**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 the *Project “Improving the Financial Sustainability of the Carpathian System of Protected Areas”* (PIMS 3458)

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

Project Summary Table

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Title: |  | | | | | |
| GEF Project ID: | | 3849 |  | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | | *at completion (Million US$)* |
| UNDP Project ID: | | Atlas: 72323  PIMS:3458 | GEF financing: | 0.95 | | 0.95 |
| Country: | | Romania | IA/EA own: | 0.02 | | 0.02 |
| Region: | | Europe& CIS | Government: | 2.,788,045  (1.,858,696 in kind) | | 4.646.741 in kind |
| Focal Area: | | Biodiversity | Other: | 0.0503 | | 0.0503 |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): | | Biodiversity, Financial Sustainability | Total co-financing: | 0.7 | | 0.7 |
| Executing Agency: | | National Forest Administration Romsilva | Total Project Cost: | 15.,667.041 | | 15.,667.041 |
| Other Partners involved: | | UNDP, WWF | ProDoc Signature (date project began): | | | 27 November 2009 |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | | Proposed:      31 December 2013 | Actual:  30 June 2014 |

Objective and Scope

The project was designed to:

The project objective is to secure the financial sustainability of Romania’s Carpathian Network of Protected Areas (CNPA) as a model for replication to the entire Carpathian Network of Protected Areas. With adequate financial resources the Romanian Carpathian PAs and the CNPAs will be on path to greater financial sustainability. The project sites include the 22 administrations of protected areas. The project is implemented through the National Forest Administration (Implementing Partner), which support the administrative costs of 18/22 PA administrations included in the project.

Project Components

1) Strengthening the supportive legislative framework and Sustainable Protected Areas Financing Strategy;

2) Strengthening the institutional and individual capacities of management authorities and other local stakeholders to develop and implement sustainable financing of protected areas.

The project sites include the 22 administrations of protected areas: Apuseni, Munţii Maramureşului, Retezat, Piatra Craiului, Vânători Neamţ (Pilot Parks), Bucegi, Buila Vânturariţa, Calimani, Ceahlău, Cheile Bicazului-Hăşmaş, Cozia, Cheile Nerei, Defileul Jiului, Defileul Mureşului Superior, Domogled Valea Cernei, Gradistea Muncelului Cioclovina, Geoparcul Platoul Mehedinţi, Geoparcul Dinozaurilor Ţara Haţegului, Porţile de Fier, Putna Vrancea, Munţii Rodnei, Semenic Cheile Caraşului (pilot parks in italics).

Expected Results

The project is expected to generate significant new revenues to the CNPAs. Taken together, this project’s investment (1 million USD) is projected to generate additional revenue of USD 5 million per year and using a 6 percent discount rate, in a 10 year period, the net benefit of this investment is 35 million USD. To this end, the main following outputs will be delivered:

(i) Assessment and amendment of the legal and regulatory framework, as well as the institutional structure governing the Romanian CNPAs.

(ii) Formulation of a sustainable finance strategy for 22 large Romanian CNPAs, including the CNPAs’ financial history, investment priorities, revenue mechanisms and proposed cost-saving strategies to address financial needs and reduce gaps.

(iii) Conducting a powerful communications strategy, the project will encourage the government to gradually increase funding for the targeted PAs (e.g., 20% yearly increases from 2007 values). Political and financial support will be mobilized not only to increase the government’s contributions to cover the costs of protected areas, but also to support the overall implementation of the sustainable financial strategy of the CNPAs.

(iv) Model business plans will demonstrate specific market-based financial mechanisms, using an approach that will maximize economic returns and minimize costs and environmental impact.

(v) Validation of a set of PA diversified income-generation mechanisms (market and non-market options) in at least 3 PAs which are one step ahead of the others due to their increased capacity for conservation management.

(vi) Development of institutional and individual capacities of management authorities and other local stakeholders to achieve sustainable financing, which will result in a critical number of PA professionals trained, a Carpathian National Association of Protected Area manager established, improved information management linking PA management plans with financial management systems, a public PA management committee monitoring revenue and expenditures of PAs, lessons and knowledge documented and transferred to key actors representing PAs from other Carpathian countries.

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.

Evaluation approach and method

An overall approach and method[[1]](#footnote-1) 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 ([*Annex C*](#_TOR_Annex_C:)) and will be discussed with UNDP CO. 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 Bucharest, including the following project sites 2 pilot parks in Piatra Craiului National Park and Vanatori Neamt Natural Park*.* Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: WWF, Ministry of Environment, NFA Romsilva, and UNDP Romania.

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](#_TOR_Annex_B:) of this Terms of Reference.

An outline of an evaluation approach is provided below; however it should be made clear that the evaluation consultant is responsible for revising the approach as necessary. Any changes should be in-line with international criteria and professional norms and standards cleared by UNDP. The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. It must be easily understood by project partners and applicable to the remaining period of project duration. The evaluation should provide as much gender disaggregated data as possible. The evaluation mission will include a visit to Bucharest and some of the project pilot sites. The international consultant is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with the government counterparts, UNDP CO, Steering Committee, project team, and key stakeholders. The Evaluation international consultant is expected to consult all relevant sources of information, such as the project document (“prodoc”), project reports – incl. Annual Reports, project budget revision, progress reports, CTA mission reports, project files, national strategic and legal documents, GEF Capacity Development scores from inception to end of project, and any other material that s/he may consider useful for evidence based assessment.

The methodology to be used by the Evaluation International Consultant should be presented in the report in detail. It shall include information on:

• Documentation reviewed;

• Interviews;

• Field visits;

• Questionnaires;

• GEF CD Scorecard completed at the time of FE (by the Evaluation Team);

• Participatory techniques and other approaches for the gathering and analysis of data.

Although the Evaluation International Consultant should feel free to discuss with the authorities concerned all matters relevant to its assignment, it s/he is not authorized to make any commitment or statement on behalf of UNDP or GEF or the project management.

The consultant’s main responsibilities are:

- Desk review of documents, development of detailed work plan and TE (Terminal Evaluation) outline (maximum 4-days home-based);

- Debriefing with UNDP CO, agreement on the methodology, scope and outline of the TE report (2 days home based);

- Interviews with project implementing partner (executing agency), relevant Government, NGO and donor representatives and UNDP/GEF Resident Representative and/or Regional Technical Advisor (6 days in-country mission including field trips to 2 project sites);

- Completion of the first TE report draft (15 days). The draft will be shared with the UNDP CO, UNDP-/GEF (UNDP-/GEF RCU Bratislava) and key project stakeholders for review and commenting;

- Finalization and submission of the final TE report through incorporating suggestions received on the draft report (maximum 2 days);

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](#_TOR_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  [Annex D](#_TOR_Annex_D:).

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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 / 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(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 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-2)

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 Romania.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 *21* days for the assignment *(travel days are excluded; the lump sum in the financial offer will include travel expenditures as well)* according to the following plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Timing | Completion Date |
| **Preparation** | *4* days *to review documents* | *15-22 May 2014* |
| **Evaluation Mission** | *8 days: 6 days in –country mission (Bucharest +travel to pilot sites) , 2 days travel* | *26 May- 4 June* |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | *15 days* | *25 June* |
| **Final Report** | *2* days | *15 July* |

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 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.

Team Composition

The evaluation team will be composed of 1 international evaluator (supported if needed by an interpreter). 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 evaluator must present the following qualifications:

* Master degree (or equivalent) in Natural Resource Management, Environmental Economics and Policy or other related areas. Postgraduate degree will be an advantage.
* Minimum *10* years of relevant professional experience in environmental project management and implementation; in addition proven experience of providing consultancy services in GEF biodiversity projects evaluation is a must
* Knowledge of UNDP and GEF
* Previous experience with results‐based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
* Technical knowledge in the biodiversity focal area(s)
* Minimum 7 years experience with environmental policy advice and/or project development/implementation in biodiversity conservation;
* Relevant experience in evaluation of biodiversity projects in Romania and/or Europe and the CIS region. Such experience within UNDP system would be an asset;
* Prior experience in evaluating biodiversity projects preferably focused on financing protected areas.

The evaluator must present the following competencies:

* Competencies in result-based management (RBM) evaluation methodologies; applying participatory monitoring approaches; SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
* Competencies and recent knowledge of the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy; UNDP’s results-based evaluation policies and procedures; Adaptive Management, as applied to capacity building projects;
* It is desirable that the International Evaluation Consultant have knowledge/understanding of Romanian/EU conservation policies and legislation, forestry management policies and institutional system, protected areas system.
* The International Evaluation Consultant must have demonstrated competency in areas of international projects’ (GEF/UNDP) evaluation.

Language skills: Fluency in English language is mandatory

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'](http://www.unevaluation.org/ethicalguidelines)

Payment modalities and specifications

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| % | Milestone |
| *10%* | Upon approval of inception report |
| *60%* | Upon approval of the 1st draft terminal evaluation report |
| *30%* | Upon approval of the final terminal evaluation report (by UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) |

Application process

A list of compatible applicants will be shortlisted from the Biodiversity Evaluation roster. Shortlisted candidates will be requested to submit a price offer indicating the 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 A: Project Logical Framework

| **Project Strategy** | **Objectively Verifiable Indicators** | **Baseline (August 2009)** | **Target (and tentative date)** | **Sources of verification** | **Risks and Assumptions** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Objective:**  To secure the financial sustainability of Romania’s Carpathian network of PAs, as a model for replication to the entire Carpathian Network of Protected Areas (CNPA) | Overall score of the Financial Scorecard: | 33% | 50% | Financial reports (income, expenses, needs and financial gaps),  Auditing reports,  Implementation of PA management and business plans reports. | **Risk:**  Lack of political will slows down project efforts.  **Assumptions:**  The political commitment to establish a strong and effective CNPAs under the Carpathian Convention will facilitate project implementation.  PA stakeholders are able to communicate in an efficient manner the needs and gaps of PAs, the value of PAs and the PAs contribution to productivity.  Alliances with key decision makers in the government branches (legislative, judicial and executive), the private sector and civil society organizations are forged to support project implementation. |
| Trend in filling funding gap | Stagnant | From Dec 2011, financial gaps are being gradually reduced a rate of 20% per year |
| Coverage of Romanian Carpathian ecoregion with ensured financial sustainability | 0 ha | > 1 million ha. |
| **Component 1.**  Supportive legislative framework and Sustainable PA Financing Strategy | Number of PA finance law and regulations reformed | 0 | 5 (central transfers, tourism, environmental compensation, payments for ecosystems services) | PA needs and gaps document.  Studies on PA valuation and contribution to productivity completed and communicated.  Agreed agenda and records of increased transfer from government.  SFS document  Reports on financial gaps reductions  SFS implementation reports.  Financial and auditing reports. | **Risks:**  PA financing-low in the political agenda. Changes proposed to amend the current legislative framework will not be officially approved during the life span of the project.  Key stakeholders (public and private) fail to get involved in co-management and sponsorship.  Pressure from development on the protected areas result in continued de facto open access to resources within them and in buffer zones  **Assumptions:**  Continuous dialogue and involvement of decision-makers is conducted in order to prioritize approval of the new legislative framework for PA financing, and implementation of the SFS.  Consultations and communication campaign on socio-economic benefits of PAs and benefits to corporate image will be conducted to secure involvement of public and private institutions.  A strong communication strategy mobilizes political ownership from start. |
| Funding gap for the Romanian Carpathian PA system: | $4 M (basic needs)  $11M (optimal). | <$1 M (basic needs)  <$5 M (optimal needs) |
| Amount of allocations from Ministry of Environment for Carpathian PAs | App.0 | By De. 2013, central budget allocation provision are available in the amount of > 1 million USD |
| Compensation payments to forest users | App. 30% | 40% (December 2013) |
| Number and level of central budget transfers. | None | Twice a tear by Dec. 2011 |
| Number of cases for environmental compensation and level of fees | None | 3 by Dec. 2013 |
| # of sites in Carpathians with business plans and cost-reduction strategies | 0 | 5 by Dec. 2013 |
| Number of sites with diversified market-based instruments for PA funding | 0 | At least 3 |
| Number of cost-saving strategies in place at PA system level | 0 | >10 | # of full and part-time staff.  # of volume purchases  # Life span of goods and equip.  # of co-management agreement  # of volunteers programs  # of corporate sponsorships |
| **Component 2.**  Institutional and individual capacities of management authorities and other local stakeholders to realize sustainable financing of PAs developed | # of PA staff trained in effective financial management of PAs  # of Champion PA Finance Leaders” graduated | 0  0 | At least 33 By Dec. 2012  11 by Dec. 2011 | Training modules and content formatted.  Learning community meetings reports  LC workshop reports  Training platform participation reports.  Trainees performance reports.  PA functional charts. | **Risks:**  No major risks for this component. However, constant staff turn around may limiting the opportunity for PA to benefit from staff with newly acquired skills.  **Assumptions:**  Progressive increases in PA income will improve personnel permanence through more attractive hiring packages and incentives to existing staff in the Romania CNPAs.  Leadership in the CNPAs will support the improved hiring packages and salary policies for PA staff. |
| A Carpathian’s Association of PA Managers | 0 | One by Dec. 2011 | By laws, minutes of meetings, ToR, action plan, results reports. |
| PAs conservation targets linked to programmes and activities through a functioning financial management system (FMS)  Metrics link conservation goals with costs.  Traceable expenses, costs, needs and gaps by program. | No | Yes (By Dec 2010) | Intranet financial system  Reports on financial gaps reductions  SFS implementation reports.  Financial and auditing reports. |
| A PSA Management Committee | 0 | Yes (By Dec. 2012) | Biannual financial reports.  Auditing reports confirm 100% transparency and compliance  ToR and minutes of meetings. |
| Experience from lessons learned is periodically feed into yearly planning | 0 | Starting in Dec. 2010, documented lessons available on a yearly basis, on three overarching aspects: cost-accounting, legal reform, formulation and implementation of financial mechanisms and business plans. | Documents with lessons on:  Online training modules  Annual operational plans  Learning community reports  Financial reports |

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

***General documentation***

*·          UNDP Programme and Operations Policies and Procedures* [*https://intranet.undp.org/global/popp/ppm/Pages/Contents.aspx?lang=en*](https://intranet.undp.org/global/popp/ppm/Pages/Contents.aspx?lang=en)

*·          UNDP Handbook for Monitoring and Evaluating for Results* [*http://web.undp.org/evaluation/handbook/*](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/handbook/)

*·          GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy* [*http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/UNDP-GEF-TE-Guide.pdf*](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/UNDP-GEF-TE-Guide.pdf)

***Project documentation***

* *GEF approved project document*
* *Project Inception Report*
* *Project MTE Report*
* *Annual Project Reports*
* *Project Implementation Reviews*
* *Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (BD2 Tracking Tool)*
* *Quarterly Reports*
* *Steering Committee Meeting minutes*
* *National Comprehensive Project Assessment*

Annex C: Evaluation Questions

| **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? | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 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 the financial mechanisms and tools, institutional development, international policies sustaining long-term project results? | | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
| **Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward improving the financial sustainability of Protected Areas?** | | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |

Annex D: 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 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 Form[[3]](#footnote-3)**

**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 F: Evaluation Report Outline[[4]](#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[[5]](#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[[6]](#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 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: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

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-1)
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-2)
3. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
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. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)