism related provisions not included in the Laws  <1 % (4)  0 | Amendments into the Law on Tourism, Tourism Sector Development Strategy, Law on Spatial Planning and Construction and, as applicable, other related documents to promote low carbon tourism adopted.  At least 33% of all officially registered collective tourist accommodation facilities and at least 100 private (non-collective) tourist accommodation facilities in at least 6 different coastal cities to be certified by EU Ecolabel or similar internationally recognized certification scheme, and of which 25% to operate on a fully carbon neutral basis.  At least one low carbon spatial plan developed in each of the 4 municipalities | Project’s intermediate and final results reports on low carbon policies  Project’s mid-term and final evaluation.  Public registries about all registered hotels *vis-à-vis* those listing the hotels being ecocertified |  |
| **Outcome 2:** Improved low carbon and carbon neutral transport infrastructure to support tourism sector related public and non-motorized transport. | Number and type of new low carbon or carbon neutral intermodal transport hubs and corridors. | NA | The main air and marine entry ports certified as low carbon facilities, including “climate friendly” shore power supply for visiting cruisers and yachts  The new Kotor-Cetinje cable car developed and constructed as a carbon free transport corridor.  Bus stations in at least 2 cities established as low carbon tourist welcome centers.  At least 25 km of new non-motorized transport corridors approved for funding. | Project’s intermediate and final results reports on low carbon transport  Project’s mid-term and final evaluation | Required political support for the planned actions |
| **Outcome 3:** Pilot investments to support low carbon tourism development implemented, followed up by the establishment of a sustainable financing mechanism to support climate change mitigation and adaptation actions in the tourism sector | Status of implementation and resulting GHG emission reductions from the pilot projects  Status of the financing mechanisms and amount of financing leveraged for supporting climate change mitigation and adaptation actions in the tourism sector. | None | New tourism sector related GHG mitigation projects financed at the amount of at least EUR 3.6 million resulting in direct GHG reduction of at least 77 ktons of CO2eq over their lifetime.  National Tourist Climate Fund established by the end of the second year of project implementation and mechanism(s) for its capitalisation in place by at least 2 milllion euros annually. | Project’s financial reports  Status report of the Fund | Available baseline financing and required political support for the planned actions |
| **Outcome 4:** GHG emission monitoring system and increased public awareness about the carbon footprint of the tourism sector, its GHG reduction potential and measures. | Annually reported GHG emissions from tourism sector.  Availability of new promotional low/no carbon tourist products and services  Market share of certified low carbon tourism services among all registered tourism services in each respective field (accommodation, transport etc.)  Share of visiting tourist in Montenegro actively looking for and using low/no carbon tourist services | None  None  < 1 % | Verified, annually reported GHG emissions of tourism sector by type of activity.  New promotional low carbon products and services such as specific booking systems, low carbon tourist welcome cards connected with voluntary carbon offset fees , green meetings and other innovative products and services integrated into the offers of official and commercial tourism related websites and other information and marketing materials (incl. international travel fairs), local tourism offices and international travel agencies  Certified low carbon tourism services gaining an annually increasing market share of the tourism sector turnover in Montenegro.  Awareness of and demand for low and no carbon tourism services, as measured by related visitor surveys, show an annually increasing trend | Annual GHG monitoring reports  Project’s intermediate and final results reports on PR and marketing related activities  Tourism sector economic and statistical surveys  Structured sample surveys (interviews) of the visiting tourists | Agreements and mechanisms in place to monitor and regularly obtain the required data |

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

1. UNDP Project Document
2. UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results
3. Project Inception Report
4. All Project Implementation Reports (PIR’s)
5. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
6. Audit reports
7. Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools at CEO endorsement and midterm
8. Oversight mission reports
9. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
10. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team

The following documents will also be available:

1. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
2. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
3. Minutes of the Towards Carbon Neutral Tourism in Montenegro Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
4. 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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***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[[5]](#footnote-5)**

**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[[6]](#footnote-6)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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[[7]](#footnote-7)) |
| **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[[8]](#footnote-8)) |
| **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. *Objective (Atlas output) monitored quarterly ERBM and annually in APR/PIR* [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. *All outcomes monitored annually in the APR/PIR. It is highly recommended not to have more than 4 outcomes.* [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. 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-8)