ANNEX 1 - Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and Global Environment Facility (GEF) M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP-supported, GEF-financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) set out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of theUNDP-GEF Project *“*Sustainable Management of Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) in Mauritius” (PIMS #3779)

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

Project Summary Table

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Title: | Sustainable Management of Persistent Organic Pollutants in Mauritius | | | | | |
| GEF Project ID: | | 3205 |  | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | | *at completion (Million US$)* |
| UNDP Project ID: | | 61756 | GEF financing: | 902,250 | |  |
| Country: | | Mauritius | IA/EA own: |  | |  |
| Region: | | Africa | Government: | 900,000 | |  |
| Focal Area: | | Persistent Organic Pollutants/Chemical Waste | Other: | 30,000 | |  |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): | | Provide assistance to Mauritius in the management of obsolete POPs chemicals and sites that are significantly contaminated by POPs | Total co-financing: |  | |  |
| Executing Agency: | | Ministry of Environment  Ministry of Health | Total Project Cost: | 1,832,250 | |  |
| Other Partners involved: | | Ministry of Public Utilities, Central Electricity Board, Ministry of Environment | ProDoc Signature (date project began): | | | 30/06/2008 |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | | Proposed: 31/03/2015 | Actual: |

Objective and Scope

Mauritius signed the Stockholm Convention on May 23, 2001 and ratified same on July 13, 2004. Article 7 of the Stockholm Convention requires the State Parties develop a National Implementation Plan (NIP). A NIP on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) has been developed with the assistance of the Global Environment Facility and UNDP by the Ministry of Environment in 2005.

To assist Mauritius in the implementation of the NIP, the Global Environment Facility (GEF) has funded a Medium-Size Project entitled ‘Sustainable Management of POPs in Mauritius’ to the tune of USD 0.9 M, that was aimed to address the first two priorities identified namely:

1. Disposal of obsolete POPs chemicals and decontamination of POPs-infested areas
2. Development and Demonstration of Alternative Strategies for Malaria Vector Management

The project was executed by the Ministry of Environment and the Ministry of Health & Quality of Life (MoH), over a period of 4 years. The project document was signed by Government of Mauritius and United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) in June 2008. The implementation of the project started in mid- Jan 2009 with the recruitment of the Project Manager

The project provided assistance to Mauritius in the management of obsolete POPs chemicals and sites that are significantly contaminated by POPs.

The specific outcomes of the project were

1. A suitable legal and enforcement structure to sustain the outcomes of the project in the future
2. A comprehensive awareness and responsible care program to make importers, distributors, users and the general public aware of the risks involved in the use of chemicals in general and POPs specifically
3. An effective non-DDT based vector control program that will limit the chance of importing malaria and outbreaks of malaria
4. Removal and disposal of all obsolete POPs chemicals
5. Removal and disposal of the few remaining transformers that have PCB containing oils that exceed international standards
6. Remediation of all POPs contaminated sites that exceed internationally acceptable standards
7. To enhance the ability to develop and implement alternative strategies for malaria vector management with the ultimate aim to eliminate future use of DDT

This project was executed by the Ministry of Environment with the support of UNDP Country Office under Country Office Support to NEX modality. .

Project Results

Theme 1

To date, UNDP has helped the Government to repackage and ship abroad 139 metric tonnes of DDT and 5 metric tonnes of PCBs and PCB-contaminated transformers for responsible disposal. Therefore virtually all POP waste in Mauritius has been eliminated. Only 5 metric tonnes of DDT – the only remaining POP on the island – are safely stored in Pamplemousses as a precautionary measure in case of malaria outbreak. Soil remediation of three sites (at Mahebourg hospital Fort George and Pamplemousses) has also been carried out by transporting contaminated soil to The Netherlands for disposal at an approved facility. In this respect, the initial objectives of the project were largely exceeded as Government provided additional co-financing. The first two priorities of our NIP have thus been adequately addressed.”

Developing Alternatives for POPs

The POPs project has facilitated identification, testing and selection of effective and safe alternatives to DDT, such as pyrethroids, which are derived from chrysanthemum flowers. All DDT spraying in sea and airport areas was discontinued as of end of 2011. Before the project started, 600 kilograms of DDT were used annually.

In order to reduce dependence on DDT for controlling the spread of malaria, the project is working with the Ministry of Health and Quality of Life to develop an Integrated Vector Management (IVM) strategy. The IVM is being piloted at the village level with local surveillance of mosquito breeding places and monitoring of the pyrethroid alternative to ensure safe use.

The work on piloting the new IVM strategy is being fully documented with evidence and recommendations for future decentralized approaches to IVM and will be submitted to the government. This is being helped by the vector Biology Control Division of the MOHQL which is documenting findings from pilot activities including local surveillance of mosquito breeding places, safe use of pyrethroids instead of DDT (which is more suitable for indoor spraying) and protection with bed nets.

Efforts to develop the capacity of stakeholders to safeguard obsolete stockpiles has been prioritized. The Project Steering Committee involving several line ministries and private and non-governmental stakeholders has provided a continuous platform for discussion, information exchange and project management. In September 2014, four pamphlets were launched under the Responsible Care programme and a series of workshops were organized for workers who are accustomed to handling chemicals.

The project has prepared reports and guidance on the safeguarding of POPs wastes for the Ministry of Environment to assist in the storage, handling and transport of obsolete stockpiles. These supplement existing environmental legislation developed for hazardous and dangerous chemical wastes.

Documents setting out best practice for the safe management of POP stockpiles have also been prepared. These include ‘Safeguarding of POP Waste’, ‘Identification of POP Chemicals and Certified Containers’, ‘Legal Review of Regulations and Laws Governing the Storage, Handling and Disposal of POPs’, and ‘Potential Remediation of Highly Contaminated POP Sites on Mauritius’.

The project was monitored by a Steering Committee (SC) which met on a quarterly basis to review implementation progress, endorse work plans, provide guidance and assist in the resolution of any issues experienced during implementation

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the [UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects.](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/UNDP-GEF-TE-Guide.pdf)

The objectives of this terminal 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]](#footnote-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*](#_TOR_Annex_C:)). The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence‐based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Mauritius. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

* UNDP
* Ministry of Environment, Sustainable Development, Disaster and Beach Management
* Ministry of Health & Quality of Life
* Ministry of Energy and Public Utilities
* Ministry of Labour & I.R.
* University of Mauritius
* Ministry of Industry, Small & Medium Enterprises, Commerce & Cooperatives
* Ministry of Agro Industry & Fisheries
* Central Electricity Board
* Mauritius Revenue Authority (Customs & Excise Department )
* Ministry of Finance & Economic Development
* Ministry of Local Government and Outer Islands
* Ministry of Tourism
* NGOs (APEXHOM, MACOSS, MFW AND PANeM)

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIRs, project budget revisions, mid-term review, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents – and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in [Annex B](#_TOR_Annex_B:) of this Terms of Reference. Subject to availability of funds and agreement of the MOESD and MOHQL, a Terminal Evaluation workshop may also be organized during the evaluation mission.

II. Functions and key results expected:

The International Consultant will be the team leader and will be responsible for the quality of the report and timely submission. The National Consultant will provide supportive roles in terms of professional inputs, knowledge of local policies, local navigation, translation / language support, etc.

A. The review team is expected to prepare an Evaluation Report based on the outline listed in Annex II while specifically including the following aspects:

1. Adequacy of the overall project concept, design, implementation methodology, institutional structure, timelines, budgetary allocation or any other aspect of the project design that the evaluation team may want to comment upon.
2. Extent of progress achieved against the overall Project Objective disaggregated by each of the individual Outcomes, Outputs and Activities (including sub-activities); as against the Impact Indicators identified and listed in the project document. Extent of the incremental value added with project implementation.
3. Performance in terms of in-time achievement of individual project activities as well as overall project in terms of adherence to planned timelines.
4. Relevance and adequacy of mid-course changes in implementation strategy with PSC approval, if any and the consequent variations in achievements, if any.
5. Evaluate the impact of the project activities on the various government institutions.
6. Extent of effectiveness of awareness generation activities by way of quality of promotional packages / awareness material, number of Awareness Programmes, Trainings undertaken and level of awareness created. Quality of documentation, if any, produced under the project like, brochure, etc. should also be considered.
7. Pattern, in which funds have been leveraged, budgeted, spent and accounted for in the project.

B. The team should also focus its assessments on project impacts as listed:

1. Perceptions on the “Situation at the end of the Project” as it seems to the review team at the terminal review stage
2. Nature and scale of the policy impact made by the project, if any, on relevant line departments of the Government or other policy making bodies
3. Extent of effectiveness of capacity building initiatives undertaken under the aegis of the project
4. Appropriateness and effectiveness of the institutional arrangement deployed in the project with alternative scenarios, if any
5. Details of co-funding, if any, leveraged by the project and its impact on the project achievements (a “Financial Planning Co-financing” format is enclosed in Annex II for reporting);
6. The effectiveness of monitoring and overseeing systems such as Project Steering Committee and suggestion on improvements if any

Evaluation Criteria & Ratings

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework ([Annex A](#_TOR_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](#_TOR_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 |  |
| **3. Assessment of Outcomes** | **rating** | **4. Sustainability** | **rating** |
| Relevance |  | Financial resources: |  |
| Effectiveness |  | Socio-political: |  |
| Efficiency |  | Institutional framework and governance: |  |
| Overall Project Outcome Rating |  | Environmental : |  |
|  |  | Overall likelihood of sustainability: |  |

Project finance / 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 | Actual | Actual |
| Grants |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Loans/Concessions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * In-kind support |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Mainstreaming

UNDP-supported, GEF-financed projects are key components in UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programmes. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender.

Impact

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.[[2]](#footnote-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 Mauritius*.* The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government, etc.

Evaluation timeframe

The total duration of the evaluation will be 1 month according to the following plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Timing (person day involvement per consultant) | Completion Date |
| Preparation and desk work | 3 days | 15 February 2015 |
| Evaluation Mission | 5 days | 16-20 February 2015 |
| Draft Evaluation Report & draft GEF Tracking Tool | 5 days | 25 February 2015 |
| Final Report & final GEF Tracking Tool | 2 days | 5 March 2015 |

Evaluation deliverables

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Deliverable | Content | Timing | Responsibilities |
| **Inception Report** | Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method | No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission. | Evaluator submits to UNDP CO |
| **Presentation** | Initial Findings | End of evaluation mission | To project management, UNDP CO |
| **Draft Final Report & draft GEF Tracking Tool** | Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes | Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission | Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFP |
| **Final Report\* & final GEF Tracking Tool** | Revised report | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft | Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC. |

\*When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluator is required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report.

The International consultant will be allocated 15 person days and the National Consultant 15 person days input.

Team Composition

The International consultant should have:

* Advanced University Degree (Masters or equivalent) in an environmental-related field such as environmental science or public health or related field
* At least 5 years of relevant professional experience in public health or waste management
* Demonstrated ability to assess complex situations, succinctly distils critical issues, and draw forward-looking conclusions and recommendations;
* Highly knowledgeable of GEF and UNDP-GEF monitoring and evaluation policies procedures an advantage;
* Familiarity with Mauritius or any Small Island Development States (SIDS);
* Excellent in human relations, coordination, planning and team work.
* Be fully IT-literate

Competencies

* Excellent communication (spoken and written) skills in English and French
* Excellent writing, analytical and research skills
* Showing strong attention to details
* Excellent interpersonal skills
* Ability to work in a multicultural and international environment
* Ability to work under pressure and to meet tight deadlines

The National consultant should have

* Advanced University Degree (Masters or equivalent) in an environmental-related field such as environmental science or public health
* At least 5 years of relevant professional experience in public health or waste management in Mauritius
* Demonstrated ability to assess complex situations, succinctly distils critical issues, and draw forward-looking conclusions and recommendations;
* Knowledgeable of GEF and UNDP monitoring and evaluation policies procedures an advantage;
* Excellent in human relations, coordination, planning and team work.
* Be fully IT-literate

Competencies

* Excellent communication (spoken and written) skills in English and French
* Excellent writing, analytical and research skills
* Showing strong attention to details
* Excellent interpersonal skills
* Ability to work in a multicultural and international environment
* Ability to work under pressure and to meet tight deadlines

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'](http://www.unevaluation.org/ethicalguidelines)

Payment modalities and specifications

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| % | Milestone |
| *20%* | Submission of Inception report |
| *30%* | Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report & draft GEF Tracking Tool |
| *50%* | Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report & GEF Tracking Tool |

Application process

Applicants are requested to apply on http://jobs.undp.org. Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions. The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in English with indication of the e‐mail and phone contact. Shortlisted candidates will be requested to submit a price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs). The international consultant and the national consultant should apply separately and the final team will be decided by the UNDP CO.

UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

Annex A: Project Logical Framework

**Project Logical Framework Theme-1**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NARRATIVE SUMMARY** | **INDICATORS OF ACHIEVEMENT** | **MEANS OF VERIFICATION** | **ASSUMPTIONS/RISKS** |
| Development objective |  |  |  |
| To reduce emission of POPs into the global environment |  |  |  |
| **Immediate objective** | - Analysis and safeguarding of existing obsolete POPs stockpiles and contaminated areas  - Disposal of obsolete POPs stockpiles  - Decontamination of POPs contaminated areas | Progress reports | Assumes good project management with regular reporting |
| Removal of obsolete POPs stocks and remediation of related POPs contamination in Mauritius |
| **Output 1** |  |  |  |
| Evaluation and Safeguarding - | - All POPs contamination of soil and sludge properly identified  - All POPs stockpiles properly safeguarded  - Relevant disposal methods evaluated  - Disposal sites and related transportation identified | - Project progress reports  - Expert mission reports  - Test analysis reports  - Field visits | - Assumes good cooperation between local experts, international experts and project management.  - A risk will be overlapping responsibilities |
| **Output 2** |  |  |  |
| Disposal of obsolete POPs  Inventories | - Preparation of disposal specifications  - Contracting of a disposal site following UNDP bidding guidelines  - Certification of disposal | - Written specifications  - Bidding documents  - Bid analysis report  - Contracts  - Shipping papers  - Certification(s) of disposal | - Risks violation of procedures  and international treaties  - Risks that surplus DDT will not be accepted in other countries  - Risks expiration of efficacy of  DDT |
| **Output 3** |  |  |  |
| Clean-up of contaminated  Areas | - Preparation of clean-up specifications  - Selection of a contractor following pertinent UNDP bidding guidelines  - Certification of decontamination | - Written specifications  - Bidding documents  - Bid analysis report  - Contracts  - Shipping papers  - Certification(s) of disposal | - Assumes the identification of sufficient qualified potential contractors |
| **Output 4**  Institution of a ”Responsible Care” program | - Preparation of a training syllabus  - Issuance of training certificates  - Written training syllabus | - Expert reports  - Attendance records  - Training certificates | - Assumes cooperation with local associations  -Assumes interest of participants  - Risks resistance to verification (“tests”) |

**Project Logical Framework Theme-2**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NARRATIVE SUMMARY** | **INDICATORS OF ACHIEVEMENT** | **MEANS OF VERIFICATION** | **ASSUMPTIONS/RISKS** |
| **Development objective** |  |  |  |
| To reduce emission of POPs into the global environment |
| **Immediate objective** |  |  |  |
| To enhance the national ability to prevent or manage vector-borne diseases with reduced reliance on DDT | a. Reduced seasonal densities of malaria vector mosquitoes b. Reduced annual use of DDT c. Absence of malaria outbreaks | Reports made by partner organizations Impact study (before and after) in selected locations | a. Assumes continued central government support for inter-sectoral collaboration and decentralization of health services  b. Assumes that prophylactic measures and medication efforts for malaria control remain at the current high level |
| **Output 1** | a. Risk assessment of imported disease conducted b. Laboratory studies and small-scale field trials on efficacy of DDT and alternative chemicals completed c. Study results to serve as basis for possible replacement of DDT with other insecticides | a. Field visits by project staff and reports on research findings from partner organization b. Official data on insecticide use for indoor residual spraying | Assumes that the evaluation results will form a conclusive basis for decision-making |
| Continued need for DDT evaluated |
| **Output 2** | a. Health inspectors and vector control teams in the project districts trained and supervised on aspects of vector surveillance  b. Doubling of coverage or frequency of surveillance in project districts. | a. Project monitoring and evaluation visits.  b. Central-level supervisory visits c. Surveillance records and database. | Assumes an increased mandate for district health offices. This is considered inherent to the decentralization effort and is expected to enhance local ownership |
| Decentralized capacity for surveillance strengthened |
| **Output 3** | a. Mechanisms established and methods developed for analysis and decision-making for IVM at district and municipal levels  b. Curricula developed for hands-on education of local stakeholders on the biology and epidemiology of disease c. District staff trained on facilitation skills d. Multi-stakeholder IVM committees and implementation of IVM established in project districts | a. Project monitoring and evaluation visits  b. Reports of specific meetings by health staff c. Detailed case study reports | Assumes that actors other than Health are willing to take responsibility for environmental health. Mitigation: the provided education will link vector-borne disease to domestic, construction and agricultural activities (incl. sugar sector) |
| Decentralized IVM strategy established |
| **Output 4** | a. Increase in environmental management by communities b. Low seasonal peaks of vector mosquitoes c. Absence of malaria outbreaks | a. Mosquito surveillance data b. Health office reporting system c. Impact assessment study covering health, ecological, behavioral and socio-economic parameters | Assumes coverage of project districts  Risk: Occasional seasonal typhoons may lead to increased vector breeding habitat |
| IVM demonstrated in project districts |

Annex B: List of Documents to be reviewed by the evaluators

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Document** | **Description** |
| Project document | UNDP project document and revisions Project identification form (PIF) endorsement document |
| Project reports | Inception report reports /Audit reports/Progress reports/Annual Review Reports/consultant reports |
| Work plans | Quarterly work plans |
| Minutes | Steering group meetings Meetings with experts, team staff etc. |
| Other relevant materials | As identified during the document review, including relevant legislation and policy documents on the project subject matter since start of project implementation |
| Information materials produced by the project activities | Information strategy Training manuals Best practices methods and publications Documents on the project website |

The following documents will also be available:

* The project M&E framework
* Knowledge products from service providers
* Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems;
* Maps
* The GEF Implementation Completion Report guidelines; and,
* The UNDP Monitoring and Evaluation Frameworks. M & E Operational Guidelines, all monitoring reports prepared by the project;
* Financial and Administration guidelines;
* Consultant reports produced by the project

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 and national levels? | | | | | | |
| * Is the project objectives conform to agreed   priorities in the UNDP Country Programme  Document (CPD)? | | * How does the project support the environment and sustainable development objectives of the Republic of Mauritius? | | * In line with the national priorities mentioned in the UNDP Country Programme   Document | * UNDP Country Programme Document * Project document | * Documents analyses * Interviews with UNDP and project team |
| * Is the project relevant to other international conventions objectives? | | * Does the project support   other international  conventions, such as the  Stockholm Convention? | | * Priorities and areas of work of other conventions incorporated in project design | * Project documents * National policies and strategies * Other international conventions,   or related to environment  more generally and other  international convention web  sites | * Documents analyses * Interviews with   project team   * UNDP and other   partners |
| * Is the project relevant to the GEF Persistent Organic Pollutants/Chemical Waste focal area? | | * How does the project support the GEF Persistent Organic Pollutants/Chemical Waste focal area? | | * Existence of a clear relationship between the project objectives and GEF Persistent Organic Pollutants/Chemical Waste focal area? | * Project documents * GEF focal areas strategies and documents | * Documents analyses * GEF website * Interviews with UNDP and project team |
| * Is the project relevant to the Republic of Mauritius’s environment and sustainable development objectives? | | * Is the project country-driven? * What was the level of stakeholder participation in project design? * What was the level of stakeholder ownership in implementation? * Does the project adequately take into account the national realities, both in terms of institutional and policy framework in its design and its implementation? | | * Degree to which the project supports national environmental objectives * Degree of coherence between the project and nationals priorities, policies and strategies * Appreciation from national stakeholders with respect to adequacy of project design and implementation to national realities and existing capacities * Level of involvement of government officials and other partners in the project design process * Coherence between needs expressed by national stakeholders and UNDP-GEF criteria | * Project documents * National policies and strategies * Key project partners | * Documents analyses * GEF website * Interviews with UNDP and project team |
| * Is the project addressing the needs of target beneficiaries at the local level? | | * How does the project support the needs of relevant stakeholders? * Has the implementation of the project been inclusive of all relevant stakeholders? * Were local beneficiaries and stakeholders adequately involved in project design and implementation? | | * Strength of the link between expected results from the project and the needs of relevant stakeholders * Degree of involvement and inclusiveness of stakeholders in project design and implementation | * Project partners and stakeholders * Project documents | * Document analysis * Interviews with relevant stakeholders |
| * Is the project internally coherent in its design? | | * Are there logical linkages between expected results of the project (log frame) and the project design (in terms of project components, choice of partners, structure, delivery mechanism, scope, budget, use of resources etc.)? * Is the length of the project sufficient to achieve Project outcomes? * Whether gender issues had been taken into account in project design and implementation and in what way has the project contributed to greater consideration of gender aspects, (i.e. project team composition, gender-related aspects of pollution impacts, stakeholder outreach to women’s groups, etc). If so, indicate how | | * Level of coherence between project expected results and project design internal logic * Level of coherence between project design and project implementation approach | * Program and project documents * Key project stakeholders | * Document analysis * Key interviews |
| * How is the project relevant with respect to other donor-supported activities? |  | * Does the GEF funding support activities and objectives not addressed by other donors? * How do GEF-funds help to fill gaps (or give additional stimulus) that are necessary but are not covered by other donors? * Is there coordination and complementarity between donors? | | * Degree to which program was coherent and complementary to other donor programming nationally and regionally | * Documents from other donor supported activities * Other donor representatives * Project documents | * Documents analyses * Interviews with project partners and relevant stakeholders |
| * Does the project provide relevant lessons and experiences for other similar projects in the future? |  | * Has the experience of the project provided relevant lessons for other future projects targeted at similar objectives | |  | * Data collected throughout evaluation | * Data analysis |
| **Evaluative Criteria** |  | **Questions** | | **Indicators** | **Sources** | **Methodology** |
| Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? | | | | | | |
| * Has the project been effective in achieving the expected outcomes and objectives? | | | * Has the project been effective in achieving its expected outcomes? | * See indicators in project document results framework and log frame | * Project documents * Project team and relevant stakeholders * Data reported in project annual and quarterly reports | * Documents analysis * Interviews with project team * Interviews with relevant stakeholders |
| * How is risk and risk mitigation being managed? |  | | * How well are risks, assumptions and impact drivers being managed? * What was the quality of risk mitigation strategies * developed? Were these sufficient? * Are there clear strategies for risk mitigation related with long-term sustainability of the project? | * Completeness of risk identification and assumptions during project planning and design * Quality of existing information systems in place to identify emerging risks and other issues * Quality of risk mitigations strategies developed and followed | * Project documents * UNDP, project team, and relevant stakeholders | * Document analysis * Interviews |
| * What lessons can be drawn regarding effectiveness for other similar projects in the future? |  | | * What lessons have been learned from the project regarding achievement of outcomes? * What changes could have been made (if any) to the design of the project in order to improve the achievement of the project’s expected results? |  | * Data collected Throughout evaluation | * Data analysis |
| **Evaluative Criteria** |  | | **Questions** | **Indicators** | **Sources** | **Methodology** |
| Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards? | | | | | | |
| * Was project support provided in an efficient way? | | | * Was adaptive management used or needed to ensure efficient resource use? * Did the project logical framework and work plans and any changes made to them use as management tools during implementation? * Were the accounting and financial systems in place adequate for project management and producing accurate and timely financial information? * Were progress reports produced accurately, timely and responded to reporting requirements including adaptive management changes? * Was project implementation as cost effective as originally proposed (planned vs. actual) * Did the leveraging of funds (co financing) happen as planned? * Were financial resources utilized efficiently? Could financial resources have been used more efficiently? * Was procurement carried out in a manner making efficient use of project resources? * How was results-based management used during project implementation? | * Availability and quality of financial and progress reports * Timeliness and adequacy of reporting provided * Level of discrepancy between planned and utilized financial expenditures * Planned vs. actual funds leveraged * Cost in view of results achieved compared to costs of similar projects from other * organizations * Adequacy of project choices in view of existing context, infrastructure and cost * Quality of results-based management reporting (progress reporting, monitoring and evaluation) * Occurrence of change in project design/ implementation approach (i.e. restructuring) when needed to improve project efficiency * Cost associated with delivery mechanism and management structure compare to alternatives | * Project documents And evaluations * UNDP Project team | * Document analysis * Key interviews |
| * How efficient are partnership arrangements for the project? | | | * To what extent partnerships/ linkages between institutions/ organizations were encouraged and supported? * Which partnerships/linkages were facilitated? Which ones can be considered sustainable? * What was the level of efficiency of cooperation and collaboration arrangements? * Which methods were successful or not and why? | * Specific activities conducted to support the development   of cooperative arrangements between partners,   * Examples of supported partnerships * Evidence that particular partnerships/linkages will be sustained * Types/quality of partnership cooperation methods utilized | * Project documents and evaluations * Project partners and relevant stakeholders | * Document analysis * Interviews |
| **Evaluative Criteria** | | | **Questions** | **Indicators** | **Sources** | **Methodology** |
| * Did the project efficiently utilize local capacity in implementation? | | | * Was an appropriate balance struck between utilization of international expertise as well as local capacity? * Did the project take into account local capacity in design and implementation of the project? * Was there an effective collaboration between institutions responsible for implementing the project? | * Proportion of expertise utilized from international experts compared to national experts * Number/quality of analyses done to assess local capacity potential and absorptive capacity | * Project documents and evaluations * UNDP * Beneficiaries | * Document analysis * Interviews |
| * What lessons can be drawn regarding efficiency for other similar projects in the future? | | | * What lessons can be learnt from the project regarding efficiency? * How could the project have more efficiently carried out implementation (in terms of management structures and procedures, partnerships arrangements etc…)? * What changes could have been made (if any) to the project in order to improve its efficiency? |  | * Data collected throughout evaluation | * Data analysis |
| * Has the project been effective in achieving the expected outcomes and objectives? | | | * Has the project been effective in achieving its expected outcomes? | * See indicators in project document results framework and log frame | * Project documents * Project team and relevant stakeholders * Data reported in project annual and quarterly reports | * Documents analysis * Interviews with project team * Interviews with relevant stakeholders |
| * How is risk and risk mitigation being managed? | | | * How well are risks, assumptions and impact drivers being managed? * What was the quality of risk mitigation strategies developed? Were these sufficient? * Are there clear strategies for risk mitigation related with long-term sustainability of the project | * Completeness of risk identification and assumptions during project planning and design * Quality of existing information systems in place to identify emerging risks and other issues * Quality of risk mitigations strategies developed and followed | * Project documents * UNDP, project team, and relevant * stakeholders | * Document analysis * Interviews |
| * What lessons can be drawn regarding effectiveness for other similar projects in the future? | | | * What lessons have been learned from the project regarding achievement of outcomes? * What changes could have been made (if any) to the design of the project in order to improve the achievement of the project’s expected results? |  | * Data collected throughout * evaluation | * Data analysis |
| **Evaluative Criteria** | | | **Questions** | **Indicators** | **Sources** | **Methodology** |
| Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? | | | | | | |
| * Is the Project financially sustainable? | | | * Are there financial risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outcomes? * What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once GEF grant assistance ends? | * The likely ability of an intervention to continue to deliver benefits for an extended period of time after completion. | * UNDP, project team, and relevant stakeholders | * Document analysis * Interviews |
| * Is the Project environmentally and socially sustainable? | | | * Are there ongoing activities that may pose an environmental threat to the sustainability of project outcomes? |  | * UNDP, project team, and relevant stakeholders | * Document analysis * Interviews |
| * To what extent the stakeholders will sustain the project? | | | * Are there social or political risks that may threaten the sustainability of project outcomes? * What is the risk for instance that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? * Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that project benefits continue to flow? * Is there sufficient public/stakeholder awareness in support of the project’s long-term objectives? |  | * UNDP, project team, and relevant stakeholders | * Document analysis * Interviews |
| **Evaluative Criteria** | | | **Questions** | **Indicators** | **Sources** | **Methodology** |
| **Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?** | | | | | | |
| * Assess the likely permanence (long lasting nature) of the impacts | | | * Clarify based on extent: a) verifiable improvement in energy intensity; and/or * b) through specified indicators that progress is being made towards achievement of project objectives * c) regulatory and policy changes at regional, national and/or local levels | * The positive and negative, foreseen and unforeseen changes to and effects produced by a development intervention | * Project documents * UNDP, project team, and relevant stakeholders | * Document analysis * Interviews |

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

**Evaluators:**

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people’s right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people’s right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders’ dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form[[3]](#footnote-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*

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

Annex F: Evaluation Report Outline[[4]](#footnote-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 * Evaluation team members * Acknowledgements |
| **ii.** | Executive Summary   * Project Summary Table * Project Description (brief) * Evaluation Rating Table * Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons |
| **iii.** | Acronyms and Abbreviations  (See: UNDP Editorial Manual[[5]](#footnote-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]](#footnote-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 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 |

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: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](http://www.undp.org/evaluation/handbook), Chapter 7, pg. 163 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
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](http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/M2_ROtI%20Handbook.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. 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. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)