**TERMS OF REFERENCE**

**Terminal Evaluation of the UNEP/GEF project**

 **“Capacity Building Initiative for Transparency (CBIT) Global Coordination Platform”**

**GEF ID #: 9675**

# Section 1: PROJECT BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW

## Project General Information

**Table 1. Project summary**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **GEF Project ID:** | 9675 |  |  |
| **Implementing Agency:** | UNEP/UNDP | **Executing Agency:** | UNEP DTU Partnership Component 1UNDP Components 2 and 3. |
| **Relevant SDG(s) and indicator(s):** | 13.2.1 Number of countries that have communicated the establishment or operationalisation of an integrated policy/strategy/plan which increases their ability to adapt to the adverse impacts of climate change, and foster climate resilience and low greenhouse gas emissions development in a manner that does not threaten food production (including a national adaptation plan, nationally determined contribution, national communication, biennial update report or other) 17.16.1 Number of countries reporting progress in multi-stakeholder development effectiveness monitoring frameworks that support the achievement of the sustainable development goals |
| **Sub-programme:** | Climate Change | **Expected Accomplishment(s):** | **EA I:** CBIT platform forcoordination, learningopportunities andknowledge sharing**EA II:** Coordinationand exchangeevents**EA III:** CBIT Needsand Gaps identified  |
| **UNEP approval date:** |  | **Programme of Work Output(s):** | Programme of Work 2018-2019 – Sub-Programme Climate ChangeExpected Accomplishment B: countries increasingly adopt and/or implement low greenhouse gas emission development strategies and invest in clean technologies |
| **GEF approval date:** | 11-August-2017 | **Project type:** | Medium Size Project |
| **GEF Operational Programme #:** |  | **Focal Area(s):** | Climate Change[[1]](#footnote-0) |
|  |  | **GEF Strategic Priority:** | Capacity Building Initiative for Transparency |
| ***Expected* start date:** |  | **Actual start date:** | 05-October-2017 |
| ***Planned* completion date:** | 31-March-2019 | **Actual operational completion date:** | 31-December-2019 |
| ***Planned* project budget at approval:** | 1,400,000 | **Actual total expenditures reported as of [date]:** |  |
| **GEF grant allocation:** | 1,000,000 | **GEF grant expenditures reported as of [date]:** | As of 30th of June (PIR)UNEP: US$ 262,973UNDP: US$ 331,985 |
| **Project Preparation Grant - GEF financing:** |  | **Project Preparation Grant - co-financing:** |  |
| ***Expected* Medium-Size Project co-financing:** | 400,000 | **Secured Medium-Size Project co-financing:** |  |
| **First disbursement:** | 05-September-2018 | **Planned date of financial closure:** |  |
| **No. of formal project revisions:** | 1 | **Date of last approved project revision:** |  |
| **No. of Steering Committee meetings:** | 2 | **Date of last/next Steering Committee meeting:** | **Last:19-December-2019** | **Next: N/A** |
| **Mid-term Review/ Evaluation *(planned date):*** | N/A | **Mid-term Review/ Evaluation (actual date):** | N/A |
| **Terminal Evaluation *(planned date):***  | 30-April-2020 | **Terminal Evaluation (actual date):**  |  |
| **Coverage - Country(ies):** | Global | **Coverage - Region(s):** | Global |
| **Dates of previous project phases:** | N/A | **Status of future project phases:** | A PIF (GEFID: 10128) for a Phase II-A has been approved, the CEO Endorsement request was submitted to the GEF and we received comments, UNDP plans to resubmit in January/February 2020. |

## Project rationale

1. Through becoming a signatory to the Paris Agreement, the global community has recognized the urgency in addressing climate change. This is evidenced by the Parties' aspiration to "holding the increase in the global average temperature to well below 2 degrees Celsius above pre-industrial levels and pursuing significant efforts to limit the temperature increase to 1.5 degrees Celsius above pre-industrial levels, recognizing that this would significantly reduce the risks of impacts" as stated in Article 2 of the Paris Agreement. The Agreement entered into force on November 4th, 2016 and it was deemed essential for countries to establish solid measuring, reporting, and verification (MRV) systems to assess the impact of climate change actions and policies and to track the implementation of the Agreement.

2. The Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC) of a country sets out its efforts to combat climate change, including its mitigation goal, corresponding to its national contribution to global mitigation efforts as well as adaptation goals and means of implementation. At the national level, NDCs have been implemented through individual policies and measures, designed by the countries. These policies, actions and measures are subject to MRV processes, nationally and internationally. The information collected from individual policies, actions and measures is able to be used nationally to monitor the level of achievement of the mitigation and adaptation goals stated in the NDC and thus contribute to the reporting of progress in implementing NDCs to United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). In addition, the information collected at the country level and reported internationally allows for the achievement of the long-term mitigation goal of the Paris Agreement, namely ‘reaching global peaking of greenhouse gas emissions as soon as possible’, to be tracked. In this context, the design and implementation of MRV systems at the national and international levels become an important tool to track individual countries’ implementation of their NDCs.

3. The Paris Agreement establishes an “enhanced transparency framework for action and support,” which covers information about the mitigation and adaptation actions undertaken by all Parties, as well as the support they provide or receive to enable them to implement these actions. However, although Article 13 of the Paris Agreement provides a framework for transparency internationally and contains guidelines of what is required by the Parties to the Conventions, how it was to be operationalized in the case of individual countries was not clearly defined. This flexibility was initially needed to accommodate countries’ difference in circumstances and to consider varying national capacities. Under this framework each party must submit a national greenhouse gas inventory report, and the information necessary to track progress made in implementing and achieving its nationally determined contribution under Article 4. The pre-2020 period was a learning period but at the same it is also expected that countries begin complying with Article 13 from 2020 and onwards. Before tracking NDC progress and taking stock of the Paris Agreement trajectory advancements, it was therefore necessary to get an overview of where we are in terms of establishing a transparency system that all countries have the capacity to report on.

4. Without systematic global coordination and efficient knowledge management, the climate change community was at risk of duplication, a lack of synergy and a lack of understanding of the availability of methodologies and their application in different countries.

5. The primary problem this project addressed was the lack of a global coordination platform for information sharing and knowledge management on the enhanced transparency framework, as defined by the article 13 of the Paris Agreement. Many developing countries were facing similar challenges resulting from the lack of a coordinated platform or forum to help facilitate discussion on lessons learned and best practices. The establishment of an online platform, www.[cbitplatform](https://www.cbitplatform.org/).org, in conjunction with global workshops, was created to ensure the efficient coordination of support initiatives both globally and domestically, allowing developing countries to share best practices and explore synergies, which helped facilitate the development of capacities and transparency systems to track the implementation of their NDCs. Many countries also found it challenging to understand what could be done in preparation for the Paris Agreement implementation and how to link the CBIT support to article 13 requirements. The coordination and information sharing platform was accompanied by publications, workshops, webinars and discussion forums, aimed at supporting countries’ understanding of article 13 requirements.

6. The CBIT initiative aimed to support countries to strengthen national institutions and build capacity to understand and meet the article 13 requirements. The coordination and information sharing platform was accompanied by publications, workshops, webinars and discussion forums, aimed at supporting countries’ understanding of article 13 requirements. Although a global initiative, the CBIT support was mainly focused on national projects, and was designed to be complimentary to all the national CBIT projects. As per January 2020 14 national CBIT projects are already under implementation according to the platform.

7. A key condition for successful implementation of the Paris Agreement’s transparency requirements was the provision requiring adequate and sustainable financial support and capacity building. This was, and still is, necessary as means to enable developing countries to significantly strengthen or scale up their efforts to build robust domestic and international measurement, tracking, reporting and verification systems, as well as more robust domestic and regulatory processes. The CBIT program’s vision was to establish a Global Coordination Platform (GCP) that was able to engage countries, the GEF Partner Agencies, and other relevant entities and institutions with related program activities, to enhance partnership of national, multilateral, and bilaterally-supported capacity-building initiatives. The GCP would also support the CBIT management, enable global coordination, maximize learning opportunities, and enable knowledge sharing to facilitate transparency enhancements.

8. The objective of this project was to establish and manage a CBIT Global Coordination Platform for sharing and obtaining information, disseminate knowledge about the Paris Agreement transparency framework for more efficient CBIT country support, easy and free access to knowledge and ultimately strengthen national transparency systems responding to article 13 of the Paris Agreement. The operationalization of the GCP was accompanied by global workshops for knowledge sharing and needs and gaps assessments to inform a more coordinated and efficient capacity building effort. The GCP was able to facilitate a more efficient operationalization of the above-mentioned areas of work and increase the impact of the existing and emerging transparency initiatives. To achieve this the GCP was designed to keep track of national CBIT projects, and other national transparency projects and initiatives, and address the lack of national transparency capacities and limited coordination efforts through three pillars: (I) the centralization of an easy-access to information platform through a web-based transparency coordination platform; (II) coordination through the platform and related events, (III) the identification of gaps and needs for enhanced transparency systems. This allowed best practices and synergies to be identified benefitting transparency activities globally.

## Project objectives and components

10. The objective of this project is to establish and manage a CBIT Global Coordination Platform for sharing and obtaining information, disseminate knowledge about the Paris Agreement transparency framework for more efficient CBIT country support, easy and free access to knowledge and ultimately strengthen national transparency systems responding to article 13 of the Paris Agreement. The operationalization of the GCP will be accompanied by regional workshops for knowledge sharing and needs and gaps assessments to inform a more coordinated and efficient capacity building effort.

Table 2: Project Outcomes and Expected results

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Component** | Outputs | Expected Results/Outcomes |
| **EA I:** CBIT platform forcoordination, learningopportunities andknowledge sharing | Output 1.1 A web-based coordination platform on transparency designed and operationalOutput 1.2 Self-assessment tool for Countries to assess the state of their national transparency systems developed and deployed Output 1.3 Platform interface for self-progress reporting by national CBIT projects and other transparency initiatives designedOutput 1.4 Coordination platform populated with data and information on transparency initiatives, CBIT national projects and country efforts (collected from 1.2 and 1.3) Output 1.5 Available transparency-related emerging practices, methodologies, and guidance collected and made available through the coordination platform  | Enhanced coordination and best practice sharing for transparency practitioners through the establishment of a web-based coordination platform.  |
| **EA II:** Coordinationand exchangeevents | Output 2.1 Coordination platform launched in kick-off eventOutput 2.2 Three technical workshops on transparency organized and executed | Information sharing enhanced through regional and global meetings. |
| **EA III:** CBIT Needsand Gaps identified | Output 3.1 Needs & gaps identified for enhancing transparency systems and CBIT coordinationOutput 3.2 Roadmap for Phase 2 to expand the CBIT coordination platform as per the scope of paragraph 21 of the CBIT programming paper, including: institutional arrangements, best practices and community of practice, global and regional capacity building programmes, implementation tracking tool, coordination with other platforms, etc. | Needs & gaps identified for enhancing transparency systems and CBIT coordination |
|  |  |  |

## Executing Arrangements

 Governance and Management Arrangements 

**Project Management Unit**

The Project Management Unit (PMU) which constitutes of a UNDP Project Manager (the GSP coordinator) and a UNEP DTU Partnership Project Manager will be responsible for day to day management of the project. The two Project Managers will be responsible for execution of the respective project components under the CBIT project. The project managers will also be expected to identify critical links and synergies between the components of the project through biweekly meetings.

Outcome 2 and 3, under UNDP responsibilities, will be managed by the Global Support Program team, as this will foster cost efficiencies and at the same time this new initiative will be able to build on the existing channels and networks established by the Global Support Program, including but not limited to, GEF, UNFCCC, more than 100 developing countries and 20 developed countries. The quota of the Project Management Cost – USD 50.000- will be used to cover part time the salary of the Global Support Program Coordinator. The IRH will also provide administrative, operative and QA/QC support during the implementation of the program.

UNEP will be responsible for implementing component 1 and 3 and will manage and implement those directly and separately, but in strict coordination with UNDP.

**Executive Management Group**

The executive management group (EMG) will comprise representatives from:

* UNEP (task manager),
* UNDP (project manager and task manager),
* UNEP DTU Partnership (project manager)

The EMG will oversee the implementation of the project through monthly meetings. Its main functions will be to approve management decisions and ensure timely delivery of quality outputs. The main purpose of the EMG is to establish a very close coordination between UNEP and UNDP in order to ensure the execution of the activities of the three components as one single project. The two project managers will act as the EMG Secretariat.

**Project Steering Committee**

The Project Steering Committee (PSC) will comprise representatives from:

* UNEP,
* UNDP,
* UNEP DTU Partnership,
* UNFCCC representative,
* GEF Secretariat representative,
* 1 Annex I country representative,
* 1 non-Annex I country representative.

The Committee will be responsible for reviewing project progress, approving annual workplans, budget and providing strategic guidance to the EMG. The PSC will meet annually, unless one of the committee members call for ad hoc interim meeting. It will allow users as well as the key donor and the UNFCCC to participate in the decision-making process. The PSC meetings will be organized back to back with some of the other workshops or side events organized by the project.



## Project Cost and Financing

The project falls under the medium-sized project category, with an overall project budget of USD 1,400,000. The total is made up of USD 1,000,000 GEF funding and USD 400,000 co-financing from the Initiative for Climate Action Transparency. The GEF project financing comes from both UNEP – USD 515,000 and UNDP – USD 485,000.

Table 3. Estimated project budget by component (Not inclusive of agency fees[[2]](#footnote-1))

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Source | Amount (USD) |
| GEF financing | 1,000,000 |
| Co-financing  | 400,000 |
| Total | 1,400,000 |

# Section 2. OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

## Objective of the Evaluation

In line with the UNEP Evaluation Policy[[3]](#footnote-2) and the UNEP Programme Manual[[4]](#footnote-3), the Terminal Evaluation is undertaken at completion of the project to assess project performance (in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency), and determine outcomes and impacts (actual and potential) stemming from the project, including their sustainability. The evaluation has two primary purposes: (i) to provide evidence of results to meet accountability requirements, and (ii) to promote operational improvement, learning and knowledge sharing through results and lessons learned among UNEP, UNDP and signatories to the Paris Agreement. Therefore, the evaluation will identify lessons of operational relevance for future project formulation and implementation, especially for the second phase of the project, where applicable

## Key Evaluation Principles

Evaluation findings and judgements will be based on **sound evidence and analysis**, clearly documented in the evaluation report. Information will be triangulated (i.e. verified from different sources) as far as possible, and when verification is not possible, the single source will be mentioned (whilst anonymity is still protected). Analysis leading to evaluative judgements should always be clearly spelled out.

**The “Why?” Question.** As this is a terminal evaluation and a follow-up project is likely [or similar interventions are envisaged for the future], particular attention will be given to learning from the experience. Therefore, the “Why?” question should be at the front of the consultants’ minds all through the evaluation exercise and is supported by the use of a theory of change approach. This means that the consultant(s) needs to go beyond the assessment of “what” the project performance was and make a serious effort to provide a deeper understanding of “why” the performance was as it was. This should provide the basis for the lessons that can be drawn from the project.

**Baselines and counterfactuals**. In attempting to attribute any outcomes and impacts to the project intervention, the consultant(s) should consider the difference between what has happened with, and what would have happened without, the project. This implies that there should be consideration of the baseline conditions, trends and counterfactuals in relation to the intended project outcomes and impacts. It also means that there should be plausible evidence to attribute such outcomes and impacts to the actions of the project. Sometimes, adequate information on baseline conditions, trends or counterfactuals is lacking. In such cases this should be clearly highlighted by the evaluators, along with any simplifying assumptions that were taken to enable the evaluator to make informed judgements about project performance.

**Communicating evaluation results.** A key aim of the evaluation is to encourage reflection and learning by UNEP staff and key project stakeholders. The consultant(s) should consider how reflection and learning can be promoted, both through the evaluation process and in the communication of evaluation findings and key lessons. Clear and concise writing is required on all evaluation deliverables. Draft and final versions of the main evaluation report will be shared with key stakeholders by the Evaluation Manager. There may, however, be several intended audiences, each with different interests and needs regarding the report. The consultant(s) will plan with the Evaluation Manager which audiences to target and the easiest and clearest way to communicate the key evaluation findings and lessons to them. This may include some, or all, of the following; a webinar, conference calls with relevant stakeholders, the preparation of an evaluation brief or interactive presentation.

## Key Strategic Questions

In addition to the evaluation criteria outlined in Section 10 below, the evaluation will address the **strategic questions** listed below. These are questions of interest to UNEP and to which the project is believed to be able to make a substantive contribution:

* 1. How are the GEF guidelines on implementing and executing agency roles manifested in the project’s implementation structure? How does the allocation of roles affect accountability?

## Evaluation Criteria

All evaluation criteria will be rated on a six-point scale. Sections A-I below, outline the scope of the criteria and a link to a table for recording the ratings is provided in Annex 1). A weightings table will be provided in excel format (link provided in Annex 1) to support the determination of an overall project rating. The set of evaluation criteria are grouped in nine categories: (A) Strategic Relevance; (B) Quality of Project Design; (C) Nature of External Context; (D) Effectiveness, which comprises assessments of the availability of outputs, achievement of outcomes and likelihood of impact; (E) Financial Management; (F) Efficiency; (G) Monitoring and Reporting; (H) Sustainability; and (I) Factors Affecting Project Performance. The evaluation consultant(s) can propose other evaluation criteria as deemed appropriate.

1. ***Strategic Relevance***

The evaluation will assess ‘the extent to which the activity is suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipient and donor’. The evaluation will include an assessment of the project’s relevance in relation to UNEP’s mandate and its alignment with UNEP’s policies and strategies at the time of project approval. Under strategic relevance an assessment of the complementarity of the project with other interventions addressing the needs of the same target groups will be made. This criterion comprises four elements:

1. *Alignment to the UNEP Medium Term Strategy[[5]](#footnote-4) (MTS) and Programme of Work* *(POW)*

The evaluation should assess the project’s alignment with the MTS and POW under which the project was approved and include, in its narrative, reflections on the scale and scope of any contributions made to the planned results reflected in the relevant MTS and POW.

1. *Alignment to UNEP / Donor/GEF Strategic Priorities*

Donor, including GEF, strategic priorities will vary across interventions. UNEP strategic priorities include the Bali Strategic Plan for Technology Support and Capacity Building[[6]](#footnote-5) (BSP) and South-South Cooperation (S-SC). The BSP relates to the capacity of governments to: comply with international agreements and obligations at the national level; promote, facilitate and finance environmentally sound technologies and to strengthen frameworks for developing coherent international environmental policies. S-SC is regarded as the exchange of resources, technology and knowledge between developing countries. GEF priorities are specified in published programming priorities and focal area strategies.

1. *Relevance to Regional, Sub-regional and National Environmental Priorities*

The evaluation will assess the extent to which the intervention is suited, or responding to, the stated environmental concerns and needs of the countries, sub-regions or regions where it is being implemented. Examples may include: national or sub-national development plans, poverty reduction strategies or Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Action (NAMA) plans or regional agreements etc.

1. *Complementarity with Existing Interventions*

An assessment will be made of how well the project, either at design stage or during the project inception or mobilization[[7]](#footnote-6), took account of ongoing and planned initiatives (under the same sub-programme, other UNEP sub-programmes, or being implemented by other agencies) that address similar needs of the same target groups. The evaluation will consider if the project team, in collaboration with Regional Offices and Sub-Programme Coordinators, made efforts to ensure their own intervention was complementary to other interventions, optimized any synergies and avoided duplication of effort. Examples may include UN Development Assistance Frameworks or One UN programming. Linkages with other interventions should be described and instances where UNEP’s comparative advantage has been particularly well applied should be highlighted.

*Factors affecting this criterion may include:*

* Stakeholders’ participation and cooperation
* Responsiveness to human rights and gender equity
* Country ownership and driven-ness
1. ***Quality of Project Design***

The quality of project design is assessed using an agreed template during the evaluation inception phase, ratings are attributed to identified criteria and an overall Project Design Quality rating is established (www.unenvironemnt.org/about-un-environment/our-evaluation-approach/templates-and-tools). This overall Project Design Quality rating is entered in the final evaluation ratings table as item B. In the Main Evaluation Report a summary of the project’s strengths and weaknesses at design stage is included, while the complete Project Design Quality template is annexed in the Inception Report.

*Factors affecting this criterion may include (at the design stage):*

* Stakeholders participation and cooperation
* Responsiveness to human rights and gender equity

***C. Nature of External Context***

At evaluation inception stage a rating is established for the project’s external operating context (considering the prevalence of conflict, natural disasters and political upheaval[[8]](#footnote-7)). This rating is entered in the final evaluation ratings table as item C. Where a project has been rated as facing either an Unfavourable or Highly Unfavourable external operating context, and/or a negative external event has occurred during project implementation, the ratings for Effectiveness, Efficiency and/or Sustainability may be increased at the discretion of the evaluation consultant and Evaluation Manager together. A justification for such an increase must be given.

***D. Effectiveness***

1. ***Availability of Outputs[[9]](#footnote-8)***

The evaluation will assess the project’s success in producing the programmed outputs and achieving milestones as per the project design document (ProDoc). Any formal modifications/revisions made during project implementation will be considered part of the project design. Where the project outputs are inappropriately or inaccurately stated in the ProDoc, reformulations may be necessary in the reconstruction of the TOC. In such cases a table should be provided showing the original and the reformulation of the outputs for transparency. The availability of outputs will be assessed in terms of both quantity and quality, and the assessment will consider their ownership by, and usefulness to, intended beneficiaries and the timeliness of their provision. The evaluation will briefly explain the reasons behind the success or shortcomings of the project in delivering its programmed outputs and meeting expected quality standards.

*Factors affecting this criterion may include:*

* Preparation and readiness
* Quality of project management and supervision[[10]](#footnote-9)
1. ***Achievement of Project Outcomes[[11]](#footnote-10)***

The achievement of project outcomes is assessed as performance against the project outcomes as defined in the reconstructed[[12]](#footnote-11) Theory of Change. These are outcomes that are intended to be achieved by the end of the project timeframe and within the project’s resource envelope. As with outputs, a table can be used where substantive amendments to the formulation of project outcomes is necessary. The evaluation should report evidence of attribution between UNEP’s intervention and the project outcomes. In cases of normative work or where several actors are collaborating to achieve common outcomes, evidence of the nature and magnitude of UNEP’s ‘substantive contribution’ should be included and/or ‘credible association’ established between project efforts and the project outcomes realised.

*Factors affecting this criterion may include:*

* Quality of project management and supervision
* Stakeholders’ participation and cooperation
* Responsiveness to human rights and gender equity
* Communication and public awareness
1. ***Likelihood of Impact***

Based on the articulation of long-lasting effects in the reconstructed TOC (i.e. from project outcomes, via intermediate states, to impact), the evaluation will assess the likelihood of the intended, positive impacts becoming a reality. Project objectives or goals should be incorporated in the TOC, possibly as intermediate states or long-lasting impacts. The Evaluation Office’s approach to the use of TOC in project evaluations is outlined in a guidance note available on the Evaluation Office website, https://www.unenvironment.org/about-un-environment/evaluation and is supported by an excel-based flow chart, ‘Likelihood of Impact Assessment Decision Tree’. Essentially the approach follows a ‘likelihood tree’ from project outcomes to impacts, taking account of whether the assumptions and drivers identified in the reconstructed TOC held. Any unintended positive effects should also be identified and their causal linkages to the intended impact described.

The evaluation will also consider the likelihood that the intervention may lead, or contribute to, unintended negative effects. Some of these potential negative effects may have been identified in the project design as risks or as part of the analysis of Environmental, Social and Economic Safeguards.[[13]](#footnote-12)

The evaluation will consider the extent to which the project has played a catalytic role or has promoted scaling up and/or replication[[14]](#footnote-13) as part of its Theory of Change and as factors that are likely to contribute to longer term impact.

Ultimately UNEP and all its partners aim to bring about benefits to the environment and human well-being. Few projects are likely to have impact statements that reflect such long-term or broad-based changes. However, the evaluation will assess the likelihood of the project to make a substantive contribution to the long-lasting changes represented by the Sustainable Development Goals and/or the intermediate-level results reflected in UNEP’s Expected Accomplishments and the strategic priorities of funding partners.

*Factors affecting this criterion may include:*

* Quality of Project Management and Supervision (including adaptive management)
* Stakeholders participation and cooperation
* Responsiveness to human rights and gender equity
* Country ownership and driven-ness
* Communication and public awareness

***E. Financial Management***

Financial management will be assessed under three themes: adherence to UNEP’s financial policies and procedures, completeness of financial information and communication between financial and project management staff. The evaluation will establish the actual spend across the life of the project of funds secured from all donors. This expenditure will be reported, where possible, at output level and will be compared with the approved budget. The evaluation will verify the application of proper financial management standards and adherence to UNEP’s financial management policies. Any financial management issues that have affected the timely delivery of the project or the quality of its performance will be highlighted. The evaluation will record where standard financial documentation is missing, inaccurate, incomplete or unavailable in a timely manner. The evaluation will assess the level of communication between the Project/Task Manager and the Fund Management Officer as it relates to the effective delivery of the planned project and the needs of a responsive, adaptive management approach.

*Factors affecting this criterion may include:*

* Preparation and readiness
* Quality of project management and supervision

***F. Efficiency***

The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project delivered maximum results from the given resources. This will include an assessment of the cost-effectiveness and timeliness of project execution. Focussing on the translation of inputs into outputs, cost-effectiveness is the extent to which an intervention has achieved, or is expected to achieve, its results at the lowest possible cost. Timeliness refers to whether planned activities were delivered according to expected timeframes as well as whether events were sequenced efficiently. The evaluation will also assess to what extent any project extension could have been avoided through stronger project management and identify any negative impacts caused by project delays or extensions. The evaluation will describe any cost or time-saving measures put in place to maximise results within the secured budget and agreed project timeframe and consider whether the project was implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternative interventions or approaches.

The evaluation will give special attention to efforts made by the project teams during project implementation to make use of/build upon pre-existing institutions, agreements and partnerships, data sources, synergies and complementarities[[15]](#footnote-14) with other initiatives, programmes and projects etc. to increase project efficiency. The evaluation will also consider the extent to which the management of the project minimised UNEP’s environmental footprint.

The factors underpinning the need for any project extensions will also be explored and discussed. As management or project support costs cannot be increased in cases of ‘no cost extensions’, such extensions represent an increase in unstated costs to implementing parties.

*Factors affecting this criterion may include:*

* Preparation and readiness (e.g. timeliness)
* Quality of project management and supervision
* Stakeholders participation and cooperation

***G. Monitoring and Reporting***

The evaluation will assess monitoring and reporting across three sub-categories: monitoring design and budgeting, monitoring implementation and project reporting.

1. ***Monitoring Design and Budgeting***

Each project should be supported by a sound monitoring plan that is designed to track progress against SMART[[16]](#footnote-15) indicators towards the provision of the project’s outputs and achievement of project outcomes, including at a level disaggregated by gender, vulnerability or marginalisation. The evaluation will assess the quality of the design of the monitoring plan as well as the funds allocated for its implementation. The adequacy of resources for mid-term and terminal evaluation/review should be discussed if applicable.

1. ***Monitoring of Project Implementation***

The evaluation will assess whether the monitoring system was operational and facilitated the timely tracking of results and progress towards projects objectives throughout the project implementation period. This should include monitoring the representation and participation of disaggregated groups (including gendered, vulnerable and marginalised groups) in project activities. It will also consider how information generated by the monitoring system during project implementation was used to adapt and improve project execution, achievement of outcomes and ensure sustainability. The evaluation should confirm that funds allocated for monitoring were used to support this activity.

1. ***Project Reporting***

UNEP has a centralised project information management system (Anubis) in which project managers upload six-monthly progress reports against agreed project milestones. This information will be provided to the Evaluation Consultant(s) by the Evaluation Manager. Some projects have additional requirements to report regularly to funding partners, which will be supplied by the project team (e.g. the Project Implementation Reviews and Tracking Tool for GEF-funded projects). The evaluation will assess the extent to which both UNEP and donor reporting commitments have been fulfilled. Consideration will be given as to whether reporting has been carried out with respect to the effects of the initiative on disaggregated groups.

*Factors affecting this criterion may include:*

* Quality of project management and supervision
* Responsiveness to human rights and gender equity (e.g disaggregated indicators and data)

***H. Sustainability***

Sustainability is understood as the probability of project outcomes being maintained and developed after the close of the intervention. The evaluation will identify and assess the key conditions or factors that are likely to undermine or contribute to the persistence of achieved project outcomes (ie. ‘assumptions’ and ‘drivers’). Some factors of sustainability may be embedded in the project design and implementation approaches while others may be contextual circumstances or conditions that evolve over the life of the intervention. Where applicable an assessment of bio-physical factors that may affect the sustainability of project outcomes may also be included.

1. ***Socio-political Sustainability***

The evaluation will assess the extent to which social or political factors support the continuation and further development of project outcomes. It will consider the level of ownership, interest and commitment among government and other stakeholders to take the project achievements forwards. In particular the evaluation will consider whether individual capacity development efforts are likely to be sustained.

1. ***Financial Sustainability***

Some project outcomes, once achieved, do not require further financial inputs, e.g. the adoption of a revised policy. However, in order to derive a benefit from this outcome further management action may still be needed e.g. to undertake actions to enforce the policy. Other project outcomes may be dependent on a continuous flow of action that needs to be resourced for them to be maintained, e.g. continuation of a new resource management approach. The evaluation will assess the extent to which project outcomes are dependent on future funding for the benefits they bring to be sustained. Secured future funding is only relevant to financial sustainability where the project’s outcomes have been extended into a future project phase. Even where future funding has been secured, the question still remains as to whether the project outcomes are financially sustainable.

1. ***Institutional Sustainability***

The evaluation will assess the extent to which the sustainability of project outcomes (especially those relating to policies and laws) is dependent on issues relating to institutional frameworks and governance. It will consider whether institutional achievements such as governance structures and processes, policies, sub-regional agreements, legal and accountability frameworks etc. are robust enough to continue delivering the benefits associated with the project outcomes after project closure. In particular, the evaluation will consider whether institutional capacity development efforts are likely to be sustained.

*Factors affecting this criterion may include:*

* Stakeholders participation and cooperation
* Responsiveness to human rights and gender equity (e.g. where interventions are not inclusive, their sustainability may be undermined)
* Communication and public awareness
* Country ownership and driven-ness
1. ***Factors and Processes Affecting Project Performance and Cross-Cutting Issues***

*(These factors are rated in the ratings table but are discussed within the Main Evaluation Report as cross-cutting themes as appropriate under the other evaluation criteria, above. Where the issues have not been addressed under other evaluation criteria, the consultant(s) will provide summary sections under the following headings.)*

1. ***Preparation and Readiness***

This criterion focuses on the inception or mobilisation stage of the project (ie. the time between project approval and first disbursement). The evaluation will assess whether appropriate measures were taken to either address weaknesses in the project design or respond to changes that took place between project approval, the securing of funds and project mobilisation. In particular the evaluation will consider the nature and quality of engagement with stakeholder groups by the project team, the confirmation of partner capacity and development of partnership agreements as well as initial staffing and financing arrangements. (Project preparation is included in the template for the assessment of Project Design Quality).

1. ***Quality of Project Management and Supervision***

In some cases ‘project management and supervision’ will refer to the supervision and guidance provided by UNEP to implementing partners and national governments while in others, specifically for GEF funded projects, it will refer to the project management performance of the executing agency and the technical backstopping and supervision provided by UNEP.

The evaluation will assess the effectiveness of project management with regard to: providing leadership towards achieving the planned outcomes; managing team structures; maintaining productive partner relationships (including Steering Groups etc.); communication and collaboration with UNEP colleagues; risk management; use of problem-solving; project adaptation and overall project execution. Evidence of adaptive management should be highlighted.

1. ***Stakeholder Participation and Cooperation***

Here the term ‘stakeholder’ should be considered in a broad sense, encompassing all project partners, duty bearers with a role in delivering project outputs and target users of project outputs and any other collaborating agents external to UNEP and the Executing Agency. The assessment will consider the quality and effectiveness of all forms of communication and consultation with stakeholders throughout the project life and the support given to maximise collaboration and coherence between various stakeholders, including sharing plans, pooling resources and exchanging learning and expertise. The inclusion and participation of all differentiated groups, including gender groups should be considered.

1. ***Responsiveness to Human Rights and Gender Equity***

The evaluation will ascertain to what extent the project has applied the UN Common Understanding on the human rights-based approach (HRBA) and the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People. Within this human rights context the evaluation will assess to what extent the intervention adheres to UNEP’s Policy and Strategy for Gender Equality and the Environment[[17]](#footnote-16).

In particular the evaluation will consider to what extent project design, implementation and monitoring have taken into consideration: (i) possible gender inequalities in access to, and the control over, natural resources; (ii) specific vulnerabilities of women and children to environmental degradation or disasters; and (iii) the role of women in mitigating or adapting to environmental changes and engaging in environmental protection and rehabilitation.

1. ***Environmental and Social Safeguards***

UNEP projects address environmental and social safeguards primarily through the process of environmental and social screening, risk assessment and management (avoidance or mitigation) of potential environmental and social risks and impacts associated with project and programme activities. The evaluation will confirm whether UNEP requirements[[18]](#footnote-17) were met to: screen proposed projects for any safeguarding issues; conduct sound environmental and social risk assessments; identify and avoid, or where avoidance is not possible, mitigate, environmental, social and economic risks; apply appropriate environmental and social measures to minimize any potential risks and harm to intended beneficiaries and report on the implementation of safeguard management measures taken.

1. ***Country Ownership and Driven-ness***

The evaluation will assess the quality and degree of engagement of government / public sector agencies in the project. While there is some overlap between Country Ownership and Institutional Sustainability, this criterion focuses primarily on the forward momentum of the intended projects results, ie. either a) moving forwards from outputs to project outcomes or b) moving forward from project outcomes towards intermediate states. The evaluation will consider the involvement not only of those directly involved in project execution and those participating in technical or leadership groups, but also those official representatives whose cooperation is needed for change to be embedded in their respective institutions and offices. This factor is concerned with the level of ownership generated by the project over outputs and outcomes and that is necessary for long term impact to be realised. Ownership should extend to all gendered and marginalised groups.

1. ***Communication and Public Awareness***

The evaluation will assess the effectiveness of: a) communication of learning and experience sharing between project partners and interested groups arising from the project during its life and b) public awareness activities that were undertaken during the implementation of the project to influence attitudes or shape behaviour among wider communities and civil society at large. The evaluation should consider whether existing communication channels and networks were used effectively, including meeting the differentiated needs of gendered or marginalised groups, and whether any feedback channels were established. Where knowledge sharing platforms have been established under a project the evaluation will comment on the sustainability of the communication channel under either socio-political, institutional or financial sustainability, as appropriate.

**Section 3. EVALUATION APPROACH, METHODS AND DELIVERABLES**

The Terminal Evaluation will be an in-depth evaluation using a participatory approach whereby key stakeholders are kept informed and consulted throughout the evaluation process. Both quantitative and qualitative evaluation methods will be used as appropriate to determine project achievements against the expected outputs, outcomes and impacts. It is highly recommended that the consultant(s) maintains close communication with the project team and promotes information exchange throughout the evaluation implementation phase in order to increase their (and other stakeholder) ownership of the evaluation findings. Where applicable, the consultant(s) will provide a geo-referenced map that demarcates the area covered by the project and, where possible, provide geo-reference photographs of key intervention sites (e.g. sites of habitat rehabilitation and protection, pollution treatment infrastructure, etc.)

The findings of the evaluation will be based on the following:

* 1. **A** **desk review** of:
	+ Relevant background documentation;
	+ Project design documents (including minutes of the project design review meeting at approval); Annual Work Plans and Budgets or equivalent, revisions to the project (Project Document Supplement), the logical framework and its budget;
	+ Project reports such as six-monthly progress and financial reports, progress reports from collaborating partners, meeting minutes, relevant correspondence and including the Project Implementation Reviews and Tracking Tool etc.;
	+ Project outputs: as applicable, based on the Results Framework (See final Project Output Document and Results Framework)
	+ Mid-Term Review or Mid-Term Evaluation of the project;
	+ Evaluations/reviews of similar projects.
	1. **Interviews** (individual or in group) with:
	+ UNEP Task Manager (TM);
	+ Project management team, including the Project Manager within the Executing Agency;
	+ UNEP Fund Management Officer (FMO);
	+ Portfolio Manager and Sub-Programme Coordinator, where appropriate;
	+ Project partners, [Please see Relevant People and Stakeholders list]
	+ Relevant resource persons, including members of host countries for workshops (Germany in 2018 and Italy in 2019).
	1. **Surveys**
	2. **Field visits**
	3. **Other data collection tools** [Existing data and surveys on the platform and use have been collected and will be accessible to evaluation consultant.]

## Evaluation Deliverables and Review Procedures

The evaluation consultant will prepare:

* **Inception Report:** (see Annex 1 for links to all templates, tables and guidance notes) containing an assessment of project design quality, a draft reconstructed Theory of Change of the project, project stakeholder analysis, evaluation framework and a tentative evaluation schedule.
* **Preliminary Findings Note:** typically in the form of a PowerPoint presentation, the sharing of preliminary findings is intended to support the participation of the project team, act as a means to ensure all information sources have been accessed and provide an opportunity to verify emerging findings. In the case of highly strategic project/portfolio evaluations or evaluations with an Evaluation Reference Group, the preliminary findings may be presented as a word document for review and comment.
* **Draft and Final Evaluation Report:** (see links in Annex 1) containing an executive summary that can act as a stand-alone document; detailed analysis of the evaluation findings organised by evaluation criteria and supported with evidence; lessons learned and recommendations and an annotated ratings table.

An **Evaluation Brief,** (a 2-page overview of the evaluand and key evaluation findings) for wider dissemination through the UNEP website may be required. This will be discussed with the Evaluation Manager no later than during the finalization of the Inception Report.

**Review of the draft evaluation report**. The evaluation consultant will submit a draft report to the Evaluation Manager and revise the draft in response to their comments and suggestions. Once a draft of adequate quality has been peer-reviewed and accepted, the Evaluation Manager will share the cleared draft report with the Task Manager and Project Manager, who will alert the Evaluation Manager in case the report contains any blatant factual errors. The Evaluation Manager will then forward revised draft report (corrected by the evaluation consultant(s) where necessary) to other project stakeholders, for their review and comments. Stakeholders may provide feedback on any errors of fact and may highlight the significance of such errors in any conclusions as well as providing feedback on the proposed recommendations and lessons. Any comments or responses to draft reports will be sent to the Evaluation Manager for consolidation. The Evaluation Manager will provide all comments to the evaluation consultant(s) for consideration in preparing the final report, along with guidance on areas of contradiction or issues requiring an institutional response.

Based on a careful review of the evidence collated by the evaluation consultants and the internal consistency of the report, the Evaluation Manager will provide an assessment of the ratings in the final evaluation report. Where there are differences of opinion between the evaluator and the Evaluation Manager on project ratings, both viewpoints will be clearly presented in the final report. The Evaluation Office ratings will be considered the final ratings for the project.

The Evaluation Manager will prepare a **quality assessment** of the first draft of the main evaluation report, which acts as a tool for providing structured feedback to the evaluation consultants. The quality of the final report will be assessed and rated against the criteria specified in template listed in Annex 1 and this assessment will be appended to the Final Evaluation Report.

At the end of the evaluation process, the Evaluation Office will prepare a **Recommendations Implementation Plan** in the format of a table, to be completed and updated at regular intervals by the Task Manager. The Evaluation Office will track compliance against this plan on a six-monthly basis for a maximum of 18 months.

## The Evaluation Consultant

For this evaluation, the evaluation team will consist of an Evaluation Consultant who will work under the overall responsibility of the Evaluation Office represented by an Evaluation Manager [Myles Hallin], in consultation with the UNEP Task Manager [Ruth Coutto], Fund Management Officer [Leena Darlington] and the Portfolio Manager of the GEF Climate Mitigation Unit, [Geordie Colville]. The consultant will liaise with the Evaluation Manager on any procedural and methodological matters related to the evaluation. It is, however, each consultant’s individual responsibility to arrange for their visas and immunizations as well as to plan meetings with stakeholders, organize online surveys, obtain documentary evidence and any other logistical matters related to the assignment. The UNEP Task Manager and project team will, where possible, provide logistical support (introductions, meetings etc.) allowing the consultants to conduct the evaluation as efficiently and independently as possible.

The Evaluation Consultant will be hired over a period of 6 months [April 2020 to September 2020] and should have: an advanced university degree in environmental sciences, international development or other relevant political or social sciences area; a minimum of 10 years of evaluation experience, including of evaluating large, regional or global programmes; a good/broad understanding of the United Nations System. English and French are the working languages of the United Nations Secretariat. For this consultancy, fluency in oral and written English is a requirement, along with excellent writing skills in English. Working knowledge of the work of UNEP is an added advantage. The work will be home-based with possible field visits.

The Evaluation Consultant will be responsible, in close consultation with the Evaluation Office of UNEP for overall management of the evaluation and timely provision of its outputs, described above in Section 11 Evaluation Deliverables, above. The consultant will ensure that all evaluation criteria and questions are adequately covered.

*Specific Responsibilities for the Evaluation Consultant:*

In close consultation with the Evaluation Manager, the evaluation consultant will be responsible for the overall management of the evaluation and timely provision of its outputs, data collection and analysis and report-writing. More specifically:

Inception phase of the evaluation, including:

- preliminary desk review and introductory interviews with project staff;

- draft the reconstructed Theory of Change of the project;

- prepare the evaluation framework;

- develop the desk review and interview protocols;

- draft the survey protocols (if relevant);

- develop and present criteria for country and/or site selection for the evaluation mission;

- plan the evaluation schedule;

- prepare the Inception Report, incorporating comments until approved by the Evaluation Manager

Data collection and analysis phase of the evaluation, including:

- conduct further desk review and in-depth interviews with project implementing and executing agencies, project partners and project stakeholders;

- (where appropriate and agreed) conduct an evaluation mission(s) to selected countries, visit the project locations, interview project partners and stakeholders, including a good representation of local communities. Ensure independence of the evaluation and confidentiality of evaluation interviews.

- regularly report back to the Evaluation Manager on progress and inform of any possible problems or issues encountered and;

- keep the Project/Task Manager informed of the evaluation progress.

Reporting phase, including:

- draft the Main Evaluation Report, ensuring that the evaluation report is complete, coherent and consistent with the Evaluation Manager guidelines both in substance and style;

- liaise with the Evaluation Manager on comments received and finalize the Main Evaluation Report, ensuring that comments are taken into account until approved by the Evaluation Manager

- prepare a Response to Comments annex for the main report, listing those comments not accepted by the evaluation consultant and indicating the reason for the rejection; and

- (where agreed with the Evaluation Manager) prepare an Evaluation Brief (2-page summary of the evaluand and the key evaluation findings and lessons)

Managing relations, including:

- maintain a positive relationship with evaluation stakeholders, ensuring that the evaluation process is as participatory as possible but at the same time maintains its independence;

- communicate in a timely manner with the Evaluation Manager on any issues requiring its attention and intervention.

## Schedule of the evaluation

The table below presents the tentative schedule for the evaluation.

**Table 3. Tentative schedule for the evaluation**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Milestone** | **Tentative Dates** |
| Evaluation Initiation Meeting | April |
| Inception Report | April |
| Evaluation Mission  | NA |
| Telephone interviews, surveys etc. | May |
| Powerpoint/presentation on preliminary findings and recommendations | June |
| Draft report to Evaluation Manager (and Peer Reviewer) | June/July |
| Draft Report shared with UNEP Project Manager and team | July/August |
| Draft Report shared with wider group of stakeholders | August/September  |
| Final Report | September |
| Final Report shared with all respondents | September |

## Contractual Arrangements

Evaluation consultants will be selected and recruited by the Evaluation Office of UNEP under an individual Special Service Agreement (SSA) on a “fees only” basis (see below). By signing the service contract with UNEP /UNON, the consultant(s) certify that they have not been associated with the design and implementation of the project in any way which may jeopardize their independence and impartiality towards project achievements and project partner performance. In addition, they will not have any future interests (within six months after completion of the contract) with the project’s executing or implementing units. All consultants are required to sigh the Code of Conduct Agreement Form.

Fees will be paid on an instalment basis, paid on acceptance by the Evaluation Manager of expected key deliverables. The schedule of payment is as follows:

Schedule of Payment for the [Evaluation Consultant/Principal Evaluator]:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Deliverable | Percentage Payment |
| Approved Inception Report (as per annex document 7) | 30% |
| Approved Draft Main Evaluation Report (as per annex document 13) | 40% |
| Approved Final Main Evaluation Report | 30% |

Fees only contracts: Air tickets will be purchased by UNEP and 75% of the Daily Subsistence Allowance for each authorised travel mission will be paid up front. Local in-country travel will only be reimbursed where agreed in advance with the Evaluation Manager and on the production of acceptable receipts. Terminal expenses and residual DSA entitlements (25%) will be paid after mission completion.

The consultants may be provided with access to UNEP’s Anubis information management system and if such access is granted, the consultants agree not to disclose information from that system to third parties beyond information required for, and included in, the evaluation report.

In case the consultants are not able to provide the deliverables in accordance with these guidelines, and in line with the expected quality standards by the UNEP Evaluation Office, payment may be withheld at the discretion of the Director of the Evaluation Office until the consultants have improved the deliverables to meet UNEP’s quality standards.

If the consultant(s) fail to submit a satisfactory final product to UNEP in a timely manner, i.e. before the end date of their contract, the Evaluation Office reserves the right to employ additional human resources to finalize the report, and to reduce the consultants’ fees by an amount equal to the additional costs borne by the Evaluation Office to bring the report up to standard.

**Annex 1:** Tools, Templates and Guidance Notes for use in the Evaluation

The tools, templates and guidance notes listed in the table below, and available on the Evaluation Office website (https://www.unenvironment.org/about-un-environment/evaluation/our-evaluation-approach), are intended to help Evaluation Managers and Evaluation Consultants to produce evaluation products that are consistent with each other and which can be compiled into a biennial Evaluation Synthesis Report. The biennial summary is used to provide an overview of progress to UN Environment and the UN Environmental Assembly.

This suite of documents is also intended to make the evaluation process as transparent as possible so that all those involved in the process can participate on an informed basis. It is recognised that the evaluation needs of projects and portfolio vary and adjustments may be necessary so that the purpose of the evaluation process (broadly, accountability and lesson learning), can be met. Such adjustments should be decided between the Evaluation Manager and the Evaluation Consultants in order to produce evaluation reports that are both useful to project implementers and that produce credible findings.

ADVICE TO CONSULTANTS: As our tools, templates and guidance notes are updated on a continuous basis, kindly download documents from these links during the Inception Phase and use those versions throughout the evaluation.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Document** | **Name**  | **URL link**  |
| 1 | Evaluation Process Guidelines for Consultants | [Link](https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/7109/18_Evaluation_Process_Guidelines_for_Consultants_17.04.18.pdf?sequence=11&isAllowed=y)  |
| 2 | Evaluation Consultants Team Roles *(Principal Evaluator and Evaluation Specialist)* | [Link](https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/7109/19_Evaluation_Consultants_Team_Roles_17.04.18.pdf?sequence=12&isAllowed=y)  |
| 3 | List of documents required in the evaluation process | [Link](https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/25542/01_List_of_project_documents_needed_for_evaluation.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y) |
| 4 | Evaluation Criteria *(summary of descriptions, as in these terms of reference)* | [Link](https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/id/c6598799-b95b-4c0a-aae5-74b603e0a22c/2_Evaluation_Criteria_17.04.18.doc)  |
| 5 | Evaluation Ratings Table (only) | [Link](https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/25543/3_Evalaution_Ratings_Table_Only_17.04.18.docx?sequence=1&isAllowed=y) |
| 6 | Matrix Describing Ratings by Criteria | [Link](https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/25544/1_Criterion_rating_descriptions_matrix_22.01.19.pdf?sequence=3&isAllowed=y) |
| 7 | Weighting of Ratings (excel) | [Link](https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/25545/4_Weightings_for_Ratings_06.05.18.xlsx?sequence=1&isAllowed=y) |
| 8 | Project Identification Tables | [Link](https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/7121/5_Project_Identification_Table_26.10.17.docx?sequence=1&isAllowed=y) |
| 9 | Structure and Contents of the Inception Report | [Link](https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/27353/6_Inception_Report_Structure_and_Contents_17.04.18.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y) |
| 10a | Template for the Assessment of the Quality of Project Design (Word template) | [Link](https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/id/00a41116-b940-44d4-9d3e-84ee406ef949/8_Quality_of_Project_Design_Assessment_Template_17.04.18.doc) |
| 10b | Template for the Assessment of the Quality of Project Design (Excel tool) | [Link](https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/id/ac39897b-8c2b-40dd-8e9c-d304d4f498ef/8_Quality_of_Project_Design_Assessment_Template_17.04.18.xlsx) |
| 11 | Guidance on Stakeholder Analysis  | [Link](https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/27354/10_Stakeholder_Analysis_Guidance_Note_26.10.17.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y) |
| 12 | Gender Note for Evaluation Consultants | [Link](https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/25546/9_Gender_Methods_Note_for_Consultants_17.04.18.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y) |
| 13 | Use of Theory of Change in Project Evaluations | [Link](https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/id/8b45f5ff-c37b-4aac-b386-6b6b8e29aaed/11_Use_of_Theory_of_Change_in_Project_Evaluation_26.10.17.pdf) |
| 14 | Assessment of the Likelihood of Impact Decision Tree (Excel) | [Link](https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/id/74a99e70-063a-46a5-a0a0-b7e7b67d1a94/12_Likelihood_of_Impact_Decision_Tree_17.04.18.xlsm) |
| 15 | Possible Evaluation Questions | [Link](https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/27348/20_Possible_Evaluation_Questions.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y) |
| 16 | Structure and Contents of the Main Evaluation Report | [Link](https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/27349/7_Main_Evaluation_Report_Structure_and_Contents_17.04.18.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y) |
| 17 | Cover Page, Prelims and Style Sheet for Main Evaluation Report  | [Link](https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/22306/15_Cover_Pages_Prelims_and_Style_Sheet_for_the_Main_Evaluation_Report_26.10.17.docx?sequence=1&isAllowed=y) |
| 18 | Financial Tables | [Link](https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/id/694da3d8-2cd8-408d-9046-d875461e2fc0/13_Financial_Tables_26.10.17.doc) |
| 19 | Template for the Assessment of the Quality of the Evaluation Report | [Link](https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/27356/14_Quality_of_Evaluation_Report_Assessment_Template_17.04.18.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y) |

1. PIR 2019 says GEF Focal area - Capacity Building Initiative for Transparency; CEO Approval says GEF Focal Area Climate Change [↑](#footnote-ref-0)
2. See CEO Approval Request for break down of estimated Agency fees [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
3. <https://www.unenvironment.org/about-un-environment/evaluation-office/policies-and-strategies> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
4. [https://wecollaborate.unep.org](https://wecollaborate.unep.org/) [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
5. UNEP’s Medium Term Strategy (MTS) is a document that guides UNEP’s programme planning over a four-year period. It identifies UNEP’s thematic priorities, known as Sub-programmes (SP), and sets out the desired outcomes, known as Expected Accomplishments (EAs), of the Sub-programmes. <https://www.unenvironment.org/about-un-environment/evaluation-office/our-evaluation-approach/un-environment-documents> [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
6. <http://www.unep.fr/ozonaction/about/bsp.htm> [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
7. A project’s inception or mobilization period is understood as the time between project approval and first disbursement. Complementarity during project implementation is considered under Efficiency, see below. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
8. Note that ‘political upheaval’ does not include regular national election cycles, but unanticipated unrest or prolonged disruption. The potential delays or changes in political support that are often associated with the regular national election cycle should be part of the project’s design and addressed through adaptive management by the project team. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
9. Outputs are the availability (for intended beneficiaries/users) of new products and services and/or gains in knowledge, abilities and awareness of individuals or within institutions (UNEP, 2019) [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
10. In some cases ‘project management and supervision’ will refer to the supervision and guidance provided by UNEP to implementing partners and national governments while in others, specifically for GEF funded projects, it will refer to the project management performance of the executing agency and the technical backstopping provided by UNEP. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
11. Outcomes are the use (i.e. uptake, adoption, application) of an output by intended beneficiaries, observed as changes in institutions or behavior, attitude or condition (UNEP, 2019) [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
12. All submitted UNEP project documents are required to present a Theory of Change with all submitted project designs. The level of ‘reconstruction’ needed during an evaluation will depend on the quality of this initial TOC, the time that has lapsed between project design and implementation (which may be related to securing and disbursing funds) and the level of any formal changes made to the project design. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
13. Further information on Environmental, Social and Economic Safeguards (ESES) can be found at <http://wedocs.unep.org/handle/20.500.11822/8718> [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
14. *Scaling up* refers to approaches being adopted on a much larger scale, but in a very similar context. Scaling up is often the longer-term objective of pilot initiatives. *Replication* refers to approaches being repeated or lessons being explicitly applied in new/different contexts e.g. other geographic areas, different target group etc. Effective replication typically requires some form of revision or adaptation to the new context. It is possible to replicate at either the same or a different scale. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
15. Complementarity with other interventions during project design, inception or mobilization is considered under Strategic Relevance above. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
16. SMART refers to results that are specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-oriented. Indicators help to make results measurable. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
17. The Evaluation Office notes that Gender Equality was first introduced in the UNEP Project Review Committee Checklist in 2010 and, therefore, provides a criterion rating on gender for projects approved from 2010 onwards. Equally, it is noted that policy documents, operational guidelines and other capacity building efforts have only been developed since then and have evolved over time. <https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/7655/-Gender_equality_and_the_environment_Policy_and_strategy-2015Gender_equality_and_the_environment_policy_and_strategy.pdf.pdf?sequence=3&isAllowed=y> [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
18. For the review of project concepts and proposals, the Safeguard Risk Identification Form (SRIF) was introduced in 2019 and replaced the Environmental, Social and Economic Review note (ESERN), which had been in place since 20XX. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)