

TERMS OF REFERENCE

STREEM Terminal Evaluation

Background

The Government of the Philippines, through the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR) received a grant from the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the Global Environment Facility (GEF) to implement the project entitled “Strengthening Coordination for Effective Environmental Management (STREEM)”. The STREEM project was designed to generate global environmental benefits through improved coordination with respect to the implementation of cross-cutting issues among the three Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs) being implemented in the country. Specifically, this includes the three Rio Conventions namely the United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity (UNCBD), the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC).

The STREEM project conducted a series of consultation and coordination activities at the national down to the local level to develop potential tools to support horizontal and vertical coordination mechanism for MEAs. At the national level, the project utilized existing mechanism for effective coordination among three Focal Point Agencies (FPAs) and consequently developed systems to pragmatically support the coordination and implementation at their level. At the local level, the project developed tools to mainstream MEAs at the local development plans and piloted these tools at the Puerto Princesa Subterranean River National Park (PPSRNP) in Palawan to strengthen local capacity for coordination. The final component of the project is the refinement and finalization of these tools generated from experience and lessons learned for dissemination and replication across the country.

The project has three project outcomes and ten expected outputs to be delivered. These are:

Outcome 1 - National Rio Convention Stakeholders are effectively coordinating the preparation and implementation of related policies, program and project activities

Expected Outputs:

- A National Technical Coordinating Committee and Office
- A Business Plan for the NTCC
- Initial Incentive System
- Potential tools to promote local level coordination

Outcome 2 - Local and National Stakeholders are addressing key global environmental issues in and around the PPSRNP in a coordinated manner.

Expected Outputs:

- Priorities and sequences of activities for MEA implementation are identified in the LGU pilot site
- Application/pilot testing of tools for enhanced MEA implementation at the local level

- Increased understanding on incentive system and the potential tools

Outcome 3 - International, national and local partners have adopted the tools prepared under the project

Expected Outputs:

- Finalized tools for promoting local level coordination
- Institutionalized Incentive System
- Tools, incentive systems, and all Project outputs disseminated to local, national and international partners

The above outputs were expected to be delivered within the three-year project implementation period (i.e. June 2009 to June 2012) with a total fund support of USD990,000.00. This consists of USD475,000.00 grant support from the GEF, and USD515,000.00 in-kind contribution from the Philippine government. However, since the project's actual ground implementation commenced only last April 2010, a no-cost extension until December 2013 was requested by the Implementing Partner to the UNDP last January 31, 2012. This was approved by the UNDP and the GEF last February 2012.

Similar to the other project monitoring and evaluation of UNDP-GEF funded projects, the final evaluation for the STREEM project will be conducted in accordance with the established UNDP and GEF guidelines and procedures. This shall be undertaken by the Project Coordinating Team and the UNDP Country Office with the support of an independent consultant. The M&E process will utilize the existing Logical Framework matrix of the project which provides the performance and impact indicators for the project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. This LogFrame along with the project's objectives will serve as the main basis for the proposed final evaluation of the project.

Purpose

The main objective of the terminal evaluation of the STREEM Project is to assess and rate the project results, the sustainability of project outcomes, the catalytic effect of the project, and the quality of the project's monitoring and evaluation systems. The evaluation will also identify "lessons learned and best practices" from the STREEM Project and offer recommendations that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP/GEF Projects.

Scope of the Terminal Evaluation

1) Assessment of Project Results

This includes the assessment of the project's achievement in terms of its objective, outputs and outcomes through corresponding ratings for each target. The assessment of project results aims to determine the extent to which the project objective was achieved, or is expected to be achieved, and assess if the project has led to any other short term or long term and positive or negative consequences. Furthermore it seeks to determine the extent of the achievement and the shortcomings of project in reaching its objective as stated in the Project Document.

Any changes with respect to the project design and whether those changes were approved will be also identified in this activity. In the absence of the baseline (initial conditions) data, an approximation of the baseline condition would be conducted to ensure that achievements and results are properly established.

Part of assessing the project results is the assessment of project outcomes. Outcomes are the likely achieved in short-term or in medium-term depending on the extent of the intervention of the project outputs. Examples of outcomes could include but are not limited to: stronger institutional capacities, higher public awareness (when leading to changes of behavior), transformed policy framework, and others. An assessment of the impact of these outcomes is encouraged when appropriate. This will be assessed using the appropriate indicators and relevant tracking tools.

To determine the level of achievement of the project's objective and outcomes, the following criteria will be assessed in the final evaluation:

- ✚ **Relevance:** Were the project's outcomes consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies and country priorities?
- ✚ **Effectiveness:** Are the actual project outcomes commensurate with the original or modified project objective?
- ✚ **Efficiency:** Was the project cost effective? Was the project the least cost option? Was the project implementation delayed and if it was, then did that affect cost effectiveness? Wherever possible, the evaluator should also compare the cost-time vs. outcomes relationship of the project with that of other similar projects.

The evaluation of the above criteria will be conducted in an objective manner supported by sufficient and convincing empirical evidence. This could be done through the project monitoring records that would indicate quantifiable information. The above criteria will also be rated as follows:

- **Highly Satisfactory (HS):** The project had no shortcomings in the achievement of its objective, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency;
- **Satisfactory (S):** The project had minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objective, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency;
- **Moderately Satisfactory (MS):** The project had moderate shortcomings in the achievement of its objective, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency;
- **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU):** The project had significant shortcomings in the achievement of its objective, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency;
- **Unsatisfactory (U)** The project had major shortcomings in the achievement of its objective, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency;
- **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU):** The project had severe shortcomings in the achievement of its objective, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

In rating the project's outcomes, the relevance and the effectiveness of the project will be considered as critical criteria. Thus, if ratings are provided separately on relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency, the overall rating for the outcome of the project should not be higher than the lowest rating on relevance and effectiveness. To achieve an overall satisfactory rating for the outcomes, the project must therefore demonstrate an at least satisfactory rating on both relevance and effectiveness.

The project will also be assessed according to its results or impacts that include actual or anticipated impacts (could be negative or positive) or emerging long-term effects. However, since impacts are measured in long terms, it is understandable that the project's impacts might not be fully assessed. The evaluators of the project

should therefore indicate the steps to be taken to assess long-term project impacts, especially impacts on local population, global environment (e.g., reduced greenhouse gas emissions), replication effects and other national and local impacts. Wherever possible evaluators should indicate how the findings on impacts will be reported to the GEF in future. Other areas for assessing the project's results are as follows:

- **Capacity Development-** The effects of the STREEM Project activities on strengthening the capacities of key relevant government bodies, private sectors, peoples'/community organizations or civil society organizations will be assessed.
- **Leverage** - An assessment of STREEM Project's effectiveness in leveraging funds that would influence larger projects or broader policies to support its goal will have to be conducted.
- **Awareness Raising**
 - STREEM Project's contribution to raise awareness of environmental issues and of the GEF will be examined;
 - STREEM Project's contribution to promote policy or advocacy activities and collaboration among communities will be assessed.

2) Assessment of Sustainability of Project Outcomes

Sustainability is defined as the likelihood of continued benefits after the project ends. The final evaluation will therefore assess the likelihood of sustainability of outcomes at project termination with corresponding rating. This includes an analysis on the risks that are likely to affect the persistence of project outcomes. The sustainability assessment would also explain how other important contextual factors that are not outcomes of the project will affect sustainability. The following are the four dimensions or aspects of sustainability that will be assessed:

- ❖ **Financial resources:** 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 the project's outcomes)?
- ❖ **Socio-political:** Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/ benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public/stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project?
- ❖ **Institutional framework and governance:** Do the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits? While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems for accountability and transparency, and the required technical know-how are in place.
- ❖ **Environmental:** Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes? The final evaluation should assess whether certain activities will pose a threat to the sustainability of the project outcomes.

On each of the dimensions of sustainability of the project, outcomes will be rated as follows:

- ✚ **Likely (L):** There are no or negligible risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.
- ✚ **Moderately Likely (ML):** There are moderate risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.
- ✚ **Moderately Unlikely (MU):** There are significant risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.
- ✚ **Unlikely (U):** There are severe risks that affect this dimension of sustainability. All the risk dimensions of sustainability are critical. Therefore, the overall rating for sustainability will not be higher than the rating of the dimension with lowest ratings. For example, if a project has an 'Unlikely' rating in either of the dimensions then its overall rating cannot be higher than 'Unlikely'.

3) **Assessment of the Catalytic Role of the project**

The final evaluation will also describe any catalytic or replication effect of the project. If no effects are identified, the evaluation will describe the catalytic or replication actions that the project carried out. No ratings will be requested for the catalytic role.

4) **Assessment of Monitoring and Evaluation System**

The final evaluation will assess whether the project met the minimum requirements for project design of M&E and the implementation of the Project M&E plan. This includes adequately funded M&E plan, and its execution or implementation. The final evaluation will look into how the Project Managers have utilized the results of the M&E to adjust or improve the project during its implementation. The assessment will also seek to determine whether the projects have considered the long-term monitoring provisions to measure mid-term and long-term results (such as global environmental effect, replication effects, and other local effects) after project completion. The final evaluation report will include separate assessments of the achievements and shortcomings of the project's M&E plan and its implementation.

Among the areas that will be looked at during the M&E assessment are as follows:

- **M&E design.** Projects should have a sound M&E plan to monitor results and track progress towards achieving project objectives. An M&E plan should include a baseline (including data, methodology, etc.), SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Timely) indicators and data analysis systems, and evaluation studies at specific times to assess results and adequate funding for M&E activities. The time frame for various M&E activities and standards for outputs should have been specified.
- **M&E plan implementation.** The final evaluation should verify that: an M&E system was in place and facilitated timely tracking of progress towards the project objective and outcomes by collecting information on chosen indicators continually through the project implementation period; annual project reports were complete, accurate and with well justified ratings; the information provided by the M&E system was used during the project to improve project performance and to adapt to changing needs; and, projects had an M&E system in place with proper training for parties responsible for M&E activities to ensure data will continue to be collected and used after project closure.

- **Budgeting and Funding for M&E Activities.** In addition to incorporating information on funding for M&E while assessing M&E design, a separate mention will be made of: whether M&E was sufficiently budgeted at the project planning stage; and, whether M&E was adequately and timely funded during implementation.

Project monitoring and evaluation systems will be rated as follows on quality of M&E design and quality of M&E implementation:

- 🚩 **Highly Satisfactory (HS):** There were no shortcomings in the project M&E system.
- 🚩 **Satisfactory(S):** There were minor shortcomings in the project M&E system.
- 🚩 **Moderately Satisfactory (MS):** There were moderate shortcomings in the project M&E system.
- 🚩 **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU):** There were significant shortcomings in the project M&E system.
- 🚩 **Unsatisfactory (U):** There were major shortcomings in the project M&E system.
- 🚩 **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU):** The Project had no M&E system.

The overall rating of M&E during project implementation will be solely based on the quality of M&E plan implementation. The ratings on quality at entry of M&E design and sufficiency of funding both during planning and implementation stages will be used as explanatory variables.

Monitoring of Long Term Changes

M&E of long term changes is often incorporated in GEF supported projects as a separate component and it may include determination of environmental baselines, specification of indicators, provisioning of equipment and capacity building for data gathering, analysis and use. This section of the final evaluation will describe the actions and accomplishments of the project in the establishment of a long term monitoring system. The review will address the following questions:

- Did this project contribute to the establishment of a long term monitoring system? If it did not, should the project have included such a component?
- What were the accomplishments and short comings in establishment of this system?
- Is the system sustainable, i.e. is it embedded in a proper institutional structure and has financing?
- Is the information generated by this M&E system being used as originally intended?

5) Assessment of Processes that Affected Attainment of Project Results

There are other factors or processes that might have affected the attainment of the project results. These factors will be considered in the performance and results section of the report although evaluators are not expected to provide ratings. This include as follows:

- ❖ **Preparation and readiness.** Were the project's objectives and components clear, practicable and feasible within its timeframe? Were the capacities of executing institution and counterparts properly considered when the project was

- designed? Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated in the project design? Were the partnership arrangements properly identified and the roles and responsibilities negotiated prior to project approval? Were counterpart resources (funding, staff, and facilities), enabling legislation, and adequate project management arrangements in place at project entry?
- ❖ **Country ownership/drivenness.** Was the project concept in line with the sectoral and development priorities and plans of the country? Are project outcomes contributing to national development priorities and plans? Were the relevant country representatives, from government and civil society, involved in the project? Did the recipient government maintain its financial commitment to the project? Has the government approved policies or regulatory frameworks that are in line with the project's objectives?
 - ❖ **Stakeholder involvement.** Did the project involve the relevant stakeholders through information-sharing, consultation and by seeking their participation in the project's design, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation? For example, did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns? Did the project consult and make use of the skills, experience and knowledge of the appropriate government entities, NGOs, community groups, private sector, local governments and academic institutions in the design, implementation and evaluation of project activities?
Were perspectives of those that would be affected by decisions, those that could affect the outcomes and those that could contribute information or other resources to the process taken into account while taking decisions? Were the relevant vulnerable groups and the powerful, the supporters and the opponents, of the processes properly involved?
 - ❖ **Financial planning.** Did the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allowed management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allowed for timely flow of funds. Was there due diligence in the management of funds and financial audits? Did promised co-financing materialize?
 - ❖ **Implementing/Executing Agency's supervision and backstopping.** Did Implementing/ Executing Agency staff identify problems in a timely fashion and accurately estimate their seriousness? Did Implementing/Executing Agency staff provide quality support and advice to the project, approve modifications in time and restructure the project when needed? Did the Implementing/Executing Agencies provide the right staffing levels, continuity, skill mix, and frequency of field visits for the GEF projects?
 - ❖ **Co-financing and Project Outcomes and Sustainability.** If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for the variance? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability, and if it did affect outcomes and sustainability then in what ways and through what causal linkages?
 - ❖ **Delays and Project Outcomes and Sustainability.** If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability, and if it did affect outcomes and sustainability then in what ways and through what causal linkages?

6) Lessons and Recommendations

Lessons learned and recommendations on all aspects of the project that are considered relevant will be reported in the Final Evaluation Report. Factors that contributed or hindered the following aspects of the project will also be analyzed: 1)

attainment of project objectives, 2) sustainability of project benefits, 3) innovation, 4) catalytic effect and replication, and 5) project monitoring and evaluation. Instead of providing recommendations to improve the project, this section will provide a well formulated lesson applicable to existing and relevant GEF projects or to GEF's overall portfolio.

7) Overall assessment or General evaluation

The Final Evaluation report will include information on when the evaluation took place, places visited, people involved, key questions utilized, and methodology. The report will likewise include the evaluation team's TOR or the individual consultant's TOR including all responses from the project management team and/or the country focal point regarding the evaluation findings. Further, the Final Evaluation Report shall not be undertaken with the motive of appraisal, preparation, or justification, for a follow-up phase. Wherever possible, the final evaluation report should include examples of good practices for other projects in a focal area, country or region.

METHODOLOGY

The evaluation will consist of a desk review of relevant project documents and reports related to the proposed evaluation including, but not limited to, project periodic reports, technical reports/documents, etc. The Evaluation Expert is expected to conduct focused group discussions, meetings, and interviews with the relevant agencies, stakeholders and other partners on topics and issues that relate to the implementation and impact of the project. He/she must also familiarize himself/herself with the objectives, historical developments, institutional and management mechanisms, project activities, and documented "lessons learned" of the project. Document review, group and individual interviews and site visits are some of the approaches that the Evaluation Expert may do. He/she may also conduct the following:

- Review of documents related to the project such as project document, quarterly and annual progress reports, other activity/component specific deliverables, reports and evaluation, if there are any, etc.
- Structured interview with knowledgeable parties, i.e., Project Director, Project Personnel, Sub-Contracting Parties/Entities, National Consultants, UNDP Country Office Counterparts, members of the Project Steering Committee/s/ Project Board, Community-Based/Peoples Organization/s, Project Beneficiaries, etc.
- A number of visits to project sites, if feasible. The site visits should be discussed with the STREEM Project Coordinating Team and the UNDP.

Timing and Submission of the Report

The STREEM Project evaluation will begin on **September 2013** and should be completed by the **November 2013**. A first draft evaluation report will be prepared by the Evaluation Expert within the evaluation period. This will initially be shared with the Implementing Partners and the other stakeholders for further deliberations and feedbacks. A final report will be prepared and delivered within one month after the evaluation exercise highlighting important observations, analysis of information and key conclusions including recommendations. Five sets of reports (i.e. electronic and hard copies) will be prepared and submitted to the UNDP Country Office and the DENR-FASPO. Below is the schedule and timing for the submission of the report:

| Deliverables | Description | Proposed Date of Submission | % Payment |
|---------------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------|
| Inception Report | Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method and submits to UNDP Country Office | September 15, 2013 | 10% |
| First Draft | Presentation of the initial findings to the Project Management Office and the UNDP Country Office at the end of the evaluation mission | October 15, 2013 | 20% |
| Draft Final Report | Submission of draft Full report following the outline in Annex A. | November 15, 2013 | 40% |
| Final Report | Submission of revised report to UNDP Country Office for uploading to UNDP ERC | November 30, 2013 | 30% |

All the costs incurred for the conduct of the evaluation shall be charged against project funds.

Roles and Responsibilities

The evaluation team will be composed of an independent national consultant. The Implementing Partner shall provide in advance copies of the necessary documents needed by the National Consultant during the evaluation period. Likewise, the DENR-FASPO shall provide the list of contact persons representing the various stakeholders of the project, which will be the basis for the tentative itinerary/schedule of activities, which the expert will prepare. The DENR-FASPO will finalize the schedule of activities in consultation with the expert and UNDP CO staff. The DENR-FASPO and UNDP-Country Office, Manila will coordinate the logistical arrangements for the evaluation.

Evaluator Ethics

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

TOR of the National Consultant

He/she must have extensive knowledge in the environmental planning and institutional frameworks in the Philippines. He/she must have experience in developing performance indicators, project appraisal and evaluation of development projects. He/she will be part of the Evaluation Team that would assess the project's results, sustainability of project outcomes, project's M&E system, processes in achieving project's results, and identify lessons learned and recommendations. Specifically, he/she will provide analysis of the project's overall performance vis-à-vis its replicability and sustainability in the Philippine context.

Qualification Requirements

- 1) The Evaluator must be independent of both the policy-making process and the delivery and management of assistance to the STREEM Project. He/she should not have been engaged in the activities to be evaluated, or responsible in decision-making roles for the design, implementation or supervision of the project. In cases where a member of an evaluation team has been involved with some aspects of the project, this member should refrain from evaluating those aspects. In cases where project evaluation team members are not independent, are biased and are not free of conflict of interest, UNDP will put in place a final evaluation quality control review by its independent evaluation office.
- 2) The Evaluator must be impartial and must present a comprehensive and balanced appraisal of the strengths and weaknesses of the project or activity being evaluated.
- 3) The Evaluator must be professional with strong evaluation experience, with requisite expertise in the subject matter of the project, and with experience in economic and social development issues.
- 4) The Evaluator must be knowledgeable about the relevant policies of the GEF.
- 5) The Evaluator must ensure that in conducting the final evaluation, the views of all relevant stakeholders are accounted. The TORs for this GEF project's final evaluation and its schedule should be made known to key stakeholders.
- 6) The Evaluator must familiarize himself with the project document and must use the information generated by the project including, but not restricted to, baseline and information generated by its M&E system. The Evaluator must also seek the necessary contextual information to assess the significance and relevance of results.

Minimum qualifications of the Terminal Evaluator/Consultant are as follows:

At least 5-10 years of proven experience with:

- Legal and policy analysis in natural resource management
- The logical framework approach and other strategic planning approaches;
- M&E methods and approaches (including quantitative, qualitative and participatory);
- Planning, design and implementation of M&E systems;
- Training in M&E development and implementation and/or facilitating learning-oriented analysis sessions of M&E data with multiple stakeholders;
- Data and information analysis
- Report writing.

She/He must also have:

- A solid understanding of environmental management , with a focus on participatory processes, joint management, and gender issues;
- Familiarity with and a supportive attitude towards processes of strengthening local organizations and building local capacities for self-management;
- Willingness to undertake regular field visits and interact with different stakeholders, especially primary stakeholders;
- Computer skills;
- Leadership qualities, personnel and team management (including mediation and conflict resolution);
- Language skills as required

Desirable:

- Knowledge of the biodiversity, climate change and land degradation - focal areas in which the project operates;
- Understanding of UNDP and GEF procedures;
- Experience in data processing and with computers.
- Experience in the evaluation of technical assistance projects, preferably with UNDP or other United Nations development agencies and major donors. If possible, experience in the evaluation of GEF-funded capacity building projects.

Application Process

Applicants/individual consultants interested to undertake the evaluation are requested to send their CV and covering letter in English to registryph@undp.org.

Shortlisted candidates will be requested to submit a price offer indicating the total cost the assignment (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs).

Evaluation Report Outline

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 Manual³²)

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 rated³³)

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

³¹ The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

³² UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

³³ 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.

3.2 Project Implementation

- Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
- Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)
- Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management
- Project Finance:
- Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (*)
- UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (*) coordination, and operational issues

3.3 Project Results

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

4. Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons

- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
- Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
- Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
- Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success

5. Annexes

- ToR
- Itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- Summary of field visits
- List of documents reviewed
- Evaluation Question Matrix
- Questionnaire used and summary of results
- Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

Annex B

EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT 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 limitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form³⁴

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

Signature: _____

³⁴ www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct