****

**DETAILED TERMS OF REFERENCE**

**FOR**

**INDEPENDENT MID-TERM EVALUATION OF THE PROJECT**

**“Grid-connected rooftop photovoltaic systems”**

1. **Project Summary Table**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Project Title:  | Grid-connected rooftop photovoltaic systems |
| GEF Project ID: | 4331 |   | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | *at completion (Million US$)* |
| UNDP Project ID: | 81971 | GEF financing:  | 1,160,000 |       |
| Country: | Seychelles  | IA/EA own: | (same as Government ) |       |
| Region: | Africa  | Government: | 1,224,697 |       |
| Focal Area: | CCM | Other: | 4,902,441 |       |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): | SO1-3 | Total co-financing: | 6,127,138 |       |
| Executing Agency: | Ministry of Environment and Energy  | Total Project Cost: | 7,287,138 |       |
| Other Partners involved: | Seychelles Energy Commission, UNDP | ProDoc Signature (date project began): | 12 September 2012 |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | Proposed:April 2016 | Actual: |

# BACKGROUND

The Government of Seychelles (GOS), in partnership with the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) is currently implementing a project ‘Grid-connected rooftop PV systems’.

Currently, the Seychelles is approximately 90% dependent on imported oil to meet its energy needs, including electricity production. The objective of the proposed project is to increase the use of grid-connected photovoltaic (PV) systems as a sustainable means of generating electricity in selected main islands and smaller islands of the Seychelles, with a focus on small-scale producers who are already connected to the national electricity grid. The project will revise the legal, regulatory and policy framework to better support the adoption of renewable energy technologies, and grid-connected PV systems in particular; design and implement financial mechanisms that will make the purchase and installation of solar PV systems more attractive to the private sector; establish the first market supply chain for solar PV systems in the country; provide training to establish local capacity for the installation and maintenance of PV systems; and demonstrate for the first time in the Seychelles the viability and practicality of grid-connected PV systems through demonstration PV systems. Together, these actions are designed to play a critical role in “jump-starting” the adoption of solar PV technology in the Seychelles, and in setting the stage for broad-scale replication by reducing the costs of PV technology through a market-based approach that will establish financial incentive mechanisms for PV systems and reduce transaction costs (by creating a reliable supply chain and establishing local capacity for installation and maintenance). In this way, the project is designed to transform an energy sector that today is almost 100% dependent on imported fossil fuels into one where solar PV and other RETs provide a significant percentage of national energy production going forward.

The project was originally planned for four years. However, after two years of implementation almost all targets are already achieved and it is likely that the project will close early, dependent upon recommendations of the MTE.

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

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures*[[1]](#footnote-1)*, all full and medium-sized country projects implemented by UNDP with GEF financing must undergo a mid-term evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Mid-term Evaluation (TE) of the project **Grid-connected rooftop PV systems’.**

MTEs are beneficial for project implementation as they provide an independent in-depth review of implementation progress, thus being responsive to GEF Council decisions on transparency and better access of information during implementation.

MTEs are intended to identify potential project design problems, assess progress towards achievement of objectives, identify and document lessons learned (including lessons that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP/GEF projects), and to make recommendations regarding specific actions that might be taken to improve the project. It is expected to serve as a means of validating of filling the gaps in the initial assessment of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency obtained from monitoring. The mid-term evaluation provides the opportunity to assess early signs of project success or failure and prompt necessary adjustments.

1. **Objective and Scope**

This evaluation is being initiated by the Government of Seychelles/UNDP/GEF Programme Coordination Unit (PCU), through its executing agency the Department of Environment (DoE), Ministry of Environment, Energy and Climate Change.

The specific objectives of the MTE are to:

* Identify potential project design problems
* Assess progress being made toward the achievement of outcomes and identify course correction if needed.
* Identify and document lessons learned (including lessons that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP/GEF projects)
* Make recommendations for enhanced implementation during the remainder of the project
* Analyze project performance up to the time of the MTE in the context of institutional and policy frameworks in the Seychelles.

The overall objective of the evaluation is to identify strengths and weaknesses of the project implementation process, progress towards targeted outcomes and to reinforce what works well and make corrections to weaknesses. The evaluation will therefore focus, among other areas, on the following:

* Project progress made towards meeting set targets and indicators
* Effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation
* Highlighting of issues requiring decisions and actions will be highlighted, and presenting of initial lessons learned about project design, implementation and management
* Review institutional and management arrangements of the project
* Undertake a stakeholder analysis, with a view to recommend appropriate strategies for engagement
* Assess the monitoring capacity of DoE, PCU and UNDP Country Office (CO)
* Recommend measures for improving project implementation and achieving project objectives.
* Outline any lessons already learnt.

# Evaluation approach and method

The evaluation must provide evidence‐based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF country focal points, steering committee, UNDP Country Office, project team, and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Seychelles including specific project sites. The evaluator is expected to use interviews as a means of collecting data on the relevance, performance and success of the project. Key stakeholders to be interviewed are as follows (see also ProDoc p.55-57) – list is not exclusive:

The following stakeholders will be consulted during the mid-term evaluation:

* Ministry of Environment, Energy and Climate Change
* Seychelles Energy Commission
* Public Utilities Corporation
* Ministry of Finance, Trade and the Blue Economy
* Seychelles Institute of Technology
* University of Seychelles
* Private Sector Partners
* Seychelles Islands Foundation
* Environmental NGOs
* Community members and SMEs investing in solar PV

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

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

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

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

* UNDP staff who have project responsibilities;
* Staff of the Programme Coordination Unit
* Staff of the Executing Agency (including the National Project Director)
* Members of the Project Board (Steering Committee)
* Project stakeholders, including individuals/SMEs benefitting from the financial rebate scheme
* Relevant staff in participating government departments.

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

**Evaluation Criteria & Ratings**

Project performance will be measured based on the Project Logical Framework (Annex 2), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact,** as defined and explained in the guidance manual.As agreed with GEF, ratings will be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. In addition, a rating must also be provided for project implementation. The obligatory rating scales are provided (Annex 3*).*

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

**Mainstreaming**

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

**Impact**

The evaluators will offer their assessment of the extent to which the project is achieving early impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts.

**Conclusions****, lessons and recommendations**

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

**Implementation arrangements**

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

**Project finance/co-finance**

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator 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 evaluation report.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Co-financing(type/source) | UNDP own financing (mill. US$) | Government(mill. US$) | Partner Agency(mill. US$) | Total(mill. US$) |
| Planned | Actual  | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual |
| Grants  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Loans/Concessions  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * In-kind support
 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * Other
 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Duties and Responsibilities**

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

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

**Required Skills and Experience and Competencies**

**Competencies**

Corporate Competencies

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

Functional Competencies

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

**Required Skills and Experience**

* An MSc (minimum requirement) or higher degree in Environment, Renewable Energy or related fields, and adequate experience in the management, design and/or evaluation of comparable CCM projects.
* In-depth understanding of energy and environment issues in tropical/subtropical and island environments (particular experience with Small Island Developing States and in the Western Indian Ocean is an advantage). A minimum of 10 years of relevant working experience is required.
* Experience with renewable energy, particularly solar energy, projects is an advantage.
* Prior experience in the evaluation of international technical assistance projects with major donor agencies, including UNDP-GEF projects.
* Demonstrated ability to assess complex situations, succinctly distil critical issues, and draw forward-looking conclusions and recommendations.
* Excellent written and verbal communication skills in English. Good knowledge of French is advantageous.
* Ability to deliver quality reports within the given time.

**Evaluation timeframe**

The total duration of the evaluation will be 20 working days over approximately 8 weeks according to the following plan (for details see Annex 4): Expected date of contract 01 April 2015.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Timing | Completion Date |
| **Preparation** | 3 days  | April 15 2015 |
| **Evaluation Mission to Seychelles** | 10 days  | April 30 |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | 5 days  | May 15 |
| **Final Report** | 2 days  | May 30 |

TE is expected to deliver the following:

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

An outline for the final report is given in Annex 5.

**Evaluator Ethics**

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

**Payment modalities and specifications [Estimated total cost USD 21,500]**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| % | Milestone |
| 20% | At contract signing, due date 01 March 2015 |
| 50% | Following submission and approval of the 1st draft mid-term evaluation report 15May 2015 |
| 30% | Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final mid-term evaluation report (no date defined yet until RTA respond) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Estimated Ticket cost USD 1,500 Due March 2014 |
|  | DSA 10 days cost USD 3,630 $363x10days |

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

**Application process**

Applicants are requested to apply online [*http://jobs.undp.org*](http://jobs.undp.org). Individual consultants are invited to submit applications & below requirements.

**1.** Duly accomplished **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the template provided by UNDP;

2. **Personal CV or P11**, indicating all past experience from similar projects, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the Candidate and at least three (3) professional references;

3. **Brief description** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a methodology, **if applicable**, on how they will approach and complete the assignment;

4. **Financial Proposal** supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template provided.

All Applicants will be requested to submit a price offer indicating their proposed daily fee rate for the assignment, based against the above stipulated evaluation schedule. Following UNDP procurement rules, both technical competence (70%) and the consultant daily fee rate (30%) will be taken into account in the selection process. Qualified women and members of social minorities are strongly encouraged to apply.

DEADLINE FOR APPLICATIONS IS xx 2014

**This TOR is approved by**: [*indicate name of Approving Manager*]

Signature

Name and Designation

Date of Signing

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

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

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

**Annex 2: Project Logical Framework. Prodoc**

To be provided (separate attachment).

**Annex 3: Ratings**

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

**Guidelines for Ratings for Project Implementation:**

1. **Progress toward achieving project objectives**

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

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

1. **Progress in project implementation**

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Criterion | Evaluator’s Summary Comments | Evaluator’s Rating |
| **A. Attainment of project objectives and results (overall rating)****Sub criteria (below)** |  |  |
| A. 1. Effectiveness  |  |  |
| A. 2. Relevance |  |  |
| A. 3. Efficiency |  |  |
| A.4. Relevance |  |  |
| **B. Sustainability of Project outcomes****(overall rating)****Sub criteria (below)** |  |  |
| B. 1. Financial |  |  |
| B. 2. Socio Political |  |  |
| B. 3. Institutional framework and governance |  |  |
| B. 4. Environmental |  |  |
| **C. Achievement of outputs and activities** |  |  |
| **D. Monitoring and Evaluation** **(overall rating)****Sub criteria (below)** |  |  |
| D. 1. M&E Design |  |  |
| D. 2. M&E Plan Implementation (use for adaptive management)  |  |  |
| D. 3. Budgeting and Funding for M&E activities |  |  |
| **E. Catalytic Role** |  |  |
| **F. Preparation and readiness** |  |  |
| **G. Country ownership**  |  |  |
| **H. Stakeholders involvement** |  |  |
| **I. Financial planning** |  |  |
| **J. Implementation approach** |  |  |
| **K. UNDP/GEF Supervision and backstopping**  |  |  |

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

**Annex 4: Plan for Evaluation Implementation**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Activity | Estimated time | Key outputs |
| 1 | Preparation by consultant* Review project documents and progress reports
* Other relevant literature
* Prepare inception report
* Agreement on activities and timeframes
* Preparation of meetings/programme
 | 3 days | * Familiarization with the projects (re. intended outcomes)
* Agreement on timeframes and programme
 |
| 2 | Meetings and discussions with stakeholders* Discussions with project staff and PCU
* Field visits. This will include interviews and discussions with various stakeholders.
* Meetings with development partners including eventually Project Steering committee and other partners
 | 10 days (including travel) | * Document records of interviews and observations with stakeholders
* Evaluate findings
 |
| 3 | Presentation of findings to stakeholders* Hold a meeting with stakeholders including Project Steering Committee, development partners, government and UN agencies to present preliminary findings and recommendations to collect feedback that will help finalise the report, give suggestions and get feedback
 | Included in the above | * Present findings to key stakeholders and create forum for participatory feedback
 |
| 4 | Writing Report* Incorporate feedback from the presentation meeting into findings
* Draft report and final report

Report should be:* Analytical in nature (both quantitative and qualitative)
* Structured around issues and related findings/lessons learnt
* Conclusions
* Recommendations

Present draft form for review by UNDP CO | 5 days | * Draft report delivered to UNDP CO for consideration
* Consideration should be given to producing a final report for public information and donors
 |
| 5 | Submission of Final Report | 2 days  | A report of maximum 40 pages in word document format with tables where appropriate (excluding annexes) will be submitted within 1 week of receiving consolidated comments made on the draft submitted to UNDP CO |
|  | Time allocated to the assignment | 20 days |  |

**Annex 5: Evaluation Report Outline*[[2]](#footnote-2)***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **i.** | Opening page:* Name of the UNDP/GEF 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
* Executing Agency and 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: UN Editorial Manual*[[3]](#footnote-3)*) |
| **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)  |
| **3.1** | Project Design / Formulation* Analysis of LFA (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 Executing Agency implementation / execution (\*) coordination, and operational issues
 |
| **3.3** | Project Results* Overall results (attainment of objectives) (\*)
* Relevance, Effectiveness, & Efficiency (\*)
* Country ownership
* Mainstreaming
* Sustainability (\*)
* Catalytic Role & Impact
 |
| **4.**  | Conclusions, Lessons &Recommendations * 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* TORs
* Itinerary
* List of persons interviewed
* Summary of field visits
* List of documents reviewed
* Questionnaire used and summary of results
* Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form
 |

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

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

Signed at (place)on

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

* **Annex 7: Evaluation Report Clearance Form**

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

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

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

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

UNDP- GEF- RTA

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

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

1. 1See 'UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results', 2009, and the 'GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy', 2010 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The Report length shall not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. <http://69.94.137.26/editorialcontrol/> [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-4)