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 Promoting Climate Resilient Community–Based Regeneration of Indigenous Forest in Zambia’s Central Province(PIMS #4712)

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

Project Summary Table

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Title: |  | | | | | |
| GEF Project ID: | | 00093441 |  | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | | *at completion (Million US$)* |
| UNDP Project ID: | | 00086025 | GEF financing: | 3,885,000 | |  |
| Country: | | Zambia | UNDP: | 100,000 | |  |
| Region: | | Southern Africa | Government: | 11,420,000 | |  |
| Focal Area: | | Climate Change | Other: | 17,610090 | |  |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): | | Sustainable environment | Total co-financing: | 28,930,090 | |  |
| Executing Agency: | | Forestry Department | Total Project Cost: | 32,915,090 | |  |
| Other Partners involved: | | ZEMA, Energy department, Comaco, Kasanka, ZCCN | ProDoc Signature : | | | 23rd July 2015 |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | | Proposed:  23rd July 2020 | Actual:       23rd July 2020 |

1. Objective and Scope

The project was designed to: promote climate resilient, community based regeneration of indigenous forests in Zambia’s central province, thereby securing ecosystems goods and services and enhancing the adaptive capacity of the local communities. The project is being implemented through three components:

**Component 1**: strengthened technical and institutional capacity of foresters and communities in central province to implement appropriate climate resilient agro- forestry and assisted natural regeneration practices in designated areas.

**Component 2**: Robust fire monitoring and management protection plans and measures in place to maintain desired regeneration targets and reduce fire frequency by 25-30% annually across the province, within a four year cycle.

**Component 3**: Energy efficient charcoal production and wood-saving technologies have successfully replaced inefficient systems in the targeted areas of central province, helping offset pressure on the forest as the climate changes.

The project is focused on Central Province with the view of undertaking a landscape-based approach in the interventions. The province was chosen because of the high rates of degradation and deforestation resulting from increased conversion of forest into agricultural expansion and the production of charcoal. In addition late fires affect the regeneration of forests and often result in tree mortality. Central Province has a total of 371,000 ha of National Forests and 594,000 ha of Local Forests. Serenje and Chitambo districts were chosen within which on-the ground activities under component 1, 2 and 3 can be undertaken. The selection followed a comprehensive stakeholder consultative process.

In terms of management arrangements, the execution modality follows the UNDPs National Implementation Modality (NIM). The Implementing Partner (IP) for the project is the Ministry of Lands and Natural Resources (MLNR) through the Department of Forestry as the lead agency. Other Stakeholders involved in the implementation to provide technical support and training include Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Chiefs and Traditional Affairs, Ministry of Energy, Ministry of Community Development, Zambia Environmental Management Agency (ZEMA), Regional government stakeholders and community-based organizations. The Project Implementation Unit (PIU), headed by the Project Manager is responsible for project management and coordination. The Project Steering Committee is responsible for approving reports and activities. It also provides guidance for proper implementation of the project. It draws membership from UNDP, MLNR, representatives of Town Councils, Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Energy, Ministry of Chiefs and Traditional Affairs, ZEMA, Zambia Climate Change Network (ZCCN) and others. In close collaboration with the PIU, the PSC plays a critical role in project monitoring and evaluation by quality assuring processes and products and using evaluations performance improvement, accountability and learning

The total budget for the project is **US$ 32,915,090, while planned co-financing is at US$ 28,930,090**

The time frame for the project is July 23, 2015 to July 22, 2020.

1. **OBJECTIVE OF THE TR**

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. 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.

The evaluator will first review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual 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 be provided to the evaluator for review. The TE mission will then consist of field mission to Serenje and Chitambo Districts project sites and interviews will be held with respective institutions that are part of the implementation team, chiefs, private sector and NGOs

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 evaluation 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.

The TE consultant will include a section in the TE report setting out the TE’s evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings. The TE consultant will also rate the projects’ progress towards achieving the development objective taking into account the project’s strategy and risks to sustainability. Additionally, the TE consultant is expected to make recommendations to the Project Team. Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. A recommendation table should be put in the report’s executive summary. The TE consultant should make no more than 15 recommendations in total.

1. **TR APPROACH & METHODOLOGY**

The TR must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The TR team will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Environmental & Social Safeguard Policy, the Project Document, project reports including Annual Project Review/PIRs, project budget revisions, lesson learned reports, national strategic and legal documents, MTR, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based review). The TR team will review the baseline GEF focal area Tracking Tool submitted to the GEF at CEO endorsement, and the midterm GEF focal area Tracking Tool that must be completed before the TR field mission begins.

The TR team is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach[[1]](#footnote-1) ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), the UNDP Country Office(s), UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisers, and other key stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful TR.[[2]](#footnote-2) Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to: Forestry Department, senior officials and task team/ component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Steering Committee, project stakeholders, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. Additionally, the TR team is expected to conduct field missions to: *Serenje and Chitambo District project sites*

The final TR report should describe the full TR approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the review.

1. **DETAILED SCOPE OF THE TR**

The TR team will assess the following four categories of project progress. See the *Guidance For Conducting Terminal Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for extended descriptions.

**i. Project Strategy**

Project design:

* Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
* Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design.
* Review how the project addresses country priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country (or of participating countries in the case of multi-country projects)?
* Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?
* Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design.

Evaluation approach and method

An overall approach and method[[3]](#footnote-3) for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact,** as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR (*fill in* [*Annex C*](#_TOR_Annex_C:)) The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence‐based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Serenje and Chitambo including the following project sites; Teta, Musola, Musangashi, Nakatambo and Bweshe Mutelele*.* Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: Forestry Department, Department of Energy, Zambia Environmental Management Agency, Community Markets for Conservation, Ministry of Agriculture, University of Zambia School of Engineering (Technology Development and Advisory Unit), Serenje and Chitambo Town Councils, Ministry of Community Development, Ministry of Chiefs and Traditional Affairs, Project Technical Committee and Project Steering Committee.

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in [Annex B](#_TOR_Annex_B:) of this Terms of Reference.

Evaluation Criteria & Ratings

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

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

Project finance / cofinance

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Co-financing  (type/source) | UNDP own financing (mill. US$) | | Government  (mill. US$) | | Partner Agency  (mill. US$) | | Total  (mill. US$) | |
| Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Actual | Actual |
| Grants | 3,888,500 | 3,600,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Loans/Concessions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * In-kind support |  |  | 11,420,000 | 11,000,000 | 17,610,090 | 21,676,000 |  |  |
| UNDP core funds | 100,000 | 50,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals | 3,988,500 | 3,650,000 | 11,420,000 | 11,000,000 | 17,610,090 | 21,676,000 |  |  |

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.[[4]](#footnote-4)

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 Zambia.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 *40* days according to the following plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Timing | Completion Date |
| **Preparation** | *5* days | *1sth April 2020* |
| **Evaluation Mission** | *15* days | *10th May 2020* |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | *10* days | *29th May 2020* |
| **Final Report** | *10* days plus feed back | *30th June 2020* |

Evaluation deliverables

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Deliverable | Content | Timing | Responsibilities |
| **Inception Report** | Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method | 1st April 2020. | Evaluator submits to UNDP CO |
| **Presentation** | Initial Findings | 9th April 2020 | To project management, UNDP CO |
| **Draft Final Report** | Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes | 29th May 2020 | Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs |
| **Final Report\*** | Revised report | 30th June 2020 | 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 and 1 national evaluators).* The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. (*If the team has more than 1 evaluator, one 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  *15* years of relevant professional experience for International and 7 years for the Local Evaluator
* Knowledge of UNDP and GEF
* Previous experience with results‐based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
* Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s)

The selection of consultants will be aimed at maximizing the overall “team” qualities in the following areas:

* Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies; \_15\_
* Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;\_\_10\_\_
* Competence in adaptive management, as applied to Biodiversity; Climate Change Mitigation; Sustainable Forestry Management/REDD-Plus and Land Degradation focal areas; \_\_\_10 \_
* Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations; \_15\_
* Experience working in Africa; \_\_\_5\_\_\_
* Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years;\_10\_
* Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and Biodiversity; Climate Change Mitigation; Sustainable Forestry Management/REDD-Plus and Land Degradation; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis; \_\_\_10 \_\_\_
* Excellent communication skills in English; \_\_5\_\_\_\_\_
* Demonstrable analytical skills; \_\_5\_\_\_\_\_
* Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset; \_5
* A Master’s degree in Natural Resources Management, Geography, Forestry, Biological Sciences, Environmental Science or other closely related field. \_\_\_\_10\_\_

Evaluator Ethics

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex E) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the [UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'](http://www.unevaluation.org/ethicalguidelines)

Payment modalities and specifications

(*this payment schedule is indicative, to be filled in by the CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on their standard procurement procedures)*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| % | Milestone |
| *10%* | Final inception Report |
| *30%* | Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report |
| *60%* | Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report |

Application process

Applicants are requested to apply online procurement.zm@undp.org) by 29th February 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.

Annex A: Project Logical Framework

# Project Results Framework

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPAP or CPD:**  CPAP Focus Area 2: Sustainable Environment and Climate Change | | | | | |
| **Country Programme Outcome Indicators:**  Output 2: Vulnerable communities better equipped when faced with climate change.  Output 3: More effective reservation interventions for the environment and ecosystem. | | | | | |
| **Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area:**  Promote climate change adaptation. | | | | | |
| **Applicable SOF (e..g GEF) Strategic Objective and Programme:**  CCA-1: Reduce the vulnerability of people, livelihoods, physical assets and natural systems to the adverse effects of climate change.  CCA-2: Strengthen institutional and technical capacities for effective climate change adaptation. | | | | | |
| **Applicable SOF (e.g. GEF) Expected Outcomes:**  Outcomes 1.1, 1.3 and 2.4 | | | | | |
| **Applicable SOF (e.g. GEF) Outcome Indicators:**  Indicators 1, 2, 4 and 10 | | | | | |
|  | **Indicators** | **Baseline** | **Targets**  **End of Project** | **Source of verification** | **Assumptions** |
| **Project Objective[[5]](#footnote-5)**  To promote climate-resilient, community-based regeneration of indigenous forests in Zambia’s Central Province, thereby securing ecosystems goods and services and enhancing the adaptive capacity of local communities. | Number of foresters and members of local groups in Central Province participating in climate-resilient, community-based regeneration of indigenous forests.  Number of households benefiting from climate-resilient, community-based regeneration of indigenous forests. | 0  0 | At least 20 foresters and 1,200 members of local groups.  At least 3,000 households. | Training reports, capacity scorecards (see source of verification for Outcomes 1 and 2), consultations with forest officers and local communities at project intervention sites in Serenje District.  Household surveys at intervention sites at project inception and termination. | *Assumption*  District forestry officers and VAGs will apply information disseminated, maps and trainings.  Regeneration activities occur in timely fashion; and intervention sites are effectively managed and conserved.  *Risk*  Encroachment threatens miombo woodlands, thereby undermining project interventions. |
| **Outcome 1[[6]](#footnote-6)**  Strengthened technical and institutional capacity of foresters and communities in Central Province to implement appropriate climate-resilient agro-forestry and natural regeneration practices in designated zones. | 1.1 Change in capacity score of district forestry officers and Village Action Group (VAG) members for planning and implementing Assisted Natural Regeneration (ANR) and agro-forestry interventions (CCA Indicator 10). | **0** | 1.1 VAGs and district forestry officers score at least 2. | Verified through scoring scorecard methodologies adapted from AMAT (2014). The indicator is based on five criteria of the capacity assessment framework:   * Are the stakeholders able to identify climate change risks and appropriate ANR interventions? * Are the stakeholders specifying targets for these interventions? * Have the institutions clearly defined roles and responsibilities for the coordination and implementation of these interventions? * Is there evidence of effective implementation of these interventions by these stakeholders? * Is there evidence of institutional capacities for the continuous assessment, learning and review of ANR? | *Assumptions*  District forestry officers and VAGs will apply information disseminated, maps and trainings.  *Risk*  Trainings are not prepared/delivered effectively. |
| 1.2 Climate-resilient agro-forestry and ANR practices implemented across 15,000 hectares (CCA Indicator 2). | **0** | 1.2 At least 15,000 hectares of climate-resilient agro-forestry established. | Ongoing monitoring at project intervention sites to record:   * Area of climate-resilient agro-forestry practices (using GPS and mapping software); and * Survivorship of agro-forestry species. | *Assumption*  Regeneration activities occur in timely fashion; and intervention sites are effectively managed and conserved.  *Risk*  Encroachment threatens miombo woodlands, thereby undermining project interventions. |
| **Outcome 2**  Robust fire monitoring and management protection plans and measures in place in all districts in Central Province to maintain desired regeneration targets and reduce fire frequency by 25-30% annually across the province, within a four-year burning cycle. | 2.1 Change in capacity score of district forestry officers, VAG members and local authorities for planning and implementing fire management interventions  (CCA Indicator 10). | **0** | 2.1 VAG members and local authorities score at least 2. | Verified through scoring scorecard methodologies adapted from AMAT (2014). The indicator is based on five criteria of the capacity assessment framework:   * Are the stakeholders able to identify climate change risks and appropriate fire management interventions? * Are the stakeholders specifying targets for these interventions? * Have the institutions clearly defined roles and responsibilities for the coordination and implementation of these interventions? * Is there evidence of effective implementation of fire management interventions by these stakeholders? * Is there evidence of institutional capacities for the continuous assessment, learning and review of adaptation strategies? | *Assumption*  District forestry officers and VAGs will apply information disseminated, maps and trainings.  *Risk*  Trainings are not prepared/delivered effectively. |
| 2.2 Change in frequency of fire across all districts in Central Province. | **0** | 2.2 Frequency of fires reduced by 25%. | Records of fires across Central Province. | *Assumption*  GIS software is applied effectively; information from GIS software is effectively packaged and disseminated to local communities; and updated fire management plans will be applied.  *Risks*  Non-climate related threats undermine project activities. |
| **Outcome 3**  Energy efficient charcoal production and wood-saving technologies have successfully replaced inefficient systems in targeted areas of Central Province, helping offset pressure on the forests as the climate changes. | 3.1 Change in number of users of improved charcoal kilns and briquetting machines (CCA Indicator 4). | **0** | 3.1 At least:  120 community members using charcoal retort kilns; and  50 community members using charcoal or sawdust briquetting machines.  (20% of who should be women)  To be validated during project inception. | Household surveys at intervention sites at project inception and termination; and records of charcoal producer groups established and kilns/briquetting machines distributed. | *Assumptions*  Local communities at intervention sites will accept and take ownership of improved kilns and briquetting machines.  *Risks*  Local communities will not adopt new technologies. |

*(to be added)*

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

* UNDP Project Document
* Project Logframe Analysis (LFA)
* Project Implementation Plan
* Implementing/ Executing partner arrangements
* List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Board, and other partners to be consulted
* Project Inception Report
* PPRs
* Project MTR Report
* Project MTR Management Response
* Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
* Project budgets and financial data
* Audit reports
* Oversight mission reports
* All monitoring reports prepared by the project
* Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team
* Project Board Meeting minutes
* Project Tracking Tool, at baseline, at mid-term, and at terminal points
* UNDP Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF)
* UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD)
* UNDP Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP)

*You could add more* 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. To be amended, completed and submitted as part of an evaluation inception 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? | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? | | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
| Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards? | | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
| Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? | | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
| **Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?** | | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |

Annex D: Rating Scales

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution*** | ***Sustainability ratings:*** | ***Relevance ratings*** |
| 6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings  5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings  4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS)  3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings  2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems  1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems | 4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability | 2. Relevant (R) |
| 3. Moderately Likely (ML):moderate risks | 1.. Not relevant (NR) |
| 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks  1. Unlikely (U): severe risks | ***Impact Ratings:***  3. Significant (S)  2. Minimal (M)  1. Negligible (N) |
| *Additional ratings where relevant:*  Not Applicable (N/A)  Unable to Assess (U/A | | |

Annex E: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form

**Evaluators:**

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people’s right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people’s right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders’ dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form[[7]](#footnote-7)**

**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[[8]](#footnote-8)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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 |
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| **3.** | Findings  (In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) must be rated[[10]](#footnote-10)) |
| **3.1** | Project Design / Formulation   * Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators) * Assumptions and Risks * Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design * Planned stakeholder participation * Replication approach * UNDP comparative advantage * Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector * Management arrangements |
| **3.2** | Project Implementation   * Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation) * Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region) * Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management * Project Finance: * Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (\*) * UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (\*) coordination, and operational issues |
| **3.3** | Project Results   * Overall results (attainment of objectives) (\*) * Relevance(\*) * Effectiveness & Efficiency (\*) * Country ownership * Mainstreaming * Sustainability (\*) * Impact |
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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
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UNDP GEF RTA
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1. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](http://www.undp.org/evaluation/handbook), Chapter 7, pg. 163 [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office:  [ROTI Handbook 2009](http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/M2_ROtI%20Handbook.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. *Objective (Atlas output) monitored quarterly ERBM and annually in APR/PIR* [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. *All outcomes monitored annually in the APR/PIR. It is highly recommended not to have more than 4 outcomes.* [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
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 section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)