

## Annex II

### TERMS OF REFERENCE

*Ref: IC 2012-25*

**for professional consulting services for FINAL EVALUATION of UNDP/GEF project  
“Integration of Ecosystem Management Principles and Practices into Land and Water Management  
of Laborec-Uh Region (Eastern Slovakian Lowlands)”**

**Duration:** November 2012 – January 2013

**Terms of Payment:** Lump sum payable in 1 installment, upon satisfactory completion and approval by UNDP of all deliverables, including the Final Evaluation Report.

**Location:** Eastern Slovakia region, Bratislava and other locations in Slovakia as required

### 1. INTRODUCTION / BACKGROUND

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the project “Integration of Ecosystem Management Principles and Practices into Land and Water Management of Laborec-Uh Region (Eastern Slovakian Lowlands)” (PIMS #.2261)

The Project Document was signed between the Ministry of the Environment of the Slovak Republic and UNDP/GEF Regional Center for Europe and CIS on 2<sup>nd</sup> May 2007. The project will end in December 2012.

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

#### PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project title:	<b>Integration of Ecosystem Management Principles and Practices into Land and Water Management of Laborec-Uh Region (Eastern Slovakian Lowlands)</b>			
GEF Project ID:	2261		<i>at endorsement (Million US\$)</i>	<i>at completion (Million US\$)</i>
UNDP Project ID:	55927 /46803	GEF financing:	0.97	0.97
Country:	Slovakia	IA/EA own:	0	0
Region:	Europe and CIS	Government:	3.27	3.45
Focal Area:	Integrated Ecosystem Management	Other:	0.073	0.35
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	12. Ecosystem management	Total co-financing:	3.35	3.70
Executing Agency:	UNDP	Total Project Cost:	4.32	4.67
Other Partners involved:	n/a	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		2 May 2007
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: 31 December 2012	Actual: 31 December 2012

## 2. DESCRIPTION OF RESPONSIBILITIES

### Objective and Scope

#### Project objective

The project was designed to contribute to mainstreaming integrated ecosystem management principles and practices into the land and water management and agricultural sectors of the new EU members and accession states within the context of the EU Rural Development Programme 2007–2013 and Danube River Protection Convention.

By the end of the project, an innovative stakeholder partnership (originally the LEADER Local Action Group was planned) shall be in place in the project area that can continue to implement a self-sustaining water and land management programme resulting in environmentally sound agricultural practices, alternative non-farm livelihoods, and further expanding the extent of (semi-) natural floodplain habitats that support a representative range of species.

The project shall generate the following four **main outcomes**:

1. Stakeholders will adopt a long-term strategy for ecosystem-based water and agricultural management practices;
2. Stakeholder capacity, policies, and motivation to implement Integrated Ecosystem Management (IEM) will be strengthened and operational;
3. Stakeholders will pilot ecosystem-oriented biodiversity conservation practices;
4. Replication of best practices and lessons learned from the experience of implementation of IEM in the pilot area in other regions of the Eastern Lowlands, as well as other new EU members and accession states in the Danube River basin.

A fifth outcome will be the successful support, monitoring and evaluation of project implementation itself.

Associated with these outcomes there is a number of Outputs (please see Attachment A for the Revised Logical Framework of the project).

#### Project area

The project is undertaken in a lowland area of 29,539 ha located within the Latorica River Basin in the Eastern Slovakian Lowlands, lies wholly inside the Danube River catchment. The Uh and the Laborec Rivers (to the West and South respectively) border the project area itself (Attachment B, Map 1). To the North and up-hill, the project area is bordered by the Zemplínska Širava Water Reservoir and on the East by a large drainage canal decanting into the Uh River. The project area is more or less bisected by the Čierna Voda River, a tributary of the Laborec (entering close to the confluence with the Uh), whose catchment is largely within the project area.

#### Key stakeholders

**Ministry of Environment of the Slovak Republic** is the National Executing Agency. MoE appointed a National Project Director (NPD) who assumed the overall responsibility for the project, i.e. accountability of the use of funds and meeting the overall objectives of the project. In addition, he will facilitate interaction among relevant governmental organizations, public organizations, research institutions and private organizations.

**The Slovak Water Management Enterprise (SWMA)** is the National Implementing Agency.

The **Project Steering Committee (PSC)** includes representatives from the Ministry of Environment, Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Construction and Regional Development, Slovak Water Management Enterprise Agricultural Payment Agency, Slovak Hydrometeorological Institute, Hydromelioration

Company, State Nature Conservancy, Office of Košice Self-Governing Region, land register, Agroekoforum as NGO representative, association of municipalities ZMOS, representative of the farmers, representative of municipalities within the project area, the Agricultural Research Institute Michalovce and the project manager.

#### Project partners

**DAPHNE**, an NGO, which role is to undertake species and habitat inventories as a base for preparation of restoration plans and monitoring of changes. In addition, DAPHNE will be responsible for preparation of restoration plans based on current habitat structure and DEM (Digital Elevation Model) in order to elaborate predictive models of habitats in restoration areas and for biodiversity monitoring of restoration areas.

**SOSNA**, an NGO, which is responsible for mobilisation of local people in the formulation of a Local Action Group and preparation of the region for the LEADER approach.

**The Slovak Technical University**, Department of Land and Water Resource Management, which is responsible for elaboration of studies on hydrology, hydropedology and hydrometeorology that are necessary for planning the restoration work.

**Society for Bird Protection in Slovakia – SOVS** (as partner of BirdLife International in Slovakia), an NGO managing a EU-LIFE project “Conservation of SPA Senné and Medzibodrozie in Slovakia” in the project area. The projects are complementary to each other, in that the LIFE project provides funding for restoration activities and the GEF project will fund preparatory works. In addition, SOVS will be a crucial partner in negotiations with local stakeholders when preparing restoration activities.

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  
<http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/UNDP-GEF-TE-Guide.pdf>.

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

#### Evaluation approach and method

An overall approach and method<sup>1</sup> for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The service provider is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact**, as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR (Attachment D). The service provider is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The service provider is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluation team is expected to conduct a field mission to Laborec-Uh region in Eastern Slovakia. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: UNDP Regional Centre Bratislava, Ministry of

---

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

Environment of the SR, National Project Director; Steering Committee members; Project Team / Project Partners, key stakeholders in the project area.

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

### **Evaluation Criteria & Ratings**

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

<b>Evaluation Ratings:</b>			
<b>1. Monitoring and Evaluation</b>	<b>rating</b>	<b>2. IA&amp; EA Execution</b>	<b>rating</b>
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	
<b>3. Assessment of Outcomes</b>	<b>rating</b>	<b>4. Sustainability</b>	<b>rating</b>
Relevance		Financial resources:	
Effectiveness		Socio-political:	
Efficiency		Institutional framework and governance:	
Overall Project Outcome Rating		Environmental :	
		Overall likelihood of sustainability:	

### **Project finance / co-finance**

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 service provider will receive assistance from the UNDP BRC and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

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

### **Mainstreaming**

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

### **Impact**

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

### **Conclusions, recommendations & lessons**

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions, recommendations and lessons**.

### **Implementation arrangements**

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP BRC. The UNDP BRC will contract the organization providing the evaluation. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

*Although the consultants of the evaluation team should feel free to discuss with the authorities concerned, all matters relevant to its assignment, they are not authorized to make any commitment or statement on behalf of UNDP or GEF or the project management.*

### **Evaluation timeframe**

The total duration of the evaluation will be minimum 13 days according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation	recommended: 2-4 days	end of November 2012
Evaluation Mission	minimum 5 days	mid December 2012
Draft Evaluation Report	recommended: 5-10 days	9 January 2013
Final Report	recommended: 1-2 days	24 January 2013

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

### Evaluation deliverables

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
<b>Inception Report</b>	Evaluation team provides clarifications on timing and method, presents the agreed mission plan	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission.	Evaluator submits to UNDP BRC
<b>Stakeholder Discussion</b>	Initial Findings based on desk review	5 December 2012	Project Final Conference in Kosice
<b>Mission debriefing</b>	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission	To project management, UNDP BRC
<b>Draft Final Report</b>	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission	Sent to UNDP BRC, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs to submit comments and suggestions within 5 working days after receiving the draft
<b>Final Report*</b>	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Sent to UNDP BRC 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.

The key product expected from this final evaluation is a comprehensive analytical **Final Evaluation Report** in English that should, at least, follow minimum GEF requirements as indicated in Attachment G.

The Final Evaluation Report will be stand-alone document that substantiates its recommendations and conclusions. The report will have to provide to UNDP complete and convincing evidence to support its findings/ratings.

The methodology used by the evaluation team should be presented in the Report in detail. It shall include information on:

- Documentation reviewed
- Interviews
- Field visits;
- Questionnaires;
- Participatory techniques and other approaches for the gathering and analysis of data.

Section of the evaluation report on lessons learnt and recommendation for replication and transfer of the experience shall be related mainly to:

- post-project sustainability of the efforts both in terms of governance and in terms of environmental benefits;
- capacity building ;
- achievements and challenges.

The Report will include a table with evaluation criteria ratings and table of planned vs. actual project financial disbursements, and planned co-financing vs. actual co-financing in this project.

The report together with the annexes shall be presented in electronic form in MS Word format.

The report shall be submitted and all further communication with UNDP regarding the implementation of this assignment should be addressed to:

Ms. Sylvie Hanzlova  
UNDP Bratislava Regional Centre  
Grosslingova 35, 811 09 Bratislava  
e-mail: [sylvie.hanzlova@undp.org](mailto:sylvie.hanzlova@undp.org)

### **Evaluator Ethics**

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

### **Payment modalities and specifications**

The service provider will be responsible for all personal administrative and travel expenses associated with undertaking this assignment including office accommodation, printing, stationery, telephone and electronic communications, and report copies incurred in this assignment. For this reason, the contract is prepared as a lump sum contract.

The remuneration of work performed will be conducted as follows: lump sum payable in 1 installment, upon satisfactory completion and approval by UNDP of all deliverables, including the Final Evaluation Report.

### **For the Contractor:**

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

Name: Dagmar Gombitova

Title: Statutory Representative

### **For the UNDP:**

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

Name: Andrey Pogrebnyak

Title: Operations Specialist

## Attachment A: Project Logical Framework - revised

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators
<b>Goal:</b>	To mainstream integrated ecosystem management principles and practices into the land and water management and agricultural sectors of new EU members and accession states within the context of the EU Rural Development Programme 2007 – 2013 and Danube River Protection Convention

Project Purpose	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
<b>Objective:</b> By the end of the project, an innovative stakeholder partnership will be in place in the project area that can continue to implement a self-sustaining water and land management programme resulting in environmentally sound agricultural practices, alternative non-farm livelihoods, and further expanding the extent of (semi-) natural floodplain habitats that provide water quality	Reduction of nutrient and pollutant loads in soils and watercourses.	> 50 mg/l of nitrates in the surface water 0 % of soil managed by good agricultural practice according to Nitrate Directive	< 50 mg/l of nitrates in the surface water 25% of soil managed by good agricultural practice according to Nitrate Directive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Hydro-meteorological Institute (water quality reports)</li> <li>➤ State Nature Conservancy of the Slovak Republic reports and publications</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ National, regional and local authorities maintain good liaison and coordination for implementation of new water and land use policies</li> <li>➤ Funding from European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development becomes available from 1<sup>st</sup> January 2007 as planned</li> <li>➤ Farmers are willing to enter organic</li> </ul>
	Semi-natural floodplain habitats restored and improved	1,300 ha of (semi-) natural floodplain habitat	2,500 ha of (semi-) natural floodplain habitat	Administration of PLA Latorica (habitats and protected areas)	
	Area of nature protection areas increased	1,490 ha designated for protection	2,000 ha designated for protection	➤ Michalovce Museum (fauna / flora surveys)	
	Response of key species to floodplain inundation and river management *	Present levels	Maintained or increased	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ SOS (bird surveys)</li> <li>➤ SOP SR</li> <li>➤ Organic farming</li> </ul>	



Project Purpose	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
improvements and support a representative range of species	No. of enterprises in tourism, handicraft production or other ESE** activities increased	1	8	certification bodies ➤ Local municipalities public hearing minutes (ESEs) ➤ State Water Management Enterprise ➤ Ministry of Agriculture	certification schemes
	No. of inhabitants added to the water treatment system	18 %	27 %		
	Aggregate market value of organic agricultural produce in project area	Nil	3% of overall value of farm production by end of project		

\* The key species (meaning biological indicators of water and habitat quality) and targets as were defined during the inception phase and could also include fish and amphibians, but those listed below have been suggested as they are threatened, representative of high value floodplain habitats, easily monitored, and have charisma for increasing public awareness. Moreover, they are all sensitive to wetland re-inundation, pollution loads and/or trophic quality of inland waters:

- Otter - *Lutra lutra* - (present status: infrequent visitor; target: at least two resident pairs)
- Spoonbill - *Platalea leucorodia* - (present status: 16 breeding pairs; target: at least 20 breeding pairs)
- Great Bittern - *Botaurus stellaris* - (present status: 5 breeding pairs; target: at least 10 breeding pairs)
- Checkered lily - *Fritillaria meleagris* - (present status: growing in four localities; target: population increase in localities at least by 25 %)

\*\* ESE = environmentally sustainable enterprise.

Project Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
<b>Outcome 1:</b> Stakeholders adopt a long-term strategy for ecosystem-based water and agricultural management practices	Čierna Voda river sub-basin management plan (Sub-BMP), prepared in accordance with EU Water Framework Directive, and adopted by stakeholders**	Basic parameters included in Bodrog River Sub-BMP	Detailed plan prepared for Čierna Voda sub-basin by end of 2009	➤ Adoption of the plan by relevant government entities including State Water Management Authority, Ministries of Environment and Agriculture, Local municipalities	➤ Stakeholder participation (especially farmers) engaged in order to achieve acceptance of the plan
	Ecological status or ecological potential of surface water in Čierna Voda sub-basin improved****	EU-WFD Class 3	EU-WFD Class 2 or better by 2015		

Project Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
<b>Outcome 2:</b> Stakeholder capacity, policies, and motivation to implement Integrated Ecosystem Management (IEM) are strengthened and operational	LEADER partnership (Local Action Group – LAG) established	No LAG	LAG formed by – end of 2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ MoA Rural Development Department and Department of Structural Policy reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Local stakeholders from municipalities, businesses and civil organisations willing to set up a Leader partnership</li> <li>➤ Support provided by Ministry of Agriculture (Rural Development Department)</li> <li>➤ Local entrepreneurs available to set up new environmentally friendly businesses</li> </ul>
	Local Integrated Development Strategy, including integrated ecosystem approach, in place	No LDS	LDS prepared by mid of 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Local municipalities and other partners</li> <li>➤ Public involvement records</li> <li>➤ Leader partnership reports</li> </ul>	
<b>Outcome 3:</b> Ecosystem-oriented biodiversity conservation practices piloted by major stakeholders	No. of pilot projects set up and / or implemented to restore (semi-) natural floodplain habitats and / or strengthen populations of representative species	0	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ State Water Management authority annual reports</li> <li>➤ State Nature Conservancy of the Slovak Republic – Administration of PLA</li> <li>➤ Latorica annual reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Land consolidation is undertaken, with priority given to designated protected areas</li> <li>➤ Farmers and local</li> </ul>

Project Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Environmentally sustainable enterprises accepted as a model for new business practices	0 ESEs with at least 3 employees registered	8 ESEs with at least 3 employees registered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Final Report</li> <li>➤ Implementation reports from pilot projects</li> <li>➤ MoA Rural Development Department annual reports</li> <li>➤ Local municipalities public hearing minutes</li> <li>➤ LEADER partnership reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>water company are willing to undertake pilot projects</li> <li>➤ Funding from European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development becomes available from 1<sup>st</sup> January 2007 as planned</li> </ul>
<b>Outcome 4:</b> Replication of best practices and lessons learned from the experience of implementation of IEM in other regions of the Eastern Lowlands, as well as other new EU members and accession states	Cooperation with similar projects in Danube River Basin	No linkages	Mechanism established for regular exchange of information and experience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Local information centres visits and web sites visits</li> <li>➤ Local municipalities public awareness meetings minutes</li> <li>➤ Partners in other parts of Eastern Slovakia reporting on replication</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ RDP and Natura 2000 under full-scale implementation</li> <li>➤ Project provides resources for public awareness consultant</li> <li>➤ State authorities support spreading information</li> </ul>
	Public awareness of integrated ecosystem management and floodplain restoration raised in project area	No awareness activities undertaken	No. of visitors of the information centre from other localities in Slovakia		

Project Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Land users elsewhere in Eastern Lowlands willing to adopt sustainable ways of IEM	No replication site identified	Talks started in at least one other site on replication of the floodplain management model by year 4 of the project	<p>strategies implementation</p> <p>➤ Best practices and lessons learned documented through IW:LEARN, BIO:LEARN, WATER-WIKI and other mechanisms in the region</p>	<p>to other regions through the network of regional advisory centres in Slovakia, providing benefit to Natura 2000 network and/or implementation of RDP</p> <p>➤ Information centre gains enough resources through Leader programme to be self-sustainable after completion of the project</p>

\*\*\* The indicator will represent the increased stakeholder awareness and will document better stakeholder involvement as the Sub-BMP will be developed in cooperation with all parties concerned.

\*\*\*\* The indicator will correspond to improved measurable chemical, physical and biological parameters of the Čierna Voda sub-basin.

## Attachment B: Map 1 - Project area



## Attachment C: List of Documents to be reviewed by the evaluators

Document	Description
Project document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Document</li> </ul>
Project reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inception Report</li> <li>• Quarterly Progress Reports</li> <li>• Annual Project Report to GEF</li> <li>• GEF focal area tracking tools</li> <li>• Mid-term Evaluation Report</li> </ul>
Technical documents produced by the project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Integrated Local Development Strategy</li> <li>• Integrated River Basin Management Plan for Čierna voda</li> <li>• Management Plan of the NPA Rybníky Senné</li> <li>• Methodology for revitalisation of natural floodplain habitats – for meadows and for forests</li> <li>• Identification of sites for low-cost measures improving the hydrological regime in the floodplain</li> <li>• Study on alternative waste water treatment opportunities in the Čierna voda River Basin</li> <li>• Business plans for environmental businesses</li> </ul>
Other relevant materials:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SC meeting minutes</li> <li>• Project budget revisions</li> <li>• Financial Audit Reports 2008-2009, 2012</li> <li>• National strategic and legal documents</li> </ul>

## Attachment D: 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?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is the Project relevant to UNCBD, RAMSAR convention, ICPDR and GEF objectives?</li> <li>Is the Project relevant to UNDP objectives?</li> <li>Is the Project relevant to Slovakia's environmental objectives?</li> <li>Does the Project address the needs of target beneficiaries?</li> <li>Is the Project internally coherent in its design?</li> <li>How is the Project complementary to activities of other stakeholders and donors active in the region?</li> <li>How could the Project better target and address the priorities and development challenges of targeted beneficiaries?</li> </ul>			
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To what extent are the outputs and activities of the project consistent with the intended project objective and goal?</li> <li>To what extent have implemented outputs produced or contributed to attaining the expected outcomes?</li> <li>How was risk and risk mitigation being managed?</li> <li>What lessons have been learnt for the Project to achieve its outcomes?</li> <li>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?</li> <li>How could the Project be more effective in achieving its results?</li> </ul>			

Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Was adaptive management used or needed to ensure efficient resource use?</li> <li>• Were the accounting and financial systems in place adequate for Project management and producing accurate and timely financial information?</li> <li>• Were progress reports produced accurately, timely and respond to reporting requirements including adaptive management changes?</li> <li>• Was Project implementation as cost effective as originally proposed (planned vs. actual)</li> <li>• Was the leveraging of funds (co-financing) happening as planned?</li> <li>• Were the findings, lessons learned and recommendations shared among Project stakeholders, UNDP and GEF Staff and other relevant organizations for ongoing Project adjustment and improvement?</li> <li>• Did the Project mainstream gender considerations into its implementation?</li> <li>• Which partnerships/linkages were facilitated? Can be considered sustainable?</li> <li>• Did the Project take into account local capacity in design and implementation of the Project?</li> </ul>			
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are sustainability issues adequately integrated in Project design?</li> <li>• Did the Project adequately address financial and economic sustainability issues?</li> <li>• Is there evidence that Project partners will continue their activities beyond Project support?</li> <li>• Are laws, policies and frameworks being addressed through the Project, in order to address sustainability of key initiatives and</li> </ul>			



<p>reforms?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is the capacity in place at the national and local levels adequate to ensure sustainability of the results achieved to date?</li> <li>Are Project activities and results being replicated elsewhere and/or scaled up?</li> <li>What are the main challenges that may hinder sustainability of results?</li> </ul>			
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will the project achieve its long-term goal to mainstream integrated ecosystem management principles and practices into the land and water management and agricultural sectors?</li> <li>What is the level of sensitization and awareness about the integrated ecosystem management approach.</li> <li>What is the impact of the demonstrated approach in private, public and/or at individual levels?</li> <li>Were cross-cutting issues identified and reflected during the project implementation?</li> <li>How could the Project build on its apparent successes and learn from its weaknesses in order to enhance the potential for impact of ongoing and future initiatives?</li> </ul>			

## Attachment E: Rating Scales

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

## Attachment F: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form

### Evaluators:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Signed at place on date

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

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

## Attachment G: Evaluation Report Outline<sup>4</sup>

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

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

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

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

- 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

## Attachment H: Evaluation Report Clearance Form

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

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

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

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

UNDP GEF RTA

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

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