**Terms of Reference**

**International Consultant for Independent Terminal Evaluation of the GEF/UNDP/UNEP/UNIDO/WB MSP project: “Preparing for HCFC phase out in CEITs: needs, benefits and potential synergies with other MEAs”**

# (Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bulgaria, Kazakhstan, Russian Federation. Tajikistan, Ukraine and Uzbekistan)

**Type of Contract:** IC (Consultant)

**Languages Required:** English

**Duration**: 1 March 2013 – 19 April 2013 (not exceeding 20 working days)

**Location:** home based (no travel required)

**1. Background**

In accordance with UNDP/GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP supported and GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. This terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the **GEF/UNDP/UNEP/UNIDO/WB MSP** project entitled “Preparing for HCFC phase out in CEITs: needs, benefits and potential synergies with other MEAs” (PIMS 3597).

The project’s primary goal was s to develop outlines of country strategies for HCFC phase out based on in-depth surveys of HCFC consumption and where applicable production, in eligible non Article 5 countries with economies in transition (CEITs) in Europe and Central Asia (specifically Belarus, Bulgaria, Kazakhstan, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan, Azerbaijan, Russian Federation and Ukraine), and to identify needs for further activities to assist these countries to remain in or attain compliance with their Montreal Protocol obligations, particularly noting the accelerated HCFC phase out requirements adopted by the 19th Meeting of Parties to the Montreal Protocol.

Main partners of the programme are National Ozone Offices in each respective country established in line Ministries of Environment. The programme has been implemented by the listed Implementing Agencies, and, in UNDP related activities, by BRC-Slovakia and UNDP Country Offices.

Project Summary Table

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Title: |  | | | | |
| GEF Project ID: | | 2331 |  | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | *at completion (Million US$)* |
| UNDP Project ID: | | 3597 | GEF financing: | 0.745 | 0.745 |
| Country: | | Regional | IA/EA own: | 0.460 | 0.110 |
| Region: | | Europe/CIS | Government: | 0.075 |  |
| Focal Area: | | GEF-Ozone | Other: |  |  |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): | | ODS-SP1 | Total co-financing: | 0.535 | 0.110 |
| Executing Agency: | | UNDP/UNIDO/UNEP/WB | Total Project Cost: | 1.280 | 0.855 |
| Other Partners involved: | | NOUs | ProDoc Signature (date project began): | | 15/09/2008 |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | Proposed:  31/12/2009 | Actual:  31/12/2011 |

This Final Evaluation is initiated by UNDP Bratislava Regional Centre as the GEF Implementing Agency for this project and it aims to provide a general assessment of this regional multi-partner project and a strategy for replicating the results. It also provides the basis for learning and accountability for implementing partners and agencies, GEF and stakeholders.

The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming. The terminal evaluation is intended to generally assess the relevance, performance and success of the project, covering potential impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global and national environmental goals. Important lessons learned will be documented with a short list of essential recommendations that project partners and stakeholders might use to improve the design and implementation of other related projects and programs in future.

The terminal evaluation is to 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>.

**2. Description of Responsibilities**

The scope of the evaluation will cover all activities undertaken in the framework of the project. The evaluators will compare planned outputs of the project to actual outputs and assess the actual results to determine their contribution to the attainment of the project objectives. It will also attempt to evaluate the efficiency of project management, including the delivery of outputs and activities in terms of quality, quantity, timeliness and cost efficiency as well as features related to the process involved in achieving those outputs and the impacts of the project. The evaluation will also address the underlying causes and issues contribution to targets not adequately achieved.

The key product expected from the terminal evaluation is a comprehensive analytical report in English that should, at least, follow requirements as indicated in Annex F.

The terminal evaluation report will be a stand-alone document that substantiates its recommendations and conclusions. The report will have to provide convincing evidence to support its findings/ratings.

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

The review will take place in consultant´s home office, using communication media for interviews and consultation of key project stakeholders. The consultant is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring engagement with the project team, project partners and key stakeholders.

The consultant is expected to use interviews as a means of collecting data on the performance and success of the project. Questionnaires prepared by the consultant can be distributed to national project partners, facilitated by participating implementing agencies.

**Evaluation approach and method**

An overall approach and method[[1]](#footnote-1) for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported and GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact,** as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR ([Annex C](#_TOR_Annex_C:)). The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence‐based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular MPU/Chemicals and implementing agencies, GEF OFPs, UNDP Country Offices, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders.

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

**Evaluation criteria and ratings**

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

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

**Project finance / 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 evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

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

**Mainstreaming**

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

**Impact**

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts.

**Conclusions, recommendations and 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. BRC will issue and manage the contract. The Project Team and Country Offices involved will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, coordinate with the Government etc.

*Although the Consultant should feel free to discuss with the authorities concerned, all matters relevant to its assignment, it is not authorized to make any commitment or statement on behalf of involved GEF implementing agencies such as UNDP, UNEP, UNIDO, and World Bank or GEF or the project management.*

The Consultant will be responsible for all personal administrative expenses associated with undertaking this assignment including office accommodation, printing, stationary, telephone and electronic communications, and report copies incurred in this assignment. No travel is expected in this assignment.

**Evaluation timeframe**

The total duration of the evaluation will be 20 days according to the following plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Timing | Completion Date |
| **Preparation (desk review)** | Approximately 4 days | Estimated by March 11, 2013 |
| **Phone/skype interviews or e-mail questionnaires** | Approximately 4 days | Estimated by March 18, 2013 |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | Approximately 6 days | Estimated by April 2, 2013 |
| **Final Report** | Approximately 6 days | Estimated by April 19, 2013 |

**Evaluation deliverables**

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Deliverable | Content | Timing | Responsibilities |
| **Draft Final Report** | Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes | Within 3 weeks after completion of review phase | Reviewed by IAs, UNDP RTA |
| **Final Report\*** | Revised report | Within 1 week of receiving comments on draft | Sent to 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 report shall be submitted to the UNDP RBEC Energy and Environment Team (Mr. Maksim Surkov, address: Grosslingova 35, 811 09 Bratislava, Slovakia, tel.: 00421-2-59337 423, e-mail: maksim.surkov@undp.org )

**Evaluator ethics**

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

Payment schedule:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| % | Milestone |
| *20%* | Following submission of the 1st draft terminal evaluation report |
| *80%* | Following submission of the final terminal evaluation report |

**3. Competencies**

* Strong interpersonal skills, communication and diplomatic skills, ability to work in a team
* Ability to plan and organize his/her work, efficient in meeting commitments, observing deadlines and achieving results
* Openness to change and ability to receive/integrate feedback
* Ability to work under pressure and stressful situations
* Strong analytical, reporting and writing abilities
* Keeps abreast of available technology, understands its applicability and limitations, willingness to learn new technology

**4. Qualifications**

The consultant should have prior experience in evaluating projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

1. Graduate degree in chemistry, physics, engineering, environmental science or equivalent experience
2. Significant experience related to the application of ODS substances, their phase out and related global environmental issues including climate change, POPs and chemicals management
3. Knowledge/understanding of the Montreal Protocol issues
4. Recent knowledge of the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy
5. Recent knowledge of UNDP’s results-based evaluation policies and procedures
6. Recent experience in evaluation of international donor driven development projects
7. Excellent English writing and communication skills
8. Knowledge of MS Word, Excel and email communication software

**5. Application procedures**

Candidates are requested to submit:

1. Up to two page cover letter explaining why you are the most suitable candidate for the assignment.

2. Financial offer as lump sum.

**Incomplete applications will not be considered. Please make sure you have provided all requested materials.**

***Payment modalities and specifications***

*Please note that the* ***financial proposal is all-inclusive*** *and shall take into account various expenses incurred by the consultant/contractor during the contract period (e.g. fee, office costs and any other relevant expenses related to the performance of services...).*

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

***General Terms and conditions*** *as well as other related documents can be found under:* [*http://europeandcis.undp.org/home/jobs*](http://europeandcis.undp.org/home/jobs)

Annex A: Project Logical Framework

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Development Objective** | **To preserve the Stratospheric Ozone Layer while not contributing to Climate Change** |
| **Overall Project Objective** | **Development of HCFC phase out strategies for the CEIT region, highlighting cost estimates for HCFC phase out, associated training needs, and potential overlap with the future work and strategic objectives of other GEF Focal areas, in respect of Decision X/16 of the Montreal Protocol.** |

| **LOGFRAME** | **Intervention logic** | **Objectively Verifiable Indicators** | ***Sources of verification*** | **Assumptions** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Sub-Project Objective(1)** | A: To develop National Strategy outlines for phase-out of HCFCs in the participating CEIT countries. (Lead Agency: UNDP/UNIDO, with UNEP assisting) | | | |
| **Outcomes** | National strategy-outlines for CEIT countries that will give guidance on HCFC phase out measures and which will contain specific outlines for requests at the sub-project level for future GEF funding needs. | 8 National HCFC phase-out strategies. | National surveys, data collected from the Government authorities, the relevant industrial, institutional, commercial sectors producing, distributing and using HCFC, HFCs and alternatives, and regulatory authorities in the participating countries. Strategy development, consultation and endorsement through integration with applicable Country Programs and legislation. | Availability of local resources and data in the relevant national sectors. |
| **Sub-Project Objective(2)** | B: To investigate the global environmental impact of HCFCs phase-out under the Montreal Protocol taking into account the global efforts in reducing GHGs (Lead Agency: WB) | | | |
| **Outcomes** | A better understanding of the global environmental impact of HCFCs, taking into account the contribution of HCFC phase-out to the global effort in reducing emissions of global warming gases. | One comprehensive report on global holistic HCFC phase out scenarios and strategies, comprising :-   1. a comprehensive analysis of the scenarios of continued consumption and production of certain HCFCs vs their phase out through various phase-out scenarios; 2. their aggregated potential GWP and economic costs, and 3. an exploration of cost effective measures to properly manage by-products of the production of HCFCs and stockpiles of unwanted CFCs. | Existing TEAP, OS, UNEP documents, as well as on studies on HCFC undertaken by individual Governments,  IPCC reports, studies funded through MLF/GEF, etc. Additional activities in non-CEIT countries may be undertaken to obtain market information. There will, however, not be detailed survey work at the National Level funded for this component and care will be taken to avoid overlap with on-going MLF funded country studies. | Complete and up-to-date information contained within source materials, which can be complemented with the more specific regional/national data gathered under the UNDP component. |
| **Sub-Project Objective(3)** | C: To examine possibilities for synergies with other chemicals MEAs (Lead Agency: UNEP) | | | |
| **Outcomes** | Better understanding of possibilities for synergies for control and phase out of HCFCs; Better understanding of needs for capacity building, | Possible options and recommendations for related non-investment work identified | Report on the handling of priorities of the MEAs globally, as well as legislative/regulatory controls at the national/regional level across countries.  Survey results, MEA Secretariats, countries, regional OzonAction Teams  Workshop report(s), MEA and GEF Secretariats, countries, regional OzonAction Teams, other IAs working in the countries. | Full access to relevant authorities in countries. |

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

* GEF: Monitoring and Evaluation Policy
* GEF, GEF-IV and V Focal Area Strategies
* GEF, MSP: Preparing for HCFC phase out in CEITs: needs, benefits and potential synergies with other MEAs
* UNDP: Mission reports of senior international expert
* GEF/UNDP: Outlines of HCFC phase-out strategies prepared and other relevant documentation
* GEF/UNDP: Annual PIRs as formulated and submitted to GEF
* UNEP, Ozone Secretariat: Decisions of Implementation Committee and MOP
* UNEP, Ozone Secretariat: Communication exchanges between Parties and Ozone Secretariat
* UNEP, Ozone Secretariat: HCFC consumption database
* Financial reports
* Others as required

Annex C: Evaluation Questions

| **Evaluative Criteria Questions** | | **Indicators** | **Sources** | **Methodology** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels? | | | | |
|  | * How and why have project outcomes and strategies contributed to the achievement of the expected results? Have the project outcomes contributed to national development priorities and plans? | * tbd[[2]](#footnote-2) | * tbd | * tbd |
|  | * Are the project’s objectives and components clear, practicable and feasible within the project’s timeframe? | * tbd | * tbd | * tbd |
|  | * Were the capacities of executing institutions and counterparts properly considered when the project was designed? | * tbd | * tbd | * tbd |
|  | * Were counterpart resources (funding, staff, and facilities), enabling legislation, and adequate project management arrangements in place at project entry? | * tbd | * tbd | * tbd |
|  | * What are the underlying factors beyond the project’s immediate control and to what extent they have influenced outcomes and results? How appropriate and effective were the project’s management strategies for these factors. | * tbd | * tbd | * tbd |
| Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? | | | | | |
|  | * To what extent have the project objectives and outcomes, as set out in the Project Document, project’s Logical Framework and other related documents, have been achieved? | * tbd | * tbd | * tbd | |
|  | * Review planned strategies and plans for achieving the overall objective of the project within the timeframe. | * tbd | * tbd | * tbd | |
|  | * Were the assumptions made by the project right and what new assumptions that should be made could be identified? | * tbd | * tbd | * tbd | |
|  | * Were the project budget and duration planned in a cost-effective way? | * tbd | * tbd | * tbd | |
|  | * How and to what extent have implementing agencies contributed and national counterparts (public, private) assisted the project? | * tbd | * tbd | * tbd | |
| Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards? | | | | | |
|  | * How useful was the logical framework as a management tool during implementation and any changes made to it? | * tbd | * tbd | * tbd | |
|  | * Were the risks identified in the project document and PIRs the most important and the risk ratings applied appropriately? | * tbd | * tbd | * tbd | |
|  | * How and to what extent have project implementation process, coordination with participating stakeholders and important aspects affected the timely project start-up, implementation and closure? | * tbd | * tbd | * tbd | |
|  | * Do the outcomes developed during the project formulation still represent the best project strategy for achieving the project objectives? | * tbd | * tbd | * tbd | |
|  | * How have local stakeholders participated in project management and decision-making? What are the strengths and weaknesses of the approach adopted by the project? What could be improved? | * tbd | * tbd | * tbd | |
|  | * Does the project consult and make use of skills, experience and knowledge of the appropriate government entities, NGOs, community groups, private sector, local governments and academic institutions in the implementation and evaluation of project activities? | * tbd | * tbd | * tbd | |
| Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? | | | | | |
|  | * Was project sustainability strategy developed during the project design? | * tbd | * tbd | * tbd | |
|  | * How relevant was the project sustainability strategy? | * tbd | * tbd | * tbd | |
|  | * Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes? What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GEF assistance ends (resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and trends that may indicate that it is likely that in future there will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project’s outcomes)? | * tbd | * tbd | * tbd | |
|  | * Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there a sufficient public/ stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project? | * tbd | * tbd | * tbd | |
| **Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?** | | | | | |
|  | * How has the project contributed to the reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status? | * tbd | * tbd | * tbd | |
|  | * Are the project outcomes contributing to national development priorities and plans? | * tbd | * tbd | * tbd | |

Annex D: Rating Scales

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

Annex E: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form

**Evaluators:**

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

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form[[3]](#footnote-3)**

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

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

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

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

Signed at *place* on *date*

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

Annex F: Evaluation Report Outline[[4]](#footnote-4)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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[[5]](#footnote-5)) |
| **1.** | **Introduction (4-5 pages)**   * Purpose of the evaluation * Scope & Methodology * Structure of the evaluation report |
| **2.** | **Project description and development context (2-3 pages)**   * 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 (20 pages)**  (In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) must be rated[[6]](#footnote-6)) |
| **3.1** | Project Design / Formulation   * Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators) * Assumptions and Risks * Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design * Planned stakeholder participation * Replication approach * UNDP comparative advantage * Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector * Management arrangements |
| **3.2** | Project Implementation   * Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation) * Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region) * Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management * Project Finance: * Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (\*) * UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (\*) coordination, and operational issues |
| **3.3** | Project Results   * Overall results (attainment of objectives) (\*) * Relevance(\*) * Effectiveness & Efficiency (\*) * Country ownership * Mainstreaming * Sustainability (\*) * Impact |
| **4.** | **Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons (3-5 pages)**   * 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 * List of persons interviewed * List of documents reviewed * Evaluation Question Matrix * Questionnaire used and summary of results * Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form |

Annex G: Evaluation Report Clearance Form

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

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

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

UNDP GEF RTA

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

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

1. For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](http://www.undp.org/evaluation/handbook), Chapter 7, pg. 163 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. tbd – to be determined by consultant in consultations with the project team [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)