

TERMINAL EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

(INDIVIDUAL CONTRACTOR AGREEMENT)

TITLE: TERMINAL EVALUATOR

PROJECT: SULU CELEBES

DUTY STATION: HOME-BASED

SECTION/UNIT: GPSO IWC

CONTRACT/LEVEL: INTERNATIONAL ICA 4

DURATION: (LUMP SUM) ONE TO TWO MONTHS

SUPERVISOR: KIRK BAYABOS, MANAGER, UNOPS, RTA, UNDP

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 Implementation of the Sulu Celebes Sea Sustainable Fisheries Management Project (PIMS 4084)

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

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:		PIMS 4063 IW FSP Sulu Celebes Sea Sustainable Fisheries Management Project		
GEF Project ID:	00058166		<i>at endorsement</i> <i>(Million US\$)</i>	<i>at completion</i> <i>(Million US\$)</i>
UNDP Project ID:	00072140	GEF financing:	\$2,890,000	
Country:	Indonesia/ Malaysia/ Philippines	IA/EA own:	\$90,000.00	
Region:	GPSO	Government:	\$3,000,000.00	
Focal Area:	IW	Other:	\$140,000.00	
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	SP-1	Total co-financing:	\$3,210,000.00	

Executing Agency:	UNOPS	Total Project Cost:	\$6,120,000.00	
Other Partners involved:	MMAF, Indonesia; DoF-Sabah, Malaysia; NFRDI, DA, Philippines	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		October 12, 2009
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: December 2014	Actual: September 2014

OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The project was designed to evaluate the Sulu-Celebes Sea (SCS) is a Large Marine Ecosystem in the tropical seas of Asia bounded by three countries – Indonesia, Malaysia and the Philippines. Being at the heart of the most bio-diverse marine area in the world, the SCS is also a very rich fishing ground for large and small pelagic as well as bay and coral reef fishes, providing livelihoods to the coastal inhabitants and food for the entire region and beyond. The fishery resources, however, have declined due to various threats, including overexploitation, habitat and community modification and global climate change.

The goal of the Project is to have an economically and ecologically sustainable marine fisheries in the SCS, for the benefit of communities who are dependent on these resources for livelihood and for the global community who benefit in the conservation of highly diverse marine ecosystems and its ecosystems services. The objective of the Project is to improve the condition of fisheries and their habitats in the SCS through an integrated, collaborative and participatory management at the local, national and tri-national levels. The three countries and other stakeholders, including NGOs, have worked together to develop the Sulu-Sulawesi Marine Ecoregion Conservation Plan and formally put in place a regional institutional mechanism to implement the plan.

The Project activities, outcomes and outputs will build on these strong regional and national initiatives. There are five major outcomes of the Project. The first is the achievement of a regional consensus on trans-boundary priorities and their immediate and root causes by updating an earlier Trans-boundary Diagnostic Analysis for the SCS and focusing on unsustainable exploitation of fisheries. The second outcome is agreement on regional measures for improved fisheries management through coordination in the formulation of a Strategic Action Program, which will build on the existing Ecoregion Conservation Plan. The third outcome is the strengthening of institutions and introduction of reforms to catalyze implementation of policies on reducing overfishing and improving fisheries management. The primary target for institutional strengthening is the Sulu-Sulawesi Marine Ecoregion Tri-National Committee and its Sub-Committees, in particular the Sub-Committee on Sustainable Fisheries. The fourth outcome is increased fish stocks of small pelagics through the implementation of best fisheries management practices in demonstration sites. The fifth outcome is the capture, application and dissemination of knowledge, lessons and best practices within the SCS and other LMEs.

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 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 (*fill in [Annex C](#)*) The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to [Jakarta, Indonesia](#); [Kota Kinabalu, Malaysia](#); [Manila, Philippines](#), including the following project sites : [Tarakan City, Semporna, Zamboanga City](#). Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

1. Romeo B. Trono, Regional Project Manager, Project Management Office, c/o NFRDI office, Philippines
2. Noel C. Barut, National Coordinator, National Fisheries Research & Development Institute, Philippines
3. Dr. Norasma Dacho, National Coordinator, Department of Fisheries – Sabah, Malaysia
4. Prof. Hari Eko Irianto Research Center for Fisheries Management and Conservation, MMAF, Indonesia
5. LGU Tarakan
6. LGU Semporna
7. LGU Zamboanga City
8. Dr. Jose Padilla, Regional Technical Adviser, UNDP
9. Ms. Amelia Supetran, UNDP Philippines
10. Mr. Kirk Bayabos, Head of Cluster Unit, UNOPS

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 Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see [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](#).

Evaluation Ratings:			
1. Monitoring and Evaluation	rating	2. IA& EA Execution	rating
M&E design at entry		Quality of UNDP Implementation	

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

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	\$90,000		\$3,000,000		\$140,000			\$3,230,000
• Other								
Totals	\$90,000		\$3,000,000		\$140,000			\$3,230,000

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

CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

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

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](#)

IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in *Philippines*. The UNOPS will contract the evaluator and the PMO in the Philippines will ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluator. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the evaluator to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the evaluation will be 25-30 days according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation	2 days (<i>recommended: 2-4</i>)	July 31, 2014
Evaluation Mission	12 days (<i>r: 7-15</i>)	August 19, 2014
Draft Evaluation Report	5 days (<i>r: 5-10</i>)	August 29, 2014
Final Report	1 days (<i>r: 1-2</i>)	September 12, 2014

EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluator 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, including powerpoint file	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission	To project management, UNDP CO; Final PSC Meeting in September ³
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.

COMPOSITION

The evaluation will be conducted by an *international evaluator*. The consultant shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The evaluator selected should

³ The consultant will be required to prepare a powerpoint presentation highlighting the terminal evaluation process and the findings. Subject to availability of funds, the consultant will be requested to present at the RSC, otherwise, UNDP Philippines will make the presentation.

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 ten (10) years of monitoring and evaluation of GEF projects and other relevant professional experience
- Knowledge of UNDP and GEF
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
- Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s) international waters
- Familiarity with integrated fisheries management
- Masters degree in the field of marine/coastal/fisheries or closely related disciplines
- English is a requirement

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

(this payment schedule is indicative, to be filled in by the CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on their standard procurement procedures)

%	Milestone
30%	At contract signing and submission and approval of an inception report listing the activities including itinerary plus a detailed outline of the report building on the outline provided in this TOR
40%	Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report
30%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report

APPLICATION PROCESS

The recruitment will follow the UNOPS procedure for recruitment of individuals.

ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Objective	To improve the condition of the fisheries and their habitats in the SCS through an integrated, collaborative and sustainable tri-national management				
	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Risks and assumptions
Outcome 1: Regional consensus on transboundary priorities, their immediate and root causes	TDA employing accepted methodology	GIWA (TDA) for SCS Report completed in 2002; Biodiversity and socio-economic assessments for SSME in 2000 (in SSME ECP)	Updated TDA and analysis of unsustainable exploitation of marine resources delivered on the 2nd year of the Project	Reports of national consultations on Scoping of fishery issues and national consultation on Causal Chain Analysis	Assumptions – national consultations will be implemented in a coordinated and timely manner, leading to the regional consultations; funds will be disbursed to national implementers efficiently; data and information from (ICM) are available
	Status of acceptance of the results of the TDA by the SSME Tri-Com and Sub-Com on Sustainable Fisheries	Profile of Coastal and Marine Fisheries, Country Reports of Indonesia, Malaysia, and Philippines (2009)	TDA on regional priorities and their immediate and root causes in the Sulu-Celebes Sea accepted by the SSME Tri-Com and the Sub-Com on Sustainable Fisheries right after completion of the report.	Reports of the meetings of the SSME Tri-Com and the Sub-Com on Sustainable Fisheries	Risks – National consultations may be delayed by local events, e.g., elections, unavailability of stakeholders
Outcome 2: RECOMMENDATIONS on regional and national legal , policy and institutional reforms for improved fisheries management	Status of appropriate regional and national legal, policy and institutional reforms and collaborative agreements for	Regional and national policies are described in section prepared under the SSME ECP	REGIONAL FISHERIES SAP endorsed by the SSME Tri-Com DURING the third year of the Project	Project monitoring and evaluation reports	Assumptions – Continuing cooperation within the entire SSME governance structure at the regional, national and local levels Risks – Among others, these would include the non-cooperation and change of priorities of the national governments, lack

	improved management of fishery resources				of budgets, resources and overall capacity to implement the needed reforms, and deterioration of security relationships between countries that could hamper regional cooperation.
		SSME Sub-Committee on Sustainable Fisheries Action Plans for 2008-2010	ENDORSEMENT or approval of the REGIONAL FISHERIES SAP BY RELEVANT NATIONAL AGENCIES AND ITS IMPLEMENTATION INITIATED DURING THE LIFE OF THE PROJECT.	Minutes of meetings the SSME Tri-Com and Sub-Com on Sustainable Fisheries	
			Collaborative agreements with regional organizations are established DURING THE LIFE of the Project.		
Outcome 3: Strengthening of existing institutions TO CATALYZE REGIONAL COOPERATION IN reducing over-fishing and improving fisheries management in the SCS	Status of institutional REVIEW AND reforms AGENDA at the regional and national levels	Regional and national institutions for SSME management are in place but reforms for improved management are needed. National laws and related legislations are also in place but need to be reviewed for necessary revisions and amendments.	Institutional REVIEW OF strengthening AGENDA are PRODUCED IN THE 2ND year of the Project and IMPLEMENTATION INITIATED in subsequent years. SAP is properly implemented with better institutions.	Refer to Outputs 3.1 and 3.2.	Assumptions - Active involvement of the management and staff of regional and national institutions involved in SSME management is assumed. Capacity of regional and national institutions to implement reforms is assumed. Willingness of national lawmakers to prioritize the revision or amendment of fishery laws is assumed. Risks – The risks include the bureaucratic red tape in national governments that make it difficult to institute reforms, indifference or resistance of government personnel in institutional reforms, and the change of leadership and short term-

					tenures at the national and ministerial/department levels that can change national priorities.
Outcome 4: INCREASED CAPACITY OF SSME NATIONAL LEVEL INSTITUTIONS TO IMPLEMENT SITE-SPECIFIC EAFM WITH LOCAL PARTNERS TO REBUILD FISH STOCKS AND IMPROVE FISHING INCOMES	STATUS OF PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION OF INTEGRATED FISHERIES MANAGEMENT PLAN (IFMP) USING EAFM IN THE THREE DEMONSTRATION SITES	It is recognized by several scientific studies that the small pelagic fisheries are overfished although the extent of overfishing remains to be verified	Within the Demonstration Sites, adoption of IFMP USING EAFM DURING 3RD YEAR OF THE PROJECT AND IMPLEMENTATION DURING THE REST OF THE LIFE OF PROJECT	Monitoring and evaluation studies in Demonstration Sites and for the entire Project	Assumptions – The small pelagic fisheries stocks are shared and transboundary stocks; Stock definition study is successfully conducted (Output 1.3); Fisheries Management Plans in Demonstration Sites across the SCS are implemented in timely and coordinated manner Risks – IUU fishing is not regulated successfully
	POSSIBLE SUPPORTING INDICATORS ARE DISCUSSED IN THE PROJECT OUTPUTS BELOW	Sulu Sea – total fish biomass estimated at 800,000 mt (2002); reported total landings was 1,000,000 mt in 2004 (FAO, 2005)	Integrated Fisheries Management Plans (IFMP) prepared and implemented at each demonstration site	National and regional studies conducted by partners	
		Celebes Sea – biomass estimate is unknown	POSSIBLE SUPPORTING INDICATORS ARE DISCUSSED IN THE PROJECT OUTPUTS BELOW		
		Celebes (=Sulawesi) Sea, Indonesian territory – 385,000 tons (est.)	POSSIBLE SUPPORTING INDICATORS ARE DISCUSSED IN THE PROJECT OUTPUTS BELOW		
Outcome 5: Facilitated	Scope, frequency	Fisheries statistics	Regularly conducted IEC,	Project monitoring and	Assumptions – Outputs from the Project

uptake of knowledge and lessons learned	and dissemination of information, education and communication (IEC) reports as well as evaluation and monitoring reports	are usually collected and gathered at the municipal/district level but are not analyzed and disseminated systematically. Results of scientific studies could find their way in publications of donor agencies, NGOs, academic institutions and in scientific journals and in the gray literature. There is limited production of information and lessons learned that is accessible to the general public.	monitoring and evaluation reports covering local, national and regional activities	evaluation reports Publications Project website Contents of relevant internet sites, including IWLEARN.net	are of the expected quality that would merit publication and dissemination. Risks - None
			Dissemination of above reports to various channels and audiences including through the IWLEARN.net		

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

1. UNDP policies and guidance :
 - 1.1. Project-Level Evaluation; guidance for conducting terminal evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-Financed projects (<http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/UNDP-GEF-TE-Guide.pdf>)
 - 1.2. UNDP Evaluation policy (<http://www.undp.org/evaluation/documents/Evaluation-Policy.pdf>)
 - 1.3. UNDP Results-Oriented Monitoring and Evaluation manual: UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results (<http://web.undp.org/evaluation/handbook/>)
2. GEF Monitoring and Evaluation policies: GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy 2010 (<http://www.thegef.org/gef/node/4184>)
3. Pertinent information available at the project web site: <http://ssme.iwlearn.org/>
4. Project document
5. Project Inception report
6. Quarterly Operational Reports
7. Annual Performance Reports/Annual Project Implementation Reviews (APRs/PIRs)
8. Mid-term evaluation report
9. GEF IW Tracking tool
10. Project Steering Committee meeting reports
11. Contracts, MOUs, MOAs
12. Organizational Chart and Functional Charts

ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

This is a generic list, to be further detailed with more specific questions by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on the particulars of the project.

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 there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•

ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

<p>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution</p> <p>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</p>	<p>Sustainability ratings:</p> <p>4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks</p>	<p>Relevance ratings</p> <p>2. Relevant (R) 1.. Not relevant (NR)</p> <p>Impact Ratings:</p> <p>3. Significant (S) 2. Minimal (M) 1. Negligible (N)</p>
<p><i>Additional ratings where relevant:</i> Not Applicable (N/A) Unable to Assess (U/A)</p>		

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 Form⁴

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: _____

⁴www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE⁵

- 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 Manual⁶)
1. Introduction
 - Purpose of the evaluation
 - Scope & Methodology; including discussion of evaluation framework
 - 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 rated⁷)
- 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

⁵The Report length should not exceed **40** pages in total (not including annexes).

⁶ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

⁷ 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 with UNDP priorities (including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters) and Gender Considerations
- 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: _____