

## 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 *Mainstreaming global environmental priorities into national policies and programmes (VAN CB2)* (PIMS 5049.)

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

### PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	<i>Mainstreaming global environmental priorities into national policies and programmes</i>			
GEF Project ID:	5051		<i>at endorsement (Million US\$)</i>	<i>at completion (Million US\$)</i>
UNDP Project ID:	00088732 00095279	GEF financing:	550,000	550,000
Country:	PALAU	IA/EA own:	100,000	100,000
Region:	Asia and the Pacific	Government:	2,552,947	2,552,947
Focal Area:	CB2 CD5	Other:		
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):		Total co-financing:	2,652,947	2,652,947
Executing Agency:	UNDP	Total Project Cost:	3,202,947	3,202,947
Other Partners involved:	Department of Environment	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		11 September 2015
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: February 2019	Actual: December 2019

### OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The project was designed to: *(provide a project summary including project goal and outcomes. Also, in cases where the GEF funded project forms part of a larger programme, specify if the TE is to cover the entire programme or only the GEF component).*

The project was designed to allow Vanuatu to address its' long outstanding national environmental information needs and in doing so, it would assist the government of Vanuatu to harmonize existing information systems, integrate internationally accepted measurement standards and methodologies, and develop the capacity for a more consistent environmental reporting both at national and global level.

The goal of the project is to provide leaders and decision-makers in the government and at the community level, with the relevant information needed to take appropriate action and to make informed decisions regarding the environment and sustainable resource management in Vanuatu. The objective is to strengthen Vanuatu's capacities to meet national and global environmental commitments through improved management of environmental data and information. In doing so, the project has focused on the three following outcomes:

1. Improve management information system to measure achievements towards global environmental objectives. This is to allow existing management information systems to improve measurements of achievements towards global environmental objectives. Under this outcome, the project has focused on assessing and strengthening those sets of measurement methodologies, negotiated agreements towards harmonizing these and institutionalized them within the relevant agencies and have shared protocols in a cost-effective manner.
2. Strengthen individual capacities to monitor and evaluate impacts and trends on the global environment: This outcome has helped strengthens technical capacities to monitor and evaluate the state of the environment in Vanuatu. While the first component focuses on strengthening the institutional and organizational capacities for improving data and information collection, management and sharing, this outcome has focused on the strengthening of human capacities to use improved data and information for strategic decision-making in the interest of meeting global environmental obligations.
3. Improved decision-making mechanisms for the global environment institutionalized: This third outcome has focused on enhancing the institutional sustainability of capacities developed under the project through the assessment and targeted strengthening of monitoring and evaluation processes. As such, this outcome has been strategically implemented alongside outcome 1 to strengthen the institutional linkages of data and information systems across agencies and stakeholder organizations. Lessons learnt and best practices have been shared in the region.

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. It will cover the entire programme under this project.

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<sup>1</sup> 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 to Vanuatu. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: Ministry of Climate Change, Department of Environmental Protection and Conservation, Department of Energy, Vanuatu Meteorological and Geo-Hazard Department, NAB, National Disaster Management Office (a list of stakeholders can also be referenced from 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 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 (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.

<b>Evaluation Ratings:</b>			
<b>1. Monitoring and Evaluation</b>	<i>rating</i>	<b>2. IA&amp; EA Execution</b>	<i>rating</i>
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	
<b>3. Assessment of Outcomes</b>	<i>rating</i>	<b>4. Sustainability</b>	<i>rating</i>
Relevance		Financial resources:	
Effectiveness		Socio-political:	

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

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								
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In-kind support</li> </ul>								
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other</li> </ul>								
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.<sup>2</sup>

## 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 Suva, Fiji. 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 20 days according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation	3 days	27 November 2019
Evaluation Mission	9 days	11 December 2019
Draft Evaluation Report	5 days	31 December 2019
Final Report	2 days	19 January 2020

## EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

---

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities

<sup>2</sup> 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](#)

<b>Inception Report</b>	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission.	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
<b>Presentation</b>	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission	CB2 PMU, UNDP CO
<b>Draft Final Report</b>	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs
<b>Final Report*</b>	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**. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The evaluator selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The Team members must present the following qualifications:

- A Masters Degree in environmental science/environmental affairs or related discipline that directly pertains to the three conventions of the UNFCCC, the UNCBD and the UNCCD
- Minimum 5 years of relevant professional experience
- Knowledge and experience with UNDP/GEF MTR and TE procedures and has conducted a satisfactory evaluation process
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
- Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s) especially on capacity building projects
- Has worked in the Pacific and is familiar some of the PI's country CCCD issues

## 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'](#)

## 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 and submission of workplan
40%	Following submission and approval of the final 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 October 31 2019. 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

Objectives and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
<p><b>Objective:</b> to strengthen Vanuatu’s capacities to meet national and global environmental commitments through improved management of environmental data and information</p>	<p>1. Reported availability of better environmental information</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Collection and use of up-to-date environmental management information is ad-hoc and poorly coordinated</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Up-to-date environmental information is being used by policy-makers and also by the public</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reports publishing environmental information</li> <li>Information products such as newsletters, flyers, articles, etc.</li> <li>Policies referring to this new environmental information</li> </ul>	<p><b>Risk:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New information is not used and stays stored in computers within organizations</li> </ul> <p><b>Assumption:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Better environmental information is readily available and actively utilized and used</li> </ul>
	<p>2. Key environmental organizations stated as primary sources for environmental information in Vanuatu by a significant number of national, regional and international development partners</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Capacity of key stakeholders for translating environmental data into information useful by decision-makers is low and dispersed over many organizations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>50% of stakeholders have benefitted from capacity development activities for better use of this information in decision-making and policy-making</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reference to environmental datasets in project documents; national strategies, programmes and plans; national assessments</li> <li>State of the environmental reports and communications/ national reports sent to Conventions</li> </ul>	<p><b>Risk:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Political will to provide environmental government organizations with the necessary resources to sustain the environmental data collection, storage and reporting</li> </ul> <p><b>Assumption:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Government will support key environmental government organizations and provide them with necessary resources to monitor the environment</li> </ul>
	<p>3. Quality of environmental monitoring reports and communications to measure implementation progress of the Rio Conventions</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Current reports are produced with limited data, weak analysis and weak trend analysis and are not fully responding to national and</li> </ul>	<p>Reports present adequate disaggregated data at local level, are informative and present environmental trends over time</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>National strategies such as national planning strategy, medium term development plan, etc.</li> <li>Environmental reports such as the State of Environment and</li> </ul>	<p><b>Risk:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Communications and national reports are not submitted on time</li> </ul> <p><b>Assumption:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Communications and national reports are submitted on time and</li> </ul>



Objectives and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
		international requirements.		Communications to Conventions	include up-to-date environmental information
	4. Capacity development scorecard rating	Capacity for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Engagement: 3 of 9</li> <li>Generate, access and use information and knowledge: 6 of 15</li> <li>Policy and legislation development: 4 of 9</li> <li>Management and implementation: 3 of 6</li> <li>Monitor and evaluate: 3 of 6 (Total score: 19/45)</li> </ul>	Capacity for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Engagement: 6 of 9</li> <li>Generate, access and use information and knowledge: 10 of 15</li> <li>Policy and legislation development: 5 of 9</li> <li>Management and implementation: 4 of 6</li> <li>Monitor and evaluate: 4 of 6 (Total targeted score: 29/45)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mid-term review and final evaluation reports, including an updated CD scorecard</li> <li>Annual PIRs</li> <li>Capacity assessment reports</li> </ul>	<p><b>Risk:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project activities and resources do not translate in increasing the capacity of key organizations to provide better environmental information</li> </ul> <p><b>Assumption:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project is effective in developing the capacity in the area of environmental information management</li> </ul>
<b>OUTCOME 1: Improved management information system to measure achievements towards global environmental objectives.</b>					
<p><b>Output 1.1:</b> Harmonized collection and measurement methodologies of key data and information</p> <p><b>Output 1.2:</b> Existing databases and information systems are strengthened and networked to improve access to environmental data and information</p> <p><b>Output 1.3:</b> Agencies' data management protocols are revised to improve access</p>	5. Adequate national standards, norms, procedures for collecting and storing environmental data are officially in place	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is limited unified set of standards, norms and procedures to collect data, conduct observations and make sampling</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adequate official standards, norms and procedures are in place and use by the relevant organizations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>List of official standards, norms and procedures</li> <li>Assessment reports</li> <li>Final Evaluation report</li> </ul>	<p><b>Risk:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New standards, norms and procedures are identified but might not be adopted by the government</li> </ul> <p><b>Assumption:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The government pursues its policies to integrate the 3 Rio Conventions obligations in the environmental information management and monitoring approach in Vanuatu</li> </ul>
	6. An environmental data repository architecture in place	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No data architecture is in place to structure environmental information at</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Environmental data is collected and stored by key organizations in a harmonized and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Technical report</li> <li>PIRs</li> <li>Web pages</li> </ul>	<p><b>Risk:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of relevant expertise in local market may result in delay of</li> </ul>

Objectives and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
		national level in Vanuatu	structured way and easily accessible		required outputs and distortion of targeted deadlines <b>Assumption:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implementation of project activities and recruitment of relevant national expertise is monitored and actions will be identified if the lack of expertise is affecting the timely implementation of the project</li> </ul>
	7. Information technologies in place to collect, store and share giving access to up-to-date environmental information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited technology is in place to support data management for an effective sharing of environmental information</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hardware, communication and networking equipment is in place to collect and store environmental data and provide easy access to this environmental information</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Equipment procured</li> <li>PIRs</li> <li>Observations</li> </ul>	<b>Risk:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acquire inadequate hardware and develop an IT architecture that is not addressing the data sharing needs</li> </ul> <b>Assumption:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Specification requirements will be done carefully to identify the adequate hardware, communication and network equipment that are needed</li> </ul>
	8. Agreements for data sharing in place	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information is shared on an ad-hoc basis among institutions mostly on an informal basis</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3-4 agreements are in place between key environmental organizations and 3-4 agencies/institutions to formally share data on a regular basis</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreements in place</li> <li>Procedures to share data</li> </ul>	<b>Risk:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Political will to agree sharing data among government and non-government organizations</li> </ul> <b>Assumption:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Government will see the benefit of sharing data through cabinet support</li> </ul>
<b>OUTCOME 2: Strengthened individual capacities to monitor and evaluate impacts and trends on the global environment.</b>					
	9. An in-service training programme for public	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is no training programme for public</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Course(s) on environmental</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Catalogue of in-service training programme</li> </ul>	<b>Risk:</b>

Objectives and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
<p><b>Output 2.1:</b> Training on new and improved data and information collection and measurement methodologies</p> <p><b>Output 2.2:</b> Training on analytical skills to analyze/measure environmental trends</p>	servants include course(s) covering environmental information management	administrators on environmental information management	information management is institutionalized as in-service training for public administrators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other training programmes</li> <li>• PIRs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The in-service training system for public servants might not be interested in integrating into its catalogue the training curricula developed with the support of the project</li> </ul> <p><b>Assumption:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The related in-service training institution(s) will be contacted early on to establish a partnership with the project and involved them in designing and delivering the course</li> </ul>
	10. Number of Environmental Officers (men and women) trained by taking the course(s) developed with the support of the project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 0</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 50 Environmental Officers are trained using the new training programme with a minimum of 40% women</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proceeding of courses delivered</li> <li>• PIRs</li> <li>• Project management reports</li> </ul>	<p><b>Risk:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No interest in better integrating environmental information in government decision-making</li> </ul> <p><b>Assumption:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is sufficient commitment from decision-makers to maintain long-term support to training in the environmental area, including support for the implementation of MEAs in Vanuatu</li> </ul>
	11. Use up-to-date environmental information in decision-making and policy-making	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited environmental information is used to develop policies and programmes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3-4 policies, programmes or plans are developed using up-to-date environmental information</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy, programme and plan documents</li> <li>• SOEs</li> </ul>	<p><b>Risk:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No interest from decision-makers to use better environmental information</li> </ul> <p><b>Assumption:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Benefits of using better environmental information and support from Cabinet will encourage decision-makers to use it</li> </ul>

Objectives and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
<b>OUTCOME 3: Institutionalized monitoring and evaluation capacities.</b>					
<b>Output 3.1:</b> Key agencies and DEPC mandates have been revised and strengthened to catalyze improved decision-making for the global environment	12. An operational inter-sectorial coordination mechanism that build on existing instruments such as NAB, etc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existing mechanisms are operational, however inter-sectorial coordination is limited.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Coordinating MEAs implementation including a broader stakeholder involvement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Government decision(s) to structure an operational inter-sectorial coordination mechanism</li> <li>Policy papers</li> <li>National assessment reports</li> </ul>	<p><b>Risks:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unclear approval mechanism for an inter-sectorial coordination body and unwillingness to participate in the inter-sectorial coordination body.</li> </ul> <p><b>Assumption:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An inter-sectorial coordination mechanism is in-place and supported by high level in the government</li> </ul>
	13. Endorsed action plans for implementing MEAs supporting government's MEA obligations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existing action plans are operational but are focused on specific sectors with limited multi-sectoral approaches</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Renewed commitments to implement MEAs in annual work plans with specific budgets and an improve multi-sectoral approach</li> <li>Greater national budget allocation to the environment sector</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MEAs action plans</li> <li>Government communications</li> <li>Assessment reports</li> <li>Minutes of inter-sectorial committee meetings</li> <li>National budget</li> </ul>	<p><b>Risk:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited participation of government in improving the implementation of MEAs</li> </ul> <p><b>Assumption:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Willingness to coordinate and collaborate for effective implementation of MEAs in Vanuatu</li> </ul>

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

### General documentation

- UNDP Programme and Operations Policies and Procedures (POPP);
- UNDP Handbook for Monitoring and Evaluating for Results;

- UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects;
- GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy;
- GEF Guidelines for conducting Terminal Evaluations.

**Project documentation**

- Signed Project Document: Mainstreaming global environmental priorities in to national policies and programmes
- Annual Project Review: 2016 – 2017
- Quarterly Progress Report: what years are in record to put here
- Inception Workshop Report
- Signed AWP 2016-2019
- Financial Audit Report 2018
- Project board meeting minutes: what years are in records to put here
- Co-financing letters

**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
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent is the project suited to local and national development priorities and policies?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent is the project is in line with GEF operational programs?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent are the objectives and design of the project supporting regional environment and development priorities?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has the project been effective in achieving the expected outcomes and objectives?</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent has the project increased institutional capacity (at national and island level) to increase the resilience of coastal areas and community settlements in Tuvalu?</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How was the project been able to influence monitoring and evaluation for coastal resilience?</li> </ul>		•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What were the risks involved and to what extent were they managed?</li> </ul>		•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What lessons have been learned from the project regarding achievement of outcomes?</li> </ul>		•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What changes could have been made (if any) to the design of the project in order to improve the achievement of the project's expected results?</li> </ul>		•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How cost-effective were project interventions? To what extent was project support provided in an efficient way?</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How efficient were partnership arrangements for the project and why?</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did the project efficiently utilize local capacity in implementation?</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What lessons can be drawn regarding efficiency for other similar projects in the future?</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Was project support provided in an efficient way?</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What risk have affected/influenced the project and in what ways?</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How were these risks managed?</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What lessons can be drawn regarding sustainability of project results?</li> </ul>	•	•	•

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What changes could have been made (if any) to the design of the project in order to improve the sustainability of the project results?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent has the project contributed to, or enabled a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What lessons can be drawn regarding contributions towards reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological stress?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What changes could have been made (if any) to the design of the project in order to improve the reduction of environmental stress and/or improve ecological status?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>

## ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

---

<p><b>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&amp;E, I&amp;E Execution</b></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><b>Sustainability ratings:</b></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><b>Relevance ratings</b></p> <p>2. Relevant (R)          1.. Not relevant (NR)</p> <p><b>Impact Ratings:</b></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 Form<sup>3</sup>

#### 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: \_\_\_\_\_

---

<sup>3</sup>[www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct](http://www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct)

## ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE<sup>4</sup>

---

- 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<sup>5</sup>)
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<sup>6</sup>)
- 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)

---

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

<sup>5</sup> UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

<sup>6</sup> 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: \_\_\_\_\_