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 *Fifth operational phase of the Small Grants Program in Ecuador* (PIMS 4518)

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

Project Summary Table

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Project Title:  |  |
| GEF Project ID: | 4375 |   | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | *at completion (Million US$)* |
| UNDP Project ID: | 00081120 | GEF financing:  | 4´398.145 | 4´398.145 |
| Country: | Ecuador | IA/EA own: |       |       |
| Region: | LATAM | Government: | 2´000.000 | 626.043,00 |
| Focal Area: | Biodiversity | Other: | 2´800.000 | 3´138.931,47 |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): |       | Total co-financing: | 4´800.000 | 3´764.974,47 |
| Executing Agency: | UNOPS | Total Project Cost: | 9´198.145 | 8´163.119,47[[1]](#footnote-1) |
| Other Partners involved: | Ministry of Environment of Ecuador COMDEKS- Satoyama Initiative | ProDoc Signature (date project began):  | 10/02/2012 |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | Proposed:30/06/2015 | Actual:30/06/2015 |

Objective and Scope

The project was designed to: Conserve biodiversity by reducing habitat fragmentation and strengthening ecological connectivity across production landscapes through community initiatives and actions in globally significant ecosystems in Ecuador.

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[[2]](#footnote-2) 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 Ecuador, including the following project sites:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Territory** | **Biocorridor** | **Project** | **CBO** | **Amount** |
|
|
| Amazonia | Biocorredor Yaku Samai | Bosques, agua y comunidades: acciones productivas y ecológicas para conservar el Bosque Protector Colonso en el Bio Corredor Yacu Samay | Asociación Pashimbi de Alto Tena | $ 50.000,00 |
| Biocorredor Akllak Sacha | Asociatividad para la conservación de nuestros bosques y ríos, y para la producción de cacao fino de aroma de manera orgánica, en “Tsatsayaku” | Asociación de Productores de Cacao Fino de Aroma “Tsatsayaku”. | $ 50.000,00 |
| Costa | Estuario del Río Chone: Islas Corazón y Fragatas, La Segua | Conservando el ecosistema manglar con acciones de restauración y desarrollo de emprendimientos productivos sostenibles en el Estuario del Rio Chone. | Cooperativa San Francisco de Salinas  | $ 40.020,00 |
| Conservación y manejo del Humedal La Segua y su área de influencia, mediante la implementación de emprendimientos agroecológicos. | Comité Pro-Mejora La Segua | $ 39.960,00 |
| Agroforestal Café - Cacao | Sostenibilidad agroecológica con aroma de café en las tabladas de la parroquia san Plácido | CEPROCAFE | $ 47.140,00 |
| Sierra Norte | Biocorredor Cayambe-Coca | Apoyo a la implementación del plan de manejo de Páramos de las micro-cuencas de la Chimba, de Gualimburo-Pisambilla y González-San Pablo de la Confederación Pueblo Kayambi | Confederación del Pueblo Kayambi | $ 50.000,00 |
| Fortalecimiento a la conservación de páramos mediante los procesos de producción y comercialización agroecológico de la RESSAK. | RESSAK  | $ 50.000,00 |
| Biocorredor Pisque Mojanda San Pablo | Conservación y manejo comunitario de páramos en las parroquias de Tupigachi y Tabacundo | Corporación TURUJTA | $ 50.000,00 |
| Conservación de los páramos y vertientes de la cordillera occidental del Cantón Otavalo, a través del fomento de medios de vida sostenibles con las comunidades involucradas | UNOCIGS - Unión de Comunidades Indígenas de González Suarez  | $ 50.000,00 |

 Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

* National Steering Committee (at least 3 representatives)
* Mr. Diego Zorrilla, Resident Representative of UNDP or his delegate
* Mr. Gabriel Jaramillo, UNDP Energy, Climate Change and Risk Management Area Specialist
* Ministry of Environment (Programa de Apoyo al Sistema Nacional de Áreas Protegidas)
* National Technical Assistance, Monitoring and Evaluation Team (EQUIPATEN)
* Regional Technical Assistance, Monitoring and Evaluation Teams (EQUIPATES) – at least 3
* National Coordinator and SGP team
* Delegates from the associative projects - at least 10
* Delegates from the local governments

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$) | Total(mill. US$) |
| 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 programs. 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.[[3]](#footnote-3)

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 *Ecuador.* 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 *21* days according to the following plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Timing | Completion Date |
| **Preparation** | *2* days  | *2015/02/23* |
| **Evaluation Mission** | *15* days  | *2015/03/06* |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | *5* days  | *2015/03/20* |
| **Final Report** | *1 day* | *2015/04/10* |

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.

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

Annex A: Project Logical Framework

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Component** | **Expected Outcomes** | **Expected Outputs** |
| 1. Effective community land use governance and planning for ecological connectivity
 | At least 12 biological corridors established and managed by designing and implementing community strategies to prevent habitat degradation. This includes management plans and community governance structures covering 1,900,000 ha and 15 micro-watersheds, that guide the uptake of community sustainable- use practices, reducing threats to habitat blocks and increasing connectivity across the production landscape. | 1.1.1 Biological corridors designed and their management plans prepared with community participation through strategic alliances between CBOs, local governments, private enterprise and NGOs, including organizational capacity development (12)1.1.2 Management plans for micro-watersheds within biological corridor areas prepared with due consideration for biodiversity (>15)1.1.3 Community territorial coordinating bodies for biological corridors established and operating (>9) |
| 2. Sustainable livelihood options for rural communities in fragile and globally important ecosystems | A mosaic of conservation and sustainable livelihood initiatives leading to ecological connectivity and increased biodiversity conservation in at least:-14,000 hectares of paramo ecosystem in the Northern and Central-Southern Highlands-600 hectares of mangroves-10,000 hectares of dry forest on the Ecuadorian coast-20,000 hectares of tropical rainforest in the Amazon eco-region In addition this will provide improved food security through crop diversification using local cultivars; increased income from sustainable productions (eg NTFP); improved generation of household incomes throughout the year and improved gender equity in communities, thus increasing sustainability over the long term and uptake over larger areas. | 2.1.1 Agrobiodiversity management and conservation practices using an agroecological approach and marketing of underutilized crops (>15 initiatives involving >60 communities)2.1.2 Eco-friendly economic activities such as alpaca breeding and production of alpaca wool (>3 initiatives involving >6 communities)2.1.3 Community-managed sustainable tourism (>10 initiatives involving >21 communities)2.1.4 Forest management and restoration through agroforestry, natural regeneration, enrichment and reforestation with native species (>10 initiatives in 40 communities)2.1.5 Sustainable artisanal fisheries, and mollusc and crustacean gathering (e.g. mangrove crab and black conch) in accordance with regulations for mangrove conservation2.1.6 Community business skills and production capacity program for sustainable harvesting and marketing of non-timber forest products (>50 initiatives) |
| 3. Knowledge systematized and disseminated, and communities trained in project design, monitoring and evaluation for adaptive management and learning | Capacity development, knowledge management, improved communications and community participation enabling implementation, replication and upscaling of successful community practices. This provides the enabling environment for upscaling thus leading to an indirect coverage of the project to:Paramo 133,800 haDry forest: 93,000ha Amazon tropical rainforest:180,000 haMangroves: 2,102 hectares | .1.1 Training programme designed and delivered through partner networks at the local, regional and national level to remove community capacity barriers (environmental management and planning, conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, environmental law, collective rights, socio-environmental conflict resolution, gender, and business planning and marketing)3.1.2 Information and communications plan designed and implemented3.1.3 Knowledge products developed and disseminated (>4)3.1.4 Experience exchange events among communities to promote strategic alliances among them (>18)3.1.5 Participatory process to analyse and codify social and environmental knowledge for each ecosystem3.1.6 Technical assistance and proposals developed by community ecotourism networks in the Páramos, mangrove areas and Amazon3.1.7 "SIMONA" Monitoring and Mentoring system strengthened and continually applied for project adaptive management |

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

* Project Document (PRODOC)
* National Strategy 2011- 2014
* National Steering Committee decisions and meeting´s minutes
* Co-financing Agreements (Ministry of Environment, Ministry of Agriculture, German Cooperation Office- GIZ, National Institute for Popular and Solidary Economy)
* Methodological and conceptual tools for the Participatory Territorial Planning Phase.
* Terms of Reference for the National Technical Assistance, Monitoring and Evaluation Team (EQUIPATEN) and the four Regional Technical Assistance, Monitoring and Evaluation Teams (EQUIPATE).
* Working Strategy with Networks
* Socio-Environmental Land Use Agreements (ASOCIATE) and Biocorridor Action Plans (ACBIO).
* Inception and exchange workshops documents.
* Associative project documents (proposals, progress reports, financial reports)
* Monitoring and Technical Support System (SIMONAA)
* Financial Guidelines for Associative Projects
* Midterm Evaluation
* Communication Strategy and materials (newsletter, publications, Web Page, Facebook).
* Informes de avance (técnicos y financieros) de los proyectos asociativos y de los EQUIPATE
* Reportes de Implementación del Proyecto (Project Implementation Report - PIR)
* Sistematización de la fase de planificación participativa y sistematizaciones parciales de los territorios.
* Lineamientos para el desarrollo de productos con identidad territorial a través de un fondo de becas.
* Legislación nacional relevante al proyecto y cualquier otro material que pueda considerarse de utilidad.
* National legislation relevant to the project and any other material that may be considered useful.

Annex C: Evaluation Questions

1. How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF local area, and to the environment priorities at the local, regional and national levels?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Evaluation criteria questions | Indicators | Sources |
| Hectares of conservation and / or management of ecosystems | Number of hectares of ecosystems conserved / protected or under management | Monitoring and evaluation system (SIMONAA)ASOCIATE y ACBIO |
| Agroecological and / or agroforestry practices | Number of hectares of agroforestry / agroecology on farms | Monitoring and evaluation system (SIMONAA)ASOCIATE y ACBIO |

1. To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Evaluation criteria questions | Indicators | Sources |
| Projects performance per biocorridor/territory/national | Percentage amount between the activities executed over the programmed (it may not exceed 120% per activity)  | Monitoring and evaluation system (SIMONAA) |
| Progress in implementing the logical frameworks of partnership projects as a contribution to the fulfillment of PRODOC | Percentage amount between the goals achieved over the programmed (it may not exceed 100% per goal)  | Monitoring and evaluation system (SIMONAA) |

1. Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Evaluation criteria questions | Indicators | Sources |
| Quality and compliance with financial reporting of project. | Finishing date over programmed date | Internal records – Financial Reports |
| Cash Flow | amount disbursed over scheduled fund | Internal records and ATLAS system |
| Contribution of counterparties | Co-financing contributions regarding the donation amount | Internal records |

1. To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Evaluation criteria questions | Indicators | Sources |
| For sustainability: Additional projects formulated territory | Number of continuity projects formulated  | Monitoring and evaluation system (SIMONAA) |
| Projects inclusion in public institutions | Degree of incorporation of the priorities of biocorridors in the planning activities in each autonomous decentralized government | Monitoring and evaluation system (SIMONAA) |

1. Are there indicators that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Evaluation criteria questions | Indicators | Sources |
| * Agreements for ecological conservation
 | * Number of local government ordinances issued
* Number of community agreements
 | Monitoring and evaluation system (SIMONAA) |
| Training and Gender | * Number of trained people (men and women)
* Number of children and adolescents in educational establishments trained in environmental education
 | Monitoring and evaluation system (SIMONAA) |

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[[4]](#footnote-4)**

**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[[5]](#footnote-5)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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[[6]](#footnote-6)) |
| **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[[7]](#footnote-7))  |
| **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. Co-financing amount as per July 2014. The information will be updated for the TE. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. 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-2)
3. 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-3)
4. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. 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-7)