

EU-UNDP Project: Improving Environmental Monitoring in the Black Sea – EMBLAS Phase 1

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Consultant for independent terminal evaluation of the project

Type of Contract:	Individual Contract
Languages Required:	English, Russian is an asset
Duration:	estimated February 2015 – March 2015 (estimated 26 working days)
Location:	Home based with mission(s) to Istanbul, Ukraine, Russia, Georgia
Payment schedule:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- First payment: 25% of the total fee upon acceptance of the workplan by UNDP Regional Technical Advisor for International Waters (IW RTA) ;- Second payment 50% of the total fee upon submission and acceptance of the draft Evaluation Report and acceptance by the UNDP IW RTA- Final payment: 25% of the total fee upon submission and acceptance of all deliverables, including the Evaluation Report approved by UNDP IW RTA
Application Deadline:	16 February 2015

Please note that UNDP is not in the position to accept incomplete applications - please make sure that your application contains all details as specified below in this notice.

1. BACKGROUND

The Black Sea is one of the most vulnerable regional seas in the world given its limited exchange of water with the open oceans and the large area of continental Europe from which it receives the drainage. The four strongly interlinked priority trans-boundary problems of the Black Sea are eutrophication - nutrient enrichment, changes in marine living resources, chemical pollution (including oil), and biodiversity/habitat changes, including alien species introduction - as well as the underlying root causes like industrial activities, agriculture, domestic wastewater, sea transport (oil spills, ballast water), and coastal zone degradation (urbanisation, tourism). The Convention on the Protection of the Black Sea against Pollution (Bucharest Convention) addresses these problems through enhanced cooperation among its signatories. The development/improvement of a monitoring network and data collection to provide for ecosystem-based and knowledge-based decision-making is considered to be a management target of high priority. Further coordination in policies and legislation between the Black Sea countries is of common interest in the region and specifically to the EU's partners countries – being also members of the Black Sea Commission (BSC) - in so far it influences their own ability to comply with EU legislation and policies, notably the EU Water Framework Directive (WFD) and the EU Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD).

The overall objective of this EC/UNDP project is to set up initiatives that will help improve the protection of the Black Sea environment. The project is addressing the overall need for support in protection and restoring the environmental quality and sustainability of the Black Sea.

The specific objectives are as follows: i) Improve availability and quality of data on the chemical and biological status of the Black Sea, in line with expected MSFD and Black Sea Strategic Action Plan needs; ii) Improve partner countries' ability to perform marine environmental monitoring along MSFD principles, taking into account Black Sea Diagnostic Report.

The following activities are carried out: i) Review of the national monitoring systems and tools for assessing data obtained from monitoring activities; ii) Support to implementation of countries obligations under the Bucharest and other related Conventions and Agreements; iii) Development of cost-effective and harmonised biological and chemical monitoring programmes in accordance with

reporting obligations under multilateral environmental agreements, the WFD and the MSFD; iv) Assessment of needs regarding laboratory infrastructure, equipment, and training, promotion of the recommendations; v) Elaboration and implementation of the comprehensive training programme on monitoring methods and quality assurance aiming at adhering to ISO 17025 standard, promotion; vi) Prepare methodology for Joint Black Sea Surveys; vii) PA7: Development of the web-based Black Sea Water Quality Database prototype.

The project will strengthen capacities of the respective national authorities for biological and chemical monitoring of the Black Sea, taking into consideration the requirements of EU water related legislation (EU WFD and MSFD). Significant effort will be put into training and other capacity building activities. In order to promote ownership, engagement of local experts and organisations is foreseen.

The implementation period of the EMBLAS I project is 1 January 2013 – 31 March 2015 and the project should be seen as a preparatory phase for a follow-up large scale monitoring programme in the BS region – EMBLAS II.

The project has been designed in the frame of the UNDP RBEC Regional Programme Document 2011-2013. In this context the project is related to the UNDP Outcome 2: By 2013, regional, national and sub-national levels have improved capacity for sustainable conservation and management of ecosystems and natural resources (linked to the Focus Area 1: Environment and Energy)

In 2014, a new RPD (2014-2017) has been approved and thus the project was linked to the Outcome 1: Growth and development are inclusive and sustainable, incorporating productive capacities that create employment and livelihoods for the poor and excluded / Output 1.3: Solutions developed at national and sub-national levels for sustainable management of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste.

This Terminal Evaluation is initiated by the UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub for Europe and CIS as the coordinator of the EU-UNDP project: Improving Environmental Monitoring in the Black Sea – phase I (EMBLAS I). The objective of the evaluation is to review and assess the project results, its efficiency, stakeholder involvement, sustainability and to provide recommendations on the follow-up of the project EMBLAS II – 2nd phase of the project (2014-2017).

More information can be found at the project website: www.emblasproject.org

2. DESCRIPTION OF RESPONSIBILITIES

This evaluation is to be undertaken in line with the Evaluation policy of UNDP <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/policy.htm>.

The objective of this Terminal Evaluation is to measure the effectiveness and efficiency of project activities in relation to the stated objectives, and to produce recommendations for the next phase of the EMBLAS project, that is already ongoing, and its activities are building –up on the results of the first phase.

The report will have to provide to the recipients a complete and convincing evidence to support its findings/ratings. The consultant should prepare specific ratings on all aspects of the project, as described in the 'Reporting' section of this Terms of Reference.

The Evaluation will include the assessment of the achievements of the project, measured against planned outputs set forth in the Project Document in accordance with rational budget allocation, and the assessment of features related to the process of achieving those outputs, as well as the impacts the

project. The evaluation will also address the underlying causes and issues contribution to targets not adequately achieved.

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework (Annex 2), 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 selected performance criteria as indicated in table in Annex 3, following the provided recommended rating scales.

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained.

The scope of the Evaluation will cover all activities undertaken in the framework of the project. The evaluator will compare planned outputs of the project to actual outputs and assess the actual results to determine their contribution to the attainment of the project objectives. It will evaluate the efficiency of project management, including the delivery of outputs and activities in terms of quality, quantity, timeliness and cost efficiency.

Products expected from the evaluation

The key product expected from this terminal evaluation is a **comprehensive analytical report in English** that should follow the outline attached in Annex 1.

The Terminal Evaluation Report will be stand-alone document that substantiates its recommendations and conclusions. The report will have to provide to UNDP complete and convincing evidence to support its findings/ratings.

Special attention shall be paid to the lessons learnt as well as to the recommendations for the follow-up project. The Terminal Evaluation Report will include a separate chapter on Lessons Learnt and Recommendations, providing recommendations for replication and transfer of the experience related mainly to:

- project results on the national level;
- support to transboundary cooperation;
- potential impact on the regional level (considering the follow-up phase of the project)
- recommendations from the project stakeholders for planning of future interventions.

The report together with the annexes, shall be presented in electronic form in MS Word format.

Responsibility for Expenses and their Reimbursement

The Consultant will be responsible for all personal administrative and travel expenses associated with undertaking this assignment including office accommodation, printing, stationary, telephone and electronic communications, and report copies incurred in this assignment. For this reason, the contract is prepared as a lump sum contract.

The remuneration of work performed will be conducted as follows:

- First payment: 25% of the total fee upon acceptance of workplan by UNDP RTA for Intl. Waters;
- Second payment 50% of the total fee upon submission and acceptance of the draft Evaluation Report and acceptance by the UNDP Regional Technical Advisor for the International Waters
- Final payment: 25% of the total contract upon submission and acceptance of all deliverables, including the final version of the Evaluation Report by the UNDP RTA for Intl. Waters.

Evaluation approach

An outline of an approach for the review is provided below; however it should be made clear that the consultant is responsible for revising the approach as necessary. Any changes must be cleared by UNDP before being undertaken by the consultant.

The review must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. It must be easily understood by project partners and informative to UNDP related to issues for future programming.

The evaluation will be home based with 1 mission to each beneficiary country: Ukraine, Georgia and Russia, with approx. 2-3 days per country. It is recommended that the evaluator attends the Stakeholder workshops planned in each country in February and March 2015, where s/he would have possibility to meet with the representatives of project partner organizations, national experts and the project team.

The evaluator is expected to consult all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports, project budget revisions, interim reports, project files, and any other material that s/he may consider useful for evidence based assessment.

The evaluator is expected to use interviews as a means of collecting data on the relevance, performance and success of the project. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at minimum:

UNDP project team, National Focal Points, representatives of Project Partner Organizations, Black Sea Commissioners of the beneficiary countries.

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

- Documentation reviewed
- Interviews
- Field visits;
- Questionnaires;
- Participatory techniques and other approaches for the gathering and analysis of data.

The Evaluator is expected to follow the UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN system (Annex 4).

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

The Consultant should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the assignment. The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation lies with UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub (IRH). UNDP IRH and the Project Manager will be responsible for liaising with the evaluator to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the project partners, etc.

The timeframe and duration of activities are estimated to be broken down as follows:

Deliverable	Time frame	Deadlines
Desk review, questions, analysis	2 days	
Detailed Project Workplan and Table of Contents for	1 days	

Assignment		
Interviews	3 days	
Field visits, interviews, questionnaires	8 days	
Draft evaluation report – to be submitted to UNDP for review and comments / circulated to key stakeholders as needed	6 days	
Final Terminal Evaluation Report	6 days	March 2015

The report shall be submitted to the UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub, Istanbul, Turkey - Regional Technical Advisor for Intl. Waters, Project Manager with copy to other relevant UNDP IRH staff (details to be provided in due course).

Prior to approval of the final report, a draft version shall be submitted for comments to UNDP and the stakeholders. The finalized Evaluation Report is expected on **31 March 2015**. The time frame of the deliverables may be adjusted considering the actual start of the contract.

If any discrepancies have emerged between impressions and findings of the consultant and the aforementioned parties, these should be explained in an annex attached to the final report.

3. COMPETENCIES

Functional competencies:

- Excellent communication and management skills and demonstrable capacity to lead a multi-national team and to work with government institutions;
- Demonstrated ability to develop strategies and work plans to accomplish objectives, empower others to translate visions and efforts into results, identify strategic issues, opportunities and risks and devise timely and effective responses;
- Openness to change and ability to receive/integrate feedback;
- Ability to work under pressure and stressful situations;
- Strong analytical, reporting and writing abilities.
-

Corporate Competencies:

- Demonstrates integrity by modeling the UN's values and ethical standards;
- Promotes the vision, mission, and strategic goals of UNDP;
- Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability;
- Treats all people fairly without favoritism;
- Fulfills all obligations to gender sensitivity and zero tolerance for sexual harassment.

4. QUALIFICATIONS

The Evaluator **must be independent** from both the policy-making process and the delivery and management of activities in question, i.e. he/she must not have participated in the preparation and/or implementation of the assessed project and must not be in a conflict of interest with project-related activities.

Academic Qualifications/Education:

- Master degree at least in one of the fields of chemistry, biology, environmental science or equivalent experience.

Experience:

- At least 7 years of professional experience in the field of integrated water resources management, EU water related legislation;

-
- Experience with UNDP projects in relevant field;
 - Experience and/or knowledge of relevant projects and activities in the Black Sea Region
 - Knowledge of UNDP's results-based evaluation policies and procedures
 - Knowledge and practical experience in evaluation of international donor driven development projects, in particular with EU funded projects;
 - Knowledge of MS Word, Excel and email communication software;

Language skills:

- Excellent English writing and communication skills
- Working knowledge of Russian

5. EVALUATION OF APPLICANTS

Individual consultants will be evaluated based on a cumulative analysis taking into consideration the **combination of the applicants' qualifications and financial proposal**.

The award of the contract should be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

a) responsive/compliant/acceptable, and

b) Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical (P11 desk reviews) and financial criteria specific to the solicitation.

Only the highest ranked candidates who would be found qualified for the job will be considered for the Financial Evaluation

Technical Criteria - 70% of total evaluation – max. 70 points:

- Academic background: 10
- Proven experience in the field integrated water resources management, water quality monitoring, EU water related legislation, in particular EU Marine Strategy Framework Directive and/or Water Framework Directive projects: 20
- Experience with water related projects in the Black Sea Region: 10
- Knowledge of evaluating programmes/projects, in particular for UNDP including knowledge of UNDP's results-based evaluation policies and procedures, experience with EU funded projects: 10
- Proven evaluation expertise with international organizations (knowledge and practical experience in development evaluations) – max points: 10
- Language skills – English and Russian: 10

Financial Criteria - 30% of total evaluation – max. 30 points

6. APPLICATION PROCEDURES

Qualified candidates are requested to apply online via this website. The application should contain:

- **Cover letter** explaining why you are the most suitable candidate for the advertised position and a **brief methodology** on how you will approach and conduct the work (based on commenting on the requirements indicated in this TOR). Please paste the letter into the "Resume and Motivation" section of the electronic application.
- **Filled P11 form** including past experience in similar projects and contact details of referees (blank form can be downloaded from

http://europeandcis.undp.org/files/hrforms/P11_modified_for_SCs_and_ICs.doc);
please upload the P11 instead of your CV.

- **Financial Proposal*** - specifying a total lump sum amount in USD for the tasks specified in this announcement. The financial proposal shall include a breakdown of this lump sum amount (number of anticipated working days – in home office/ number of work days on mission/ travel costs – international and local, per diems and any other possible costs). Please note that you are free to decide in your offer to take 1 or 2 missions to Istanbul that would amount up to approx. 4 days in total.

Incomplete applications will not be considered. Please make sure you have provided all requested materials

Please note that the **financial proposal is all-inclusive and shall take into account various expenses incurred by the consultant/contractor during the contract period (e.g. fee, health insurance, vaccination and any other relevant expenses related to the performance of services...). All envisaged **travel costs** must be included in the financial proposal.*

Payments will be made only upon confirmation of UNDP on delivering on the contract obligations in a satisfactory manner.

*Individual Consultants are responsible for ensuring they have **vaccinations/inoculations** when travelling to certain countries, as designated by the UN Medical Director. Consultants are also required to comply with the UN **security directives** set forth under dss.un.org*

General Terms and conditions as well as other related documents can be found under:

*Qualified **women** and members of **minorities** are encouraged to apply.*

Due to large number of applications we receive, we are able to inform only the successful candidates about the outcome or status of the selection process.

Annexes:

1. Evaluation Report: Sample Table of Contents for Final Project Evaluation
2. Project Logical Framework
3. Performance criteria to be rated; the recommended rating scales
4. Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form

Evaluation Report: Sample Table of Contents for Final Project Evaluation

- i.** Cover page:
 - Title of UNDP project
 - UNDP ID#s.
 - Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report
 - Region and countries included in the project
 - Implementing Partner and other project partners
 - 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 Manual¹)
- 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 rated²)
- 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

¹ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

² 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.

implementation)

- Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)
- Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management
- Project Finance:
- Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (*)
- UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (*) coordination, and operational issues

3.3 Project Results

- Overall results (attainment of objectives) (*)
- Relevance(*)
- Effectiveness & Efficiency (*)
- Country ownership
- Mainstreaming
- Sustainability (*)
- Impact

4. Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons

- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
- Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
- Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
- Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success

5. Annexes

- ToR
- Itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- Summary of field visits
- List of documents reviewed
- Evaluation Question Matrix
- Questionnaire used and summary of results
- [Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form](#)

Project Logical Framework - Results and Resources Framework

Intended Outcome as stated in the Regional Programme Results and Resource Framework: OUTCOME 2: By 2013, regional, national and sub-national levels have improved capacity for sustainable conservation and management of ecosystems and natural resources
Outcome indicators as stated in the Regional Programme Results and Resources Framework, including baseline and targets: 1. Number of legal and regulatory frameworks that address the sustainable conservation and management of ecosystems and natural resources. <u>Baseline:</u> 14 in sectors such as agriculture, forestry, fishery, water, environment / <u>Target:</u> 20 – to cover at least one intervention in each country where UNDP has an active portfolio in ecosystems and natural resource management 4. Amount of funds mobilized by BRC from GEF, bilaterals and other funds for governments and private sector in RBEC. <u>Baseline:</u> US\$ 30 million (GEF, bilaterals) / <u>Targets:</u> US\$ 45 million (GEF, bilaterals, new environmental finance) 5. Number of Transboundary mechanisms for natural resource management established with the support of the projects or supported by the projects. <u>Baseline:</u> 5 (Danube, Black Sea, Dniro, Tisza, Caspian, Carpathians) / <u>Target:</u> 11 – additional six over the baseline (Dinaris karst, Drini, Kura-Aras and three in Central Asia)
Applicable Key Result Area (from Regional Programme document for ECIS (2011-2013)): Primary: Mainstreaming environment and energy / Secondary: Expanding access to environmental and energy services for the poor
Partnership Strategy: UNDP – overall responsibility for project implementation/ project partners from beneficiary countries / cooperation with other EU funded research projects and EU / cooperation with Governmental bodies of beneficiary countries and with the Black Sea Commission
Project title and ID (ATLAS Award ID): Environmental Protection of the Black Sea

INTENDED OUTPUTS	OUTPUT TARGETS	INDICATIVE ACTIVITIES	RESPONSIBLE PARTIES	INPUTS
Improvement of availability and quality of chemical and biological data to provide for integrated assessments of the Black Sea state of environment, including pressures and impacts <i>Baseline: National monitoring systems are existing, additional technical assistance support for amendment to the relevant water legislation and administrative reforms is needed</i> <i>Indicators: Level of involvement of national organizations responsible for monitoring</i>	<i>Targets:</i> Y1: Review on status of monitoring systems and assessment tools, gap analysis for each country Y1: Recommendations for the further development of monitoring systems and tools for each country	Project Activity 1: Review of the national monitoring systems and tools for assessing data obtained from monitoring activities	UNDP	International Consultants Local Consultants - Experts Travel Travel DSA staff intl.events Travel DSA local events Travel DSA participants Contractual Services Services/meetings Grants Services / evaluation Services / visibility actions
Baseline: Bucharest convention and other agreements, EU Marine Strategy Indicators: Availability of further developed compliance indicators and indicator based reporting aimed at strengthening the Bucharest Convention implementation; Support provided to development of knowledge-based adaptive management and harmonization of	<i>Targets:</i> Y1: Indicator based reporting indicator-based reporting scheme developed Y2: Support provided to the countries in harmonization of national policies, including common understanding of water quality	Project Activity 2: Support to implementation of countries obligations under the Bucharest and other related Conventions and Agreements	UNDP	Services / translations Publications /visibility products Subtotal: 916,100 USD

INTENDED OUTPUTS	OUTPUT TARGETS	INDICATIVE ACTIVITIES	RESPONSIBLE PARTIES	INPUTS
<i>approaches to environment protection</i>				
Baseline: National monitoring programs are existing, but revision is needed; results from Project Activity 1 available, Indicators: Revised monitoring programs and developed/updated relevant guidelines	Targets: Y1: Recommendations for revision & extension of national monitoring programs, including parameters, monitoring network sites Y2: Guidelines for biological monitoring developed	Project Activity 3: Development of cost-effective and harmonised biological and chemical monitoring programmes in accordance with reporting obligations under multilateral environmental agreements, the WFD and the MSFD	UNDP	
Baseline: Network of Black Sea reference laboratories exists, assessment of their technical capacities is needed Indicators: Needs for laboratory infrastructure/equipment and training assessed	Targets: Y1: Analysis report on available equipment and needs and training necessities Y2: Recommendations to improve the efficient use of equipment and database on equipment availability	Project Activity 4: Assessment of needs regarding laboratory infrastructure, equipment, and training, promotion of the recommendations		
Baseline: Network of Black Sea reference laboratories exists, further capacity building is needed Indicators: Strengthening the capacities of national reference laboratories, in terms of staff and methodologies; Monitoring-related training programme elaborated and initial implementation started	Targets: Y1: Training programme & material prepared, SOPs and QA/QC manuals Y2: Trainings organized and capacities of Laboratories strengthened	Project Activity 5: Elaboration and implementation of the comprehensive training programme on monitoring methods and quality assurance aiming at adhering to ISO 17025 standard, promotion		
Baseline: Joint surveys are planned under other EU funded projects Indicators: Available methodology for Survey, including the list of parameters and sites.	Targets: Y1: Methodology for Black Sea survey developed, including the list of parameters, sites, and an outline for cooperation with joint surveys planned under another EU projects	Project Activity 6: Prepare methodology for Joint Black Sea Surveys		
Baseline: Black Sea Water Quality database exists, but not as web-based system Indicators: Improvement of the Black Sea Water Quality database, Phytoplankton and Mnemiopsis components of BSIS	Targets: Y1: Concept for Web-Based Database agree programming and web portal tested Y2: Guidelines for the database use and data upload, concept for the long-term maintenance	Project Activity 7: Development of the web-based Black Sea Water Quality Database prototype		
	Overall project management, support to the national experts and stakeholders, reporting according to the donor requirements	Project Management		Local Cons. -adm support / project manager / reg. support Equipment / Communication

INTENDED OUTPUTS	OUTPUT TARGETS	INDICATIVE ACTIVITIES	RESPONSIBLE PARTIES	INPUTS
				/ Supplies Rental and Maintenance Miscellaneous Subtotal: 461,100 USD
TOTAL USD				1,377,200

Annex 3

Performance criteria to be rated

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

The recommended rating scales

<i>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution</i> 6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings 5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings 4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS) 3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings 2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems 1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems	<i>Sustainability ratings:</i> 4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks	<i>Relevance ratings</i> 2. Relevant (R) 1.. Not relevant (NR) <i>Impact Ratings:</i> 3. Significant (S) 2. Minimal (M) 1. Negligible (N)
<i>Additional ratings where relevant:</i> Not Applicable (N/A) Unable to Assess (U/A)		

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 Form¹

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: _____

¹ www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct