***Terms of Reference for***

**Terminal Evaluation of**

**SUSTAINABLE LAND MANAGEMENT (SLM) IN COOK ISLANDS**

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with United Nation Development Programme (UNDP) and Global Environment Facility (GEF) Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the Sustainable Land Management Project in Cook Islands

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

Project Summary Table

|  |
| --- |
| AGENCY’S PROJECT ID: 00043651  GEFSEC PROJECT ID: 3403  COUNTRY: COOK ISLANDS  PROJECT TITLE: Capacity Building for  Sustainable Land Management in **COOK ISLANDS**  GEF AGENCY: UNDP  OTHER EXECUTING AGENCY(IES):  DURATION: Three years  GEF FOCAL AREA: Land Degradation  ESTIMATED STARTING DATE: August 31st 2006 |
|  |

Objective and Scope

The long-term sustainable development of the Cook Islands demands that land degradation trends and issues be addressed as a matter of priority.

The long-term goal of the project is to contribute to maintaining and improving ecosystem stability, integrity, functions and services while enhancing sustainable livelihoods by building the capacity to implement sustainable land management into all levels of decision making. It also aims to mainstream SLM in relevant policy and regulatory frameworks, and it will assist in developing a National Action Plan and Medium Term Investment Plan. The objective of the project is to strengthen human, institutional, and systemic capacity for Sustainable Land Management in the Cook Islands.

The project has 4 outcomes:

1. Knowledge and awareness of land degradation and the importance of sustainable land management increased;

ii) Technical, individual and institutional capacities for SLM enhanced;

iii) Systemic capacity building and mainstreaming of SLM principles and objectives achieved and,

iv) Technical support at the local, Outer Island and national levels to assist with mainstreaming and integrated decision-making enhanced.

The lead executing agency will be the National Environment Service, in conjunction with the Ministry of Infrastructure and Planning. The Ministry of Agriculture will be a collaborating Agency. A Project Management Unit will be established to execute the project. The total budget of the project is USD 1,046,249 of which USD 500,000 would be the GEF increment.

**Annex 1** contains the two logical frameworks for these 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. Specific objectives include:

* Assess extent of achievements of projects outputs and results including extent of implementation of Mid-Term Evaluation recommendations
* Examine current level of impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to institutional strengthening, biodiversity conservation and conservation friendly livelihood promotion, and the achievement of global and national environmental goals
* Identify and document lessons learned and make recommendations that will maximize the impact of the project and also to provide evidences to improve design and implementation of similar projects in near future
* Identify an exit strategy for the project by linking its products to other ongoing initiatives

Evaluation approach and method

An overall approach and method[[1]](#footnote-2) for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects have developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact,** as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects.

A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR (***Annex 2***) 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 Cook Islands visiting the relevant project sites. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: (UNDP, National Environment Services, etc).

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment.

Evaluation Criteria & Ratings

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see  [***Annex***](#_TOR_Annex_A:) ***1***), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact.** Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in ***Annex 3***.

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

Project finance / CO FINANCE

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

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

Mainstreaming

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

Impact

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.[[2]](#footnote-3)

Conclusions, recommendations & lessons

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

Implementation arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in *Samoa.* 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 Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

Evaluation timeframe

The total duration of the evaluation will be *25* working days according to the following plan: **Annex 4** presents schedule of detailed time frame of evaluation.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Timing | Completion Date |
| **Preparation** | *4* days |  |
| **Evaluation Mission** | *10* days (6 field days) |  |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | *8* days |  |
| **Final Report** | *3* days |  |

Evaluation deliverables

The evaluation is expected to deliver the following:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Deliverable | Content | Timing | Responsibilities |
| **Inception Report** | Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method | 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 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. ***Annex 5*** presents tentative outline of evaluation report.

Team Composition

The evaluation team will be composed of 1 international evaluator and one national evaluator. The international evaluator will lead the team and will be responsible for ensuring overall quality and finalizing the report. The evaluators shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The team is required to combine international calibre evaluation expertise, the latest thinking in landscape conservation and sustainable-use, and knowledge of the regional context. The consultant will be hired by UNDP directly, following UNDP rules and procedures.

International Consultant/Team leader should have following qualification:

* At-least Master degree in natural resource management or relevant subjects
* Minimum 10 years of relevant professional experience with strong technical background and proven competency in landscape level biodiversity conservation, protected areas management, or related areas of natural resource management, including demonstrable expertise in project formulation, implementation and evaluation
* Knowledge of UNDP and GEF
* Demonstrated ability to work with developing country government agencies and NGOs. Previous work experience in the Pacific, working experience in Cook Islands would be an asset
* Previous experience with results‐based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
* Familiarity with GEF programming and procedures, as well as its evaluation policies and guidelines, will be a useful asset
* Previous work experience with United Nations or other multilateral/bilateral development assistance agencies is a useful asset.
* Experience leading multi-disciplinary, multi-national teams in high stress. Ability to meet short deadlines

The national evaluator, with expertise on Landscape Conservation and Livelihoods and Gender and Social Inclusion will be hired to support the international expert/Team leader. The Team members must present the following qualifications:

* At-least Master degree in natural resource management, social sciences or relevant subjects
* Minimum 10 years of relevant professional experience in relevant field
* Previous experience with results‐based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
* Familiarity with GEF programming and procedures, as well as its evaluation policies and guidelines, will be a useful asset
* Technical knowledge and competences in the targeted focal area(s)
* Demonstrated analytical skills, ability to assess complex situations, to succinctly and clearly distill critical issues, and to draw practical conclusions

The evaluation team shall conduct a debriefing at the end of evaluation mission. The international consultant shall lead the presentation on a draft review of the findings and recommendations with the national level stakeholders, planned at the end of the evaluation mission. Likewise, s/he should lead drafting and finalization of the terminal evaluation. The allocation of tasks in the execution of this TOR shall be decided mutually between the International and National consultants.

Evaluator Ethics

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (**Annex 6**) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the [UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'](http://www.unevaluation.org/ethicalguidelines)

Payment modalities and specifications

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| % | Milestone |
| *Reimbursable costs* | At contract signing |
| *50%* | Following submission and approval of the draft terminal evaluation report |
| *50%* | Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report |

Application process

Applicants are requested to apply online ([bidding.ws@undp.org](mailto:bidding.ws@undp.org)) by (29th October 2012). 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) together with a price offer indicating total cost of the assignment (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs).

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.

Annex 1: Project Logical Framework

This information is provided in the Project Document

Annex 2: Evaluation Questions

The evaluation matrix below serves as a general guide for the evaluation. It is expected that evaluators will further revised and improve evaluation question and matrixes.

| **Evaluative Criteria** | **Evaluation Questions** | **Indicators** | | | **Sources** | **Methodology** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| * **Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?** | | | | | | |
| *Is the Project relevant to GEF biodiversity focal area?* | * How does the project support GEF biodiversity focal area and strategic priorities? | | * Existence of a clear relationship between the project objectives and GEF biodiversity focal area | | * Project documents * GEF focal areas strategies and documents | * Documents analyses * GEF website * Interviews with UNDP and project team |
| *Is the Project relevant to UNDP objectives?* | * How does the Project support on achieving UNDAF outcome of sustainable livelihoods in general and energy and environment in particular? | | * Existence of a clear relationship between project objectives and sustainable livelihoods outcomes of UNDP (UNDAF). * Existence of a clear relationship between project objectives and UNDP Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) | | * Project documents * UNDP strategies and programmes * Key government officials and other partners | * Documents analyses * Interviews with government officials and other partners * Interviews with UNDP |
| *Is the Project relevant to Cook Island’s land conservation and development objectives?* | * How does the Project support objectives of land conservation? * How country-driven is the Project? * Does the Project adequately take into account the national realities, both in terms of institutional framework and programming, in its design and its implementation? * How the project has been effective to influence national policy and planning processes? | | * Degree to which the project support national conservation objectives * Degree of coherence between the project and nationals priorities, policies and strategies * Appreciation from national stakeholders with respect to adequacy of project design and implementation to national realities and existing capacities? | | * Project documents * National policies and strategies (NBS, TALS, TYIP, TYP) * Key government officials and other partners * National policies and strategies to protect and manage the environment | * Documents analyses * Interviews with government officials and other partners |
| *Is the Project addressing the needs of target beneficiaries?* | * How does the Project support the needs of target beneficiaries; including all relevant government agencies, local government and the communities leaving in the area? * Is the implementation of the Project been inclusive of all relevant Stakeholders? * Are local beneficiaries and stakeholders adequately involved in Project design and implementation? | | * Strength of the link between expected results from the Project and the needs of target beneficiaries * Degree of involvement and inclusiveness of beneficiaries and stakeholders in Project design and implementation | | * Beneficiaries and stakeholders * Needs assessment studies * Project documents | * Document analysis * Interviews with beneficiaries and stakeholders |
| *Is the project internally coherent in its design?* | * Are there logical linkages between expected results of the project (log frame) and the project design (in terms of project components, choice of partners, structure, delivery mechanism, scope, budget, use of resources etc)? * Is actual Project implementation coherent with Project design? * Is the length of the project sufficient to achieve project outcomes? | | * Level of coherence between project expected results and project design internal logic * Level of coherence between project design and project implementation approach | | * Program and project documents * Key project stakeholders | * Document analysis * Key interviews |
| *How is the Project relevant in light of other donors?* | * Does the GEF funding support activities not addressed by other donors? * How do GEF-funds help to fill gaps (or give additional stimulus) that are crucial but are not covered by other donors? * Is there coordination and complementarities between donors? | | * Degree to which program was coherent and complementary to other donor programme | | * Other Donors’ policies and programming documents * Other Donor representatives * Project documents | * Documents analyses * Interviews with other Donors |
| *Does the project provide relevant lessons and experiences for other similar projects in the future?* | * What lessons have been learnt and what changes should have been made to the Project in order to strengthen the alignment between the Project and the Partners’ priorities and areas of focus? * How could this type of project better target and address the priorities and development challenges of targeted beneficiaries? | | * Lessons learned | | * Data collected throughout evaluation | * Data analysis |
| **Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?** | | | | | | |
| *Has the project been effective in achieving the expected outcomes and objectives?* | * Is the Project being effective in achieving its expected outcomes: * See outcomes in ProDoc | | * See indicators in project log frame (Annex 1) | | * Project documents * Project team and relevant stakeholders * Data reported in project annual and quarterly report s | * Documents analysis * Interviews with project team * Interviews with relevant stakeholders |
| *How was risk and risk mitigation being managed?* | * How well are risks and assumptions being managed? * What was the quality of risk mitigation strategies developed? Were these sufficient? * Are there clear strategies for risk mitigation related with long-term sustainability of the project? | | * Completeness of risk identification and assumptions during Project planning * Quality of existing information systems in place to identify emerging risks and other issues? * Quality of risk mitigations strategies developed and followed | | * Project documents and evaluations * UNDP staff and Project Partners | * Document analysis * Interviews |
| *Did Project effectively addressed the Midterm Evaluation recommendations* | * Are the midterm recommendations are relevant and adequate to achieve project results? * Did the project made any operational and strategic changes after midterm recommendation? * Are the project efforts adequate and effective to address midterm evaluation recommendations? | | * Relevancy and adequacy of midterm evaluation recommendation * Strategic and operational changes of project implementation after midterm evaluation * Project efforts on addressing midterm evaluation recommendations | | * UNDP staff and Project Partners * MFSC officials * Project staff | * Document analysis * Interviews |
| *How was level of participation and support from implementing/ executing agency for effective implementation of project?* | * Did Implementing/Executing Agency staff identify problems in a timely fashion and accurately estimate its seriousness? * Did Implementing/Executing Agency staff provide quality support and advice to the project, approved modifications in time and restructured 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? | | * Timely support and advice from implementing agency | | * Project team and relevant stakeholders * Data reported in project annual and quarterly report s | * Document analysis * Interviews |
| *What lessons can be drawn regarding effectiveness for other similar project in the future?* | * What lessons have been learned by project to achieve its outcome? * What changes could have been made (if any) to the design this type of project in order to improve the achievement of the project’s expected results? * How could the Project have been more effective in achieving its results? | | * Lessons learned from project implementation | | * Data collected throughout evaluation | * Data analysis |
| **Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?** | | | | | | |
| *Was project support provided in an efficient way?* | * Was adaptive management used or needed to ensure efficient resource use? * Did the Project logical framework and work plans and any changes made to them use as management tools during implementation? * Were progress reports produced accurately, timely and respond to reporting requirements including adaptive management changes? * How was Result Based Management used during program and Project implementation? * Was there an institutionalized or informal feedback or dissemination mechanism to ensure that findings, lessons learned and recommendations pertaining to Project design and implementation effectiveness are shared among Project stakeholders, UNDP and GEF Staff and other relevant organizations for ongoing Project adjustment and improvement? * Did the Project mainstream gender considerations into its implementation? | | * Availability and quality of progress reports * Timeliness and adequacy of reporting provided * Adequacy of Project choices in view of existing context, infrastructure and cost * Quality of RBM reporting (progress reporting, monitoring and evaluation) * Occurrence of change in Project design/ implementation approach (ie restructuring) when needed to improve Project efficiency * Existence, quality and use of M&E, feedback and dissemination mechanism to share findings, lessons learned and recommendation on effectiveness of Project design. * Gender disaggregated data in Project documents | | * Project documents and evaluations * UNDP, MFSC Officials and Project personnel * Beneficiaries and Project partners | * Document analysis * Key Interviews |
| *How delays on project implementation have affected outcomes and sustainability?* | * Do project completed as planned? What are the reasons for delays in project implementation and completion? * Did the delay affect the project’s outcomes and/or sustainability? How did it affect outcomes and sustainability then in what ways and through what causal linkages? | | * Reasons for delay on project implementation * Effect on delay on achieving project outcomes and sustainability | | * UNDP, MFSC and Project personnel * Beneficiaries and | * Key Interviews |
| *Were financial resources utilized efficiently?* | * Were the accounting and financial systems in place adequate for Project management and producing accurate and timely financial information? * Was Project implementation as cost effective as originally proposed (planned vs. actual) * Did the leveraging of funds (co-financing) happen as planned? * Were financial resources utilized efficiently? * Could financial resources have been used more efficiently? | | * Availability and quality of financial reports * Level of discrepancy between planned and utilized financial expenditures * Planned vs. Actual funds leveraged * Cost in view of results achieved compared to costs of similar Projects from other organizations * Cost associated with delivery mechanism and management structure compare to alternatives | | * Project documents and evaluations * UNDP, MFSC and Project personnel * Beneficiaries and Project partners | * Document analysis * Key Interviews |
| *How efficient were partnership arrangements for the Project?* | * To what extent were partnerships/ linkages between institutions/ organizations being encouraged and supported? * Which partnerships/linkages were facilitated? Which one can be considered sustainable? * What is the level of efficiency of cooperation and collaboration arrangements? (between local actors, UNDP-GEF and the MFSC) * Which methods were successful or not and why? | | * Specific activities conducted to support the development of cooperative arrangements between partners, * Examples of supported partnerships * Evidence that particular partnerships/linkages will be sustained * Types/quality of partnership cooperation methods utilized | | * Project documents and evaluations * Project Partners * Beneficiaries | * Document analysis * Interviews |
| *Did the Project efficiently utilize local capacity in implementation?* | * Was an appropriate balance struck between utilization of international expertise as well as local capacity? * Did the Project take into account local capacity in design and implementation of the Project? * Was there an effective collaboration between institutions responsible for implementing the project? | | * Proportion of total expertise utilized taken from Cook Islands * Number/quality of analyses done to assess local capacity potential and absorptive capacity | | * Project documents and evaluations * UNDP and Project partners * Beneficiaries | * Document analysis * Interviews |
| *What lessons can be drawn regarding efficiency for other similar projects in the future?* | * What lessons can be learnt from the project on efficiency? * How could the Project be more efficient in achieving its results? * How could the project more efficiently address its key priorities (in terms of management structure and procedures, partnership arrangement etc.)? * What changes should be made (if any) to the Project in order to improve its efficiency? | |  | | * Data collected throughout evaluation | * Data analysis |
| **Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?** | | | | | | |
| *How is the Project effective in achieving its long term goal and objectives?* | * Is the Project achieving its long term goal of ensuring the conservation and sustainable use of globally significant biodiversity in Cook Islands? * Is the Project achieving its objectives to establish effective management systems and build capacity for the conservation and sustainable use? * To what extent is the Project focusing on building the capacity of key individuals and institutions at the national and local levels? | | | * See indicators in project log frame (Annex 1) | * Project documents * Key Stakeholders * Research findings; if available | * Documents analysis * Meetings with UNDP and Project Partners and MFSC Officials * Interviews with Project beneficiaries and other stakeholders |
| *What are positive impacts of the project?* | * What are the positive impacts or likely impacts of the Project (both intended and unintended) * Institutional capacity development * Landscape level biodiversity conservation; * Resource dependency * Livelihoods diversification * Policy influences * How project has contributed on achieving Millennium Development Goal (MDGs)? | | | * Provide specific examples of impacts, as relevant * Contribution of project on MDGs | * Project documents * Key Stakeholders * Research findings | * Data analysis * Interviews with key stakeholders |
| *Are there any likely negative impacts or consequences of project?* | * What are the negative impacts of the project on biodiversity and local livelihoods? * How project has been effective to address un-intended consequences or impact of intervention? | | | * Negative impact of the project * Measures taken to address negative consequences | * Project documents * Key Stakeholders * Research findings | * Data analysis * Interviews with key stakeholders |
| *What lessons can be drawn regarding impact for other similar projects in the future?* | * How could the Project build on its apparent successes and learn from its weaknesses in order to enhance the potential for impact of ongoing and future initiatives? * What changes should be made (if any) to the Project in order to improve its impact? | | | * Lesson learned | * Data collected throughout evaluation | * Data analysis |
| **Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?** | | | | | | |
| *Are sustainability issues adequately integrated in Project design?* | * Were sustainability issues integrated into the design and implementation of the Project? * Are there any delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons? * Did the delay affect the project’s outcomes? | | | * Evidence/Quality of sustainability strategy * Evidence/Quality of steps taken to address sustainability | * Project documents and evaluations * UNDP personnel and Project Partners * Beneficiaries | * Document analysis * Interviews |
| *Financial Sustainability* | * Did the Project adequately address financial and economic sustainability issues? * Are the recurrent costs after Project completion sustainable? | | | * Level and source of future financial support to be provided activities after termination of project? * Evidence of commitments from government or other stakeholder to financially support relevant sectors of activities after project end * Level of recurrent costs after completion of Project and funding sources for those recurrent costs | * Project documents and evaluations * UNDP personnel and Project Partners * MFSC officials * Beneficiaries | * Document analysis * Interviews |
| *Organizations arrangements and continuation of activities* | * Were the results of efforts made during the Project implementation period well assimilated by organizations and their internal systems and procedures? * Is there evidence that Project partners will continue their activities beyond Project support? * What degree is there of local ownership of initiatives and results? | | | * Degree to which Project activities and results have been taken over by local counterparts or institutions/ organizations * Level of financial support to be provided to relevant sectors and activities by in-country actors after Project end | * Project documents and evaluations * UNDP personnel and Project Partners * MFSC officials * Beneficiaries | * Document analysis * Interviews |
| *Enabling Environment* | * Were laws and policies frameworks being addressed through the Project, in order to address sustainability of key initiatives and reforms? * Were the necessary related capacities for lawmaking and enforcement being built? * What is the level of political commitment built on the results so far? | | | * Efforts to support the development of relevant laws and policies * State of enforcement and law making capacity * Evidences of commitment by the political class through speeches, enactment of laws and resource allocation to priorities | * Project documents and evaluations * UNDP personnel and Project Partners * Beneficiaries | * Document analysis * Interviews |
| *Institutional and individual capacity building* | * Is the capacity in place at the national and local levels adequate to ensure sustainability of the results achieved to date? | | | * Elements in place in those different management functions, at the appropriate levels (national, district and local) in terms of adequate structures, strategies, systems, skills, incentives and interrelationships with other key actors | * Project documents and evaluations * UNDP personnel and Project Partners * Beneficiaries * Capacity assessments available, if any | * Interviews * Documentation review |
| *Social and political sustainability* | * Did the Project contribute to key building blocks for social and political sustainability? * Did the Project contribute to citizens’ acceptance of the new products or practices? | | | * Example of contributions to sustainable political and social change in support of the biosphere reserve | * Project documents and evaluations * UNDP personnel and Project Partners * Beneficiaries | * Interviews * Documentation review |
| *Replication* | * Are Project activities and results being replicated elsewhere and/or scaled up? * What was the Project contribution to replication or scaling up of innovative practices or mechanisms? | | | * Number/quality of replicated initiatives * Number/quality of replicated innovative initiatives * Volume of additional investment leveraged | * Other donor programming documents * Beneficiaries * UNDP personnel and Project Partners | * Document analysis * Interviews |
| *Challenges to sustainability of the Project* | * What are the main challenges that may hinder sustainability of efforts? * Have any of these been addressed through Project management? * What could be the possible measures to further contribute to the sustainability of efforts achieved with the Project? | | | * Challenges in view of building blocks of sustainability as presented above * Recent changes which may present new challenges to the Project | * Project documents and evaluations * Beneficiaries * UNDP personnel and Project Partners | * Document analysis * Interviews |
| *What lessons can be drawn regarding sustainability for other similar projects in the future?* | * Which areas/arrangements under the Project show the strongest potential for lasting long-term results? * What are the key challenges and obstacles to the sustainability of results of the Project initiatives that must be directly and quickly addressed? | | |  | * Data collected throughout evaluation | * Data analysis |

Annex 3: Rating Scales

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

Annex 4: EvaLUATION SCHEDULE

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Dates** | **Task** | **Time proposed** |
| 1. **Preparation** | | |
|  | * ***Home-based work to*** prepare for evaluation including desk review of documents provided in advance at home office and develop preliminary evaluation methodology | 3 days |
|  | * International consultant arrives in country. |  |
| **B.Evaluation Mission** | | |
|  | * Evaluation attend briefing session with UNDP CO * Project briefing by key project staff (PM), * Visit to relevant stakeholders |  |
|  | * Further desk review of relevant documents and reports, preparation and presentation of evaluation methodology and report outline, * Review and discussions on study approach and methodology * Refinement of methodology |  |
|  | * Meetings with central level project stakeholders |  |
|  | * Field trips and other meetings |  |
|  | * Initiate preparation of first draft report. |  |
|  | * Preparation of (initial findings), * Debriefing to validate/clarify findings with Project staff & focal persons, project partners, UNDP and follow up discussion |  |
|  | * Presentation of evaluation findings to national stakeholders, and project partners * International consultant departs |  |
| 1. **Draft Evaluation Report** | | |
|  | * ***Home-based work to*** prepare draft report * Submission of final draft report to UNDP for further circulation and clarification | 5 days |
|  | * UNDP provides comments and suggestions on draft report | NA |
|  | * ***Home-based work to*** address comments and suggestions on final draft report * Submission of final draft report to UNDP for further circulation and clarification | 1 day |
|  | * Stakeholders provide comments on draft report | N/A |
| 1. **Final Evaluation Report** | | |
|  | ***Home-based work to*** finalize report based on comments from stakeholders, followed by submission of the final report to UNDP for further circulation | 1 days |
|  | Submission of final report to UNDP for further dissemination |  |

Note: Total consultancy time comprises 25 working days

Annex 5: Evaluation Report Outline[[3]](#footnote-4)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **i.** | Opening page:   * Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project * UNDP and GEF project ID#s. * Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report * Region and countries included in the project * GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program * Implementing Partner and other project partners * Evaluation team members * Acknowledgements |
| **ii.** | Executive Summary   * Project Summary Table * Project Description (brief) * Evaluation Rating Table * Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons |
| **iii.** | Acronyms and Abbreviations  (See: UNDP Editorial Manual[[4]](#footnote-5)) |
| **1.** | Introduction   * Purpose of the evaluation * Scope & Methodology * Structure of the evaluation report |
| **2.** | Project description and development context   * Project start and duration * Problems that the project sought to address * Immediate and development objectives of the project * Baseline Indicators established * Main stakeholders * Expected Results |
| **3.** | **Findings**  (In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) must be rated[[5]](#footnote-6)) |
| **3.1** | **Project Design / Formulation**   * Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators) * Assumptions and Risks * Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design * Planned stakeholder participation * Replication approach * UNDP comparative advantage * Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector * Management arrangements |
| **3.2** | **Project Implementation**   * Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation) * Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region) * Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management * Project Finance: * Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (\*) * UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (\*) coordination, and operational issues |
| **3.3** | **Project Results**   * Overall results (attainment of objectives) (\*) * Relevance(\*) * Effectiveness & Efficiency (\*) * Country ownership * Mainstreaming * Sustainability (\*) * Impact |
| **4.** | **Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons**   * 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 6: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form

**Evaluators:**

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people’s right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people’s right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals ,and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrong doing 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. Inline 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 ina way that clearly respects the stakeholders’ dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form[[6]](#footnote-7)**

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

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

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

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

Signed at *place*on *date*

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

Annex 7: Evaluation Report Clearance Form

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

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

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

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

UNDP GEF RTA

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

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

1. For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](http://www.undp.org/evaluation/handbook), Chapter 7, pg. 163 [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office: [ROTI Handbook 2009](http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/M2_ROtI%20Handbook.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
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. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-7)