



Empowered lives.  
Resilient nations.

**DETAILED TERMS OF REFERENCE  
FOR  
INDEPENDENT TERMINAL EVALUATION OF THE PROJECT  
Mainstreaming Prevention and Control Measures for Invasive alien Species into Trade, Transport  
and Travel across the Production Landscape**

**1. Project Summary Table**

Project Title	<b>Mainstreaming Prevention and Control Measures for Invasive alien Species into Trade, Transport and Travel across the Production Landscape</b>			
GEF Project ID:	1620		<i>at endorsement (US\$)</i>	<i>at completion (US\$)</i>
UNDP Project ID:	53109	GEF financing:	2,000,000	
Country:	Seychelles	IA/EA own:		
Region:	Africa	Government:	2,475,000	
Focal Area:	Biodiversity	Other:	2,480,624	
Operational Programme:	SO2 - SP4, SP5 + SO4, SP7	Total co-financing:	4,955,624	
Executing Agency:	Ministry of Environment and Energy	Total Project Cost:	6,955,624	
Other Partners involved:	UNDP, Customs Section, Immigration Department, Maritime Safety Administration, Seychelles National Parks Authority, Ports Authority, Airport Authority, NGOs, Farmers Association, private tourism operators	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		18 Dec 2007
		(Operational) Closing Date: 18 December 2012	Proposed: 30 June 2014	Actual: 30 June 2014

**2. Background**

The Government of Seychelles (GOS), in partnership with the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) is currently implementing a programme of mainstreaming biodiversity management, in particular the prevention and control measures for Invasive Alien Species, across the Production Landscape of Seychelles.

Isolated from the continents for 65 million years, the fauna and flora of Seychelles have evolved into unique forms with ancient Gondwanan lineage. The archipelago is a repository of globally important terrestrial diversity. It is also a storehouse of marine biodiversity. Seychelles is part of one of the major biodiversity hotspots in the world: Madagascar and the Indian Ocean Islands. Its biodiversity is at risk of extirpation, and in some instances outright extinction, from a variety of human induced pressures.

Seychelles faces the typical constraints of a SIDS, with its small land area and population, remoteness from major markets, limited natural resources and environmental vulnerability. Its most important assets are the truly rare beauty of the environment, and a significant fishery resource including pelagic and various coastal stocks.

Seychelles is typical of remote islands in the ecological susceptibility of its terrestrial biodiversity to IAS. IAS out-compete and replace indigenous fauna and flora through predation, elimination of natural regeneration, introduction of diseases and smothering by creepers. Animal IAS, like rats, feral cats and other predators, can be devastating to the avifauna and small fauna, reducing levels of recruitment. IAS also pose a threat of unquantified magnitude to Seychelles' marine biodiversity. Most of the terrestrial ecosystems of Seychelles have been heavily affected by certain invasive alien species. The introduction of IAS into Seychelles has long been associated with trade, agriculture, and movement of people. The nature of the IAS threat has changed dramatically as a result of the increased trade and movement of people associated with the development of tourism and industrial off-shore fisheries. This has increased the number of pathways for IAS introductions. Three sets of barriers are impeding efforts to remediate the threats posed by invasive alien species. These are 1) capacity deficits at the systemic level; 2) limited capacities at the institutional level; and 3) technical capability.

The project *Mainstreaming Prevention and Control Measures for Invasive Alien Species into Trade, Transport and Travel across the Production Landscape* is expected to contribute to the achievement of the following goal: The functional integrity of the terrestrial and coastal ecosystems is secured now and into the future, thus providing a base for sustainable development. The project is responsible for achieving the following project objective: Increased capacities to prevent and control the introduction and spread of Invasive Alien Species through Trade, Travel and Transport across the Production Landscape. The project is divided into three outcomes, namely:

- 1) Outcome 1: Policy and regulatory framework for effective control of the introduction and spread of IAS in place.
- 2) Outcome 2: Strengthened Institutional capacity to prevent and control the introduction and spread of IAS.
- 3) Outcome 3: Improved knowledge and learning capacities to control the introduction, establishment and spread of IAS.

The project was originally planned for five years, but has received a no-cost extension of 18 months, terminating end of June 2014.

### **3. UNDP GEF monitoring and evaluation (M&E) policy**

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures<sup>1</sup>, all full and medium-sized country projects implemented by UNDP with GEF financing must undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the project *Mainstreaming Prevention and Control Measures for Invasive Alien Species into Trade, Transport and Travel across the Production Landscape*.

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

### **4. Objective and Scope**

#### **Objective**

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 (2011).

<http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/UNDP-GEF-TE-Guide.pdf>

---

<sup>1</sup> See 'UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results', 2009, and the 'GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy', 2010

The purpose of the evaluation is to:

- Assess overall performance against the project objectives as set out in the Project Document and other related documents
- Assess project relevance to national priorities, as well as UNDP and GEF strategic objectives
- Assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the project
- Critically analyze the implementation and management arrangements of the project, including financial management.
- Assess the sustainability of the project interventions and consider project impacts
- Document lessons and best practices concerning project design, implementation and management which may be of relevance to other projects in the country and elsewhere in the world.

### **Scope**

The TE should consider and report on the following evaluation issues and criteria:

1. Project relevance and consistency with country priorities and the GEF Focal Area.
2. Ownership of the project at the national and local levels; stakeholder participation across local levels and partnerships developed through the project.
3. Effectiveness in realizing project immediate objectives, planned outcomes and outputs; the effects of the project on target groups and institutions; the extent to which these have contributed towards strengthening the institutional, organizational and technical capability of the government in achieving its long-term sustainable development objectives (including environmental management goals).
4. Sustainability of project achievements and impacts, including financial and institutional sustainability, and an assessment of planned replication and exit strategies.
5. Management arrangements, including supervision, guidance, back-stopping, human resources, and the Implementing Agency's (UNDP) supervision and backstopping; the quality and timeliness of inputs, activities, responsiveness of project management to changes in the project environment and other M&E feedback.
6. Financial planning and sustainability, including the timely delivery and use of committed co-financing.
7. Efficiency or cost-effectiveness in the ways in which project outputs and outcomes were achieved.
8. Adaptive management, including effective use of log-frame, UNDP risk management system, annual Project Implementation Reviews, and other parts of the M&E system, tools and mechanisms as appropriate; evaluate whether project design allowed for flexibility in responding to changes in the project environment.
9. Risk management, including the UNDP risk management system within ATLAS, which is also incorporated in the annual PIR. The evaluator is requested to determine how effectively the risk management system is being used as an adaptive management tool. Risks may be of a financial, socio-political, institutional, operational, environmental (or other) type.
10. Cross-cutting issues:
  - Governance: How has the project facilitated the participation of the local communities in natural resource management and decision making processes
  - Promotion of gender equity: Has the project considered gender sensitivity or equal participation of man and women and boys and girls in decision making processes
  - Capacity development of participants and target beneficiaries, communications and use of technology.

Lessons and Recommendations: The evaluator will present lessons and recommendations on all aspects of the project s/he considers relevant. with special attention given to analysing lessons and proposing recommendations on aspects related to factors that contributed to or hindered attainment of project objectives, sustainability of project benefits, innovation, catalytic effect and replication, the role and effectiveness of M & E and adaptive management in project implementation.

## **Evaluation approach and method**

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 country focal points, steering committee, UNDP Country Office, project team, and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Seychelles including specific project sites. The evaluator is expected to use interviews as a means of collecting data on the relevance, performance and success of the project. Key stakeholders to be interviewed are as follows (see also ProDoc p.82-84):

- Ministry of Environment and Energy
- GEF Operational Focal Point (National Project Director)
- Ministry of Natural Resources and Industry
- Ministry of Home Affairs
- Ministry of Transport and Tourism
- Ministry of Health (Public Health Division)
- Ministry of Finance – Trade Division
- District Administration Offices
- Seychelles Agriculture Agency
- Seychelles Civil Aviation Authority
- Seychelles Ports Authority
- Seychelles Coastguard
- Maritime Safety Administration
- Seychelles Tourism Board
- Seychelles Farmers Association
- Seychelles Bureau of Standards
- Island Development Corporation
- Island Conservation Society
- Marine Conservation Society, Seychelles
- Nature Seychelles
- Plant Conservation Action Group
- Seychelles Islands Foundation (also implementing an EU-funded biosecurity project)
- Seychelles National Parks Authority
- National Biosecurity Committee
- UNDP Country Office in Seychelles
- UNDP Environment and Energy (EEG) Group Regional Coordination Unit (Regional Technical Advisor)

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, mid-term evaluation, project reports (including Annual Reports APR/PIR, project budget revisions, progress reports), focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other material that s/he may consider useful for evidence based assessment. A list of documentation that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included with this Terms of Reference ([Annex 1](#)).

A least 1 week prior to the evaluation mission, the evaluator will submit a brief (2 page) inception note, to include:

- Further elaboration on the intended approach & method, consistent with this TOR.
- Planned timing for carrying out the evaluation mission.
- Any requests to include additional participatory techniques, such as surveys and focus groups, or other approaches for the gathering and analysis of data that are otherwise not specified in the TOR, and which may entail additional time or cost.
- Requests for additional project background information not included with this TOR

On arrival in Seychelles the evaluator will conduct interviews with involved personnel including:

- UNDP-GEF staff who have project responsibilities;
- Staff of the Programme Coordination Unit
- Staff of the Executing Agency (including the National Project Director)
- Members of the Project Board (Steering Committee)

- Project stakeholders, including participating members of the demo sub-projects
- Relevant staff in participating government departments.

Field visits will be undertaken to project sites on Mahe and other inner islands as needed.

### Evaluation Criteria & Ratings

Project performance will be measured based on 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**, as defined and explained in the guidance manual. As agreed with GEF, ratings will be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. In addition, a rating must also be provided for project implementation. The obligatory rating scales are provided ([Annex 3](#)).

Evaluation Ratings			
1. Monitoring and Evaluation	rating	2. IA & EA execution	rating
M&E Design at Entry		Quality of UNDP Implementation	
M&E Plan Implementation		Quality of Execution - Executing Agency	
Overall quality of M&E		Overall Quality of Implementation / Execution	
3. Assessment of Outcomes	rating	4. Sustainability	rating
Relevance		Financial resources:	
Effectiveness		Socio-political:	
Efficiency		Institutional Framework and Governance:	
Overall Project Outcome Rating		Environmental :	
		Overall Likelihood of Sustainability	

### Mainstreaming

UNDP/GEF projects are key components in UNDP country programming. As such, the objectives and outcomes of the project should conform to UNDP country programme strategies as well as to GEF-required outcomes. Based on a review of key documents, including the Project Document, UNDP Country Programme (CP), mid-term review, plus key stakeholder interviews, the evaluation will provide a brief assessment of the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP strategic priorities, such as poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and the empowerment of women.

### Impact

The evaluators will offer their assessment of 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, or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.

### Conclusions, lessons and recommendations

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

### Implementation arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO for Mauritius and Seychelles. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country (Seychelles) for the evaluator. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the evaluator to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the government etc. This should be done at least 2 weeks ahead of the evaluation mission to allow sufficient time for the evaluator to provide input and confirm that they can meet the proposed schedule.

## Project finance/co-finance

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	Planned	Actual
Grants								
Loans/Concessions								
• In-kind support								
• Other								
Totals								

## Duties and Responsibilities

The evaluator conducting the TE for this Project will be an international consultant with in depth understanding of UNDP and GEF projects, including evaluation experience. S/he will be responsible for developing the evaluation methodology, conducting the evaluation and delivering the key products expected from the evaluation. The evaluator will work with a small consultative group from PCU and UNDP Seychelles. The evaluation exercise will be supported and facilitated by the Project Manager and International Technical Advisor to the project, in conjunction with Programme Coordination Unit and UNDP Seychelles. The consultant will sign an agreement with UNDP to undertake the Biosecurity Project TE and will be bound by its terms and conditions set out in the agreement.

The evaluator selected for the assignment should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have any conflict of interest with project related activities

## Required Skills and Experience and Competencies

### Competencies

#### Corporate Competencies

- Demonstrates integrity by modelling the UNs values and ethical standards.
- Advocates and promotes the vision, mission, and strategic goals of UN.
- Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability.
- Treats all people fairly without favouritism.

#### Functional Competencies

- Operational effectiveness.
- Solid knowledge of financial and human resources management, contract, asset and procurement, information and communication technology, general administration.
- Ability to lead business processes re-engineering, implementation of new systems (business Management and Leadership).
- Builds strong relationships with clients, focuses on impact and result for the client and responds positively to feedback.
- Consistently approaches work with energy and a positive, constructive attitude.
- Demonstrates excellent oral and written communication skills.

- Demonstrates openness to change and ability to manage complexities.
- Shows mentoring as well as conflict resolution skills.

### Required Skills and Experience

- An MSc (minimum requirement) or higher degree in Environment, Natural Resource Management or related fields, and adequate experience in the management, design and/or evaluation of comparable natural resources management projects.
- In-depth understanding of land and environment issues in tropical/subtropical and island environments (particular experience with Small Island Developing States and in the Western Indian Ocean is an advantage). A minimum of 10 years of relevant working experience is required.
- Prior experience in the evaluation of international technical assistance projects with major donor agencies, including UNDP-GEF projects.
- An understanding of local application of commitments to international conventions, and how local actions contribute to global benefits, is crucial.
- Demonstrated ability to assess complex situations, succinctly distil critical issues, and draw forward-looking conclusions and recommendations.
- Excellent written and verbal communication skills in English. Good knowledge of French is advantageous.
- Ability to deliver quality reports within the given time.

### Evaluation timeframe

The total duration of the evaluation will be 30 working days over approximately 8 weeks according to the following plan (for details see [Annex 4](#)): Expected date of contract 20 September 2014

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation	3 days	September 23rd
Evaluation Mission to Seychelles	15 days	October 22nd
Draft Evaluation Report	8 days	October 30th
Final Report	4 days	November 19th

TE is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
<b>Inception Note</b>	Evaluator clarifications on timing and method	No later than 1 week 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 2 weeks of the evaluation mission	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF FPs
<b>Final Report</b>	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Sent to CO

An outline for the final report is given in [Annex 5](#).

## Evaluator Ethics

Evaluation consultant will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex 6) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the 2008 UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations.

## Scope of Price Proposal

A financial proposal has to be submitted by offerors which specifies:

- i) Daily Fee. The Daily fee should be all inclusive<sup>1</sup>. *The term "All inclusive" implies that all costs (professional fees, travel costs, living allowances, communications, consummables, etc.) that could possibly be incurred by the Contractor are already factored into the final amounts submitted in the proposal.* In general, UNDP should not accept travel costs exceeding those of an economy class ticket. Should the consultant wish to travel on a higher class he/she should do so using their own resources. For information only, the UN Daily Subsistence Allowance at the duty station is 363 USD as August 2014.
- ii) An IC Time Sheet must be submitted by the Contractor, duly approved by the Individual Contractor's supervisor, which shall serve as the basis for the payment of fees (as per template)

## Payment modalities and specifications

%	Milestone
20%	At contract signing due date Sep 2014
50%	Following submission and approval of the 1st draft terminal evaluation report Oct 24 <sup>th</sup> 2014
30%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report ( no date defined yet until RTA respond)
	Due Sep 2014
	DSA 15 days in the field (Seychelles)

Prior to the final payment, sign-off is required as per Annex 7.

## Application process

Applicants are requested to apply online <http://jobs.undp.org>. Individual consultants are invited to submit applications as below below requirements.

1. Duly accomplished **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the template provided by UNDP
2. **Personal CV or P11**, indicating all past experience from similar projects, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the Candidate and at least three (3) professional references;
3. **Brief description** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a methodology, **if applicable**, on how they will approach and complete the assignment.
4. **Financial Proposal** supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template provided.

All Applicants will be requested to submit a price offer indicating their proposed daily fee rate for the assignment. Following UNDP procurement rules, both technical competence (70%) and the consultant



daily fee rate (30%) will be taken into account in the selection process. The Technical Evaluation will be based on the following Evaluation Criteria.

Masters or equivalent in Environmental sciences or agricultural sciences, environmental management	5 years minimum field experience in project development and/or evaluation and/or implementation preferably in the field of Biosecurity/Biodiversity	Minimum of 5 Project Evaluations of which 3 must be GEF related	Experience and skills in multi-stakeholder and participatory approaches in project management especially in SIDS	Proficiency in English and workable knowledge of French	Knowledge of UNDP and GEF projects evaluations and procedures an advantage	Total
20 MARKS	20 MARKS	20 MARKS	20 MARKS	10 MARKS	10 MARKS	100 MARKS

Qualified women and members of social minorities are strongly encouraged to apply.

DEADLINE FOR APPLICATIONS IS 12 September 2014

**This TOR is approved by :** Roland Alcindor



Roland Alcindor  
Programme Manager -UNDP

Signature

Date of Signing

27 August 2014\_\_

## Annex 1: List of Documents to be reviewed by the evaluators

It is anticipated that the methodology to be used for the TE will include, but may not be limited to, the review of the following:

- Project Document
- Project implementation reports (PIRs)
- Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the project
- Mid-term Evaluation report
- Audit reports
- Annual Review Reports
- The project M&E framework
- Reports from implementers of various project activities, legal documents (e.g. Biosecurity Bill)
- M&E Operational Guidelines
- Financial and Administration guidelines
- Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
- Minutes of the Project Board Meetings and any other project management meetings
- The GEF Implementation Completion Report guidelines
- The UNDP Monitoring and Evaluation Frameworks.

## Annex 2: Project Logical Framework. Prodoc

To be provided (separate attachment).

## Annex 3: Ratings

Ratings Scales		
<p><i>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&amp;E, I&amp;E Execution</i></p> <p><b>6. Highly Satisfactory (HS):</b> any shortcomings are of negligible significance</p> <p><b>5. Satisfactory (S):</b> minor shortcomings</p> <p><b>4. Moderately Satisfactory (MS):</b> moderate shortcomings</p> <p><b>3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU):</b> significant shortcomings</p> <p><b>2. Unsatisfactory (U):</b> major problems</p> <p><b>1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU):</b> severe problems</p>	<p><i>Sustainability ratings:</i></p> <p><b>4. Likely (L):</b> negligible risks to sustainability</p> <p><b>3. Moderately Likely (ML):</b> moderate risks</p> <p><b>2. Moderately Unlikely (MU):</b> significant risks</p> <p><b>1. Unlikely (U):</b> severe risks</p> <p><i>Additional ratings where relevant: Not Applicable (N/A) ; Unable to Assess (U/A)</i></p>	<p><i>Relevance ratings:</i></p> <p><b>2. Relevant (R)</b></p> <p><b>1. Not relevant (NR)</b></p>

### Guidelines for Ratings for Project Implementation:

#### 1. Progress toward achieving project objectives

**Rating of Project Progress towards Meeting Objective:** Taking into account the cumulative level of progress compared to the target level across all of the objective indicators, please rate the progress of the project towards meeting its objective, according to the following scale.

Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Project is expected to achieve or exceed all its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as “good practice”.
Satisfactory (S)	Project is expected to achieve most of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings.
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Project is expected to achieve most of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve some of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits.
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Project is expected to achieve of its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only some of its major global environmental objectives.
Unsatisfactory (U)	Project is expected not to achieve most of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits.
Highly Unsatisfactory (U)	The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, any of its major global environment objectives with no worthwhile benefits.

## 2. Progress in project implementation

Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Implementation of all components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised implementation plan for the project. The project can be presented as “good practice”.
Satisfactory (S)	Implementation of most components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan except for only a few that are subject to remedial action.
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Implementation of some components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with some components requiring remedial action.
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Implementation of some components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with most components requiring remedial action.
Unsatisfactory (U)	Implementation of most components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Implementation of none of the components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.

Criterion	Evaluator's Summary Comments	Evaluator's Rating
<b>A. Attainment of project objectives and results (overall rating)</b> <b>Sub criteria (below)</b>		
A. 1. Effectiveness		
A. 2. Relevance		
A. 3. Efficiency		
A.4. Relevance		
<b>B. Sustainability of Project outcomes (overall rating)</b> <b>Sub criteria (below)</b>		

B. 1. Financial		
B. 2. Socio Political		
B. 3. Institutional framework and governance		
B. 4. Environmental		
<b>C. Achievement of outputs and activities</b>		
<b>D. Monitoring and Evaluation (overall rating)</b> <b>Sub criteria (below)</b>		
D. 1. M&E Design		
D. 2. M&E Plan Implementation (use for adaptive management)		
D. 3. Budgeting and Funding for M&E activities		
<b>E. Catalytic Role</b>		
<b>F. Preparation and readiness</b>		
<b>G. Country ownership</b>		
<b>H. Stakeholders involvement</b>		
<b>I. Financial planning</b>		
<b>J. Implementation approach</b>		
<b>K. UNDP/GEF Supervision and backstopping</b>		

**Please note:** Relevance and effectiveness will be considered as critical criteria. The overall rating of the project for achievement of objectives and results **may not be higher** than the lowest rating on either of these two criteria. Thus, to have an overall satisfactory rating for outcomes a project must have at least satisfactory ratings on both relevance and effectiveness.

#### Annex 4: Plan for Evaluation Implementation

	Activity	Estimated time	Key outputs
1	Preparation by consultant <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Review project documents and progress reports</li> <li>- Other relevant literature</li> <li>- Prepare inception report</li> <li>- Agreement on activities and timeframes</li> <li>- Preparation of meetings/programme</li> </ul>	3 days	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Familiarization with the projects (re. intended outcomes)</li> <li>• Agreement on timeframes and programme</li> </ul>
2	Meetings and discussions with stakeholders <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Discussions with project staff and PCU</li> <li>- Field visits. This will include interviews and discussions with various stakeholders.</li> <li>- Meetings with development partners including eventually Project Steering committee and other partners</li> </ul>	14 days (including travel)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document records of interviews and observations with stakeholders</li> <li>• Evaluate findings</li> </ul>
3	Presentation of findings to stakeholders <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Hold a meeting with stakeholders including Project Steering Committee, development partners, government and UN agencies to present preliminary findings and recommendations to collect feedback that will help finalise the report, give suggestions and get feedback</li> </ul>	1 day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Present findings to key stakeholders and create forum for participatory feedback</li> </ul>
4	Writing Report	8 days	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft report delivered</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Incorporate feedback from the presentation meeting into findings</li> <li>- Draft report and final report</li> </ul> <p>Report should be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Analytical in nature (both quantitative and qualitative)</li> <li>- Structured around issues and related findings/lessons learnt</li> <li>- Conclusions</li> <li>- Recommendations</li> </ul> <p>Present draft form for review by UNDP CO</p>		<p>to UNDP CO for consideration</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consideration should be given to producing a final report for public information and donors</li> </ul>
5	Submission of Final Report	4 days	A report of maximum 40 pages in word document format with tables where appropriate (excluding annexes) will be submitted within 1 week of receiving consolidated comments made on the draft submitted to UNDP CO
	Time allocated to the assignment	30 days	

## Annex 5: Evaluation Report Outline<sup>2</sup>

<b>i.</b>	<p>Opening page:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Name of the UNDP/GEF project</li> <li>• UNDP and GEF project ID's.</li> <li>• Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report</li> <li>• Region and countries included in the project</li> <li>• GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program</li> <li>• Executing Agency and project partners</li> <li>• Evaluation team members</li> <li>• Acknowledgements</li> </ul>
<b>ii.</b>	<p>Executive Summary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Summary Table</li> <li>• Project Description (brief)</li> <li>• Evaluation Rating Table</li> <li>• Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons</li> </ul>
<b>iii.</b>	<p>Acronyms and Abbreviations (See: UN Editorial Manual<sup>3</sup>)</p>
<b>1.</b>	<p>Introduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Purpose of the evaluation</li> <li>• Scope &amp; Methodology</li> <li>• Structure of the evaluation report</li> </ul>
<b>2.</b>	<p>Project description and development context</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project start and duration</li> <li>• Problems that the project sought to address</li> <li>• Immediate and development objectives of the project</li> <li>• Baseline Indicators established</li> <li>• Main stakeholders</li> <li>• Expected Results</li> </ul>

<sup>2</sup>The Report length shall not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

<sup>3</sup> <http://69.94.137.26/editorialcontrol/>

3.	Findings (In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (*) must be rated)
3.1	Project Design / Formulation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analysis of LFA (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)</li> <li>• Assumptions and Risks</li> <li>• Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design</li> <li>• Planned stakeholder participation</li> <li>• Replication approach</li> <li>• UNDP comparative advantage</li> <li>• Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector</li> <li>• Management arrangements</li> </ul>
3.2	Project Implementation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)</li> <li>• Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)</li> <li>• Feedback from M&amp;E activities used for adaptive management</li> <li>• Project Finance:</li> <li>• Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (*)</li> <li>• UNDP and Executing Agency implementation / execution (*) coordination, and operational issues</li> </ul>
3.3	Project Results <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overall results (attainment of objectives) (*)</li> <li>• Relevance, Effectiveness, &amp; Efficiency (*)</li> <li>• Country ownership</li> <li>• Mainstreaming</li> <li>• Sustainability (*)</li> <li>• Catalytic Role &amp; Impact</li> </ul>
4.	Conclusions, Lessons & Recommendations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project</li> <li>• Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project</li> <li>• Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives</li> <li>• Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success</li> </ul>
5.	Annexes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TORs</li> <li>• Itinerary</li> <li>• List of persons interviewed</li> <li>• Summary of field visits</li> <li>• List of documents reviewed</li> <li>• Questionnaire used and summary of results</li> <li>• Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form</li> </ul>

**Annex 6: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct Agreement Form**

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form**

**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 reviewed and will abide by the 2008 UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation.**

Signed at (place) on \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

**Annex 7: Evaluation Report Clearance Form**

(to be completed by CO and RCU and included in the final document)

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

UNDP- GEF- RTA

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

<sup>4</sup> [www.unevaluation.org/unegecodeofconduct](http://www.unevaluation.org/unegecodeofconduct)