**TERMS OF REFERENCE**

**Terminal Evaluator for UNDP-GEF Global Project on “Support to Eligible Parties to Produce the Sixth National Report” (6NR)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Type of Contract:** | Individual contract  |
| **Location:** | Home based  |
| **Languages Required:** | English  |
| **Starting Date** | 28 February 2020 |
| **Duration of Contract:** | Up to 40 working days through June 10, 2020 |
| **Supervisor:** | Technical Project Advisor |

1. **Background:**

Sixty-four countries have accessed Global Environmental Facility’s (GEF) Biodiversity Enabling Activities (BD EA) funding through UNDP with the aim of updating their Sixth National Reports (6NR) to the Convention of Biological Diversity (CBD). The “Support to Eligible Parties to Produce the Sixth National Report” (6NR) project objective is to provide financial and technical support to GEF-eligible Parties to the CBD in their work to develop high quality, data driven 6NRs that will improve national decision-making processes for the implementation of NBSAPs; that report on progress towards achieving the Aichi Biodiversity Targets (ABTs) and inform both the fifth Global Biodiversity Outlook (GBO5) and the Global Biodiversity Strategy of 2021 – 2030.

The CBD Secretariat has prepared a reference manual that complements guidelines for the 6NR and is intended to assist Parties in preparing their 6NR by the reporting deadline, in accordance with decision [XIII/27](https://www.cbd.int/doc/decisions/cop-13/cop-13-dec-27-en.pdf)  and [Article 26](https://www.cbd.int/convention/articles/default.shtml?a=cbd-26) of the Convention. The reference manual provides suggestions on the types of information Parties may wish to include in their 6NR and sources of information they may wish to draw on. This includes other reporting and assessment processes related to biodiversity, such as those related to other biodiversity-related conventions and multilateral environmental agreements, as well as relevant information managed or maintained by international organizations. The CBD 6NR information portal can be accessed here: <https://www.cbd.int/nr6/>.

This project includes trainings and capacity building opportunities that are based on the information provided in the 6NR reference manual, and that are developed and executed in close collaboration with the CBD Secretariat and UN Environment. The project also supports Parties to assess each national target using a stakeholder consultation process, and to participate in a technical review process. The project team provides on-demand technical support to each country participating in the project to ensure that each 6NR is high quality, gender-responsive and data-driven. This helps to ensure the preparation of a comprehensive 6NR and create ownership of its conclusions.

The Terminal Evaluation 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.

**2. Description of Responsibilities**

This final project evaluation will provide assessment on the potential impact of project interventions on the targeted groups. The Evaluation also aims to provide information about project implementation to ensure accountability for the expenditures to date and the implementation of the activities. In addition, the UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub (IRH) and stakeholders would like to derive lessons learned, so to improve the quality of the project design and implementation and thus to maximise the potential impact of similar interventions in the future programming. The results of this evaluation will be shared with the Project Board and relevant UNDP country offices. The evaluation should also include a chapter on lessons learned.

**EVALUATION SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES:**

This evaluation is expected to evaluate four GEF projects on “Technical Support to Eligible Parties to Produce the Sixth National Report” (6NR).” The evaluation will cover the full implementation period (2017-2020) of the projects.

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.

**Objectives of the evaluation are the following:**

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 evaluation will:

* Review effectiveness of the overall project interventions, their main achievements, compliance with expanding country’s needs;
* Review the efficiency of project management and implementation, use of funds and monitoring and evaluation frameworks and tools used under the project;
* Review and evaluate the extent to which project activities have reached the intended beneficiaries;
* Assess the likelihood of continuation and sustainability of project outputs and benefits after completion of the project - analyze how far the system of exit policy in the project ensures the sustainability of the project benefits;
* Review and assess the project impact in participating countries and globally;
* Identify gaps/weaknesses in the project design and provide recommendations as to their improvement;
* Identify lessons learned from projects interventions.

The scope of the evaluation will cover all activities undertaken in the framework of the project and will be done through a desk review and Skype/ phone interviews with no anticipated travel to the project countries. The evaluator will compare expected outputs of the project to actual achieved outputs, assess the development results to determine their contribution to the attainment of the project objectives. They will also attempt to evaluate the efficiency of project management, including the delivery of outcomes and activities in terms of quality, quantity, timeliness and cost efficiency as well as features related to the process involved in achieving those outputs and the impacts of the project. The evaluation will also address the underlying causes and issues that contributed to targets not adequately achieved. 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](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/UNDP-GEF-TE-Guide.pdf).

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 Offices, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct phone/Skype interviews with stakeholders, the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub, UNDP GEF, UN Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), as well as Country Office/government representatives from selected participating countries. The exact list of countries will be specified by UNDP at the beginning of the contract.

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual Progress Report (APR)/Project Implementation Report (PIR), project budget revisions, Project Board reports and minutes, progress reports, GEF core indicators, project files, national strategic and legal documents, exit surveys from participating countries 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 to this TOR and a set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included in Annex C of this Terms of Reference. 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 report must include a chapter providing a set of conclusions, recommendations and lessons. These final conclusions, recommendations and lessons will be based on consultations with project team, UNDP COs, donor representatives, PB members, as well as other key stakeholders. Interviews are expected to be conducted through email and telephone/ Skype and will inform the conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned.

Central to the evaluation are the following concepts:

**Relevance**-this is directly related to the consistency of activities and targets with national and local development programmes and priorities and the needs of intended beneficiaries. This also relates to the relevance to UNDP’s corporate and human development priorities.

**Effectiveness:** measures the manner in which the intended output targets were achieved. Measuring effectiveness involves an assessment of cause and effect in that how far can observable changes be attributed to project activities. This includes the following steps:

* Measuring change in the observed output and outcome;
* Attributing observed changes or progress towards the project;
* Assessing the value of the change (positive and/or negative).

**Efficiency** measures how economically resources (funds, expertise and time) are converted into results.

**Sustainability** is a key issue for the activities implemented under component II. It is important to measure to what extend the benefits of the activities will continue after the project has ended. Assessing sustainability involves evaluating to what extend the capacity can be maintained.

**Impact**, especially from UNDP’s perspective, measures the changes on human development that are caused by the project activities. Impact evaluation not only provides useful information for the continuation of phase II, it will also allow evaluating the success of the projects. Impact evaluation faces a number of challenges, first of all it is very often difficult to attribute impacts to certain activities. Furthermore, it is difficult to evaluate impact in a certain time span. Indeed, an impact evaluation ideally should be conducted sometime after the completions of the project.

Evaluations in UNDP are guided by the principles of **human rights** and **gender equality**. As a result, when collecting data, evaluator need to ensure that women and disadvantaged groups are adequately represented.

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 UNDP IRH 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.[[1]](#footnote-1)

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 targeted, 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.

Evaluation timeframe

The consultant is expected to deliver the following:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Deliverable | Content  | Timing | Responsibilities |
| **Inception Report** | Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method, evaluation design matrix, and a data collection plan and tools and approval of work plan | By March 11, 2020  | Evaluator submits to UNDP IRH  |
| **Presentation** | Initial Findings for the 6NR project once all interviews and research have been completed | By April 6, 2020 | To project management, UNDP IRH |
| **Draft Final Report**  | Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes | By April 30, 2020 | Sent to UNDP IRH, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF Operational Focal Point |
| **Final Report\*** | Revised report  | By May 20,2020  | Sent to UNDP IRH 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.

**Expected outputs and deliverables:**

The key product expected from the terminal evaluations is a comprehensive analytical report written in English and according to the provided outline.

The report, together with its annexes, will be submitted in electronic format in both, MS Word and pdf format.

All outputs will be reviewed and approved by the Senior Programme Cooridnator at UNDP IRH and GEF Regional Technical Advisor.

**Payment schedule:**

* Inception report- 10%
* Presentation on initial findings - 20%
* First Draft Terminal Evaluation Reports - 30%
* Final Terminal Evaluation Reports within one week of receiving UNDP comments on the draft- 40%

**Information on Working Arrangements:**

* The consultant will work from home;
* The Consultant will be given access to relevant information necessary for execution of the tasks under this assignment;
* All templates and log frame will be provided by UNDP;
* The Consultant will be responsible for providing her/his own working station (i.e. laptop, internet, phone, scanner/printer, etc.) and must have access to a reliable internet connection;
* Given the global consultations to be undertaken during this assignment, the consultants are expected to be reasonably flexible with his/her availability for such consultations taking into consideration different time zones;
* Payments will be made upon satisfactory delivery of outputs and submission of a certification of payment form, and acceptance and confirmation by the Senior Programme Coordinator at UNDP IRH on outputs delivered.
1. **Competencies:**

**Corporate Competencies:**

* Demonstrates integrity by modelling the UN’s values and ethical standards;
* Promotes the vision, mission, and strategic goals of UNDP;
* Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability;
* Treats all people fairly without favoritism.

**Technical Competencies:**

* Demonstrated ability to coordinate processes to collate information and facilitate discussion and analysis of material;
* Technical competencies in undertaking complex evaluations which involve multiple countries and variety of stakeholders
* Demonstrated strong research and analytical skills

**Client Orientation and Communications:**

* Excellent writing skills in English; knowledge of Spanish or French is an asset
* Demonstrated knowledge of UN terms, language and style;
* Excellent communication skills and experience in conducting structured interviews with a variety of stakeholders;
* Good interpersonal and networking skills, ability to establish and maintain effective working relations, supports and encourages open communication in the team, and facilitates team work;
* Ability to communicate verbally and in writing with a wide range of stakeholders, in a manner which is courteous and professional at all times, employing an appropriate level of formality and diplomacy;
* Ability to follow instructions accurately and also to work under minimum supervision.

**Professionalism:**

* Demonstrated ability to meet deadlines and work under pressure;
* Demonstrated excellent organizational skills.
1. **Qualifications:**

Education:

* Advanced (Master or PhD) degree in environmental studies/governance, public policy, development studies or any other related field.

Experience:

* Minimum six years of relevant professional experience in the area of biodiversity and/or evaluations;
* Experience working with UNDP and GEF monitoring and evaluation policies and procedures;
* Previous experience with results‐based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
* Experience working with international institutions, civil societies and/or governmental authorities, and experience working with and in developing countries;
* Working experience in the targeted focal area (biodiversity) will be an advantage;
* Experience with evaluations of GEF financed initiatives or UNDP supported projects will be an advantage.

Language skills:

* Excellent English writing and communication skills;
* Knowledge of French or Spanish is an asset;

**5. Application procedures**

Qualified candidates are requested to submit an application containing:

* **Financial Proposal\*** - specifying a total lump sum amount for the tasks specified in this announcement. The financial proposal shall include a breakdown of this lump sum amount (number of anticipated working days, travel, per diems and any other possible costs).

*\*Please note that the* ***financial proposal is all-inclusive*** *and shall take into account various expenses incurred by the consultant/contractor during the contract period (e.g. fee, health insurance, vaccination, personal security needs and any other relevant expenses related to the performance of services...). No* ***travel is envisaged under this consultancy.***

***Payments*** *will be made only upon confirmation of UNDP on delivering on the contract obligations in a satisfactory manner.*

*Individual Consultants are responsible for ensuring they have* ***vaccinations****/inoculations when travelling to certain countries, as designated by the UN Medical Director. Consultants are also required to comply with the UN* ***security directives*** *set forth under dss.un.org*

*General Terms and conditions as well as other related documents can be found under: http://on.undp.org/t7fJs.*

*Qualified women and members of minorities are encouraged to apply.*

*Due to large number of applications we receive, we are able to inform only the successful candidates about the outcome or status of the selection process.*

*Individual Consultants are responsible for ensuring they have* ***vaccinations****/inoculations when travelling to certain countries, as designated by the UN Medical Director. Consultants are also required to comply with the UN* ***security directives*** *set forth under dss.un.org*

*General Terms and conditions as well as other related documents can be found under: http://on.undp.org/t7fJs.*

*Qualified women and members of minorities are encouraged to apply.*

*Due to large number of applications we receive, we are able to inform only the successful candidates about the outcome or status of the selection process.*

Annex A: Project Logical Framework

|  |
| --- |
| **This project will contribute to the following Sustainable Development Goal (s):** *Goals 14 and 15* |
| **This project will contribute to the following country outcome included in the UNDAF/Country Programme Document:** This is a global project.UNDP will ensure this project is anchored in the individual country UNDAF processes, and thus will expose the results to the rest of the UN players in the region. This is crucial to making sure that the outputs and outcomes are visible to many other development agencies and therefore stand a better chance to attract more national and regional support in the future. While the number of countries may pose a challenge for this mainstreaming due to differences UNDAF cycles, it will still be possible to capture and include it sometime within the 24 months of the project duration. A typical UNDAF framework runs for 5 years and has five pillars including (a) Human rights; (b) Gender mainstreaming; (c) Environment Sustainability; (d) Capacity development; and (e) Results-based management. This 6th NR project is based on the environment angle but addresses all the others- and so it will be easy for any country to articulate and mainstream the project in UNDAF. Each of the 64 countries will interrogate their own UNDAF documents and make sure the project answers to their requirements. |
| **This project will be linked to the following output of the UNDP Strategic Plan:**Output 2.5: Legal and regulatory frameworks, policies and institutions enabled to ensure the conservation, sustainable use, and access and benefit sharing of natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystems, in line with international conventions and national legislation. |
|  | ***Objective and Outcome Indicators***  | ***BASELINE*** | ***END OF PROJECT TARGETS*** | ***MEANS OF VERIFICATION*** | ***MID-TERM EVALUATION*** | ***ASSUMPTIONS*** |
| *Objective: To provide financial and technical support to GEF-eligible Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) in their work to develop high quality, gender-responsive and data driven sixth national reports (6NR) that will improve national decision-making processes for the implementation of NBSAPs; that report on progress towards achieving the Aichi Biodiversity Targets (ABTs) and inform both the fifth Global Biodiversity Outlook (GBO5) and the Global Biodiversity Strategy of 2021 – 2030.* | *Number of countries that have produced their 6th National reports and submitted them to the CBD Sec* | *In the past the GEF eligible countries have been supported to conduct country planning for BD conservation including initial NBSAPs, four rounds of national reports for biodiversity. This planning has been useful in guiding the countries and the COPs in BD conservation.*  | *64 National reports produced and uploaded on the CBD website by end of project* | *Project reports.* *Minutes of the PSC.**Terminal Evaluation**Project website at the SCBD.* *Interviews with government agents, CBD focal points* |  *NA* | *1. Development and sectoral planning frameworks at country level integrated measurable biodiversity conservation and sustainable use targets during the NBSAP process.**2. The 64 countries are enabled and informed for better decision making in BD conservation*  |
| ***Outcome 1:*** *A functional steering committee is formed to prepare the 6NR, project timelines and methods are developed, funding is mobilized and training and capacity building activities are complete* | *Percentage of countries with functional steering committees*  | *All the participating countries do not have functional project steering committees for the production of the 6th NR* | *At least 80% of the countries have functional steering committees by midterm of the project and 100% by project end*  | *Project reports.* *Minutes of the PSC.**Terminal evaluation**Interviews with government agents, CBD focal points* | *NA* | *Relevant key institutions will be willing to second their staff for membership of the steering committee*  |
| ***Outputs:****1.1. The SC is formed, roles for the preparation of the 6NR are assigned, and a production plan and timeline is developed.**1.2. Necessary project funding and resources are acquired, including the submission of an Annual Work Plan and Letter of Authorization and the identification of other funding sources, as needed.**1.3. Participation in training and capacity building opportunities on the use of the CBD online reporting tool and the development of data that reports on progress in achieving the targets and activities in the post-2010 NBSAP.* |
| ***Outcome 2:*** *Stakeholder owned reports for each ABT and/or national equivalent are produced and compiled* | *Percentage of all identified stakeholders registered in a comprehensive stakeholder inventory involved in producing and compiling of ABTs and/or national equivalent* | *0%* | *100%* | *Project reports.* *Minutes of the PSC.**Terminal evaluation**Interviews with government agents, CBD focal points* | *NA* | *Forming partnerships between relevant stakeholders interested in biodiversity conservation issues and in development issues**A gender responsive approach fully considers the different needs, roles, benefits, impacts, risks and access to/control over resources of women and men and integrates appropriate measures taken to address and these and promote gender equality and women’s empowerment.* |
| *Percentage of countries that have produced reports for each ABT and/or national equivalent*  | *0%* | *At least 80% of the countries have produced reports for each national targets by midterm of project time frame and 100% by project end* |
| *Number of countries with gender-responsive reports for each ABT and/or national equivalent include a gender section* | *0* | *64* |
| *2.1. Scoping report/zero draft for each ABT and/or national equivalent is prepared.**2.2. Consultations with stakeholders are undertaken to verify data and progress assessments and address information gaps for each ABT.**2.3. Reports for each ABT and/or national equivalent are developed, which strive to be gender responsive, considering the resources and timeframe of the project in each country.* |
| ***Outcome 3:*** *A Stakeholder owned 6th national Report is produced and submitted to the CBD* | *Percentage of the number of countries submitting 6NRs to the CBD* | *None of the participating countries have submitted the 6th NR to the CBD* | *50% of the countries submit 6NRs to the CBD by midterm and 100% at project end* | *Project reports.* *Minutes of the PSC.**Terminal evaluation**Interviews with government agents, CBD focal points* | *NA* | *The ongoing training by SCBD will support countries and contribute to better articulation of country requirements for the project.* |
| ***Outputs:****3.1. The draft 6NR is compiled, undergoes a technical peer review, revised and finalized.**3.2. The 6NR is validated and officially submitted to the CBD.* |

Annex B: List of documents to be reviewed by the evaluator

* Project Document signed by UNDP
* Project Reports (Inception Report, Progress Reports, Annual Progress Reports, Project Implementation Reports (PIR).
* List and contact details for project staff including Project Boards
* Project Board Reports and Minutes
* GEF National Strategic and Legal Documents
* GEF Core Indicators
* Financial Data including Combined Delivery Reports (CDRs)
* Exit Surveys from participating countries
* Knowledge Products (technical guidance documents, webinars, posters, story maps, best practices)

Annex C: Evaluation Questions

| **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?  |
|  | * Does the project support other regional or international conventions
 | * Priorities and areas of work of other conventions incorporated in the project design
 | * Project documents
* National policies and strategies
* Other international conventions, or related to environment more generally and other international convention web sites
 | * Documents analyses
* Interviews with project team
* UNDP and other partners
 |
|  | * Is the project internally coherent in its design?
 | * Level of coherence between project expected results and project design internal logic
* Level of coherence between project design and project implementation approach
* Existence of a gender analysis and evidence that it informed project design
 | • Program and project documents • Key project stakeholders | • Document analysis • Key interviews |
|  | * Is the project relevant to the GEF Biodiversity focal area and how does the project support the GEF biodiversity focal area?
 | * Existence of a clear relationship between the project objectives and GEF Biodiversity focal area?
* Alignment with GEF Biodiversity focal area;
* Identify contribution to GEF Biodiversity focal area
 | * Project documents,
* GEF focal areas strategies and document
 | * Documents analyses
* GEF website
* Interviews with UNDP and project team
 |
|  | * Does the project provide relevant lessons and experiences for other similar projects in the future?
* Has the experience of the project provided relevant lessons for other future projects targeted at similar objectives
 | * Proposals in pipelines
 | * Data collected during evaluation
 | * Data analysis
* Interviews with project staff
 |
| Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? |
|  | * Has the project achieved its output and outcome level objectives?
 | * See indicators in project document results framework and log frame
 | * Project documents
* Annual reports (PIRs)
* Data collected during analysis
 | * Documents analysis
* Interviews with project team
* Interviews with relevant stakeholders
 |
|  | * How is risk and risk mitigation being managed?

-How well are risks, assumptions and impact drivers being managed?-What was the quality of risk mitigation strategies developed? -Were these sufficient? -Are there clear strategies for risk mitigation related with longterm sustainability of the project? | * Completeness of risk identification and assumptions during project planning and design
* Quality of existing information systems in place to identify emerging risks and other issues
* Quality of risk mitigations strategies developed and followed
 | * Project documents
* UNDP, project team, and relevant stakeholders
 | * Documents analysis
* Interviews
 |
|  | * What lessons can be drawn regarding effectiveness for other similar projects in the future?
* Were the lessons learned captured during the project implementation used to inform project implementation/management?

- What changes could have been made (if any) to the design of the project in order to improve the achievement of the project’s expected results? |  | * Data collected throughout evaluation
 | * Data analysis
 |
| Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards? |
|  | * Was the project implemented in an efficient way?

-Was adaptive management used or needed to ensure efficient resource use?- Did the project logical framework and work plans and any changes made to them use as management tools during implementation?- Did the leveraging of funds (co financing) happen as planned?- Were financial resources utilized efficiently? Could financial resources have been used more efficiently?- Was procurement carried out in a manner making efficient use of project resources? | * Availability and quality of financial and progress reports
* Timeliness and adequacy of reporting provided
* Level of discrepancy between planned and utilized financial expenditures
* Planned vs. actual funds leveraged
* Quality of results-based management reporting (progress reporting, monitoring and evaluation)
 | * Project documents
* UNDP project team
 | * Documents analysis
* Key Interviews
 |
|  | * How efficient are partnership arrangements for the project?
* To what extent partnerships/ linkages between institutions/ organizations were encouraged and supported?
* Which partnerships/linkages were facilitated? Which ones can be considered sustainable?
* -What was the level of efficiency of cooperation and collaboration arrangements?
* -Which methods were successful or not and why?
 | * Specific activities conducted to support the development of cooperative arrangements between partners
* Examples of supported partnerships
* Evidence that particular partnerships/linkages will be sustained
* Types/quality of partnership cooperation methods utilized
 | * Project documents and evaluations
* Project partners and relevant stakeholders
 | * Documents analysis
* Key Interviews
 |
|  | * Has the project been efficient in achieving its expected outcomes?
 | * See indicators in project document results framework and log frame
 | * Project documents
* Data collected during analysis
 | * Documents analysis
* Interviews with project team
* Interviews with relevant stakeholders
 |
|  | * What are the lessons learned/ recommendations to improve the efficiency of similar global projects/ interventions?
 |  | * Progress Reports
* Interviews with stakeholders
 | * Documents analysis
* Interviews with project team
* Interviews with relevant stakeholders
 |
|  Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? |
|  | * To what extent will the stakeholders sustain the project?
* -What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained?
* To what degree is there sufficient public/stakeholder awareness in support of the project’s long-term objectives?
 | * Degree of political and social support
* Changes in national legislation, reporting
* Level of engagement of national stakeholders
 | * UNDP, project team, and relevant stakeholders
 | * Document analysis
* Interviews
* Monitoring data/Progress reports
* Progress reports
* Exit surveys
 |
|  | * The what extend did the project improve national capacities in the area of national reporting and led to improved quality of reporting?
 |  | * UNDP, CBD and relevant stakeholders
 | * Interviews with relevant stakeholders
 |
| **Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?**  |
|  | * Assess the likely permanence (long lasting nature) of the impacts
 | * The positive and negative, foreseen and unforeseen changes to and effects produced by a development intervention
 | * Project documents
* UNDP, project team, and relevant stakeholders
 | * Document analysis
* Interviews
 |
|  | * Based on the 6NR as well as previous generations of national reporting, what is the estimated impact of UNDP interventions? Did the project manage to build capacities on the local level and improve the quality of national reporting?
 |  | * Project documents
* UNDP, project team, and relevant stakeholders
 | * Interviews with project team
* Interviews with relevant stakeholders
 |

*Annex D:*

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 below:

|  |
| --- |
| **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: |       |

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 shortcomings4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS)3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems1. 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 risks1. 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

**Evaluator:**

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. Evaluator must respect people’s right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluator 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. Evaluator 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, evaluator 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, evaluator 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[[2]](#footnote-2)**

**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]](#footnote-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[[4]](#footnote-4)) |
| **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[[5]](#footnote-5))  |
| **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
 |
| **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 UNDP IRH and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and included in the final document)*

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP IRH Office

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

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

UNDP GEF RTA

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

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

Annex H: TE Report audit trail

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 by comment number (“#” column):*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author** | **#** | **Para No./ comment location**  | **Comment/Feedback on the draft TE report** | **Evaluator response and actions taken** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

1. 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-1)
2. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. 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-5)