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 Scale Up of Access to Clean Energy for Rural Productive Uses (India ACE Project) (PIMS #4605)

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

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	Scale Up of Access to Clean Energy for Rural Productive Uses (India ACE Project)				
GEF Project ID:	4900			_at endorsement (Million US$)_	_at completion (Million US$)_
UNDP Project ID:	4605	GEF financing:		4,006,849	4,006,849
Country:	India	IA/EA own:		800,000	
Region:	Asia	Government:		10,000,000	
Focal Area:	Climate Change	Other:		8,233,767	
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	CCM-3	Total co-financing:		19,033,767	
Executing Agency:	Ministry of New and Renewable Energy (MNRE)	Total Project Cost:		23,040,616	
Other Partners involved:		ProDoc Signature (date project began):			23 July 2015
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: 23 July 2020	Actual: 23 July 2020	

1. Evaluation purpose, scope and objectives

The objective of the project "Scale up of Access to Clean Energy for Rural Productive Uses (India Ace Project)" is to enhance reliable and affordable clean energy access for rural livelihoods in un-served and underserved areas and thereby reducing GHG emissions. The project activities aim to generate outcomes focussed on strengthening livelihoods, improving income generation and reduce use of fossil fuel. The project was approved during GEF 5 programming cycle with a total budget of USD 4,006,849. The implementing partner of the projects is Ministry of New and Renewable Energy.

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

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

In this case, however, project implementation has been very limited under all the four components of the project. Although originally designed implementation modality was changed for effective implementation of the project through support of centre government supported ACE scheme of $10 million yet there has been no progress post the scheme approval in the project.

2. Evaluation Criteria & Ratings

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

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

PROJECT FINANCE / COFINANCE

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

Co-financing (type/source)	UNDP own financing (mill. US$)		Government (mill. US$)		Partner Agency (mill. US$)		Total (mill. US$)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Actual	Actual
Grants								
Loans/Concessions								
• In-kind support								
• Other								
Totals								

3. Evaluation Approach and Method

An overall approach and method[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 in 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.

Considering the COVID outbreak and lockdown as well as a very limited implementation of this project evaluation will take place through virtual interviews.

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

1. Joint Secretory, MNRE
2. Director, MNRE
3. Scientist, MNRE
4. Director of state nodal agencies in Assam, Madhya Pradesh and Odisha
5. Directors of Rural Livelihood Missions in Assam, Madhya Pradesh and Odisha

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports including Annual APR/PIR and other Reports, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other material 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 TOR Annex B of this Terms of Reference.

Methodological approaches may include the following:

- Evaluation should employ a combination of both qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods and instruments.
- **Document review of all relevant documentation.** This would include a review of inter alia
  - Project document (contribution agreement).
  - Theory of change and results framework.
  - Programme and project quality assurance reports.
  - Annual workplans.
  - Activity designs.
  - Consolidated quarterly and annual reports.
  - Results-oriented monitoring report.
  - Highlights of project board meetings.
  - Technical/financial monitoring reports.
- **Semi-structured interviews** with key stakeholders including key government counterparts, donor community members, representatives of key civil society organizations, UNCT members and implementing partners:
  - **Development of evaluation questions** around relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability and designed for different stakeholders to be interviewed.
  - Key informant and focus group discussions with men and women, beneficiaries and stakeholders.
  - All interviews should be undertaken in full confidence and anonymity. The final evaluation report should not assign specific comments to individuals.

---

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

- **Surveys and questionnaires** including participants in development programmes, UNCT members and/or surveys and questionnaires involving other stakeholders at strategic and programmatic levels.
- **Virtual meetings for** on-site validation of key tangible outputs and interventions.
- The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach that ensures close engagement with the evaluation managers, implementing partners and direct beneficiaries.
- **Other methods** such as outcome mapping, observational visits, group discussions, etc.
- **Data review and analysis** of monitoring and other data sources and methods.
    - Ensure maximum validity, reliability of data (quality) and promote use; the evaluation team will ensure triangulation of the various data sources.

4. Evaluation products (deliverables)

These products could include:

- **Evaluation inception report (10-15 pages).** The inception report should be carried out following and based on preliminary discussions with UNDP after the desk review, and should be produced before the evaluation starts (before any formal evaluation interviews, survey distribution or field visits) and prior to the country visit in the case of international evaluators.
- **Evaluation debriefings.** Immediately following an evaluation, UNDP may ask for a preliminary debriefing and findings.
- **Draft evaluation report (within an agreed length).**[2] The programme unit and key stakeholders in the evaluation should review the draft evaluation report and provide an amalgamated set of comments to the evaluator within an agreed period of time, addressing the content required (as agreed in the TOR and inception report) and quality criteria as outlined in these guidelines.
- **Evaluation report audit trail.** Comments and changes by the evaluator in response to the draft report should be retained by the evaluator to show how they have addressed comments.
- **Final evaluation report.**
- **Presentations to stakeholders and/or the evaluation reference group** (if requested in the TOR).
- **Evaluation brief and other knowledge products** or participation in knowledge-sharing events, if relevant.

5. Evaluation team composition and required competencies

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

The Team members must present the following qualifications:

- Minimum *10* years of relevant professional experience with post graduate degree in engineering/ environment/ management or related filed domain
- Knowledge of UNDP and GEF experience

---

[2] A length of 40 to 60 pages including executive summary is suggested.

- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies.
- Proven technical knowledge of solar PV system, rural livelihood and climate change and mitigation activities

6. Evaluation ethics

"This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'. The consultant must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data. The consultant must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the evaluation

Preparation	04 days *(recommended: 2-4)*	15/7/2020
Evaluation Mission (Virtual)	5 days *(r: 7-15)*	25/7/2020
Draft Evaluation Report	5 days *(r: 5-10)*	5/8/2020
Final Report	2 days *(r: 1-2)*	10/8/2020

and not for other uses with the express authorization of UNDP and partners."

7. Implementation arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in *India*. Due to COVID pandemic and lockdown evaluation is proposed to be carried out through virtual meetings.

8. Time frame for the evaluation process

The total duration of the evaluation will be *14* days according to the following plan:

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

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

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

9. Application submission process and criteria for selection

Applicants are requested to apply online (indicate the site, such as http://jobs.undp.org, etc.) by (25/07/2020).
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.

10. TOR annexes

ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in the UNDP Strategic Plan 2014-2017 and the UNDP India CPAP 2013-2017:	

This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in the UNDP Strategic Plan 2014-2017 and the UNDP India CPAP 2013-2017:

Project: Scale Up of Access to Clean Energy for Rural Productive67 Uses (India ACE Project)

Outcome: Expanded access to clean energy.

Output: Support for initiatives that increase access to clean energy for productive uses in off-grid, underserved rural regions.

Output indicators: number of REPTRL packages developed and trialled, number of RE for rural livelihoods applications fostered by project.

Country Programme Outcome Indicators:

Outcome: Progress towards meeting national commitments under multilateral environmental agreements

Output: Supporting national development objectives with co-benefits of mitigating climate change

Output indicators: (a) Annual reductions in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions in India; (b) million USD flowing annually to India from GEF through UNDP for this programme; (c) number of additional UNDP initiatives for achieving global and national targets under multilateral environmental agreements.

Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area): Strengthened national capacities to mainstream environment and energy concerns into national development plans.

Expanding access to environmental and energy services for the poor.

Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program:

Strategic Objective: Climate Change Objective 3: Promote investment in renewable energy technologies

Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes: Increased market uptake of RE systems for rural livelihoods

Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators:

a. Extent to which EE policies and regulations are adopted and enforced

b. Volume of investment mobilized

c. Tonnes of CO_2 equivalent avoided

Strategy	Objectively Verifiable Indicators			Source of Verification/Means of Gauging Success	Risks and Assumptions
	Indicator	Baseline	Target (End of Project)		
Project goal: Reduced GHG emissions achieved through renewable energy systems in rural livelihood sectors	Cumulative CO_2 emission reduced from start of project to End-Of-Project (EOP), (tCO_2e)	0	0 69,115	M&E reports of the demonstration and replication projects	Continued support and participation from co-financing institutions, MNRE, CLIAs and other stakeholders
Project Objective: Enhancing reliable and affordable clean energy access for rural livelihoods in unserved and underserved areas	Total energy savings achieved from implemented RETPRLs by EOP MWhe MWhth	0 0	112,737 1,376,631	M&E reports of the demonstration and replication projects	Selected end users for demos and replications have sufficient finance and favourable business environment
Component 1: Development and deployment of key RE-rural livelihood application packages					
Outcome 1: Deployment of RErural	No. of household enterprises adopting RETPRLs through	0	30,000	M&E reports of the	Sufficient finance is available for the

livelihood application packages	demonstrations and replications in the targeted states by the EOP			demonstration and replication projects	implementation of developed packages for RE-rural livelihood
Output 1.1: At least ten (10) cost effective RE technology packages developed for rural livelihood (RETPRL) applications and established technical specifications	No. of RETPRLs developed by Year 2	0	10	Performance assessment reports on RETPRLs	RE technology suppliers willing to provide services as required for technology packages in rural areas
Output 1.2: Demonstrated and documented RE – rural livelihood application packages in 15 clusters and benefitting 1,500 household enterprises	No. of demonstration project clusters by EoP	0	15	Reports from CLIAs M&E reports of the demonstration	Household enterprises are convinced with RE application benefits in livelihood activities
	No. of household enterprises adopting RETPRLs in the demonstration clusters by Year 3	0	1500	Reports from CLIAs M&E reports of the demonstration	End-users are interested and have the sufficient finance
Output 1.3: Completed training programmes and training of trainers activities for replication and scale up of RE – rural livelihood application packages	No. of training programmes conducted by EoP	0	14	Report of training Programmes	Continued support and participation from co-financing institutions, MNRE, CLIAs and other stakeholders
	No. of training packages developed by Year 2	0	7	Training package material	Continued support and participation from co-financing institutions, MNRE, CLIAs and other stakeholders
	No. of persons trained by EoP	0	280	Report of training programmes	Continued support and participation from co-financing institutions, MNRE, CLIAs and other stakeholders
Output 1.4: Completed promotion of replicated and documented RE – rural livelihood application packages promoted to other districts / states and applied to 28,500 household enterprises	No. of household enterprises adopting RETPRLS through replications by EoP	1,500 (at the end Of demonstration)	30,000	M&E reports of the replication projects	Implementing agencies and end-users are interested, accept RETPRLs and are equipped to implement the project
Component 2: Supply chain for RE technology supply and service providers for enhancing rural livelihoods					

Outcome 2: Increased supply of RE technology and service providers for rural livelihood applications	No. of RE technology supply and service providers for rural livelihood applications by EoP	0	100	M&E of supply chain development activity	There is sufficient demand for RETPRLs amongst existing and new RE technology and service providers
Output 2.1: Business development aspects supported for 100 RE technology supply and service providers for rural livelihoods applications	No. of RE technology supply and service providers for rural livelihoods applications by EoP	0	100	M&E of supply chain development activity	Enterprises have sufficient technical and financial capacity
	No. of business plans developed for RE technology supply and service providers by Year 2	0	20	M&E of supply chain development activity/ business plan reports	
	No. of financial mechanism to access finance for RE technology supply and service suppliers by Year 2	0	1	M&E of supply chain development activity	
Component 3: Policy and regulatory support for RE - rural livelihood applications					
Outcome 3.1: Inclusion of RE applications in national and state level rural livelihoods policies for key livelihood sectors in rural areas	No. of states enforcing policies on the RE applications as part of their SRLM and in line with the same policies at the national level by year 3	0	4	NRLM (1) and SRLMs (3 states) policy documents	NRLM and SRLMs that support RE applications for rural livelihoods is sustained
Output 3.1.1: National and State level rural livelihood mission statements / documents emphasising the use of RE	No. of Ministries/Departments that officially adopt mission statements that support RE applications for rural livelihoods by Year 3	0	4	Policy documents of NRLM and SRLM, meeting/ workshop reports	
Output 3.1.2: National and State level policies that support the use of RE for	No. of livelihood sectors where RE is promoted in 3 targeted states by year 3	0	20	Central (e.g. KVIC) and state livelihoods sectors /departments policy documents	Continued support and participation from co-financing institutions, MNRE, CLIAs and other stakeholders

key rural livelihood sectors					
Output 3.1.3: Documented experiences and lessons on RE applications for rural livelihoods at suitable regional and international fora	No. of peer reviewed publications sharing experiences regarding RE and rural livelihoods by EoP	0	7	Published reports	
Outcome 3.2: Future MNRE programs also cater to actions towards enhanced RE utilisation in rural livelihoods	No. of MNRE programs that espouse RE applications for rural livelihoods programme by Year 3	0	1	MNRE policy document	Continued support and participation from co-financing institutions, MNRE, CLIAs and other stakeholders
Output 3.2.1: Developed MNRE supported programme for enhanced RE utilisation in rural livelihoods	No. of replication projects implemented by MNRE in new programme using RETPRLs by EoP	0	28,500	Documentation of MNRE supported RET operated rural livelihood projects	
Outcome 3.3: Improved tariff and grid interconnection regulations for decentralised RE	No. of state regulatory commissions (SRCs) implement policy guidelines of improved tariff structure for decentralised RE by year 3	0	3		Continued support and participation of SRCs
Output 3.3.1: Completed roadmap and workshops for supporting improved tariff structures for small scale captive and off-grid RE	No. of state level workshops to implement the revised tariff structures by Year 3	0	3	Workshop reports	Continued support and participation from co-financing institutions, MNRE, CLIAs and other stakeholders especially SRCs
Output 3.3.2: Developed and implemented regulatory, technical and tariff guidelines for RE based captive/decentralised systems' grid	No. of SRCs implement policy guidelines for captive/decentralised RE grid interconnection by year 3	0	3	National level study report	Continued support and participation from co-financing institutions, MNRE, CLIAs and other stakeholders especially SRCs, where SRCs see RE grid interconnection as an important issue.

interconnection					

Component 4: Financial support for decentralised RE - rural livelihood applications					
Outcome 4.1: Improved decentralised RE subsidies and support for rural livelihoods	No. of developed improved overall subsidy and support models by Year 2	0	1	Review report	
Output 4.1.1: Assessed RE subsidy and support models for increased effectiveness of decentralised RE	No. of completed study on existing subsidies and supports by Year 1	0	1	Review report	Continued support and participation from co-financing institutions, MNRE, CLIAs and other stakeholders in subsidising and supporting decentralised RE
Output 4.1.2: Improved RE subsidy and support models for increased effectiveness of decentralised RE for rural livelihoods funding	No. of RE subsidy and support models for rural livelihoods available by year 1	0	3	Report on recommendations	
Outcome 4.2: Enhanced provision of financial support for decentralised RE in rural livelihood applications	No. of financial institutions supporting RETPRL by Year 3	0	3	Report on new financial support packages developed	Continued interest, and participation from co-financing institutions, MNRE, CLIAs and other stakeholders such as IREDA
Output 4.2.1: Implemented financial support packages for RE technology – rural livelihood applications	No. of household enterprises adopting RETPRLs that were funded by the established financial support packages by EOP	0	28500		

				Study report	
Output 4.2.2: Pooled available financial resources for supporting viable livelihood business models and enhanced market linkages	No. of completed studies on inter-institutional linkages for finance pooling to support viable livelihood business models and enhanced market linkages covering three states and centre by Year 2	0	1		Institutions are willing to continuously pool their financial resources and other financing institutions continued to provide support
Outcome 4.3: Improved investment risk mitigation for decentralised RE in rural livelihood applications	Number of states implement designed suitable risk guarantee/mitigation mechanisms by Year 3	0	3	Communication by the state governments / Review report	
Output 4.3.1: Enhanced risk mitigation mechanisms designed and supported for RE enterprises and RE technology adopters / end-users in rural livelihoods applications	No. of completed studies on risk assessment and risk mitigation in applicable sectors by Year 3	0	1	Study report	Continued interest, and participation from co-financing institutions, MNRE, CLIAs and other stakeholders such as IREDA
	No. of designed suitable risk guarantee/mitigation mechanisms by Year 3	0	1	Study report	

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

- Project Document
- Inception Workshop Report
- Annual Work and Financial Plans
- Annual Project Report/Project Implementation Review (APR/PIR) 2015-2019;
- Review the tracking tool. If it is not available, review the required information to complete the tracking tool as required for climate change mitigation projects.
- Quarterly Reports
- Minutes of Project Technical Committee/Project Steering Committee meetings
- Back-to-Office Reports of UNDP staff (if any)
- Study reports/Conference proceedings/government guidelines, etc.

Outcome evaluation sample questions

Relevance
- To what extent is the initiative in line with the UNDP mandate, national priorities and the requirements of targeted women and men?
- To what extent is UNDP support relevant to the achievement of the SDGs in the country?
- To what extent did UNDP adopt gender-sensitive, human rights-based and conflict-sensitive approaches?
- To what extent is UNDP engagement a reflection of strategic considerations, including the role of UNDP in a particular development context and its comparative advantage?
- To what extent was the method of delivery selected by UNDP appropriate to the development context?
- To what extent was the theory of change presented in the outcome model a relevant and appropriate vision on which to base the initiatives?

Effectiveness
- To what extent has progress been made towards outcome achievement? What has been the UNDP contribution to the observed change?
- What have been the key results and changes attained? How has delivery of country programme outputs led to outcome-level progress?
- Have there been any unexpected outcome-level results achieved beyond the planned outcome?
- To what extent has UNDP improved the capacities of national implementing partners to advocate on environmental issues, including climate change issues and disaster risk reduction?
- To what extent has UNDP partnered with civil society and local communities to promote environmental and disaster risk awareness in the country?
- To what extent have the results at the outcome and output levels generated results for gender equality and the empowerment of women?
- To what extent have marginalized groups benefited?
- To what extent have triangular and South-South cooperation and knowledge management contributed to the results attained?
- Which programme areas are the most relevant and strategic for UNDP to scale up or consider going forward?

Efficiency
- To what extent have the programme or project outputs resulted from economic use of resources?
- To what extent were quality country programme outputs delivered on time?
- To what extent were partnership modalities conducive to the delivery of country programme outputs?
- To what extent did monitoring systems provide management with a stream of data that allowed it to learn and adjust implementation accordingly?
- To what extent did UNDP promote gender equality, the empowerment of women, human rights and human development in the delivery of country programme outputs?
- To what extent have UNDP practices, policies, processes and decision-making capabilities affected the achievement of the country programme's outcomes?
- To what extent did UNDP engage or coordinate with beneficiaries, implementing partners, other United Nations agencies and national counterparts to achieve outcome-level results?

Sustainability

- To what extent did UNDP establish mechanisms to ensure the sustainability of the country programme outcomes?
- To what extent do national partners have the institutional capacities, including sustainability strategies, in place to sustain the outcome-level results?
- To what extent are policy and regulatory frameworks in place that will support the continuation of benefits?
- To what extent have partners committed to providing continuing support (financial, staff, aspirational, etc.)?
- To what extent do mechanisms, procedures and policies exist to carry forward the results attained on gender equality, empowerment of women, human rights and human development by primary stakeholders?
- To what extent do partnerships exist with other national institutions, NGOs, United Nations agencies, the private sector and development partners to sustain the attained results?

Project evaluation sample questions

Relevance:

- To what extent was the project in line with the national development priorities, the country programme's outputs and outcomes, the UNDP Strategic Plan and the SDGs?
- To what extent does the project contribute to the theory of change for the relevant country programme outcome?
- To what extent were lessons learned from other relevant projects considered in the project's design?
- To what extent were perspectives of those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the attainment of stated results, taken into account during the project design processes?
- To what extent does the project contribute to gender equality, the empowerment of women and the human rights-based approach?
- To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to political, legal, economic, institutional, etc., changes in the country?

Effectiveness

- To what extent did the project contribute to the country programme outcomes and outputs, the SDGs, the UNDP Strategic Plan and national development priorities?
- To what extent were the project outputs achieved?
- What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving intended country programme outputs and outcomes?
- To what extent has the UNDP partnership strategy been appropriate and effective?
- What factors contributed to effectiveness or ineffectiveness?
- In which areas does the project have the greatest achievements? Why and what have been the supporting factors? How can the project build on or expand these achievements?
- In which areas does the project have the fewest achievements? What have been the constraining factors and why? How can or could they be overcome?
- What, if any, alternative strategies would have been more effective in achieving the project's objectives?
- Are the projects objectives and outputs clear, practical and feasible within its frame?
- To what extent have stakeholders been involved in project implementation?

- To what extent are project management and implementation participatory and is this participation contributing towards achievement of the project objectives?
- To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to the needs of the national constituents and changing partner priorities?
- To what extent has the project contributed to gender equality, the empowerment of women and the realization of human rights?

Efficiency

- To what extent was the project management structure as outlined in the project document efficient in generating the expected results?
- To what extent have the UNDP project implementation strategy and execution been efficient and cost-effective?
- To what extent has there been an economical use of financial and human resources? Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve outcomes?
- To what extent have resources been used efficiently? Have activities supporting the strategy been cost-effective?
- To what extent have project funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner?
- To what extent do the M&E systems utilized by UNDP ensure effective and efficient project management?

Sustainability

- Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outputs?
- To what extent will financial and economic resources be available to sustain the benefits achieved by the project?
- Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outputs and the project's contributions to country programme outputs and outcomes?
- Do the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project benefits?
- To what extent did UNDP actions pose an environmental threat to the sustainability of project outputs?
- What is the risk that the level of stakeholders' ownership will be sufficient to allow for the project benefits to be sustained?
- To what extent do mechanisms, procedures and policies exist to allow primary stakeholders to carry forward the results attained on gender equality, empowerment of women, human rights and human development?
- To what extent do stakeholders support the project's long-term objectives?
- To what extent are lessons learned being documented by the project team on a continual basis and shared with appropriate parties who could learn from the project?
- To what extent do UNDP interventions have well-designed and well-planned exit strategies?
- What could be done to strengthen exit strategies and sustainability?

Evaluation cross-cutting issues sample questions

Human rights

- To what extent have poor, indigenous and physically challenged, women and other disadvantaged and marginalized groups benefited from the work of UNDP in the country?

Gender equality

- To what extent have gender equality and the empowerment of women been addressed in the design, implementation and monitoring of the project?
- Is the gender marker data assigned to this project representative of reality?
- To what extent has the project promoted positive changes in gender equality and the empowerment of women? Were there any unintended effects?

ANNEX D: RATINGS

Ratings Scales		
Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution	Sustainability ratings:	Relevance ratings
6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): The project had no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency 5: Satisfactory (S): There were only minor shortcomings 4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS):there were moderate shortcomings 3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): the project had significant shortcomings 2. Unsatisfactory (U): there were major shortcomings in the achievement of project objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency 1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): The project had severe shortcomings	4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3. Moderately Likely (ML):moderate risks 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks	2. Relevant (R) 1.. Not relevant (NR) 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 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

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[3]

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)

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[4])

   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] The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).
[4] Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory,3:Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory,

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

(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 County Office

Name:_____

Signature:_____

_____

Date:_____

UNDP GEF RTA

Name:

Signature:_____

_____

Date:_____