Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the**“Strengthening the Marine and Coastal Protected Areas of Russia”** Project (PIMS 4051)

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

Project Summary Table

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Project Title:  |  |
| GEF Project ID: | 3518 |   | *at endorsement**(Million US$)* | *at completion**(Million US$)* |
| UNDP Project ID: | PIMS 4051Atlas 00069210 | GEF financing:  | 4.00 |  |
| Country: | Russian Federation | IA/EA own: | 0.00 |  |
| Region: | Europe & CIS | Government: | 8,93 |  |
| Focal Area: | Biodiversity | Other: | 0.466 |  |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): | SO -1 | Total co-financing: | 9.396 |  |
| Executing Agency: | Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MNR) | Total Project Cost: | **13.396** |  |
| Other Partners involved: | Department of Federal Service for Control in the Field of Nature Use (”Rosprirodnadzor”) | ProDoc Signature (date project began):  | 8 June 2009 |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | Proposed:Dec 2014 | Actual:tbd |

Objective and Scope

In 2009, with funding from the Global Environment Facility, UNDP launched a project targeting conservation and sustainable use of globally significant coastal and marine biodiversity of Russia. This project is designed to complement the governmental efforts to expand the marine protected area system and strengthen its management effectiveness.

The Project Objective is therefore to facilitate expansion of the national system of marine and coastal protected areas and improve its management effectiveness as reflected in design issues relating to both individual sites and protected area systems and adequacy and appropriateness of management systems and processes, and the delivery of protected area objectives. The three main outcomes of the project are: (i) Improved MCPA system-level capacity enables the expansion of marine and coastal protected areas; (ii) MCPA management know-how is demonstrated, expanded and reinforced; and (iii) Strengthened MCPA system effectively captures knowledge and enables replication of best practice. The project is supposed to improve the coverage of marine and coastal ecosystems by 8.7 million hectares by: a) finalizing the protection of the new 14,000 ha Ingermanland Zapovednik, b) facilitating the expansion or establishment of additional eight MCPA covering 7,680,000 hectares; and c) creating the enabling environment for the protection of an additional 1,006,000 million ha of marine and coastal ecosystems. The project is also designed to improve management effectiveness of a network of 35 MCPA across Russia covering over 24 million ha. This is believed to be an important step in securing the long-term conservation of globally significant coastal and marine biodiversity sheltered in the longest coastline in the world.

Project location: Russian Federation

Project pilot sites: Commander Islands, Primorsky Krai, Leningrad Oblast

The implementation of project activities are coordinated by the Project implementation Unit based in Moscow. The overall management of the project is the responsibility of Project Manager, who is a full time employee of the project, stationed in the UNDP Project Support Office in Moscow. The project funding provided by the GEF, amounts to USD 4 000 000.00. Pledged cofinancing is estimated at USD 9 396 000.00.

The project is implemented by the Government of Russia (GOR) represented by the federal Ministry of Natural Resources & Environment (MNR) and operates according to UNDP National Implementation Modality (NIM).

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects.

The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

Evaluation approach and method

An overall approach and method[[1]](#footnote-1) for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact,** as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR ([*Annex C*](#_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 Moscow and pilot project sites, such as Komandorsky State Nature Reserve and Leningrad Oblast*.* Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: Federal Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment, Komandorsky State Nature Reserve and Far Eastern Marine Reserve Nature Reserve, Leningrad Oblast Committee for Natural Resources and Environment, Leningrad Regional Protected Areas Directorate, Baltic Fund for Nature, Expert in Protected Area Management Effectiveness, and/or other major stakeholders.

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in [Annex B](#_TOR_Annex_B:) of this Terms of Reference.

Evaluation Criteria & Ratings

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see  [Annex A](#_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 / cofinance

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Co-financing(type/source) | UNDP own financing (mill. US$) | Government(mill. US$) | Partner Agency(mill. US$) | Other | Total(mill. US$) |
| Planned | Actual  | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual |
| Grants  | 0,00 |  | 8,93 |  |  |  | 0.466 |  | 9,396 |  |
| Loans/Concessions  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * In-kind support
 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * Other
 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals | 0,00 |  | 8,93 |  |  |  | 0.466 |  | 9,396 |  |

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 Project Support Office (PSO) in the Russian Federation. The UNDP PSO 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 up to two months; within this time period, up to *32* days working days are expected to be distributed according to the following plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Time allocation | Tentative timeframe |
| **Preparation** | *3* days | *Tentatively Sept 27-29* |
| **Evaluation Mission** | *14* days (incl.travel) | *Tentatively Sept 30 –October 13* |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | *8* days | *Tentatively Oct 14-21* |
| **Final Report** | *2* days  | *Tentatively Oct 22-23*  |

Evaluation deliverables

The evaluator 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**  | Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes | Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission | Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs |
| **Final Report\*** | Revised report  | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft  | Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC.  |

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

Team Composition

The evaluation will be conducted by an international evaluator with prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The evaluator selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The evaluator must present the following qualifications:

* Minimum 7years of relevant professional experience
* Knowledge of UNDP and GEF
* Previous experience with results‐based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
* Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s)
* Familiarity with protected area policies and management structures in Eastern Europe/CIS/Russia
* Excellent English communication and report writing skills

Evaluator Ethics

Evaluation consultant 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 |
| *10%* | At contract signing |
| *40%* | Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report |
| *50%* | Following submission and approval (UNDP PSO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report  |

Application process

Applicants are requested to send their applications to UNDP responsible official at irina.bredneva@undp.org by June 15, 2014. The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in with indication of the e‐mail and phone contact. Shortlisted candidates will be requested to submit a price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs).

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

**Annex A: Logical Framework Matrix**

| Project Strategy | Objectively verifiable indicators |
| --- | --- |
| Goal | Conservation and sustainable use of globally significant coastal and marine biodiversity |
|  | Indicator | Baseline | End of project Target | Sources of verification | Risks and Assumptions |
| Objective:To facilitate expansion of the national system of marine and coastal protected areas and improve its management effectiveness.  | Area of coastal and marine area under protection expanded. | 24,577,651 ha | Additional area protected with direct influence of project: +14,000 ha. - Additional area protected with facilitation of the project + 7,680,000 ha. - Enabling environment created for establishment of additional 1,006,000 million ha. - New total area under protection: 33,277,651 ha  | Field, map assessments; expert opinion. Official gazette. - Official gazette of new or expanded areas amounting to 7,680,000 million. -Strategic plan endorsed calling for additional 1.006 million ha protected. | Action on marine conservation may be difficult in Russia’s rapidly growing natural resource sector. |
| Indirect impact on improved management effectiveness in 24 million hectares of MCPA through METT Score. | Baseline Zapovedniks - Arctic Bolshoi Arktichesky - 29Gydansky - 40Kandalakshsky - 37Kandalakshsky - 42Nenetsky - 36U-Lensky - 49Taimyrsky - 50Wrangel Island - 47Far East Botchinsky - 37Dzhugdzhursky - 35Kronotsky – 58Koryaksky - 42Kurilsky - 55Lazovsky – 54Magadansky – 51Poronaisky – 43Sikhote-Alinsky – 56Caspian Sea Astrakhansky – 62Dagestansky – 44BalticRegional zakazniks - 30National ParksKurshskaya Kosa - 63Sochinsky - 59Federal ZakazniksFranz-Josef Land - 29Nenetsky -- 28Nizhne-Obskiy - 13Severnaya Zemlya - 13Yuzhno-Kamchatsky - 28Malye Kurily - 34Tumninskiy - 13Agrakhansky - 41Priazovsky - 19Samursky – 13 | +20%Zapovedniks - Arctic Bolshoi Arktichesky - 36Gydansky - 50Kandalakshsky - 40Kandalakshsky - 50Nenetsky - 45U-Lensky - 60Taimyrsky - 58Wrangel Island - 55Far East Botchinsky - 45Dzhugdzhursky - 43Kronotsky – 70Koryaksky - 50Kurilsky - 68Lazovsky – 70Magadansky – 65Poronaisky – 50Sikhote-Alinsky – 68Caspian Sea Astrakhansky – 65Dagestansky – 45BalticRegional zakazniks - 35National ParksKurshskaya Kosa - 70Sochinsky - 68Federal ZakazniksFranz-Josef Land - 35Nenetsky -- 35Nizhne-Obskiy - 19Severnaya Zemlya - 19Yuzhno-Kamchatsky - 35Malye Kurily - 40Tumninskiy - 19Agrakhansky - 45Priazovsky - 25Samursky – 19 | METT Score sheets for 33 MCPA in the network. | Political commitment of the regional government is maintained. State financing for PA system inventory and gap analysis materializes in time. |
| Breeding pairs (number of nests) of red-legged kiitiwake, a threatened seabird species at standard monitoring sites of CIZ (Toporkov Island and Ariy Kamen’). | Toporkov Island: 22 pairs; Ariy Kamen’: 223 pairs (2008 survey) | Pop #s within natural range of variation: “natural” variation range should be identified on the basis of the results of the innovative monitoring partnership (see Table 10) | Annual field surveys. | Environmental perturbations will not affect results. |
| Steller sea lion populations on Medniy Island, South-Eastern rookery standard monitoring site;- # of adult/juveniles- # of Pups- # of breeding males | Adult males, 105 subadult males, 295 females, 182 1year + specimens, 231 pups (2007 survey) | Stable pop or within +/- 20% of Long-Term Mean (LTM) | Field Survey reports |  |
| # and distribution of sea cucumbers in Far Eastern Marine Biosphere Reserve. | 0.02 – 0.03 m2 | Stable or increasing. | Field Survey reports |  |
| # of breeding adults and pups of larga seal in Far Eastern Marine Biosphere Reserve | 380 white-coat seals and 2100 adult males in 2008; 440 white-coat seals and 2200 adult males in 2009;410 white-coat seals and 2000 adult males in 2010. | Stable or slightly increasing population. |  |  |
| Ringed seal population | Baseline figure: based upon 2010 spring aerial survey : 40-45 | Stable pop or within +/- 20% of LTM.  | Follow-up field survey from Nord-stream survey. |  |
| **Outcome 1:**  Improved MPA system and institutional-level capacity enables the expansion of the MCPA system. | Area of MCPA in the process of establishment.  | 14,000 | 2,500,000 hectares  | Official MNRE proposal for establishment of each new MCPA. | There is a high level of political acceptance of the need for additional protected marine and coastal areas. |
|  | # of new policies and guidelines developed and adopted by MNRE to strengthen effectiveness. | 0 | At least 4 in total. | Official policy and guideline documents published by MNRE.  |  |
|  | # of marine mammal zones with strengthened protection. | 0 | At least 10. | Memorandum of Understanding - FAF and MNRE; Official announcement creating IUCN #3 protection for marine mammal zones. |  |
|  | MNRE MCPA [Capacity Scorecard](#PartDXI)Policy formulation Systemic Institutional Implementation Systemic Institutional  IndividualEngagement & consensus Systemic Institutional  IndividualInfo & knowledge Systemic Institutional  IndividualMonitoring Systemic Institutional  Individual | BaselinePolicy Formulation3/out of 61/out of 3Implementation3/out of 97/out of 274/out of 12Eng. & consensus3/out of 63/out of 61/out of 3Info & knowledge2/out of 33/out of 31/out of 3Monitoring2/out of 63/out of 61/out of 3 | EoP Target:Policy Formulation5/out of 62/out of 3Implementation7/out of 920/out of 278/out of 12Eng. & consensus5/out of 65/out of 62/out of 3Info & knowledge3/out of 33/out of 32/out of 3Monitoring4/out of 64/out of 62/out of 3 | Capacity Assessment Scorecard | The reform process in Russia will continue to support high-level political acceptance and update of project strategy. |
| **Outcome 2:** MPA management know-how is demonstrated, expanded and reinforced.  | Di Direct impact on improved effectiveness in pilot sites = improved management in 6 million ha though METT Score. | CIZ: 55FEMZ: 63IZ: 13 | CIZ: 68 FEMZ - 75IZ – 55 | METT score sheet for three pilot sites | Baseline Gov’t funding will continue to support basic management functions. |
|  | Alien marine and coastal species in insular areas of MCPAs | Situation not clear | Insular areas of pilot MCPAs contain no or significantly less marine and coastal alien species compared to neighboring unprotected areas | Field surveys. | Protection and restricted access to insular areas may prevent introduction of alien species. This may be not true for offshore invasive species with a strong colonizing potential, however effective protection regime may be a barrier for some invasive species and may restrict their expansion compared to non-protected areas. |
| **Outcome 3:** Strengthened MCPA system effectively captures knowledge and enables replication of best practice. | # of Russia’s MCPAs included in the North Pacific monitoring network | 1 | At least 3 | Website of monitoring network, reports on monitoring | The experience of the Commander Islands Zapovednik is in demand in several other Russia’s pacific MCPA |
| # of MCPA adopting invasive species management plans. | 0 | 3 (FEMZ, IZ, and probably Kurshskaya Kosa National Park) | MNRE reports; Project APR; Planning documents. |  |
|  | # of MCPA adopting contingency plans for hazardous material spills. | 0 | 4 (Baltic MCPAs, FEMZ, CIZ, probably Kurshskaya Kosa National Park) | MNRE reports; Project APR; Planning documents. |  |
|  | # of official partnerships (monitoring, enforcement) formed by MCPA nationwide. | Agreements, monitoring marine and coastal ecosystems - 14 Cooperation agreement with other MCPA – 2Cooperation agreement with tourism companies - 2Written agreement for cooperation in enforcement – 0 | At least 20 monitoring agreements. At least 10 cooperation agreements. At least 7 tourism management and promotion agreements. At least 5 written agreements in cooperation on enforcement. | Signed Memoranda of Understanding or Agreement between agencies or Signed agreement between MCPA and respective partner. | The multi-level, approach to building a monitoring program could be perceived as non-scientific. |
| **Outcome 1:**Output 1.1: Improved MCPA system and Institutional-level capacity enables the expansion of the MCPA systemOutput 1.2: System-level MCPA management effectiveness measuring and monitoring program Output 1.3: Elaborated policy and guidelines on MCPA collaboration with stakeholders for more effective management of current and emerging threatsOutput 1.4: Expanded network of MCPA**Outcome 2:**Output 2.1: Pilot I - Management and the implementation of conservation practice capacity building programmeOutput 2.2: Pilot II - Strengthened enforcement & monitoring partnerships among MCPA and key stakeholder institutionsOutput 2.3: Pilot III - Sustainable tourism managementOutput 2.4: Pilot IV - Integrated invasive species management. Output 2.5: Pilot V - Emergency response and control of their consequences **Outcome 3:**Output 3.1: System-level MCPA management effectiveness measuring and monitoringOutput 3.2: National Program for the Development of Experience MCPA ManagementOutput 3.3: Strengthened replication policies at national MCPA level |

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

* Project document
* Inception Report
* Annual Project Implementation Reports
* Tracking tools
* Mid-term evaluation report
* Management response to Mid-Term evaluation report
* Project Steering Committee meeting minutes
* Notes from project monitoring missions
* Financial management documents, such as project budget revisions and audit reports
* Various reports and documents available on the project website/with the PIU

Annex C: Evaluation Questions

*This is a generic list, to be further elaborated during the evaluation mission.*

| **Evaluative Criteria Questions** | **Indicators** | **Sources** | **Methodology** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?  |
|  | * Did the project’s objectives fit GEF strategic priorities?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * Did the project’s objectives fit within national priorities, priorities of the local government and local communities?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * Do the project’s objectives support implementation of the relevant multi-lateral environmental agreement?
 |  |  |  |
| Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? |
|  | * To what extent have the project Objective and Outcomes have been achieved?
 | * Logframe indicators at the level of project Objective and Outcomes achieved as planned/otherwise
 | * Project Logframe, last year PIR
 |  |
|  | * How did stakeholder involvement and public awareness contribute to the achievement of project objective and outcomes?
 | * Stakeholder pools from the project show raise of interest to project objective and activities; corresponding Logframe indicator values show progress as planned; interview with the project management and key stakeholders confirmed/otherwise PM reports on stakeholder involvement
 | * Last year PIR, Project Logframe, interviews
 |  |
|  | * Which were the key factors that contributed to project success/underachievement; can positive key factors be replicated in other cases, or could negative factors have been anticipated and minimized?
 |  |  |  |
| Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards? |
|  | * Was the project cost-effective? In case its implementation was delayed, did that affect cost-effectiveness? Were expenditures in line with international standards and norms? Was co-financing received at the level anticipated in the project document?
 | * Project expenditures for each of the outcomes correspond with rates agreed in the project document; project management costs did not exceed acceptable levels; project audits revealed no questionable costs and/or violation of procurement, financial and HR administration rules
 | * Project financial statements, co-financing reports, PIRs, NIM audit reports
 |  |
|  | * Was the project management effective? Were there any particular challenges with the management process? Did the project Steering Committee provide the anticipated input and support to project management? Were risks assessed in time and adequately dealt with? Was the level of communication and support from the implementing agency adequate and appropriate?
 | * Project management arrangements contributed/otherwise to attainment of project objective and outcomes, and were implemented according to the established principles and procedures
 | * Interviews with key project stakeholders, incl. National Implementing Agency and UNDP; project risk log, project Steering Committee minutes
 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? |
|  | * What is the likelihood that any required financial resources will be available to sustain the project results once the GEF funding is over?
 | * Major project endeavors (such as financial instruments, institutional arrangements, infrastructure support) will get financial support and be maintained without GEF funding
 | * Interviews with stakeholders, project reports, financial data if available
 |  |
|  | * What is the likelihood that institutional and technical achievements, legal framework, policies and governance structures and processes will allow for the project results to be sustained? Are there key institutional and governance risks to sustainability?
 | Major institutional changes, technical solutions, legal framework amendments get strong support at policy and decision-making levels  | Interviews with stakeholders, project reports,  |  |
|  | * Are there any environmental risks that can undermine the post-project impact and global environment benefits?
 |  |  |  |
| **Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?**  |
|  | * Did the project achieve its planned impacts? Why or why not?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * Which where the key lessons learned in course of project implementation?
 |  |  |  |

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 shortcomings4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS)3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems1. 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 risks1. 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)