

TERMS OF REFERENCE

PROJECT TERMINAL EVALUATION



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

Position: 01 international consultant to conduct a terminal evaluation of the project *Conservation of Critical Wetland Protected Areas and Linked Landscapes*

Duty Station: Home base with travel to Viet Nam¹

Type of appointment: Individual contract

Duration: International consultant: 20 days (from September 2020 to October 2020)

Reporting to: UNDP Viet Nam & PMU

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

GEF Project ID:	PIMS #4537		At endorsement (Million US\$)	At completion (Million US\$)
UNDP Project ID:	00088048	GEF financing:	3,180,287	
Country:	Viet Nam	IA/EA own:	1,000,000	
Region:	Asia and the Pacific	Government:	12,871,600	
Focal Area:	Biodiversity	Other:	1,020,000	
FA Objectives, OP/SP):	Objective 1: <i>Improve Sustainability of PA Systems</i>	Total co-financing:		
Executing Agency:	Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MONRE)	Total project cost:	18,071,887	
Other Partners involved:	Institute of Strategy and Policy on Natural Resources and Environment (ISPONRE) Biodiversity Conservation Agency (BCA)/VEA	ProDoc Signature (date project began):	9 June 2015	
		(Operational) Closing Date:		

¹ International travels will be determined subject to the impact of COVID-19

1 INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP-supported GEF-financed projects are required to undergo a Terminal Evaluation (TE) upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) set out the expectations for a TE of the project *Conservation of Critical Wetland Protected Areas and Linked Landscapes* (PIMS #4537).

The TE process must follow the guidance outlined in the document *Guidance For Conducting Terminal Evaluation of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*.²

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

2 PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

An estimated 30% of Viet Nam's national land area comprises inland and coastal wetlands. These harbors are considerable globally significant biodiversity and generate a vast array of ecosystem services. However, these wetlands are under increasing threats from a range of economic activities, particularly conversion for agriculture and aquaculture, overexploitation of biotic resources and pollution. The project was formulated to enhance systematic, institutional, and operational capacity for effective wetlands biodiversity management in Viet Nam nationally and at provincial level of the selected sites. The project's immediate objective is to establish new wetland protected areas and create capacities for their effective management to mitigate existing and emerging threats from connected landscapes in two project provinces: Thai Binh and Thua Thien Hue. The project also seeks to remove the policy barriers that currently prevent the effective conservation and sustainable use of Viet Nam's wetlands. Project design was organized into two inter-related components that reflect the GEF's focus on system-level solutions and on influencing behavioral change at different levels:

1. **Component 1** focuses on overcoming the existing gap in Viet Nam's otherwise impressive national PA system, namely the inadequate representation of wetlands ecosystems, which are being increasingly threatened by other economic sectors. In order to do so, activities under Component 1 are centered on developing systemic capacity at national and subnational levels for the establishment and effective administration and management of a subsystem of wetlands protected areas in Viet Nam. This is to be achieved through the following Outputs:
 - Output 1.1: New and updated national policy, regulatory and planning frameworks for wetlands conservation
 - Output 1.2: Strengthened national capacity for administration of wetland conservation areas
 - Output 1.3: Two new wetland conservation areas established with management systems in place
 - Output 1.4 Strengthened provincial capacity for wetlands conservation management and sustainable use
2. **Component 2** addresses the lack of capacity among key stakeholders from government to local communities to effectively identify and manage threats to wetlands arising from activities and interventions within the wider landscape, through the following Outputs:
 - Output 2.1 Increased understanding and knowledge about wetlands ecosystem values, sustainable use and management across the wider landscape
 - Output 2.2 Wetlands conservation and sustainable use mainstreamed into key provincial development plans
 - Output 2.3 Reduced threats to biodiversity from local livelihoods

² Please refer to: <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/UNDP-GEF-TE-Guide.pdf>.

Since the start of the novel coronavirus (COVID-19) outbreak, Vietnam has closely monitored the situation and installed a series of proactive, comprehensive measures to combat the spread of the virus within the country and prepare its public health facilities. The first confirmed cases of COVID-19 appeared in Vietnam on January 23, 2020. Of the confirmed cases that have appeared in Vietnam to date, 307 are Vietnamese, and the rest are foreigners. Vietnam has reported no cases of community spread since April 17. Vietnam lifted its 22-day social distancing directive on April 23. Most trades and services are back in business. Flights, public transportation, inter-provincial transportation, hotels, monuments, tourism attractions, and government offices have reopened with safety measures in place. Only Vietnamese nationals, foreigners on diplomatic or official business, and highly skilled workers are allowed to enter the country at this time. Anyone entering Vietnam must undergo medical checks and 14-day quarantine upon arrival³.

3 OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the *Guidance For Conducting Terminal Evaluation of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*.

The objectives of the evaluation are (1) to assess the achievement of project results, and (2) to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP country programme 2017 – 2021 (CPD), One Strategic Plan 2017-2021 (OSP), and recommendations for the new Programming Period.

4 EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

An overall approach and method⁴ for conducting project terminal evaluations for 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 has been drafted and is included with this TOR (see [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 team 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 evaluators are expected to conduct a field mission in Viet Nam, including the following project sites: **Thai Binh province (2 days) and Thua Thien Hue province (4 days)**.

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

- Institute of Strategy and Policy on Natural Resources and Environment (ISPONRE) / Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MONRE);
- Biodiversity Conservation Agency (BCA)/VEA (MONRE)
- Senior officials, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Steering Committee (PSC), and Project Management Unit (PMU);
- DoNREs in Thua Thien Hue and Thai Binh provinces.
- DARD in Thai Binh province
- Thai Binh Wetland Protected Area Management Board.
- Integrated Coastal Coordination and Management Board of Thua Thien Hue province.

³ Further update can be found at <https://vietnam.travel/things-to-do/information-travellers-novel-coronavirus-vietnam> and <https://ncov.moh.gov.vn/>

⁴ For additional information on methods, see the *Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results*, Chapter 7, pg. 163.

- District People’s Committee of Thai Thuy District
- District People’s Committees of Phong Dien, Quang Dien and People’s committee of Huong Tra Town, Thua Thien Hue province
- Selected communities/households who are beneficiaries of the project’s demonstration models at two project sites.

The evaluators will review all relevant sources of information (refer to Annex B) , such as the project document, the project inception report, project reports (including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, and 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.

As of 11 March 2020, the World Health Organization (WHO) declared COVID-19 a global pandemic as the new coronavirus rapidly spread to all regions of the world. Travel to the country has been restricted since April 1, 2020 and travel in the country is also restricted. If it is not possible to travel to or within the country for the TE mission then the TE team should develop a methodology that takes this into account the conduct of the TE virtually and remotely, including the use of remote interview methods and extended desk reviews, data analysis, surveys and evaluation questionnaires. This should be detailed in the TE Inception Report and agreed with the Commissioning Unit.

If all or part of the TE is to be carried out virtually then consideration should be taken for stakeholder availability, ability or willingness to be interviewed remotely. In addition, their accessibility to the internet/computer may be an issue as many government and national counterparts may be working from home. These limitations must be reflected in the final TE report.

If a data collection/field mission is not possible then remote interviews may be undertaken through telephone or online (skype, zoom etc.). International consultants can work remotely with national evaluator support in the field if it is safe for them to operate and travel. No stakeholders, consultants or UNDP staff should be put in harm’s way and safety is the key priority.

A short validation mission may be considered if it is confirmed to be safe for staff, consultants, stakeholders and if such a mission is possible within the TE schedule. Equally, qualified and independent national consultants can be hired to undertake the TE and interviews in country as long as it is safe to do so.

5 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](#)), 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:	

6 PROJECT FINANCE / CO-FINANCE

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's 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								

7 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 equality.

8 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:

- 1) verifiable improvements in ecological status;
- 2) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems; and/or
- 3) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.⁵

9 CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

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

10 IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Viet Nam. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems while travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team will be made by the PMU. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluator Team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government, etc.

11 EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the evaluation will be over a time period of 10 weeks (20 days for IC and 25 for NC) according to the following plan:

Timeframe	Activity
21/9/2020	Preparation period for TE team (handover of documentation)
25/9/2020 (2 days)	Document review and preparation of TE Inception Report
6/10/2020 (2 days)	Finalization and Validation of TE Inception Report; latest start of TE mission
15/10/2020 (7 days)	TE mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits, etc.
30/10/2020 (2 days)	Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings; earliest end of TE mission
16/11/2020 (5 days)	Preparation of draft TE report
30/11/2020	Circulation of draft TE report for comments
10/12/2020	Incorporation of comments on draft TE report into Audit Trail & finalization of TE report
15/12/2020	Preparation and Issuance of Management Response
20/12/2020 (2 days)	Expected date of full TE completion

⁵ 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**.

12 EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	TE Inception Report	TE team clarifies objectives, methodology and timing of the TE	No later than 2 weeks before the TE mission: September 2020	TE team submits Inception Report to UNDP and PMU
2	Presentation	Initial Findings	End of TE mission: September 2020	TE team presents to UNDP and PMU
3	Draft TE Report	Full draft report (using guidelines on report content in ToR Annex C) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of end of TE mission: October 2020	TE team submits to PMU and UNDP; reviewed by GEF RTA
5	Final TE Report* + Audit Trail	Revised final report and TE Audit trail in which the TE details how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final TE report (See template in ToR Annex H)	Within 1 week of receiving comments on draft report: October 2020	TE team submits both documents to UNDP

13 TEAM COMPOSITION

The evaluation team will be composed of **01 international evaluator** and **1 national evaluator** (the international evaluator will be the team leader and will be responsible for finalizing the report). The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF-financed projects is an advantage. The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project-related activities.

QUALIFICATIONS

The team members must present the following qualifications:

Education

Master's degree or higher in Environment, Natural Resources, and/or other closely related field;

Experience

Relevant experience with results-based management evaluation methodologies;

Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;

Competence in adaptive management, as applied to biodiversity;

Experience in evaluating projects;

Experience working in Asia Pacific Region;

Experience in relevant technical areas of wetland conservation, biodiversity conservation, and other relevant areas such as climate change and land degradation for at least 10 years;

Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and biodiversity; experience in gender responsive evaluation and analysis;
 Excellent communication skills;
 Demonstrable analytical skills;
 Project evaluation/review experience within United Nations system will be considered an asset;
 Experience with implementing evaluations remotely will be considered an asset.

Language

- Fluency in written and spoken English.

SELECTION CRITERIA

INTERNATIONAL CONSULTANT		
No.	Criteria	Score
1	Minimum 10 years of experience with results-based management evaluation methodologies;	100
2	Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;	100
3	Competence in adaptive management, as applied to biodiversity;	50
4	Experience in evaluating projects;	200
5	Experience working in Asia Pacific Region;	50
6	Experience in relevant technical areas of wetland conservation, biodiversity conservation, and other relevant areas such as climate change and land degradation for at least 10 years;	200
7	Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and biodiversity; experience in gender responsive evaluation and analysis;	100
8	Demonstrable analytical and report-writing skills (at least two reports in English relevant to technical areas must be provided)	100
9	Master’s degree or higher in Environment, Natural Resources, and/or other closely related field;	100
Total		1000

14 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*.⁶

⁶ <http://www.unevaluation.org/ethicalguidelines>

15 PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

%	Milestone
20%	Payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final TE Inception Report and approval by UNDP
40%	Payment upon satisfactory delivery of the draft TE report to UNDP
40%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report

In line with the UNDP's financial regulations, when determined by the Commissioning Unit and/or the consultant that a deliverable or service cannot be satisfactorily completed due to the impact of COVID-19 and limitations to the TE, that deliverable or service will not be paid.

Due to the current COVID-19 situation and its implications, a partial payment may be considered if the consultant invested time towards the deliverable but was unable to complete to circumstances beyond his/her control.

ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

(To be included in the project document packages)

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

The following documents will be reviewed:

- GEF Project Information Form (PIF), Project Inception Report
- Project document
- Annual Workplans of 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019 and 2020
- Implementing/Executing partner arrangements
- Project reports
- Annual Project Implementation (APR/PIR) Reports
- Project budget and financial data
- Project Tracking Tool, at the baseline and at the mid-term
- Mid-term Review Report
- One UN Plan II 2017-2021
- UNDP Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP)
- GEF focal area strategic program objectives
- List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Boards, and other partners to be consulted:
 - Institute of Strategy and Policy on Natural Resources and Environment (ISPONRE) / Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MONRE);
 - Biodiversity Conservation Agency (BCA)/VEA (MONRE)
 - Senior officials, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Steering Committee (PSC), and Project Management Unit (PMU);
 - DoNREs in Thua Thien Hue and Thai Binh provinces
 - Thai Binh Wetland Protected Area Management Board.
 - Integrated Coastal Coordination and Management Board of Thua Thien Hue province.
 - District People's Committee of Thai Thuy District
 - District People's Committees of Phong Dien, Quang Dien and People's committee of Huong Tra Town, Thua Thien Hue province
 - Selected communities/households who are beneficiaries of the project's demonstration models at two project sites.

ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

This Evaluation Criteria Matrix must be fully completed by the consultant and included as an Annex to the TE report.

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 (including CPD & OSP 2017 – 2021)?			
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</p> <p>5 – Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings</p> <p>4 – Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</p> <p>3 – Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings</p> <p>2 – Unsatisfactory (U): major problems</p> <p>1 – Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems</p>	<p>Sustainability Ratings:</p> <p>4 – Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability</p> <p>3 – Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks</p> <p>2 – Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks</p> <p>1 – Unlikely (U): severe risks</p>	<p>Relevance Ratings:</p> <p>2 – Relevant (R)</p> <p>1 – Not Relevant (NR)</p> <hr/> <p>Impact Ratings:</p> <p>3 – Significant (S)</p> <p>2 – Minimal (M)</p> <p>1 – Negligible (N)</p>
<p><i>Additional ratings where relevant:</i></p> <p>Not Applicable (N/A)</p> <p>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 Form⁷

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 _____ on _____

Signature: _____

⁷www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE⁸

I. OPENING PAGE

- Title of UNDP-supported GEF-financed project
- UNDP and GEF project ID #s
- Evaluation timeframe 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.)⁹

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)¹⁰*

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

⁸The report length should not exceed **40** pages in total (not including annexes).

⁹ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008.

¹⁰ Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see [Annex D](#) for ratings explanations.

- Replication approach
- UNDP comparative advantage
- Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
- Management arrangements

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

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

- TE ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
- TE Mission itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- List of documents reviewed
- Summary of field visits
- Evaluation Question Matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology)
- Questionnaire used and summary of results
- Co-financing tables (if not include in body of report)
- TE Rating scales
- Signed Evaluation Consultant Agreement form
- Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form
- Signed TE Report Clearance form
- Annexed in a separate file: TE Audit Trail
- Annexed in a separate file: relevant terminal GEF/LDCF/SCCF Core Indicators or Tracking Tools, as applicable

ANNEX G: EVALUATION REPORT CLEARANCE FORM

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by:

UNDP Country Office

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

UNDP GEF RTA

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

ANNEX H: TE Audit Trail

The following is a template for the TE Team to show how the received comments on the draft TE report have (or have not) been incorporated into the final TE report. This Audit Trail should be listed as an annex in the final TE report but not attached to the report file.

To the comments received on (date) from the Terminal Evaluation of (project name) (UNDP Project PIMS #)

The following comments were provided to the draft TE report; they are referenced by institution/organization (do not include the commentator's name) and track change comment number (“#” column):

Institution/ Organization	#	Para No./ comment location	Comment/Feedback on the draft TE report	TE team response and actions taken