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. Due to the current prevailing situation and limited accessibility to project sites, it was agreed with UNDP /GEF Headquarter and Regional Office to downscale the requirements and to conduct a Preliminary Terminal evaluation Report Rapid assessment) to be carried out by a national consultant instead of a team formed from international and national consultants. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the outline andexpectations for a Preliminary Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the project **Biodiversity Conservation & Protected Area Management (PIMS 227).**

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

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	SYRIA BIODIVERSITY CONSERVATION AND PROTECTED AREA MANAGEMENT				
GEF Project ID:	1169			_at endorsement (Million US$)_	_at completion (Million US$)_
UNDP Project ID:	PIMS 227	GEF financing:		3291850	-
Country:	Syria	IA/EA own:			
Region:	RBAS	Government:		In Kind 2,407000	.
Focal Area:	BD	(500 Track+ 525 Government) Other:		1025000	995000
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	1: catalyzing sustainability of protected areas; OP1: Arid and semiarid ecosystems, crosscutting with land degradation	Total co-financing:		3432000410	3,434
Executing Agency:	MLAE	Total Project Cost:		_**6723850**_	???
Other Partners involved:	Ministry of Environment & Ministry of Agriculture	ProDoc Signature (date project began):			February 8, 2005
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: February 8, 2012		Actual: December 31, 2012

OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The project was designed to demonstrate practical methods of protected area management that effectively conserve biodiversity and protect the interest of local communities while supporting the consolidation of an enabling environment that will facilitate replication throughout the country. The Executing Agency of the project is Ministry of Local Administration and Environment in cooperation with the Ministry of Agriculture and Agrarian Reform. The project was subjected to a Midterm Review in 2008. Based on the results and recommendations of the MTR, changes in activities were made. Furthermore, the project team revised the logical framework and annual work plans was developed and implemented based on the revised logframe.

The PTE will be will consider 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] for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects have developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact,** as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR (Annex 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. Due to the current conflict situation in the country, the evaluator will be home-based and not undertake missions to project sites. The consultant will conduct face-to-face interviews were possible, telephone/internet. Field visits will not be undertaken. Evaluator will be held meetings in Damascus with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

> Ministry of Environment (Biodiversity department)
> Ministry of Agriculture (forestry department)
> Forestry directorate at the three sites (if possible)
> Site teams (if possible)
> Representative of local communities (if possible)

---

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

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 UNDP will provide to the evaluator for review is included in Annex B of this Terms of Reference.

EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS

An primary 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		
M&E Plan Implementation								Quality of Execution - Executing Agency		
Overall quality of M&E								Overall quality of Implementation / Execution		
Co-financing (type/source)	UNDP own financing (mill. US$)		Government (mill. US$)		Partner Agency (mill. US$)		Total (mill. US$)		*rating*	**4. Sustainability**	*rating*
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Actual	Actual			
Grants											
Loans/Concessions											
• In-kind											

support											
• Other											
Totals											
3. Assessment of Outcomes											
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) to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

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**.

IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Syria. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluator and ensure the timely provision of per diems , if applicable, within the country for the national evaluator. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews (face to face or via internet and or telephone when possible), coordinate with the Government etc.

EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the evaluation will be 18 days according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation	*2* days	*6-7 November 2014*
Evaluation process (desk review and Telephone/internet-communication, face to face meetings in Damascus)	7 days	*22 November 2014*

---

[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

Draft preliminary terminal Evaluation Report	*7* days		*30 November 2014*
Final Report	*2* days		*3 December 2014*

EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluator is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
Presentation	Initial Findings	End of evaluation process	To UNDP CO
Draft Final Report	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the evaluation process	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, UNDP CO ,
Final Report*	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Sent to CO.

*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.

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
50%	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

ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Biodiversity Conservation and Protected Area Management Project - SYR/05/010

Logical Framework / Project Planning Matrix **(Seventh draft Modified in Sept 2008)**

Project Goal: To ensure Syria's globally and nationally significant biodiversity is sustainably used by, and provides benefits to its current generation while being conserves for the benefit of present and future generations worldwide.

Description	Key indicators	Baseline	Target	Means of Verification	Assumptions and Risks
Project Objective To demonstrate practical methods of protected area management that effectively conserve biodiversity and protect the interests of local communities, while supporting the consolidation of an enabling environment that will facilitate replication and effective PA management throughout the country	Change in overall human footprint within demonstration PAs, as defined by an impact reduction index	Impacts of human use of natural resources at their current levels are unsustainable in the three sites but not categorized as severe	Major threats in each site to be identified under the ecological baseline surveys and IRI to be developed and monitored as part of the management plan for each site.	Biodiversity monitoring reports (see AA 1.3 and 1.4)	Project's ability to accurately assess human footprints and quantify the impact of management on their reduction or increase (R) Potential large scale fires especially in Fronloq and Abu Qbais
	Level of local communities involvement in sustainable use and management of the natural resources in the 3 sites	0 = local communities have almost no involvement in PA planning, management or natural resources management	By the end of the project all target local communities are taking an effective leading role in the management of the three PAs and their natural resources in full partnership with MAAR and MLAE	Monitoring reports measuring people participation in the project	The new community based PA governance and management approaches not supported by adequate policies and legislations (R)
	Level of development in PA related national policies and legislations supporting effective and collaborative approaches	Current policies merely support conventional PA management and require substantial development to adopt to the new approaches	National PA policies, system and governance to be initiated and promoted to be operational by the project end	Revised policies and legislations documents The operational organizational structure of MAAR and MLAE	New policy reforms not operationalised and legislations not passed or enforced (R)
	Improve of PA management effectiveness at least in one new site	Three PA areas are officially gazette and targeted by the project.	Replication of PA effective management approach in one new	PA annual reports New PAs decrees	PA areas increased in size but not managed effectively or collaboratively

Description	Key indicators	Baseline	Target	Means of Verification	Assumptions and Risks
			site		
Project outcome 1: Policies and institutional systems that allow for the wise selection and effective operation of protected areas to conserve globally significant biodiversity	Level of Practical national institutional arrangements in relation to PA planning and management supported by sound policies and legislations	There are almost no effective nor formal institutional arrangements for PA planning and management Current policies and legislations do not support the new approaches for effective and collaborative management	By end of Year 3, a detailed and agreed set of streamlined national institutional arrangements describing the functions of all units and agencies involved in PA management and clarifying their respective roles and mechanisms of co-operation By the end of year 3, a new set of PA guidelines and best practices supporting effective and collaborative management of PAs developed and adopted nationally By the end of year 5, a set if new policies and legislations developed and submitted supporting the new PA management approaches	Legal framework and coordination documents New PA policies and legislations documents National PA guidelines on effective management documents	New policy reforms process not supported by all relevant parties or not operationalised and legislations not passed or enforced (R) Institutional arrangements subject to redundancy if not supported by adequate policies and legislations (R)
	Level of capacity of MAAR and MLAE to effectively manage the overall PA system	There is no legal framework or operational mechanisms for	By end of Year 4, relevant HQ units are well staffed and effectively managed to	Project reporting Team and individual performance reviews	Improper targeting for capacity building programs (R)

Description	Key indicators	Baseline	Target	Means of Verification	Assumptions and Risks
		effective over all PA system management	sustain the overall PA system, including oversight of individual PAs		
	Level of MAAR's capacity to manage and extend PAs within forest areas and other dryland ecosystems	MAAR has legal mandate for PA management but lacks institutional and technical capacities	By end of project, MAAR has developed and is implementing a clear set of strategies and action plans at HQ and site level for PAs within forest areas and other extending in semi arid zone in Syria	Project reporting: mid-term and final evaluations	Ability to effectively transfer central PA management arrangements to the site levels (R)
	Level of MLAE's capacity to ensure that the national system of PAs is well integrated in the national biodiversity conservation and sustainable development objectives	MLAE has the legal mandate to oversee the national PA system but has no effective institutional mechanisms and technical capacities	By end of project, MLAE is closely monitoring and providing guidance to other ministries to ensure that the national system is meeting its targets as set in the national biodiversity conservation and sustainable development objectives	Project reporting: mid-term and final evaluations Reviews reports of national strategies	Acceptance, recognition and support of MLAE national mandate by all national and local agencies and stakeholders (R)
Project outcome 2: Effective techniques for PA management and biodiversity conservation have been demonstrated through the design and implementation of management plans at three sites	Level of effectiveness of local cadres and managers at project sites in ecosystem-based management	No significant capacity	By end of Year 4, local cadres and managers at project sites are trained in ecosystem-based management and have been exposed to examples of international best practices	Project reporting	Ability to ensure proper targeting of cadre selection and capacity building (R)

Description	Key indicators	Baseline	Target	Means of Verification	Assumptions and Risks
			By year 5, Local cadres are equipped and functional in PA management.		
	Level of effectiveness of all monitoring programs related to biodiversity dynamics and natural resource management	Only PDF B reports	By end of year one, all baselines information gaps related to the project outcomes and objective filled and their monitoring programs developed By end of Year 2, all ecological and socio economic monitoring programs fully developed and implementation is initiated for the three sites	Project reports	Feasibility and level of complexity of some monitoring programs Ability to feed monitoring programs results into the project log frame under adaptive management program (A)
	Level of completeness and effectiveness of site management plans	There are no management plans	By end of Year 2, integrated management plans are agreed at each site. Plans may be updated annually on a rolling basis thereafter	Site management plans documents	Ability to ensure the development of the plans in a fully participative approach (A) Ensuring the adequate level of legal endorsement of the developed plans (A) National and local capacity for sound implementation of the plans (A)
	Level of implementation of management plans actions	No management plans	All Management plans actions are consistently implemented in accordance with management plans	Site management plans reports; site-based annual reports	Ability to adopt a decentralized management system for the plans implementation (A) Sites managers fully delegated and

Description	Key indicators	Baseline	Target	Means of Verification	Assumptions and Risks
					supported to lead plans implementation (R) Ensuring a transparent and continuous METTS exercise (R) Ability to ensure a long term financing of PAs
	Level of PA management effectiveness on the medium and long terms	First METT exercise was conducted successful for the three sites and targets were set for the project med term and project end (Fronloq Abu Qbais 20.68%, Jabal Abdul Aziz 25.86)	By the project mid term METTS targets are (F43%, AQ 47%, JA 35%) and by the project end (F66%, AQ 69%, JA 61%	Periodical METTS report National budgets allocations Sites business plans	Ability to ensure an effective and transparent METTS exercise Ensuring effective site governance systems inclusive to all stakeholders and local communities
	Level of government budgetary support for the implementation of the sites management plans	There is no definite allocated budget for the PAs, PA budget is included in directorate of forestry budget	Mechanisms of PA financing to be developed and promoted by the project Adequate Budget from MAAR for the implementation of the Pas management plans.	Sites business plan	Success in adopting an effective decentralized approach for PA self-financing
Project outcome 3: Sustainable use of natural resources in and around protected areas has been demonstrated through the development and implementation of a	Level of integration of participatory management mechanisms and stakeholder within site management plans	No integration at the moment	By year 2, all management plans to include specific components for community involvement mechanisms and tools	Management plans and operational policies, feedback from local stakeholders, management committees and community consultations.	Willingness to adopt an effective local communities' involvement program by all project parties (R) Local communities' capacity to actively participate in the process (R)

Description	Key indicators	Baseline	Target	Means of Verification	Assumptions and Risks
programme for alternative sustainable livelihoods and community resource management	Level of direct and indirect benefits gained by local communities through alternative sources of income derived from the protected areas and as a result of their new management programs in he three sites	0 = no benefits are gained by local communities	Alternative sources of income introduced by the project to represent at least 25% of the total number of people harvesting the PA natural resources.	Micro credit scheme reports Project reporting PAs business plans	Project ability to include all target communities in its socio economic programs (R) Socio economic programs sustainability (micro credits systems)(R) Project success in closely linking economic development with the conservation program(R)
	Change in understanding of co-management concept by both government agencies and local communities	There is Ambiguous comprehension for co-management approach by both government and locals	By the end of the project a clear mechanisms to be developed and adopted for PA co-management at the three sites	Local PAs management boards minutes of meetings. Project reports	Ensuring the adequate level of legal endorsement of the developed mechanisms Ensuring the capacity of both government agencies and local community to implement the co-management approach

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

Project Original Document, original and amended Logframe
Project Annual Workplans
Quarterly Planning and Reporting packages
Project Monthly Reports
Project MTE Report and Management response
Project Annual Reports
Project PIRs
Financial Reports
Project publications
Three protected (demonstration) sites management plans
Consultants' technical reports
Annual Audit reports/ Management Responses

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?			
• Did the project's objective align with the priorities of the local government and local communities?	• Level of coherence between project objective and stated priorities of local stakeholders	• Local stakeholders (if possible) • Document review of local development strategies, environmental policies, etc.	• Interviews • Desk review
• Did the project's objective fit within Croatia's national environment and development priorities?	• Level of coherence between project objective and national policy priorities and strategies, as stated in official documents	• National policy documents, such as National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan, National Capacity Self-Assessment, etc.	• Desk review • National level interviews
• Did the project concept originate from local or national stakeholders, and/or were relevant stakeholders sufficiently involved in project development?	• Level of involvement of local and national stakeholders in project origination and development (number of meetings held, project development processes incorporating stakeholder input, etc.)	• Project staff • Local and national stakeholders • Project documents	• Interviews • Desk review
• Did the project objective fit GEF strategic priorities?	• Level of coherence between project objective and GEF strategic priorities (including alignment of relevant focal area indicators)	• GEF strategic priority documents for period when project was approved • Current GEF strategic priority documents	• Desk review
• Did the project's objective support implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity? Other relevant MEAs?	• Linkages between project objective and elements of the CBD, such as key articles and programs of work	• CBD website • National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan	• Desk review

Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
• Are the project objectives likely to be met? To what extent are they likely to be met?	• Level of progress toward project indicator targets relative to expected level at current point of implementation	• Project documents • Project staff • Project stakeholders	• Interviews • Desk review
• What were the key factors contributing to project success or underachievement?	• Level of documentation of and preparation for project risks, assumptions and impact drivers	• Project documents • Project staff • Project stakeholders	• Interviews • Desk review
• What are the key risks and barriers that remain to achieve the project objective and generate Global Environmental Benefits?	• Presence, assessment of, and preparation for expected risks, assumptions and impact drivers	• Project documents • Project staff • Project stakeholders	• Interviews • Desk review
• Are the key assumptions and impact drivers relevant to the achievement of Global Environmental Benefits likely to be met?	• Actions undertaken to address key assumptions and target impact drivers	• Project documents • Project staff • Project stakeholders	• Interviews • Desk review
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?			
• Was the project cost-effective?	• Quality and adequacy of financial management procedures (in line with GEF Agency and national policies, legislation, and procedures) • Financial delivery rate vs. expected rate • Management costs as a percentage of total costs	• Project documents • Project staff	• Desk review • Interviews with project staff
• Were expenditures in line with international standards and norms?	• Cost of project inputs and outputs relative to norms and standards for donor projects in the country or region	• Project documents • Project staff	• Desk review • Interviews with project staff
• Was the project implementation approach efficient for delivering the planned project results?	• Adequacy of implementation structure and mechanisms for coordination and communication • Planned and actual level of human resources available • Extent and quality of engagement with relevant partners • Quality and adequacy of project	• Project documents • National and local stakeholders • Project staff	• Desk review • Interviews with project staff • Interviews with national and local stakeholders

	monitoring mechanisms (oversight bodies' input, quality and timeliness of reporting, etc.)		
• Was the project implementation delayed? If so, did that affect cost-effectiveness?	• Project milestones in time • Planned results affected by delays • Required project adaptive management measures related to delays	• Project documents • Project staff	• Desk review • Interviews with project staff
• What was the contribution of cash and in-kind co-financing to project implementation?	• Level of cash and in-kind co-financing relative to expected level	• Project documents • Project staff	• Desk review • Interviews with project staff
• To what extent did the project leverage additional resources?	• Amount of resources leveraged relative to project budget	• Project documents • Project staff	• Desk review • Interviews with project staff
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
• To what extent are project results likely to be dependent on continued financial support? What is the likelihood that any required financial resources will be available to sustain the project results once the GEF assistance ends?	• Financial requirements for maintenance of project benefits • Level of expected financial resources available to support maintenance of project benefits • Potential for additional financial resources to support maintenance of project benefits	• Project documents • Project staff • Project stakeholders	• Interviews • Desk review
• Do relevant stakeholders have or are likely to achieve an adequate level of "ownership" of results, to have the interest in ensuring that project benefits are maintained?	• Level of initiative and engagement of relevant stakeholders in project activities and results	• Project documents • Project staff • Project stakeholders	• Interviews • Desk review
• Do relevant stakeholders have the necessary technical capacity to ensure that project benefits are maintained?	• Level of technical capacity of relevant stakeholders relative to level required to sustain project benefits	• Project documents • Project staff • Project stakeholders	• Interviews • Desk review
• To what extent are the project results dependent on socio-political factors?	• Existence of socio-political risks to project benefits	• Project documents • Project staff • Project stakeholders	• Interviews • Desk review
• To what extent are the project results dependent on issues relating to institutional frameworks and governance?	• Existence of institutional and governance risks to project benefits	• Project documents • Project staff	• Interviews • Desk review

		• Project stakeholders	
• Are there any environmental risks that can undermine the future flow of project impacts and Global Environmental Benefits?	• Existence of environmental risks to project benefits	• Project documents • Project staff • Project stakeholders	• Interviews • Desk review
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
• Was there a logical flow of inputs and activities to outputs, from outputs to outcomes, and then to impacts	• Inputs, outputs and outcomes of project directly targeted towards reducing environmental stress and/or improved ecological status	• Annual Work Plans • Logical Framework (original and revised versions)	• Desk review • Interviews
• Did the project achieve its anticipated/planned impacts? Why or why not?	• Improvement in Management Effectiveness in the target Protected Areas leading to conservation of biodiversity • Reduction of fires at Fronloq and Abu Qbais PAs	• Wildlife surveys • METTs • Park Records	• Interviews • Desk review

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 3. Moderately Likely (ML):moderate risks 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks	2. Relevant (R) 1.. Not relevant (NR) *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

Evaluator:

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrong doing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. 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 stake holders, 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 procedure sand be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form[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*

ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE[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
- Evaluator
- 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])

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])

    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

- 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: _____