

## 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 Strengthening National Capacities for the Operationalization, Consolidation, and Sustainability of Belize's Protected Areas System (PIMS # 4207.)

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

### PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	Strengthening National Capacities for the Operationalization, Consolidation, and Sustainability of Belize's Protected Areas System			
GEF Project ID:	4207		<i>at endorsement</i> <i>(Million US\$)</i>	<i>at completion</i> <i>(Million US\$)</i>
UNDP Project ID:	00074617	GEF financing:	975,000.00	975,000.00
Country:	Belize	IA/EA own:	25,000.00	25,000.00
Region:	LAC	Government:		
Focal Area:	Biodiversity	Other:	947,471.00	947,471.00
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):		Total co-financing:	972,471.00	972,471.00
Executing Agency:	<b>Ministry of Forestry Fisheries and Sustainable Development</b>	Total Project Cost:	1,947,471.00	1,947,471.00
Other Partners involved:	Forest Department/ Fisheries Department	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		September 30, 2010 (November 1 <sup>st</sup> 2010)
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: December 31 2013	Actual: October 31, 2014

### OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The project was designed to: safeguard globally significant terrestrial, coastal, and marine biodiversity of Belize. The project objective is that by July 2013, Belize will have effectively developed legal, financial, and institutional capacities to ensure sustainability of the existing NPAS. This objective will be achieved through three interrelated outcomes that will generate the flow of global-, national-, and local-level benefits for:

- enhanced protection of over 1.22 million ha of terrestrial, coastal, and marine ecosystems, including 546,904 ha of lowland broadleaf forests, 195,844 ha of sub-mountain broadleaf forests, and 17,075 ha of mangroves;
- improved management effectiveness for 28 PAs (3 Forest Reserves, 7 Marine Reserves, 4 National Monuments, 5 National Parks, 2 Natural Reserves, 4 Private Protected Areas, and 3 Sanctuaries);

c) an increase in the financial capacity of Belize's NPAs by 30%, which is currently at 26.4% as measured through the total average score for all PAs in the UNDP Financial Scorecard, including an increase of annual government budgeting for PAs from \$2.3 million USD to \$2.9 million USD per year and doubling the income generated by non-governmental sources for eight participating PAs; and

d) a national training program to sustain long-term capacity building for PAs that will be developed to train staff from 20 co-managed PAs in management and business plan development, administration, and financial planning, as well as 90 staff from the PAs' administrative body in PA management and monitoring techniques.

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<sup>1</sup> 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) 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 Belize including the following project sites:

- **Chiquibul National Park**
- **Cockscomb Basin Wildlife Sanctuary (CBWS)**
- **APAMO Office**
- **National Protected Areas Secretariat**

Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

- **Martin Alegria** – Chief Environmental Officer and Past GEF Operational Focal Point
- **Beverly Wade**- Fisheries Administrator
- **Wilber Sabido**- Chief Forest Officer/ Project Director

---

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

- **Jose Perez**- Executive Director, Association of Protected Areas Management Organization
- **Nayari Diaz Perez**- Protected Areas Conservation Trust
- **Natalie Rosado**- Past Acting Executive Director, Protected Areas Conservation Trust
- **Imani Fairweather Morrison** – Oak Foundation
- **Colin Gillett**- Past Representative of Coastal Zone Management Authority and Institute
- **Amanda Burgos Acosta**- Belize Audubon Society
- **Arlene Maheia Young** – National Protected Areas Secretariat
- **Elma Kay** – Environment Research Institute
- **Adele Catzim Sanchez**- Chief Executive Officer, Ministry of Forestry Fisheries and Sustainable Development
- **Diane Wade Moore**- United Nations Development Programme
- **Rafael Manzanero** – Friends for Conservation and Development
- **Edilberto Romero** – Past Chair of Association of Protected Areas Management Organization
- **Anthony Hislop**- Chair, Association of Protected Areas Management Organization
- **Hon. Minister Lisel Alamilla**- ( she was the past Representative of BAPPA at the inception of the project)
- **Christina Gacia**- Belize Association of Private Protected Areas (BAPPA)

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](#).

<b>Evaluation Ratings:</b>			
<b>1. Monitoring and Evaluation</b>	<i>rating</i>	<b>2. IA&amp; EA Execution</b>	<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	
<b>3. Assessment of Outcomes</b>	<i>rating</i>	<b>4. Sustainability</b>	<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

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.<sup>2</sup>

## CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

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

## IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

<sup>2</sup> 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](#)

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Belize. 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 15 days according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
<b>Preparation</b>	2 days	<b>November 21<sup>st</sup> 2014</b>
<b>Evaluation Mission</b>	7 days	<b>November 23<sup>rd</sup> -29<sup>th</sup> 2014</b>
<b>Draft Evaluation Report</b>	5 days	<b>December 19<sup>th</sup> 2014</b>
<b>Final Report</b>	1 day	<b>January 9<sup>th</sup> 2014</b>

## EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
<b>Inception Report</b>	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission.	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
<b>Presentation</b>	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission	To project management, UNDP CO
<b>Draft Final Report</b>	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs
<b>Final Report*</b>	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 evaluators). 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 Team members must present the following qualifications:

- Minimum 5 years of 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)

## 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%	At contract signing
40%	Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report
50%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report

## APPLICATION PROCESS

---

Applicants are requested to apply online (indicate the site, such as <http://jobs.undp.org>, etc.) by (date). Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions. The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in English with indication of the e-mail and phone contact. 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

<b>This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPAP:</b> <i>Innovative approaches and strategies established for improved sustainable land use and comprehensive water resources management and utilization knowledge and practices.</i>					
<b>Country Programme Outcome Indicators:</b> <i>An operationalized framework for national integrated sustainable development strategy developed.</i>					
<b>Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area:</b> <i>1. Mainstreaming environment and energy.</i>					
<b>Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program:</b> <i>BD-SPI-PA Financing</i>					
<b>Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes:</b> <i>PA systems secure increased revenue and diversification of revenue streams to meet total expenditures required to meet management objectives; Reduction in financing gap to meet PA management objectives.</i>					
<b>Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators:</b> <i>Total revenue and diversification in revenue streams.</i>					
	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
<b>Project Objective:</b> By July 2013, Belize will have effectively developed legal, financial, and institutional capacities to ensure sustainability of the existing National Protected Areas System (NPAS).	Existence of a reformed NPAS.	– Fragmented NPAS into three different Ministries.	– Institutionally articulated NPAS under the management of a statutory national coordination body.	– Official gazette/national law registry	– Cabinet approves the National Protected Areas System Act (NPASA) and authorizes the establishment of NPAS.
	Increase in financial capacity of NPAS in Belize as measured through the Total Average Score for all PAs in the UNDP Financial Scorecard.	– Legal and regulatory framework: 36.7% – Business planning: 18.0% – Tools for revenue generation: 21.1% – Total: 26.4%	– Legal and regulatory framework: 75% – Business planning: 40% – Tools for revenue generation: 48% – Total: 56.8%	– Financial sustainability score sheets	– The range of investment instruments and revenue mechanisms proposed by the project is supported by the GOB and co-funders.
	Change in the financial gap to cover basic PA management costs and investments.	– \$5,997,247 USD/yr	– ≤ \$4,743,897 USD/yr	– Financial sustainability score sheets – Budget appropriations	
	Change in coverage of key terrestrial, coastal, and marine ecosystems within NPAS.	– Lowland broad-leaved forests: 546,904 ha – Sub-mountain broad-leaved forests: 195,844 ha – Mangroves: 17,075 ha	– Lowland broad-leaved forests: 546,904 ha – Sub-mountain broad-leaved forests: 195,844 ha – Mangroves: 17,075 ha	– GIS and overlay maps – Aerial photography/satellite imagery	– Trends in deforestation rate remain unchanged or improve. – Environmental changes (including climate change) within their natural variability.

<b>Outcome 1:</b> The NPAS is supported by legal and institutional reforms furthering efforts in attaining sustainability of the system.	Change in the institutional framework for the NPAS.	– The Forest Department (forest reserves and PAs) and the Fisheries Department (marine reserves) under the coordination of a temporary National Protected Areas Commission (NPAC)	– Single statutory agencies within the Forest and Fisheries Departments (i.e., “Forest and Wildlife Authority” and “Wildlife Authority/Fisheries and Marine Resources Authority,” respectively) with a permanent/participatory Protected Areas Coordinating Mechanism (PCM)	– Government gazette	– There is a high level of political will to organize and administer Belize’s PAs as an articulated system. – PA stakeholders (i.e., CBOs and NGOs) have the capacity to engage in external services.
	Number of legal instruments (new and amended) which directly support the financial sustainability of the NPAS.	– Two (2): PACT (tourism) and Forest Regulations (concessions and royalties)	– Tourism (fees and concessions) = 2 – Petroleum & Mineral Extraction (concessions and royalties) = 1 – Water use (fees) = 1	– Gazetted Statutory Instruments and Acts – Memoranda of Agreement and contracts	
	Number of officials from the GOB and other key stakeholders supporting the national coordination body for NPAS management.	– 15 members (government members: 6, quasi-governmental members: 4; non-government members: 5)	– 45 members (government members: 26, quasi-governmental members: 9; non-government members: 10)	– Terms of Reference and contracts – Employee guidelines and policy manuals – National coordination body (or PCM) organization chart	
<b>Outputs:</b> 1.1. National Protected Areas System Act (NPASA). 1.2. Reformed Forest Act, National Parks System Act, Finance Act, and Fisheries Act in support of NPAS. 1.3. Legal instruments/frameworks addressing royalty payments, concessions, cost-sharing arrangements with long-term productive sectors (e.g., tourism, oil, gas, and mineral extraction) and environmental safeguards within NPAS. 1.4. Fees and charges standardization policy. 1.5. NPAS management organization including structure and operational guidelines.					
<b>Outcome 2:</b> Modernize and diversify financing for the sustainability of the NPAS.	Existence of a national budget for the PA system.	– No budget specific for the existing NPAS	– National budgetary allocation for NPAS	– NPAS financial plans and corresponding budget allocations – Financial sustainability score sheets	– Effective coordination among various institutions allows for joint programming/budgeting. – National and international macroeconomic conditions stabilize and return to pre-global
	Increase in annual government budgeting for PAs.	– \$2,318,171 USD/yr	– \$2,897,714 USD/yr	– Budget appropriations – Annual financial	



				and expense reports – Financial Sustainability Scorecard update	economic crisis levels (2008). – Willingness within the GOB to increase funding for PAs. – Complementing ongoing activities funded from external programmes proceed without impediment.
	Increase in income generated by non-governmental sources for eight (8) participating parks.	– To be established within first 6 months of project implementation	– A 25% increase over the baseline	– Official letters of financial commitments – Annual financial and expense reports – Audit reports	– Openness by partners in revenue reporting. – Willingness of the civil sector to continue support of individual PAs.
	Increase in tourism-based fees collected in PAs and accounted for by the GOB.	– \$1,925,160.00 USD/yr	– \$2,598,966 USD/yr	– Accounting reports – Audit reports	– Private sector and co-managers are active participants of NPAS revenue collection accountability system.
	Number of long-term/biodiversity-friendly investment plans established with key productive sectors (e.g., tourism, fisheries, forestry, electricity generation, and mineral extraction and oil).	– Zero (0)	– At least four (4) representing diversified sectors	– Approved investment plans – Outlines of impact mitigation plans	– Willingness of private and public sectors to support individual PAs and NPAS.
	Number of cooperation agreements with public and private sectors to underwrite PA management costs.	– One (1): University of South Florida and Belize Audubon Society for scientific research	– Up to 10 medium- to long-term cooperation agreements	– Signed agreements – Project technical and highlight reports	
<b>Outputs:</b> 2.1. Selected instruments (e.g., legislated NPASA-related regulations for increased government budget appropriations; amended co-management agreements for accountability, enabling regulations for tourism concession and royalty assignment to PAs, regulation for fee definition, etc.) enable PA investments. 2.2. Selected mechanisms (e.g., business plans, PA marketing strategies; PA cross-subsidization; small-scale PA infrastructure and businesses; reinvestment system for concessions, royalty, and fees in PAs) increase PA revenues. 2.3. Socialization program to build awareness and acceptance of the PA Financial Sustainability Strategy. 2.4. Revenue accountability system improves the efficiency of tourism fee collection and administration. 2.5. Long-term investment plans with key productive sectors (e.g., tourism, fisheries, forestry, electricity generation, and mineral extraction and oil) embrace the concept of biodiversity offsets to ensure that there is no net loss of biodiversity occurring in the PA system. 2.6. Cooperation agreements with public and private sectors (including international partnerships) for scientific research, environmental education, ecotourism management, and					

monitoring as a means of underwriting management costs of at least 10 PAs.					
<b>Outcome 3:</b> NPAS is supported by enhanced management capacity.	Increase in PA management effectiveness as measured by METT scores for 28 PAs (3 Forest Reserves, 7 Marine Reserves, 4 National Monuments, 5 National Parks, 2 Natural Reserves, 4 PPAs, and 3 Sanctuaries) (METT scores for all 28 PAs are presented in Annex 8.5 of the Project Document).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– High: 11 PA</li><li>– Medium: 14 PA</li><li>– Low: 3 PA</li></ul> <p>Based on the following definitions: High (75&gt;), Medium (55-74), Low (&lt;55).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– High: 18 PA</li><li>– Medium: 10 PA</li><li>– Low: 0 PA</li></ul> <p>Based on the following definitions: High (75&gt;), Medium (55-74), Low (&lt;55).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– METT score sheets</li><li>– Project monitoring and evaluation reports</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– Continued interest from the GOB and civil sector to engage in co-management of PAs.</li><li>– PACT and its programs continue to support capacity building in PAs.</li></ul>
	Number of PA administrative staff (government and non-government) trained in PA management and monitoring techniques.	Annual Average (National training sessions): <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– Enforcement training: 1 event, 25 persons/event</li><li>– Biodiversity Monitoring: 2 events, 15 persons/event</li><li>– Data Management/Analysis: 1 event, 8 persons/event</li></ul>	– Up to 90 additional trained PA staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– Training memoirs</li><li>– Databases containing records of individuals trained</li></ul>	
	Number of PA management organizations with tools for effective management in place.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– To be established within first 6 months of project implementation</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– 50% of participating PA management organizations are using management tools in their planning (<i>tentative</i>)</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– In-house plans developed (management plans, business plans, etc.)</li><li>– Management and monitoring reports</li></ul>	
<b>Outputs:</b> 3.1. A national training program to sustain long-term capacity building for PAs. 3.2. Staff from 20 co-managed PAs trained in management and business plan development, administration, and financial planning. 3.3. Institutionalized management effectiveness assessment.					

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

---

- 1. Audit Reports**
- 2. Inventory and Assets**
- 3. PEG Meeting Records**
- 4. Stage Plans / End of Stage Reports and Highlight Reports**
- 5. Project Implementation Review Reports (PIRs)**
- 6. Key Project Deliverables**
- 7. Project Logframe**
- 8. Protected Areas Scorecards**

## ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

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

## ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

<p><b><i>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&amp;E, I&amp;E Execution</i></b></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><b><i>Sustainability ratings:</i></b></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><b><i>Relevance ratings</i></b></p> <p>2. Relevant (R)  1.. Not relevant (NR)</p> <p><b><i>Impact Ratings:</i></b></p> <p>3. Significant (S)  2. Minimal (M)  1. Negligible (N)</p>
<p><b><i>Additional ratings where relevant:</i></b>  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 Form<sup>3</sup>

#### 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: \_\_\_\_\_

<sup>3</sup>[www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct](http://www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct)

## ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE<sup>4</sup>

---

- 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<sup>5</sup>)
- 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<sup>6</sup>)
- 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

---

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

<sup>5</sup> UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

<sup>6</sup> 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: \_\_\_\_\_