

GEF/UNDP Capacity Building for Sustainable Land Management in Mauritius

including Rodrigues

Terms of Reference for Final Evaluation

Title: Consultancy for a UNDP/GEF Final Project Evaluation

Duration of Contract: 13 working days (spread over three weeks, one week in the field and 2 weeks home based)

Contract starting date: June 2012

Duty station: Mauritius

1. Introduction

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures¹, all full and medium-sized country projects implemented by UNDP with GEF financing must undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. This terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of Capacity Building for Sustainable Land Management in Mauritius.

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

2. Project Summary Table

Project Title	Capacity Building for Sustainable Land Management in Mauritius including Rodrigues			
GEF Project ID:	PIMS No. 3092		<i>at endorsement (Million US\$)</i>	<i>at completion (Million US\$)</i>
UNDP Project ID:	00049100	GEF financing:	574,073.00	
Country:	Mauritius	IA/EA own:		
Region:	SIDS	Government:	US\$ 600,000	
Focal Area:	Land Degradation	Other:	US\$ 164,000 (FAO)	
Operational Program:	Sustainable Land Management (SLM)	Total co-financing:	764,000	
Executing Agency:	Ministry of Agro-Industry and Food Security	Total Project Cost:	US\$ 1,338,073	
Other Partners involved:		ProDoc Signature (date project began):		2006
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: 2009	Actual: 2012

see 'UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results', 2009, and the 'GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy', 2010

3. Objective and Scope

Objective

The objective of the project was to build capacities for sustainable land management (SLM) in appropriate government and civil society institutions/user groups in Mauritius and Rodrigues, and SLM is mainstreamed into government planning and strategy development. It benefited a land surface area estimated at 50,000 ha and contributed towards the achievement of the following long-term goal: The agricultural, pasture, forest and other terrestrial land management in Mauritius and Rodrigues are sustainable, productive systems that maintain ecosystem productivity and ecological functions while contributing directly to the environmental, economic and social well-being of the country.

The Project on Building Capacity and Mainstreaming Sustainable Land Management in Mauritius, including Rodrigues, is a Global Environment Facility (GEF)-funded Project through the United Nations Development Program (UNDP). The Project has been implemented by the Ministry of Agro Industry and Food Security through the National Directorate of Forestry from 2007 to 2011. The Project has been supervised by the Project Steering Committee (PSC) and received technical guidance from a Project Working Committee (PWC). Further details on the background and activities of the SLM Project are contained in the Project Document, the Mid-Term Evaluation Report (2008).

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 (2011).

The purpose of the evaluation is to:

- Assess overall performance against the project objectives as set out in the Project Document and other related documents
- Assess project relevance to national priorities, as well as UNDP and GEF strategic objectives
- Assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the project
- Critically analyze the implementation and management arrangements of the project, including financial management.
- Assess the sustainability of the project interventions and consider project impacts
- Document lessons and best practices concerning project design, implementation and management which may be of relevance to other projects in the country and elsewhere in the world.

Scope

The TE should consider and report on the following evaluation issues and criteria:

1. Project relevance and consistency with country priorities and the GEF Land Degradation Focal Area (specifically GEF-4 Strategic Objective 1 & 2, to develop an enabling environment that will place Sustainable Land Management in the mainstream of development policy and practices at the regional, national, and local levels; and to scale-up SLM investments that generate mutual benefits for the global environment and local livelihoods).
2. Ownership of the project at the national and local levels; stakeholder participation at national and local levels and partnerships developed through the project.
3. Effectiveness in realizing project immediate objectives, planned outcomes and outputs; the effects of the project on target groups and institutions; the extent to which these have contributed towards strengthening the institutional, organizational and technical capability of the government in achieving its long-term sustainable development objectives (including environmental management goals).
4. Sustainability of project achievements and impacts, including financial and institutional sustainability, and an assessment of planned replication and exit strategies.
5. Management arrangements, including supervision, guidance, back-stopping, human resources, and the Implementing Agency's (UNDP) supervision and backstopping; the quality and timeliness of inputs, activities, responsiveness of project management to changes in the project environment and other M&E feedback.
6. Financial planning and sustainability, including the timely delivery and use of committed co-financing.

7. Efficiency or cost-effectiveness in the ways in which project outputs and outcomes were achieved.
8. Adaptive management, including effective use of logframe, UNDP risk management system, annual Project Implementation Reviews, and other parts of the M&E system, tools and mechanisms as appropriate; evaluate whether project design allowed for flexibility in responding to changes in the project environment. Review the recommendations of the MTR and assess how the MTR had helped adaptive management of the project.
9. Risk management, including the UNDP risk management system within ATLAS, which is also incorporated in the annual PIR. The evaluators are requested to determine how effectively the risk management system is being used as an adaptive management tool. Risks may be of a financial, socio-political, institutional, operational, environmental (or other) type.
10. Cross-cutting issues:
 - Poverty reduction: How has the project contributed to poverty reduction through SLM initiatives in the pilot sites and enhanced sustainable livelihoods
 - Governance: How has the project facilitated the participation of the local communities in natural resource management and decision making processes
 - Promotion of gender equity: Has the project considered gender sensitivity or equal participation of man and women and boys and girls in decision making processes
 - Capacity development of participants and target beneficiaries, communications and use of technology.
11. Lessons and Recommendations: The evaluator will present lessons and recommendations on all aspects of the project s/he considers relevant. with special attention given to analyzing lessons and proposing recommendations on aspects related to factors that contributed to or hindered attainment of project objectives, sustainability of project benefits, innovation, catalytic effect and replication, the role and effectiveness of M & E and adaptive management in project implementation.

4. Evaluation approach and method

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF country focal points, steering committee, project team, and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Mauritius including specific project sites. The evaluator is expected to use interviews as a means of collecting data on the relevance, performance and success of the project. Key stakeholders to be interviewed are listed in [Annex 1](#).

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports, including: Annual Reports, project budget revisions, progress reports, focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other material that s/he may consider useful for evidence based assessment. A list of documentation that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included with this Terms of Reference ([Annex 3](#)).

Two weeks prior to the evaluation mission, the evaluator will submit a brief (2 page) inception note, to include:

- Further elaboration on the intended approach & method, consistent with this TOR.
- Planned timing for carrying out the evaluation mission.
- Any requests to include additional participatory techniques, such as surveys and focus groups, or other approaches for the gathering and analysis of data that are otherwise not specified in the TOR, and which may entail additional time or cost.
- Requests for additional project background information not included with this TOR

5. Evaluation Criteria & Ratings

Project performance will be measured based on the Project Logical Framework ([Annex 2](#)), 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, as defined and explained in the hyperlinked guidance manual. As agreed with GEF, ratings will be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. In addition, a rating must also be provided for project implementation. The obligatory rating scales are provided ([Annex 4](#)).

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

6. Mainstreaming

UNDP/GEF projects are key components in UNDP country programming. As such, the objectives and outcomes of the project should conform to UNDP country programme strategies as well as to GEF-required outcomes. Based from a review of key documents, including the Project Document, UNDP Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) and UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF), plus key stakeholder interviews, the evaluation will provide a brief assessment of the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP strategic priorities, such as poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and the empowerment of women.

7. Impact

The evaluators will offer their assessment of 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, or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.

8. Conclusions, lessons and recommendations

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

9. Implementation arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Mauritius. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the evaluator to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the government etc. This should be done at least 2 weeks ahead of the evaluation mission to allow sufficient time for the evaluation team to provide their input and confirm that they can meet the proposed schedule.

10. Duties and Responsibilities

The evaluator for the SLM Project TE will be an international consultant with in depth understanding of UNDP and GEF projects including evaluation experience. S/He will be responsible for developing the evaluation methodology, conducting the evaluation and delivering the key products expected from the evaluation. The evaluator will work with a small consultative group from Forestry Services and UNDP Mauritius. Because the SLM Project manager and implementation unit have been disbanded already, the evaluation exercise will be supported and facilitated by the UNDP Programme officer responsible for the SLM Project. The consultant will sign an agreement with UNDP to undertake the SLM Project evaluation and will be bound by its terms and conditions set out in the agreement.

Evaluator selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have any conflict of interest with project related activities

11. Required Skills and Experience and Competencies

Competencies

Corporate Competencies

- Demonstrates integrity by modelling the UNs values and ethical standards.
- Advocates and promotes the vision, mission, and strategic goals of UN.
- Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability
- Treats all people fairly without favoritism.

Functional Competencies

- Operational effectiveness;
- Solid knowledge of financial and human resources management, contract, asset and procurement, information and communication technology, general administration;
- Ability to lead business processes re-engineering, implementation of new systems (business Management and Leadership
- Builds strong relationships with clients, focuses on impact and result for the client and responds positively to feedback.
- Consistently approaches work with energy and a positive, constructive attitude.
- Demonstrates excellent oral and written communication skills.
- Demonstrates openness to change and ability to manage complexities.
- Shows mentoring as well as conflict resolution skills

Required Skills and Experience

- The candidates should have at least MSc or higher degree in Environment, Agriculture, Natural Resource Management or related fields, and should have adequate experience in the management, design and/ or evaluation of comparable projects.
- In-depth understanding of land and environment issues in tropical/ subtropical and island environments. A minimum of 10 years of relevant working experience is required.
- Prior experience in evaluation of international technical assistance projects with major donor agencies, including UNDP-GEF projects, is an advantage.
- Familiar with SLM approaches in Indian Ocean either through management and/or implementation or through consultancies in evaluation of land related projects. Understanding of local actions contributing to global benefits is crucial.
- Demonstrated ability to assess complex situations, succinctly distil critical issues, and draw forward-looking conclusions and recommendations.
- Excellent written and verbal communication skills in English. Good knowledge of French advantageous.
- Ability to deliver quality reports within the given time.

12. Evaluation timeframe

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

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation	2 days	date
Evaluation Mission	5 days	date
Draft Evaluation Report	3 days	date

Final Report	3 days	date
---------------------	--------	------

13. Evaluation deliverables

TE is expected to deliver the following:

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

14. Evaluator Ethics

Evaluation consultant will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (*Annex 5*) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the *2008 UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations*.

15. Payment modalities and specifications

%	Milestone
20%	At contract signing
50%	Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report
30%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report

16. Application process

Applicants are requested to apply online <http://jobs.undp.org> Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions. The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in English with indication of the e-mail and phone contact.

Shortlisted candidates will be requested to submit a price offer indicating their proposed fee rate for the assignment, based against the above stipulated evaluation schedule. Following UNDP procurement rules, both technical competence (70%) and the consultant fee rate (30%) will be taken into account in the selection process. Qualified women and members of social minorities are strongly encouraged to apply.

Annex 1: List of Stakeholders to be consulted

List of Stakeholders	Stakeholder's interest in SLM
Ministry of Agro Industry and Food Security MoAF (Forestry Service)	National coordination for project; Forest laws and Pas Geometriques
MoE&NDU	Dealing with all environmental issues including capacity building
MoFED	Coordinating body; Funding; Financial control; Incremental cost
Ministry of Housing and Lands MoHL (LIS)	Data of all land (State and private)
Ministry of Housing and Lands MoHL (Survey Division)	Mandate for State lands management
FoA, UoM	Research, training, capacity building; extension and outreach
MSIRI	Research in sugarcane production and extension
Mauritius Institute of Education (MIE)	Training of primary & secondary school teachers in environmental education; Public awareness
MoAF (Land Use Division)	Land use survey; Land settlement survey
MoAF (AREU)	Research and extension in non-sugar agriculture
MoAF (FARC)	Apex body for funds and policy on agricultural research
MoAF (NPCS)	Biodiversity conservation
MoAF (NRSC)	Satellite photos and their interpretation; remote sensing
MoAF (FSCs)	Interest in small sugarcane planters
Ministry of Public Utilities	Domestic, industrial and agricultural water supply and waste water management; River and stream flow; surface and underground water
Meteorological Services	Meteorological data (intensity, duration and distribution pattern of rainfall; drought forecasting; cyclones; floods; climate change
Irrigation Authority	Irrigation methods; irrigation plans; irrigation water
Beach Authority	All aspects of beach management
Mauritius Oceanography Institute (MOI)	All aspects of the marine environment
Mauritius Vegetable Planters Association	Vegetable crop production
National Young Farmers Club	Young farmers
Northern Planters Association	Sugarcane cultivation in the north of the island
Onion Producers Association	Onion production
Deer Meat Producers Association	Production of deer meat in private forests and state leased forests

Annex 2: Project Logical Framework. Prodoc

See prodoc p.36

Annex 3: List of Documents to be reviewed by the evaluators

It is anticipated that the methodology to be used for the TE will include, but may not be limited to the following:

A) Documentation review including, *inter alia*:

- Project Document and Project Appraisal Document;
- Project implementation reports (PIR's);
- Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams;
- Audits reports
- Annual Review Reports
- M & E Operational Guidelines, all monitoring reports prepared by the project;
- Financial and Administration guidelines;

The following documents will also be available:

- The project M&E framework
- Knowledge products from service providers
- Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems;
- Minutes of the Project Board Meetings, task teams and other project management meetings;
- Maps
- The GEF Implementation Completion Report guidelines; and,
- The UNDP Monitoring and Evaluation Frameworks.

B) Interviews with:

- UNDP-GEF staff who have project responsibilities;
- Staff of the Project Coordination Unit;
- Executing agencies:
- Members of the Project Board
- Task Team members (if appropriate).
- Project stakeholders, particularly members of the various project level steering committees and project beneficiaries;
- Participating members of the Pilot projects
- Relevant staff in participating government departments.

C) Field Visits:

The following project sites should be visited: Sites in Mauritius

In addition, **but separate from project staff and their institutions**, the evaluators will need to specifically meet with selected communities (intended beneficiaries of the project during the field visits).

Annex 4: Ratings

Ratings Scales		
<i>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution</i>	<i>Sustainability ratings:</i>	<i>Relevance ratings:</i>
6. Highly Satisfactory (HS): any shortcomings are of negligible significance	4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability	2. Relevant (R)
5. Satisfactory (S):	3. Moderately Likely (ML):	1. Not relevant

minor shortcomings 4. Moderately Satisfactory (MS): moderate shortcomings 3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings 2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems 1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems	moderate risks 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks <i>Additional ratings where relevant: Not Applicable (N/A) ; Unable to Assess (U/A)</i>	(NR)
--	--	------

Project Implementation Rating

Guidelines for Ratings for Project Implementation

1. Progress toward achieving project objectives

Rating of Project Progress towards Meeting Objective: Taking into account the cumulative level of progress compared to the target level across all of the objective indicators, please rate the progress of the project towards meeting its objective, according to the following scale.

Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Project is expected to achieve or exceed all its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as “good practice”.
Satisfactory (S)	Project is expected to achieve most of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings.
Marginally Satisfactory (MS)	Project is expected to achieve most of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve some of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits.
Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU)	Project is expected to achieve of its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only some of its major global environmental objectives.
Unsatisfactory (U)	Project is expected not to achieve most of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits.
Highly Unsatisfactory (U)	The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, any of its major global environment objectives with no worthwhile

	benefits.
--	-----------

2. Progress in project implementation

Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Implementation of all components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised implementation plan for the project. The project can be presented as “good practice”.
Satisfactory (S)	Implementation of most components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan except for only a few that are subject to remedial action.
Marginally Satisfactory (MS)	Implementation of some components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with some components requiring remedial action.
Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU)	Implementation of some components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with most components requiring remedial action.
Unsatisfactory (U)	Implementation of most components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Implementation of none of the components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.

Criterion	Evaluator's Summary Comments	Evaluator's Rating
A. Attainment of project objectives and results (overall rating) Sub criteria (below)		
A. 1. Effectiveness		
A. 2. Relevance		
A. 3. Efficiency		
B. Sustainability of Project outcomes (overall rating) Sub criteria (below)		
B. 1. Financial		
B. 2. Socio Political		
B. 3. Institutional framework and governance		
B. 4. Ecological		
C. Achievement of outputs and activities		
D. Monitoring and Evaluation		

Criterion	Evaluator's Summary Comments	Evaluator's Rating
(overall rating)		
Sub criteria (below)		
D. 1. M&E Design		
D. 2. M&E Plan Implementation (use for adaptive management)		
D. 3. Budgeting and Funding for M&E activities		
E. Catalytic Role		
F. Preparation and readiness		
G. Country ownership		
H. Stakeholders involvement		
I. Financial planning		
J. Implementation approach		
K. UNDP/GEF Supervision and backstopping		

Please note: Relevance and effectiveness will be considered as critical criteria. The overall rating of the project for achievement of objectives and results **may not be higher** than the lowest rating on either of these two criteria. Thus, to have an overall satisfactory rating for outcomes a project must have at least satisfactory ratings on both relevance and effectiveness.

Annex 5: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct Agreement Form

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form	
<p>Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System</p> <p>Name of Consultant: _____</p> <p>Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____</p> <p>I confirm that I have reviewed and will abide by the 2008 UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation.</p> <p>Signed at (place)on _____</p> <p>Signature: _____</p>	

Annex 6: Plan for Evaluation Implementation

	Activity	Estimated time	Key outputs
1	Preparation by consultants <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Review project documents and progress reports - Other relevant literature Preparation (by consultants) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Briefing from UNDP Office - Prepare inception report - Agreement on activities and timeframes - Preparation of meetings/programme 	4 days	Familiarization with the projects (re. intended outcomes) Agreement on timeframes and programme
2	Meetings and discussions with stakeholders <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Discussions with project teams (PMUs) - Field visits. This will include interviews and focus group discussions with various stakeholders. - Meetings with development partners including eventually Project steering committees and other partners 	3 days	Document records of interviews and observations with stakeholders Evaluate findings
3	Presentation of findings to stakeholders <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Hold a meeting with stakeholders including Project Steering Committees, development partners, government and UN agencies to present preliminary findings and recommendations to collect feedback that will help finalise the report, give suggestions and get feedback 	1 days	Present findings to key stakeholders and create forum for participatory feedback

² www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

	- Incorporate feedback into findings		
4	<p>Writing Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Draft report and final report <p>Report should be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Analytical in nature (both quantitative and qualitative) - Structured around issues and related findings/lessons learnt - Conclusions - Recommendations <p>Present draft form for review by UNDP CO</p>	3 days	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Draft report delivered to UNDP CO for consideration - Consideration should be given to producing a final report for public information and donors
5	Submission of Final Report	2 days after presentation to UNDP CO	A report of maximum 25 pages in word document format with tables where appropriate will be submitted within four working days after the completion of the mission, incorporating comments made on the draft submitted to UNDP CO
	Time allocated to the assignment	13 days	-



Annex 6: Evaluation Report Outline³

- i. Opening page:
 - Name of the UNDP/GEF 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
 - Executing Agency and 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: UN Editorial Manual⁴)
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 rated⁵)
- 3.1 Project Design / Formulation
 - Analysis of LFA (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)
 - Assumptions and Risks
 - Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design
 - Planned stakeholder participation

³The Report length shall not exceed 35 pages in total (not including annexes).

⁴ <http://69.94.137.26/editorialcontrol/>

- 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 Executing Agency implementation / execution (*) coordination, and operational issues

3.3 Project Results

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

4. Conclusions, Lessons & Recommendations

- 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
- Questionnaire used and summary of results
- Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

Annex 7: Evaluation Report Clearance Form

(to be completed by CO and RCU and included in the final document)

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

UNDP- GEF- RTA

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____