



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

TERMS OF REFERENCE

TERMINAL EVALUATION OF THE “ADAPTATION TO CLIMATE CHANGE IMPACTS IN MOUNTAIN FOREST ECOSYSTEMS OF ARMENIA” UNDP-SUPPORTED GEF-FINANCED PROJECT (PIMS 3814)

Contents

I.	INTRODUCTION	2
II.	OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE.....	2
III.	EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD	3
IV.	EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS	4
V.	PROJECT FINANCE / COFINANCE	5
VI.	MAINSTREAMING	5
VII.	IMPACT	5
VIII.	CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS	5
IX.	IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS.....	5
X.	EVALUATION TIMEFRAME.....	6
XI.	EVALUATION DELIVERABLES	6
XII.	EVALUATOR	6
XIII.	EVALUATOR ETHICS.....	6
XIV.	PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS	7
XV.	APPLICATION PROCESS.....	7
	TOR ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK	8
	TOR ANNEX B: LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE EVALUATOR.....	12
	TOR ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS	13
	TOR ANNEX D: RATINGS	14
	ANNEX E: EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT AGREEMENT FORM.....	15
	TOR ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE	16
	ANNEX G: EVALUATION REPORT CLEARANCE FORM.....	18

I. INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP-supported GEF-financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the “Adaptation to Climate Change Impacts in Mountain Forest Ecosystems of Armenia” Project (PIMS 3814).

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

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE		
Project Title: Adaptation to Climate Change Impacts in Mountain Forest Ecosystems of Armenia		
GEF Project ID:	3417	
UNDP Project ID:	3814	
Country:	Armenia	
Region:	Europe and Central Asia	
Focal Area:	Climate Change	
Operational Program:	SPA	
GEF Implementing Agency:	UNDP	
National Implementing Partner:	Ministry of Nature Protection	
Other Partners involved:	Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Emergency Situations	
Project Funds	at endorsement (Million US\$)	at completion (Million US\$)
GEF financing:	0.9	0.9
UNDP own funds:	0	0
Government of Armenia:	1.9	1.01*
Other:	0	1.45*
Total co-financing:	1.9	2.47*
Total Project Cost:	2.8	3.37*
Project duration		
Prodoc Signature (D/M/Y):	11/12/2008	
Date of first expenditure (D/M/Y):	06/05/2009	
(Operational) Closing Date (D/M/Y):	Proposed:	Actual:
	31/05/2013	31/05/2013

* The co-financing data are presented as of 31.06.2012 and will be further updated.

II. OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The project was designed to increase the adaptive capacity of Armenia’s south-east mountain forest ecosystems to be resilient to climate change. The long-term development **goal** of this medium size project is to assist Armenia in beginning a process by which strategies to moderate, cope with, and take advantage of the consequences of climate change are enhanced, developed, and implemented. The specific **objective** of the project is to enhance adaptive capacities of the vulnerable mountain forest ecosystems to climate change in the Syunik region. The following **outcomes** contribute to the achievement of the project objective:

Outcome 1: The enabling environment for integrating climate change risks into management of forest ecosystems is in place.

Outcome 2: Forest and protected area management in the Syunik region integrates pilot adaptation measures to enhance adaptive capacity of mountain forest ecosystems.

Outcome 3: Capacities for adaptive management, monitoring and evaluation, learning, and replication of project lessons are developed.

(The project document can be retrieved from: http://www.thegef.org/gef/project_detail?projID=3417)

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.

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.

III. EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

An overall approach and method¹ for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluator (evaluation consultant) 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). The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

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

Organisations	Individuals (name, position)
UNDP CO Armenia	Ms. Claire Medina, Deputy Resident Representative, Mr. Armen Martirosyan, Portfolio Analyst, Environmental Governance
Ministry of Nature Protection of Armenia	Mr. Simon Papyan, First Deputy Minister, National Director of UNDP Environmental Projects, Mr. Aram Gabrielyan, UNFCCC National Focal Point, Project National Coordinator, Mr. Surik Hovhannisyan, Director, "Arevik National Park" SNCO (Syunik Province)
Ministry of Agriculture of Armenia	Mr. Martun Matevosyan, Director, "Hayantar" SNCO, Mr. Ruben Petrosyan, Deputy Director, Chief Forester, "Hayantar" SNCO, Mr. Armen Ishkhanyan, Head, Syunik Forest Enterprise, "Hayantar" SNCO (Syunik Province), Mr. Vladik Mirzoyan, Head, Kapan Forest Enterprise, "Hayantar" SNCO (Syunik Province),
Ministry of Emergency Situations of Armenia	Mr. Vrezh Gabrielyan, Deputy Director, Rescue Service, Mr. Karen Hovhannisyan, Deputy Head, Department of Population and Territories Protection, Rescue Service
WWF Armenia	Mr. Karen Manvelyan, Director
OSCE Office in Yerevan	Mr. William Hanlon, Deputy Head of Office

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

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – incl. Annual APR/PIR and other Reports, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other material 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 TOR [Annex B](#) of this Terms of Reference.

IV. EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework ([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 TOR [Annex D](#).

Rating Project Performance		
Criteria	Comments	
Monitoring and Evaluation: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S) Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)		
Overall quality of M&E	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
M&E design at project start up	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
M&E Plan Implementation	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
IA & EA Execution: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S) Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)		
Overall Quality of Project Implementation/Execution	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Implementing Agency Execution	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Executing Agency Execution	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Outcomes: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S) Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)		
Overall Quality of Project Outcomes	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Relevance: relevant (R) or not relevant (NR)	(rate 2 pt. scale)	
Effectiveness	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Efficiency	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Sustainability: Likely (L); Moderately Likely (ML); Moderately Unlikely (MU); Unlikely (U).		
Overall likelihood of risks to Sustainability:	(rate 4 pt. scale)	
Financial resources	(rate 4 pt. scale)	
Socio-economic	(rate 4 pt. scale)	
Institutional framework and governance	(rate 4 pt. scale)	
Environmental	(rate 4 pt. scale)	
Impact: Significant (S), Minimal (M), Negligible (N)		
Environmental Status Improvement	(rate 3 pt. scale)	

Environmental Stress Reduction	(rate 3 pt. scale)	
Progress towards stress/status change	(rate 3 pt. scale)	
Overall Project Results	(rate 6 pt. scale)	

V. PROJECT FINANCE / COFINANCE

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 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	Planned	Actual
Grants								
Loans/Concessions								
• In-kind support								
• Other								
Totals								

VI. 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. In addition, the evaluation will be included in the country office evaluation plan.

VII. IMPACT

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

VIII. CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

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

IX. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Armenia. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluator 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. The project will also bear the costs of transportation and interpretation for the evaluator during the in-country mission to Armenia.

X. EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the evaluation will be 15 days according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date *
Preparation	2 days	18 March 2012
Evaluation Mission	6 days	31 March 2012
Draft Evaluation Report	5 days	15 April 2012
Final Report	2 days	29 April 2012

* The completion dates are indicative and to be specified after consultation with the selected International Consultant

XI. EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluator is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
Inception Note	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method	No later than 1 week 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 2 weeks of the evaluation mission	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs
Final Report*	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Sent to CO 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.

XII. EVALUATOR

The TE will be conducted by an international consultant. The evaluator shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The selected evaluator should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The evaluator must present the following qualifications:

- Advanced university degree in Forest Management, Environmental and/or Natural Resource Management or other related areas;
- Minimum 7 years of relevant professional experience in providing management or consultancy services to the forest and/or environmental management projects;
- Knowledge of UNDP and GEF M&E guidelines and procedures;
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies, particularly with regard to forest and/or environmental management projects.

XIII. EVALUATOR ETHICS

Evaluator will be held to the highest ethical standards and is 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'.

XIV. PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

%	Milestone
100%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report

XV. APPLICATION PROCESS

The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in English with indication of the e-mail and phone contact. Shortlisted and interviewed candidates will be requested to submit a price offer of the assignment indicating: (a) the total cost (including consultancy and travel) and (b) the consultancy fee per day.

UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

TOR ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Project goal	The long-term development goal of this medium size project is to assist Armenia in beginning a process by which strategies to moderate, cope with, and take advantage of the consequences of climate change are enhanced, developed, and implemented in the forestry sector.
--------------	---

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators				
	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Source of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
<p>Project objective:</p> <p>To enhance adaptive capacities of the vulnerable mountain forest ecosystems to climate change in the Syunik region.</p>	Enhanced resilience of mountain forest ecosystems in the Syunik region due to adaptation measures (such as better management of forest fires, pest holes)	There are no efforts currently underway to address climate change impacts on mountain forest ecosystem degradation in the Syunik region.	At least two types of resilience-enhancing measures employed by the project upon its completion, covering approximately 87% of forest covered area in Syunik (65,000 ha under the forest enterprises and 10,000 ha under SPANs)	Ecological Risk Assessment report and/ or extracts from bio-monitoring; Pilot project reports; Project annual reports	In the pilot sites, baseline activities aimed at promoting sustainable forest management in general and addressing anthropogenic pressure on forest resources including threats to biodiversity in particular are successful in meeting their baseline objectives. (The risk of this assumption not holding is low. Current developments in Armenia support better control, monitoring and management of forests. To further mitigate this risk, the project will maintain constant and close dialogue with forest and other relevant authorities to ensure that baseline sustainable forest management is seen as an essential foundation on which additional institutional and policy enhancements to specifically respond to climate change are built.)
<p>Outcome 1:</p> <p>The enabling environment for integrating climate change risks into forest sector management is in place.</p>	Forest sector management planning documents for Syunik region include adaptation measures tested through the project and provide for resources to undertake these measures so as to enhance the resilience of biodiversity to CC related risks.	Planning documents for Syunik are in the process of being developed and do not include CC adaptation measures.	By project end, at least two management plans include adaptation measures recommended and tested by the project (focusing on fire management and pest control)	Final project report; Independent evaluation	<p>Recommendations for strengthening of forest sector documents and institutional roles and responsibilities are supported and approved by the government. (The risk of this assumption not holding is low because nationally-driven prioritization exercises have identified the importance of mainstreaming climate risks in the forest sector. To further mitigate this risk, the project will maintain constant and close dialogue with forest and other relevant authorities to ensure ownership of recommended institutional and policy enhancements to respond to climate change.)</p>
	Institutions that need to be involved in early warning and response to CC related impacts on forests (such as the local forestry, emergency management agency, fire department) have clarity on their mandate and role in responding to CC risks	There is no clarity on roles and responsibilities. There is no practice of scenario planning that systematically takes into account climate risks as part of wildfire management and pest control	By project end, roles and responsibilities are developed and approved on the basis of the comparative advantage of each agency. By project end scenario planning exercise becomes part of the forest management decision and routine.	Final project report; Independent evaluation	
<p>Outcome 2:</p> <p>Forest and protected area management in the Syunik</p>	Ability of forest areas under the jurisdiction of the Syunik (Goris), Kapan and Meghri forest enterprises to				Local forest enterprises and communities in the Syunik region understand climate change implications and are supportive of proposed

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators				
	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Source of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
region integrates pilot adaptation measures to enhance adaptive capacity of mountain forest ecosystems.	provide effective protection to the region's globally significant biodiversity against CC related risks is increased. Indicators for monitoring this are based on the GEF's METT approach of using proxy indicators, as follows:				adaptation measures in addition to their participation in ecosystem management activities. (The risk of this assumption not holding is low. In order to mitigate this risk the project will put specific emphasis on building awareness of the regional forest management bodies and communities (under Outcome 2; Outputs 2.1 to 2.3) and putting in place guidance and supervision of Hayantar SNCO (authorized agency of forest management in the country) as a legitimate mechanism for their active participation in the identification and implementation of adaptation measures. The project will also involve local specialized NGOs in project activities. Further, by identifying, testing, selecting and implementing proper technologies and measures that are appropriate for the pilot areas, the project will secure buy-in from local stakeholders.
	1) Landscape coverage	Forest enterprises do not take into account climate risks to biodiversity harbored in forest areas	75,000 ha of forest covered lands (65,000 ha under the forest enterprises and 10,000 ha under SPANs) will benefit from restoration measures designed specifically to address degradation pressures induced by climate change; the project will also indirectly influence 20,000 ha of non-forest covered lands under the forest enterprises	Final project report; Independent evaluation	
	2) Management practices applied 2a) Improved management of pest holes that are being exacerbated by climate change and variability, measured by the following indicators				
	Increase in area covered by an improved monitoring system for pest invasions	0 hectares	4,000 ha (2,000 ha will directly be brought under improved management; an additional surrounding area of 2,000 ha will also benefit)	Final project report; Independent evaluation	
	Increase in use of environmentally sound aerial pest control using biological treatment	0 hectares are subject to biological pest control	4,000 ha (2,000 ha will directly be brought under improved management; an additional surrounding area of 2,000 ha will also benefit)	Final project report; Independent evaluation	
	Increase in capacity of forest enterprises and SPAN staff to monitor and respond to pests	Currently no staff are trained in improved monitoring and application of biological control techniques	16 staff from SPANs and forest enterprises are trained	Final project report; Independent evaluation	

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators				
	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Source of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
	2b) Improved management of forest fires that are being exacerbated by climate change and variability, measured by the following indicators:	0 hectares	75,000 ha (65,000 ha of forest covered lands under the forest enterprises and 10,000 ha under SPANs)	Final project report; Independent evaluation	
	Reduction in activities that tend to lead to forest fires (agricultural waste burning and open fires in forest recreational areas in the dry season)	Agricultural waste burning is reported approximately 55 times a year Open fires in recreational areas during dry season are reported approximately 70 times a year	Reduction in these activities by 50% by project end	Final project report; Independent evaluation	
	Increase in awareness of local communities, NGOs, tourist organizations of the importance of fire prevention leading to behavioural change	No such awareness efforts have been undertaken. Preventive measures haven't been practiced by identified stakeholders	By project end, targeted training workshops are held and tailored material is distributed to all identified partner groups	Final project report; Independent evaluation	
	Increase capacity of staff to implement an early warning and response system	0 staff trained	24 people trained covering foresters from forest enterprises, republican, regional and local administrations, emergency and fire departments, protected area management units and community representatives	Final project report; Independent evaluation	
	2c) Reduction in forest fragmentation to enhance ecosystem resilience to climate change and variability, including: - reforested area - recovered (rejoined) area	0 hectares	15 ha (will directly be brought under improved management and will be rejoined to forested tracts)	Final project report; Independent evaluation	
Outcome 3: Capacities for adaptive management, monitoring and evaluation, learning, and replication of project lessons are developed.	Number of forest enterprises outside the Syunik region that have initiated the process of integrating adaptation to CC in their forest management plans	Zero	6 forest enterprises	Final project report; Independent evaluation	Forest enterprises and others responsible for implementing conservation plans in other regions of Armenia are open to cooperation and trustful relations are established with neighboring communities for integrating adaptation measures. (The risk of this assumption not holding is

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators				
	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Source of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
					<p>considered medium. It will be mitigated through an emphasis on participatory and cooperative schemes for implementation of proposed measures, and inviting representatives from other regions to participate in training sessions and site visits. Local communities will be fully aware and will be involved in adaptation aimed forest works. The transparency of project activities will be ensured through periodic meetings with partners, specialized scientific institutions, NGO, as well as through the project web-site.)</p>

TOR ANNEX B: LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE EVALUATOR

- Project Document (2008)
- Project Inception Report (2009)
- APR/PIRs (2010, 2011, 2012)
- Standard Annual Progress Reports (2009, 2010, 2011, 2012)
- Project Mid-term Evaluation Report (2011)
- Annual/Multi-year Work Plans (project budget and its revisions 2009-2013)
- Project Annual Work Programmes (2009-2013)
- Minutes of the Project Board meetings (2009, 2010, 2011, 2012)
- Project Terminal Report (draft APR/PIR 2013)
- Letters of Intent and Letters of Agreement signed with regard to the project
- Factsheets on the reforestation pilot projects
- Data on co-financing, including additionally leveraged
- List of project publications (copies of the publications to be provided)
- List of contracted experts
- List of sub-contractor

TOR ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

Evaluative Criteria	Questions	Indicators	Sources
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?			
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?			
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			

TOR ANNEX D: RATINGS

Ratings Scales		
Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution	Sustainability ratings:	Relevance ratings
<p>6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): The project had no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency</p> <p>5: Satisfactory (S): There were only minor shortcomings</p> <p>4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS):there were moderate shortcomings</p> <p>3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): the project had significant shortcomings</p> <p>2. Unsatisfactory (U): there were major shortcomings in the achievement of project objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency</p> <p>1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): The project had severe shortcomings</p>	<p>4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability</p> <p>3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks</p> <p>2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks</p> <p>1. Unlikely (U): severe risks</p>	<p>2. Relevant (R)</p> <p>1. Not relevant (NR)</p> <p>Impact Ratings:</p> <p>3. Significant (S)</p> <p>2. Minimal (M)</p> <p>1. Negligible (N)</p>
<p>Additional ratings where relevant:</p> <p>Not Applicable (N/A)</p> <p>Unable to Assess (U/A)</p>		

ANNEX E: 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 imitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form²

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: _____

² www.undp.org/unegcodeofconduct

TOR ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE ³

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 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/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

³ The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

⁴ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008.

⁵ 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.

- 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

- 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 G: EVALUATION REPORT CLEARANCE FORM

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP County Office

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

UNDP GEF RTA

Name:

Signature: _____ Date: _____