

## 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 *Niger Delta Biodiversity Project* (PIMS 2047.)

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

### PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	NIGER DELTA BIODIVERSITY CONSERVATION PROJECT			
GEF Project ID:	4090 PIMS 2047		<i>at endorsement</i> <i>(Million US\$)</i>	<i>at completion</i> <i>(Million US\$)</i>
UNDP Project ID:	00077181	GEF financing:	3,610,000	3,610,000
Country:	NIGERIA	IA/EA own:	1,000,000	
Region:	WEST AFRICA	Government:	65,000	65,000
Focal Area:	BIODIVERSITY	Other:		
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):		Total co-financing:		
Executing Agency:	UNDP	Total Project Cost:	4,675,000	
Other Partners involved:	FEDERAL MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMEN T	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed:	Actual:

### OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The project was designed to:

Contribute to the conservation and sustainable use of globally significant biological diversity in the Niger Delta. The project objective is “to mainstream biodiversity management priorities into the Niger Delta oil and gas (O&G) sector development policies and operations.” The project’s three main outcomes designed to achieve this objective are:

- 1) Stakeholders strengthen the governance framework of law, policy, and institutional capacity to enable the mainstreaming of biodiversity management into the O&G sector in the Niger Delta;
- 2) Government, the O&G industry and local communities adopt and pilot new biodiversity action planning tools for proactive biodiversity mainstreaming in the Niger Delta;

3) Stakeholders support long-term biodiversity management and the use of these new tools in the Niger Delta by capitalizing the Niger Delta Biodiversity Trust with a collaborative engagement mechanism for local communities, O&G companies and Government at its core.

Each of the three outcomes of this project reflects the project's (and UNDP's) focus on strengthening the governance of biodiversity in the Niger Delta. By mainstreaming biodiversity into the O&G sector of the Niger Delta, the project is strengthening the governance of those resources. The geographic focus of the project is on the four core Nigerian States within the Niger Delta (Akwa Ibom, Bayelsa, Delta, and Rivers States), which combined encompass an area of 46,420 km<sup>2</sup> (the 'indirect landscape mainstreaming target'). The physical footprint of the O&G company assets within this area is admitted by the industry to be 600 km<sup>2</sup>, which is considered the project's initial 'direct landscape mainstreaming target'. The project will bring improved biodiversity management to these areas indirectly and directly, respectively, as measured by improved state of globally significant species and ecosystems, legal and policy frameworks that incorporate biodiversity objectives, and O&G companies adopting best practice for biodiversity actions

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.

## EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

---

An overall approach and method<sup>1</sup> for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact**, as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR (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 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 some of the project locations in the **South – South of Nigeria**. The states where the project was implemented are **Akwa Ibom, Bayelsa, Delta and Rivers**. However, travel to these locations are subject to clearance from the UNDSS, including the following project sites Akwa Ibom; Ikot Uso Akpan, Itam, Itu LGA. Bayelsa; Oluasiri. Delta; Source of River Ethiope, Umuaja, Kwale LGA. Rivers; Andoni Barrier Island elephant conservation site. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

1. Serving Permanent Secretaries & Directors of Forestry in
  - a. Akwa Ibom State Ministry of Environment

---

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

- b. Bayelsa State Ministry of Environment
- c. Delta State Ministry of Environment
- d. Rivers State Ministry of Environment

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

## EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (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:	

## PROJECT FINANCE / COFINANCE

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

Co-financing (type/source)	UNDP own financing (mill. US\$)		Government (mill. US\$)		Partner Agency (mill. US\$)		Total (mill. US\$)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Actual	Actual
Grants								
Loans/Concessions								

• In-kind support								
• Other								
Totals								

## MAINSTREAMING

UNDP supported GEF financed projects are key components in UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programmes. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender.

## IMPACT

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.<sup>2</sup>

## CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions, recommendations and lessons**. Conclusions should build on findings and be based in evidence. Recommendations should be prioritized, specific, relevant, and target, with suggested implementers of the recommendations. Lessons should have wider applicability to other initiatives across the region, the area of intervention and for the future.

## IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in **Nigeria**. 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 30 days according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
<b>Preparation</b>	4 days (recommended: 2-4)	10 February 2020
<b>Evaluation Mission</b>	15 days (r: 7-15)	29 February 2020 (last date of mission)
<b>Draft Evaluation Report</b>	7 days (r: 5-10)	24 March 2020 (within 3 weeks)
<b>Final Report</b>	2 days (r: 1-2)	28 March 2020

<sup>2</sup>A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office: [ROtI Handbook 2009](#)

## EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

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

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

## TEAM COMPOSITION

The evaluation team will be composed of **1 international 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:

Criteria	Weight
<b>Master's degree or advanced certificate</b> in biology, ecology, forestry, zoology, forest landscape management or other closely related field.	10
Minimum <b>15</b> years of relevant professional experience	10
Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s)	20
Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;	15
Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations;	10
Experience working in developing countries especially Sub – Saharan Africa;	10
Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and biodiversity mainstreaming, experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis;	5
Excellent communication skills;	5
Demonstrable analytical skills;	5
Project evaluation/review experience within United Nations system will be considered as an asset	<b>10</b>

Fluency in written and spoken English is required	0
---	---

## EVALUATOR ETHICS

---

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

## PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

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

%	Milestone
10%	TE inception report
40%	Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report
50%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report

## APPLICATION PROCESS

---

Applicants are requested to apply online <https://procurement-notices.undp.org> by **5th June 2019**. Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions. The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in English with indication of the e-mail and phone contact. Shortlisted candidates will be requested to submit a price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs).

UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

**ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK**

Objective/ Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	End of Project target	Source of Information	Risks and assumptions
<p><b>Objective:</b> To mainstream biodiversity management priorities into the Niger Delta oil and gas (O&amp;G) sector development policies and operations.</p>	<p><u>Direct:</u> Improved management of 600 km<sup>2</sup>) “inside the fence” of O&amp;G operations as measured by adoption of Biodiversity Action Plans for a target number of O&amp;G operations in the Delta.</p>	<p>No BAP for operations in the Delta</p>	<p>At least 600 km<sup>2</sup> of O&amp;G footprint covered by new or revised BAP for O&amp;G operations in ND.</p>	<p>Copies of the BAPs themselves.</p>	<p><u>Risks:</u></p> <p>Fluctuation in the global price of oil may force O&amp;G companies to act short-sightedly.</p> <p>Government policies and programs will support unrestrained O&amp;G development in the Niger Delta, as world demand for oil increases.</p> <p>Bush meat trade may place too much pressure on the Red colobus monkey, hampering the ability of the project to achieve this target.</p> <p>Insecurity and violence in the Niger Delta makes project operations expensive and at</p>
	<p><u>Indirect:</u> Threats to biodiversity linked to O&amp;G are reduced in a spatial area of 46,420 km<sup>2</sup> as measured by condition, number or extent of key species and ecosystems in the Niger Delta:</p> <p>- Area in ND where Niger Delta red colobus monkey is confirmed</p> <p>- # of hectares of mangrove ecosystem in under improved</p>	<p>- Area in ND where Niger Delta red colobus monkey is unknown and un-measured.</p> <p>- Zero hectares of mangrove ecosystem in under improved special management regime</p> <p>- Zero hectares cover of barrier island lowland forest under protection.</p>	<p>- Red colobus monkey is confirmed present in 15,000 hectares by end of project (EoP).</p> <p>- At least 25,000 ha of mangrove ecosystem in under improved special management regime</p> <p>- At least 10,000 ha cover of barrier island lowland forest</p>	<p>Field surveys in first year of project and in last.</p> <p>Integrated Biodiversity Assessment Tool for the Niger Delta.</p>	

Objective/ Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	End of Project target	Source of Information	Risks and assumptions
	special management regime  - # of hectares cover of barrier island lowland forest under protection.		under protection.		times impossible.  <u>Assumption:</u>
	# of O&G companies and Government agencies utilizing IBAT regularly for Niger Delta biodiversity mainstreaming.	Zero	At least three O&G companies and 3 Government agencies by end of project.	Field interviews; IBAT subscription records; Policy documents from government calling for use of IBAT in EIA process or other.	Despite some uncertainties, the O&G sector in the Niger Delta will continue to operate in a robust manner, with new fields being explored and increasing production coming on line from new O&G activities.
	# of hectares of community PA/set-aside or other PA gazetted and under biodiversity management in four pilot States of the Niger Delta.	Zero	At least 5,000 hectares by end of project.	Gazette documentation. Field visits  Annual Project Reports	The designation of special management status for mangroves or barrier island lowland forest will be backed up with real management action and legal protection.
	Amount of funding committed to the NDBT by EoP.  Presence or absence of operational Niger Delta Biodiversity Trust mechanism and level of funding	Zero funding committed.  Does not exist. No funding committed to any mechanism for Delta biodiversity	US\$3 million committed to the Trust by EoP.  Niger Delta	Articles of incorporation  Investment statements for Trust's accounts.	



Objective/ Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	End of Project target	Source of Information	Risks and assumptions
	committed.	conservation/ mainstreaming	Biodiversity Trust (NDBT) Articles of Incorporation agreed upon by the GoN, O&G companies, and relevant civil society partners and legally approved under Nigeria's Companies and Allied Matters Act.		
	# of primary laws and policies and regulations improved with biodiversity mainstreaming guidelines, recommendations, and amendments.	No laws/ policies have biodiversity mainstreamed into them, including the EIA, EGASPIN, PIB, and Oil Spill Response Plan.	At least four have biodiversity mainstreamed into their language via adopted guidelines, amendments, or modified language in the laws themselves.	Actual guidelines and amendments  Government gazettes announcing adoption of amendment or guidelines.	
<b>Outcome 1</b> – The governance framework of law, policy, and institutional capacity to enable the mainstreaming	<p>Output 1.1 IBAT for the Niger Delta is in place and operational.</p> <p>Output 1.2 Action Plan for Community-level Biodiversity Mainstreaming in the Niger Delta is developed and implemented.</p> <p>Output 1.3. The biodiversity elements of legal and policy frameworks governing the O&amp;G sector and its regulation are strengthened.</p> <p>Output 1.4. The capacity of key Federal and State government agencies to assess and mitigate the risks and threats to biodiversity from the O&amp;G sector in the Niger Delta is strengthened.</p>				

Objective/ Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	End of Project target	Source of Information	Risks and assumptions
of biodiversity management into the O&G sector in the Niger Delta is strengthened.	# of central O&G policies and guidelines and plans that incorporate biodiversity management checklists, criteria and objectives	Zero	At least three by end of project.	EIA Policy (FMoE) EGASPIN (DPR) National oil spill response plan (NOSDRA)	<u>Risks:</u> Government policies and programs will support unrestrained O&G development in the Niger Delta, as world demand for oil increases.
	Improvement in Score of UNDP Capacity Assessment Tool over life of project.  (see PRODOC Error! Reference source not found.)	5 out of 48, i.e.	Improvement from 5/45 to minimum 10/48.	UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard may be adapted for use as a measurement tool	<u>Assumptions:</u> The GoN's commitment to the project is demonstrated by its participation in the EITI initiative, by its ongoing and nearly completed revision of the O&G body of law and by the clear trend evident in improving environmental aspects of Nigerian O&G law and policy in the past 10 year period.
	# of measurable/ tangible improvements in the EIA process for biodiversity mainstreaming.	EIA has few if any specific biodiversity conservation targets/ objectives.	Biodiversity mainstreamed into EIA process in at least 3 entry points.  (See PRODOC Error! Reference source not found. under the description of output 1.3)	Mid-term and final independent evaluations will validate the achievement of this indicator.	
	Level of improvement of data available through IBAT	Info on KBA available through IBAT driven by one	Coverage of taxonomic groups expanded to at least	IBAT data sets.	

Objective/ Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	End of Project target	Source of Information	Risks and assumptions
	decision support tool.	taxa (birds).	four in total.	Project records  Interviews with data partners.	
<b>Outcome 2 –</b> Government, the O&G industry and local communities build and pilot new biodiversity action planning tools for the proactive biodiversity management in the Niger Delta.	Output 2.1. An agreed approach for O&G company Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs) for the Niger Delta is achieved.				
	Output 2.2: A participatory process is instituted for the pilot demonstration of community-engagement in BAP for mainstreaming biodiversity management objectives into O&G project lifecycle.				
	Output 2.3: O&G BAPs are independently reviewed as a means to improve corporate biodiversity mainstreaming practices.				
	Change in level of corporate investment in biodiversity management.	TBD at project inception.	A 20% increase in corporate investment of O&G companies in biodiversity management will ensure biodiversity safeguarding at O&G extraction sites, pipeline and tanker transportation.	Voluntary reporting from O&G partner companies.	<u>Risks:</u>  Companies may decide that corporate investment of O&G companies in biodiversity management is privileged information and not be willing to make it public.  <u>Assumptions:</u>
	# of O&G companies adopting new BAP for operations.	Zero	At least 3 companies adopt model BAP for their inside the fence	New BAP documents.	O&G operators will continue to see biodiversity conservation and collaboration with local

Objective/ Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	End of Project target	Source of Information	Risks and assumptions
			operations.		communities and other stakeholders as a win-win for their business model both on the local and international levels.
<b>Outcome 3</b> Stakeholders support long-term biodiversity management in the Niger Delta by capitalizing and accessing the Niger Delta Biodiversity Trust as a collaborative engagement mechanism for local communities, O&G companies and Government at its core.	Output 3.1. Niger Delta Biodiversity Trust legally established with a transparent management structure, to enable the efficient and transparent allocation of resources to biodiversity conservation priorities in the Delta.  Output 3.2. NDB Trust Capitalization: Compacts with O&G companies to capitalize the Niger Delta Biodiversity Trust are successfully negotiated.  Output 3.3. Organized communities, partnerships of communities and NGOs, and NGOs and Government, Universities, in the Niger Delta at large have the capacity to and count on an appropriate mechanism to access funding from the Trust.				
	Presence/absence of NDB Trust operational and funded with a first tranche of US\$ 3 million supporting biodiversity conservation in critical ecosystems within the whole of the Niger Delta Region	No NDBT and minimal funding for biodiversity in general.	Niger Delta Biodiversity Trust operational with at least US\$3 million in funding supporting biodiversity conservation in critical ecosystems within the whole of the Niger Delta Region	Funding commitments from major O&G companies and the Ecological Fund of the Gov't of Nigeria.	<u>Risks:</u>  Fluctuation in the global price of oil may force O&G companies to act short-sightedly with respect to investments and it make them less likely to collaborate in the project and capitalise the Niger Delta Biodiversity Trust.
	# of community proposed biodiversity conservation projects funded and operational in the four pilot	Zero	At least 15 by end of project.		<u>Assumption:</u>  Increased awareness and capacity will lead to a change

Objective/ Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	End of Project target	Source of Information	Risks and assumptions
	States of the Niger Delta.				in behaviour by O&G operators with respect to the mainstreaming of biodiversity into their operations and a change in behavior by local communities and State government staff with respect to conceptualizing and implementing local biodiversity conservation initiatives.

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

---

1. GEF Project Information Form (PIF)
2. Project Document and Log Frame Analysis
3. Project Implementation Plan
4. Implementing/Executing Partner arrangements
5. List and contact of details of project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Boards, and other partners to be consulted
6. Project sites, highlighting suggested visits
7. Mid Term Review and other relevant evaluations and assessment
8. Annual; Project Implementation Report (PIR)
9. Project budget, broken out by outcomes and outputs
10. TRG Minutes, PSC minutes, etc
11. Financial data
12. Sample of project communications materials, i.e. press releases, brochures, documentaries etc.

### **UNDP Documents**

1. Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF)
2. Country Programme Document (CPD)
3. UNDP Strategic Plan

## ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

*This is a generic list, to be further detailed with more specific questions by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on the particulars of the project.*

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
<b>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?</b>			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
<b>Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?</b>			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
<b>Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?</b>			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
<b>Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?</b>			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
<b>Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?</b>			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•

## ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

---

<p><b>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&amp;E, I&amp;E Execution</b></p> <p>6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings</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><b>Sustainability ratings:</b></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><b>Relevance ratings</b></p> <p>2. Relevant (R)</p> <p>1.. Not relevant (NR)</p> <p><b>Impact Ratings:</b></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 limitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

### Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form<sup>3</sup>

#### Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System

Name of Consultant: \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): \_\_\_\_\_

**I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.**

Signed at *place on date*

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

---

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

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

---

- i. Opening page:
  - Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
  - UNDP and GEF project ID#s.
  - Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report
  - Region and countries included in the project
  - GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program
  - Implementing Partner and other project partners
  - Evaluation team members
  - Acknowledgements
- ii. Executive Summary
  - Project Summary Table
  - Project Description (brief)
  - Evaluation Rating Table
  - Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons
- iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations  
(See: UNDP Editorial Manual<sup>5</sup>)
1. Introduction
  - Purpose of the evaluation
  - Scope & Methodology
  - Structure of the evaluation report
2. Project description and development context
  - Project start and duration
  - Problems that the project sought to address
  - Immediate and development objectives of the project
  - Baseline Indicators established
  - Main stakeholders
  - Expected Results
3. Findings  
(In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) must be rated<sup>6</sup>)
- 3.1 Project Design / Formulation
  - Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)
  - Assumptions and Risks
  - Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design
  - Planned stakeholder participation
  - Replication approach
  - UNDP comparative advantage
  - Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
  - Management arrangements
- 3.2 Project Implementation
  - Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)

---

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

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

<sup>6</sup> Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations.

- Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)
- Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management
- Project Finance:
- Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (\*)
- UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (\*) coordination, and operational issues

### 3.3 Project Results

- Overall results (attainment of objectives) (\*)
- Relevance(\*)
- Effectiveness & Efficiency (\*)
- Country ownership
- Mainstreaming
- Sustainability (\*)
- Impact

### 4. Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons

- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
- Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
- Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
- Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success

### 5. Annexes

- ToR
- Itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- Summary of field visits
- List of documents reviewed
- Evaluation Question Matrix
- Questionnaire used and summary of results
- Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

**ANNEX G: EVALUATION REPORT CLEARANCE FORM**

---

*(to be completed by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and included in the final document)*

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

UNDP GEF RTA

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## ANNEX H: TE REPORT AUDIT TRAIL TEMPLATE

---

The following is a template for the evaluator 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 included as an annex in the final TE report.

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

*The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft Terminal Evaluation report; they are referenced by institution (“Author” column) and track change comment number (“#” column):*

Author	#	Para No./ comment location	Comment/Feedback on the draft TE report	TE response and action taken