Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference International Consultant

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 an International Consultant for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the Project *“Improving the Resilience of the Agriculture Sector in Lao PDR to Climate Change Impacts”*(PIMS 0003868.)

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

Project Summary Table

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Title: |  | | | | | |
| GEF Project ID: | |  |  | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | | *at completion (Million US$)* |
| UNDP Project ID: | | 76176 | GEF financing: | 4,445,450 | |  |
| Country: | | Lao PDR | IA/EA own: |  | |  |
| Region: | | SE Asia | Government: | 378,320 | |  |
| Focal Area: | | Climate Change Adaptation | Other: | 7,340,228 | |  |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): | | Food insecurity minimized and flood/drought vulnerability reduced | Total co-financing: | 7,718,548 | |  |
| Executing Agency: | | UNDP | Total Project Cost: | 12,163,998 | |  |
| Other Partners involved: | | • Ministry of Agriculture (MAF)  • National Agriculture and Forestry Research Institute (NAFRI)  • Department for Disaster Management and Climate Change (DDMCC/MONRE)  • Department of Agriculture Extension and Cooperatives (DAEC/MAF)  • Department of Land Planning and Development (DLPD/MONRE)  • National Disaster Management Office (NDMO/MLSW) | ProDoc Signature (date project began): | | | 10 May 2011 |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | | Proposed:  October 2015 | Actual:  October 2015 |

Objective and Scope

The project was designed to promote resilience in the agricultural sector of Lao PDR and to provide assistance in improving the knowledge base on climate change, strengthening agriculture and rural sector policies and developing institutional capacities so that systematic adaptation planning can be carried out. At the same time, appropriate and adaptive agricultural practices needed to be introduced on the ground together with measures to introduce alternative livelihood options for poor rural communities.

In its efforts to increase the overall adaptive capacity of the agriculture sector in Lao PDR and to improve the resilience of food production systems, the project proposed the following four-pronged approach: (i) strengthening of the national knowledge and information base on climate change impacts in Lao PDR and their effects on agricultural production and food security; (ii) enhancement of the capacity of sector planners and agricultural producers to understand and address climate change related risks and opportunities for local food production; (iii) demonstration and promotion of diversified and adaptive agricultural practices and other off farm livelihood alternatives at the community level; and (iv) adaptation monitoring and learning as a long term process that assures that lessons learnt do benefit the local population, as well as national policies and international climate change adaptation efforts.

*Project Objective*

The objective of the project is to minimize food insecurity resulting from climate change in Lao PDR and reduce the vulnerability of farmers to extreme flooding and drought events.

*Four* outcomes will contribute to this objective;

Outcome 1: Increased knowledge and understanding of climate variability and climate induced threats on agricultural production, food security and vulnerability in Lao PDR.

Outcome 2: Capacities of sectoral planners and agricultural producers strengthened to understand and address climate change – related risks and opportunities for local food production and socio-economic conditions.

Outcome 3: Community-based adaptive agricultural practices and off-farm opportunities demonstrated and promoted within suitable agro-ecological systems.

Outcome 4: Adaptation Monitoring and Learning as a long-term process.

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 Savannakhet province (Outhoumphon and Champhon districts) and Xayaboury province (Phiang and Paklay districts)*,* including a selected number of the target villages*.* Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: MAF, NAFRI, DAEC, DNDMCC, DLPD, NDMO, PAFO, DAFO, LIP committees (including LWU), provincial, and district and village / farmer representatives.

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 [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$) | | Total  (mill. US$) | |
| 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 Lao PDR.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 *25* days according to the following plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Timing | Completion Date |
| **Preparation** | *3* days | *Late July 2015* |
| **Inception Report** | *1 day* | *Late July 2015* |
| **Evaluation Mission** | *12* days | *August 2015* |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | 7 days | *August 2015* |
| **Final Report** | *2* days | *Latest 31 August 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** | 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 team will be composed of 1 international and 1 national evaluators. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage*. (The international evaluator will be designated as the team leader and will be responsible for finalizing the report).*The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The International Team member must present the following qualifications:

Education:

* Technical knowledge/recognized degree in the targeted focal area(s): agriculture, food security, knowledge management, climate change adaptation

Experience:

* Minimum 20 years of relevant professional experience in the academia or research institutions, with a focus on socio-economic analysis,
* 10 years technical experience with climate change adaptation analysis and the development of composite indices, the socio-economic impact assessment related to agriculture and rural development, and institutional development towards climate change adaptation
* Experience in project reviewing or evaluating within United Nations system
* Experience in reviewing or evaluation of similar climate change adaptation in the agriculture sector projects with UNDP-GEF supported projects
* Experience with results‐based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
* 3 years of working experience in the Mekong region (South East Asia)

Other Knowledge and Skills:

* Capability to lead and guide the works of the national consultant into joint working results and evaluation reports
* Demonstrated analytical and presentation skills
* Excellent English communication and report writing skills;

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

(*this payment schedule is indicative, to be filled in by the CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on their standard procurement procedures)*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| % | Milestone |
| *10%* | On submission of Inception Report |
| *30%* | On completion of Mission to Lao PDR and presentation of initial findings to stakeholders |
| *40%* | On submission and acceptance (by UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the 1st draft terminal evaluation report |
| *20%* | On submission and acceptance (by UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report |

Application process

Applicants are requested to apply online (indicate the site, such as http://jobs.undp.org, etc.) by 6th of March 2015. 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).

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Objective / Outcomes** | **Indicators** | **Target by end of project** |
| **Objective:**  Food insecurity resulting from climate change in Lao PDR minimized and vulnerability of farmers to extreme flooding and drought events reduced | * Availability of a framework for climate change resilient agriculture in Lao PDR * Percentage of households in pilot districts (Savannakhet, Saravan and Xayaboury province) actively implementing climate change adaptation measures introduced by the project * Proportion and value (yield) of agricultural assets with increased resilience to climate change as a result of adaptation measures implemented by this project | By the end of the Project a framework for CC resilient agriculture is available  By the end of the project 6 Training and Agricultural Adaptation Modules (CCTAMs) have been extended to 75% of target households in 2 pilot districts (Savannakhet province, Xayaboury province)  By the end of the project interventions on the ground increase agricultural productivity on Climate Change affected land by 25% |
| **Outcome 1:**  Increased knowledge and understanding of climate variability and climate induced threats on agricultural production, food security and vulnerability, in Lao PDR | **1.1 Cover:** Number and type of stakeholders served by expanded climate and vulnerability information and knowledge base related to agriculture and food security  **1.2 Impact:** Numbers of national and provincial level stakeholders using improved climate and vulnerability information in formulation of climate resilient policies and plans.  **1.3 Sustainability:** Resources available to maintain knowledge base after end of the project | All stakeholders identified during PPG and inception phases have access to an efficiently organized and up to date knowledge and information network for climate change impacts on agriculture and food security.  By the end of the project 60% of identified national and provincial government stakeholders are using the knowledge base for sector planning: strategies, long-term plans, annual plans and budgets, project work plans  By the end of the project 50% of cost for operation and maintenance of the knowledge base and information network are included in the sectoral budget allocation for agriculture |
| **Outcome 2:**  Capacities of sectoral planners and agricultural producers strengthened to understand and address climate change – related risks and opportunities for local food production and socio-economic conditions | **2.1 Cover:** Number of targeted institutions (agriculture, water management, food security, early warning, poverty alleviation, etc) with increased capacity to reduce risks of and respond to climate variability.  **2.2 Impact:** Number of targeted agricultural officers, extension workers, farmer cooperatives and TSC (Technical Service Center) members in target districts having an advanced understanding of key climate change risk and impacts on agricultural production and socio-economic conditions. | By the end of the project at least 4 planners from at least 6 sectors / sub-sectors relevant to agriculture, food security and CC are able to effectively apply climate risk information in annual and multi- year planning exercises and have applied these skills to the review and revision of existing sector / sub-sector strategies.  By the end of the project 75% of District Agriculture and Forestry Office (DAFO), District Disaster Management Committee (DDMC), and TSC staff in target districts have been trained in applying climate risk information and are applying this acquired knowledge in the planning and implementation of their activities. |
| **Outcome 3:**  Community-based adaptive agricultural practices and off-farm opportunities demonstrated and promoted within suitable agro-ecological systems | **3.1. Cover:** Number and type of climate risk-reducing farmer level practices identified and trialed to support adaptation of livelihoods and/or resource management.  **3.2. Cover:** % or targeted farming households aware of predicted adverse impacts of climate change and implementing new adaptive practices for agro-ecosystem and landscape management.  **3.3. Impact:** Improvement in farmer yields and water availability due to adaptation measures trialed in more than 50% of targeted communities. | By the end of the project at least 100 practical field-based adaptation interventions (food security, water management, flood and drought control) are trialed in the 5 pilot districts according to accepted technical standards  By the end of the project 75% of farming households in 5 pilot districts (3 provinces), equivalent to 13,500 households, have had access to extension services based on 6 Climate Change Training and Agriculture Adaptation Modules (climate resilient cropping, livestock, fisheries and forestry practices, water management etc.)  By the end of the project there is a 25% improvement in farmer yields resulting from adaptation measures trialed in target communities in 5 pilot districts**.** |
| **Outcome 4:**  Adaptation Monitoring and Learning as a long-term process | **4.1. Replicability:** Number of ‘lessons learned’ codified in a specific KM facility such as the Adaptation Knowledge Platform for South East Asia or the global Adaptation Learning Mechanism  **4.2. Replicability:** Number and type of relevant networks or communities through which lessons learned are disseminated to enable replication. | A project internal M+E system covering all components and all project locations systematically provides quantitative and qualitative data and information on coded ‘lessons learned’ and a website has been established linked to wider dissemination through regional and global networks (ALM, Wiki-adapt, Eldis and the Asia Knowledge Platform)  By the end of the project 2 regional conferences on CC+AA are organized by NAFRI for GMS member states (in collaboration with partner organizations) for SE ASIA (UNEP, SID, SEI, UNDP, ADB) |

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

*Project Document,*

*Annual Project Reports,*

*Technical Reports from Consultants,*

*Annual Work Plans and Budgets,*

*Minutes of PTF and Board Meetings,*

*Training and Workshop Reports;*

*Knowledge Products / Tangible Outputs of IRAS:*

*GIS-based vulnerability scenarios,*

*village land use plans,*

*district and village disaster preparedness guide and plans,*

*agricultural extension materials (“CCTAMs”),*

*climate change information materials and other documents and videos available through the NAFRI/IRAS and UNDP ALM websites.*

*Some reports and knowledge products are in Lao language only.*

Annex C: Evaluation Questions

*This list is to be further detailed with more specific questions by the Evaluation Team based on the particulars of the project and included in the Inception report, draft TE report, and final TE report.”*

*.*

| **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? | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? | | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
| Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards? | | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
| Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? | | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
| **Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?** | | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
|  | “This list is to be further detailed with more specific questions by the Evaluation Team based on the particulars of the project and included in the Inception report, draft TE report, and final TE report.” |  |  |  | |

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)