

TERMINAL EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF 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 several projects managed by UNDP Barbados and the OECS in Barbados, Dominica, St Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, and St Vincent and the Grenadines.

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

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	Capacity Building in and Mainstreaming of Sustainable Land Management in Barbados			
GEF Project ID:	PIMS 3408		<i>at endorsement</i>	<i>at completion</i>
UNDP Project ID:	00046566	GEF financing:	485,000	159,749.59
Country:	Barbados	IA/EA own:		
Region:	LAC	Government:	543,717	
Focal Area:	land degradation	Other:	209,600	
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	OP15 SP1	Total co-financing:	753,317	
Executing Agency:	UNDP	Total Project Cost:	1,238,317	
Other Partners involved:	Ministry of Ministry of Housing, Lands and the Environment	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		21 Nov 2008
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed:	Actual: 30 June 2012
Project Title:	Capacity Building in and Mainstreaming of Sustainable Land Management in Dominica			
GEF Project ID:	PIMS 3410		<i>at endorsement</i>	<i>at completion</i>
UNDP Project ID:	00045747	GEF financing:	500,000	468,468.69
Country:	Commonwealth of Dominica	IA/EA own:		
Region:	LAC	Government:	184,250	
Focal Area:	land degradation	Other:	324,050	
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	OP15 SP1	Total co-financing:	508,300	
Executing Agency:	UNDP	Total Project Cost:	1,008,300	

Other Partners involved:	Environmental Coordinating Unit	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		23 April 2008
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed:	Actual: 30 June 2012

Project Title:	Capacity Building and Mainstreaming of Sustainable Land Management in St Kitts and Nevis			
----------------	--	--	--	--

GEF Project ID:	PIMS 3415		<u>at endorsement</u>	<u>at completion</u>
UNDP Project ID:	00046155	GEF financing:	500,000	366,894.28
Country:	St Kitts and Nevis	IA/EA own:		
Region:	LAC	Government:	500,000	
Focal Area:	Land degradation	Other:	8,000	
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	OP15 SP 1	Total co-financing:	508,000	
Executing Agency:	UNDP	Total Project Cost:	1,008,000	
Other Partners involved:	Ministry of Sustainable Development	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		23 April 2008
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed:	Actual: 30 June 2012

Project Title:	Capacity Building and Mainstreaming of Sustainable Land Management in Saint Lucia			
----------------	---	--	--	--

GEF Project ID:	PIMS 3450		<u>at endorsement</u>	<u>at completion</u>
UNDP Project ID:	00046154	GEF financing:	485,000	152,489.70
Country:	Saint Lucia	IA/EA own:		
Region:	LAC	Government:	196,500	
Focal Area:	Land Degradation	Other:	839,700	
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	OP15 SP1	Total co-financing:	1,036,200	
Executing Agency:	UNDP	Total Project Cost:	1,536,200	
Other Partners involved:	Ministry of Physical Development Environment and Housing	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed:	Actual: 30 June 2012

Project Title:	Capacity building and Mainstreaming of Sustainable Land Management in St. Vincent and the Grenadines			
----------------	--	--	--	--

GEF Project ID:	PIMS 3416		<u>at endorsement</u>	<u>at completion</u>
UNDP Project ID:	00046250	GEF financing:	485,000	264,490.01

Country:	St. Vincent and the Grenadines	IA/EA own:		
Region:	LAC	Government:	402,760	
Focal Area:	Land Degradation	Other:	975,000	
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	OP15 SP1	Total co-financing:	1,377,760	
Executing Agency:	UNDP	Total Project Cost:	1,877,760	
Other Partners involved:	Ministry of Health and Environment	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed:	Actual: 30 June 2012

OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The projects were designed to achieve the following:

Country	Project goal	Expected outcomes
Barbados	Agricultural land, wooded and protected areas are fully functioning, sustainable ecosystems that maintain the ecological integrity and productivity of terrestrial and associated marine ecosystems	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Policy/regulatory frameworks and resource mobilisation for SLM integrated into national development policies and legislative/regulatory frameworks governing land use planning and management 2. Institutional strengthening and coordination among all relevant planning and land management agencies 3. Development of an Information Management System 4. Development of human resource capacity for sustainable land management at all levels 5. Adaptive management and learning
Dominica	Ensure that agricultural, coastal, forestry and other terrestrial land and resource uses in Dominica are sustainable, thereby allowing for the maintenance of productive systems that assure ecosystem productivity and ecological functions while contributing directly to the environmental, economic and social wellbeing of the people of Dominica	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. SLM mainstreamed into national development policies, plans and regulatory frameworks 2. Individual and institutional capacities for SLM enhanced 3. Capacities for knowledge management in support of SLM developed 4. Investment planning and resource mobilisation for implementation of SLM interventions elaborated 5. Adaptive management and learning

Country	Project goal	Expected outcomes
St Kitts and Nevis	The agricultural, forest, residential, tourism and urban land uses of St Kitts and Nevis are sustainable, so that the ecosystem productivity and ecological functions are maintained while contributing directly to the environmental, economic and social wellbeing of the country	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. SLM mainstreamed into national development policies, plans and regulatory frameworks 2. Individual and institutional capacities for SLM enhanced 3. Capacities for knowledge management in support of SLM developed 4. Investment planning and resource mobilisation for implementation of SLM interventions elaborated 5. Adaptive management and learning
Saint Lucia	Ensure sustainable management of the land resources of Saint Lucia in order to enhance ecosystem health, integrity and social well-being of the people of Saint Lucia.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. SLM mainstreamed into national development policies 2. Individual and institutional capacities for knowledge management enhanced 3. Awareness increased on SLM issues and capacities for knowledge management enhanced 4. Investment planning and resource mobilisation for implementation of SLM is elaborated 5. National action plan completed
St Vincent and the Grenadines	Strengthen and/or develop capacities for sustainable land management in relevant government ministries, the private sector and civil society organizations and to mainstream sustainable land management into national development planning	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. SLM is mainstreamed into national development policies, plans and regulatory frameworks 2. Individual and institutional capacities for SLM developed 3. Capacities for knowledge management in support of SLM are developed 4. Investment planning and resource mobilisation for implementation of SLM interventions are elaborated 5. Adaptive management and learning

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 evaluations are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from these projects, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

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 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. 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 **each country**, including project sites. Interviews to be held with organizations and individuals will be discussed during the inception meeting with the UNDP CO.

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

EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS

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

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

PROJECT FINANCE / COFINANCE

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

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

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

MAINSTREAMING

UNDP-supported GEF-financed projects are key components in UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programmes. The evaluations will assess the extent to which the projects were 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 projects are achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the projects have 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

CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

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

IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing these evaluations resides with the UNDP CO for Barbados and the OECS. 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 countries' Project Teams 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 20 days per country according to the following plan:

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](#)

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation	3 days	12 July 2013
Evaluation Mission	7 days	2 August 2013
Draft Evaluation Report	8 days	23 August 2013
Final Report	2 days	30 August 2013

Note that an individual work plan must be submitted for each country, adhering to the timing (no. of days) above. Individual assignments can be completed before the overall completion dates above.

EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
Inception Report	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission.	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
Presentation	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission	To project management, UNDP CO
Draft Final Report	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF 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 reports, the evaluators are required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report.

TEAM COMPOSITION

A single consultant will be contracted to undertake the evaluation process in each country. A consultant may conduct evaluations in more than one country, but no more than two. The consultant shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF-financed projects is an advantage. The evaluator selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project-related activities.

The consultant must present the following qualifications:

- Minimum MSc qualification or equivalent in ecological conservation, environmental management, geography, agriculture, sustainable development, or related discipline
- Minimum 8 years of relevant professional experience
- Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s)
- Knowledge of and experience with UNDP and GEF project cycles and implementation processes
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies
- Previous experience evaluating UNDP-supported GEF-financed projects in the Caribbean
- Strong technical report writing, data acquisition and analysis skills

- Excellent interpersonal and communication skills
- Excellent command of written and oral English
- Good understanding of the region’s norms, practices and cultural sensitivities – evidence of work experience in the region, especially engaging with stakeholders at multiple levels (grassroots, communities, national, sub-regional)
- Previous experience in the targeted country would be an asset.

EVALUATOR ETHICS

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

PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

%	Milestone
10%	Following submission and approval of the inception report
40%	Following submission and approval of the first draft terminal evaluation report
50%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report

APPLICATION PROCESS

Individual consultants are invited to submit applications to procurement.bb@undp.org (cc: registry.b@undp.org) by 3 July 2013 at 11:00pm Eastern Caribbean Time (GMT-4). Applications should consist of a single email containing the following:

- Cover letter of no more than 3 pages, including a description of main achievements and how the candidate meets/exceeds the profile requirements
- Completed letter as per Annex H
- A current and complete CV or UNDP P11 form (preferred) in English, with e-mail and phone contact
- A proposed methodology for conducting the evaluation of no more than 3 pages
- Work plan indicating which countries are being applied for (up to 3) and the proposed scheduling of each activity per country
- Contact details of 3 referees
- A price proposal quoted in United States dollars, as per Annex I, one for each Lot (country)

SELECTION PROCESS

This procurement process will be executed in 5 Lots – 1 per country being evaluated. A candidate may apply for up to 2 Lots. Candidates may or may not be awarded any number of Lots from those for which they have applied. Lots are as follows:

1. BARBADOS
2. DOMINICA
3. ST KITTS AND NEVIS
4. SAINT LUCIA

5. ST VINCENT AND THE GRENADINES

A single work plan must be submitted indicating the time allocated to each Lot.

Separate price proposals must be submitted for each Lot to allow review of each Lot individually.

The review process will consist of a cumulative analysis, with technical and financial proposals weighted at 60:40.

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 A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

St Kitts and Nevis document is provided as a reference. Others will be provided prior to the inception meeting.

ANNEX B: LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE EVALUATORS

Approved project document

Mid-term evaluation where it exists

Auditor's report where it exists

Project Implementation Reports (PIRs)

Quarterly Operational Reports (QORs)

Steering Committee meeting minutes

Any document generated as an output of the projects

ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

Further details will be discussed during inception meeting with the UNDP CO.

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Were the project's outcomes consistent with the focal areas/ operational program strategies and country priorities? 	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the project support the environment and sustainable development objectives of the participating country? 	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What was the level of stakeholder ownership in implementation? 	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Did the project adequately take into account the national realities, both in terms of institutional and policy framework in its design and its implementation? 	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has the experience of the project provided relevant lessons for other future projects targeted at similar objectives? 	•	•	•
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are the project outcomes commensurable with the expected outcomes (as described in the project document) and the problems the project was intended to address (i.e. original or modified project objectives)? 	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has the project been effective in achieving its targets of expected outcomes? Answer for each outcome. 	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In case in the original or modified expected outcomes are merely outputs/inputs, were any real outcomes of the project? 	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If yes, were these commensurate with the realistic expectations from such projects? 	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Was the length of the project sufficient to achieve project outcomes? 	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Did the leveraging of funds (co-financing) happen as planned? 	•	•	•

Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?

• Was the project cost effective?	•	•	•
• Was project implementation as cost effective as originally proposed (planned vs. actual)?	•	•	•
• Was adaptive management used or needed to ensure efficient resource use?	•	•	•
• Were the project logical framework and work plans and any changes made to them used as management tools during implementation?	•	•	•
• Were the accounting and financial systems in place adequate for project management and producing accurate and timely financial information?	•	•	•
• Were progress reports produced accurately, timely and responded to reporting requirements including adaptive management changes?	•	•	•
• How was results-based management used during project implementation?	•	•	•
• To what extent were partnerships/linkages between institutions/ organisations encouraged and supported?	•	•	•
• What was the level of efficiency of cooperation and collaboration arrangements? Which methods were successful or not and why?	•	•	•
• How could the project have been more efficiently carry out implementation (in terms of management structures and procedures, partnerships arrangements etc)?	•	•	•
• What changes could have been made to the project in order to improve its efficiency?	•	•	•

Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?

• What risks are likely to affect the persistence of project outcomes?	•	•	•
• How are these risks likely to affect the persistence of project outcomes?	•	•	•
• How will other important contextual factors that are not outcomes of	•	•	•

the project affect sustainability?			
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the project played a catalytic role (e.g. provided opportunities for replication, scaling/up or influencing relevant public policies)? 	•	•	•

ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

<i>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution</i>	<i>Sustainability ratings:</i>	<i>Relevance ratings</i>
6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): 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 3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks	2. Relevant (R) 1.. Not relevant (NR) <i>Impact Ratings:</i> 3. Significant (S) 2. Minimal (M) 1. Negligible (N)
<i>Additional ratings where relevant:</i> Not Applicable (N/A) Unable to Assess (U/A)		

ANNEX E: EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT AND AGREEMENT FORM

Evaluators:

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

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form³

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: _____

³www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE⁴

- 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 Manual⁵)
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 rated⁶)
- 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

⁴The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

⁵ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

⁶ Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations.

- 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

(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: _____