**INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANT PROCUREMENT NOTICE**

Date: Nov. 25th, 2014

**Country: Jordan**

**Description of the assignment:**

**International Consultant to Conduct a Final Term Evaluation**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Post Title:** | **International Consultant to Conduct a final-term Evaluation** |
| **Duration:** | 12 working days in Dec. out of which 5 working days in Jordan. |
| **Location:** | Jordan – Amman and home based |
| **Project:** | **Energy Efficiency Standards and Labelling in Jordan** |

* 1. **BACKGROUND & CONTEXT**

The Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan is currently experiencing a high population growth rate, boosted by the immigration of many Iraqi business and intellectual classes to the country. The country covers an area of about 89,200 km2, sharing borders with Iraq, Israel, Syria and Saudi Arabia. More than 80% of its population of 5.7 million (2007)[[1]](#footnote-1) lives predominantly in urban centres, particularly in the northwest of the country in areas constituting about ten percent of the country’s total land area. Amman is the largest and the most important city in the country. In 2007, the population of Greater Amman was estimated at about 2.2 million, representing more than 38% of Jordan’s total population[[2]](#footnote-2).

The country is a large importer of energy and is highly affected by the cost of energy imports, which has been a major burden on its economy. Small quantities of crude oil were discovered in the 1980s on Jordanian territory but the amount represents less than 1% of the country’s oil imports. The country still depends heavily on oil imports as its main source of energy. There is no production or use of coal in Jordan. In 1987, gas was discovered in Risha and the production of natural gas has expanded subsequently. However, the country’s natural gas reserves are modest and only produce about 10% of Jordan’s annual electricity requirements. Most of Jordan’s gas resources are imported. In 2003, the construction of a pipeline section in Egypt was completed, allowing natural gas to be delivered to the Aqaba thermal power plant, the largest station in the country. Since then, many industries and services in Jordan have converted from oil to natural gas. Jordan is currently focusing its efforts on exploring other possible indigenous resources to meet the increasing demand for energy and reduce the burden being imposed by costly energy imports: oil shale reserves are known to cover more than 60% of Jordan’s territory and are estimated at about 40 billion tonnes, but their exploitation is still in the early stages.

To meet the challenges in the energy sector, a comprehensive Energy Strategy was approved by the Ministry of Energy and Mineral Resources (MoEMR) in December 2004 to provide a vision for the development of the energy sector over the next ten years. The Government has expressed particular concern about ongoing energy expenditures.

Energy efficiency programmes such as EE Standards and Labeling for the domestic sector have a long and proven history, with the generation of substantial energy savings in many countries. The application of EE Standards and Labeling in Jordan will help to maintain a lower growth rate of energy consumption.

**PROJECT GOAL, OBJECTIVES, OUTCOMES and OUTPUTS:**

The project **goal** is the reduction of Jordan’s energy-related greenhouse gas emissions through increased adoption of energy efficient domestic refrigerators, air conditioners, freezers and washing machines.

The **objective** is to remove the barriers that are currently present in Jordan for the rapid and widespread usage of energy efficient appliances in the domestic sector.

**Outcomes:** The project includes five outcomes that are designed to overcome the barriers for an energy efficient appliances market transformation. These outcomes are the following:

***Outcome 1: Enhanced capacities in Government and energy agency units for appliance EE policy development, implementation and market surveillance.*** This outcome will focus on: (i) establishing the necessary legal and institutional frameworks, including the preparation of an enabling energy efficiency law, to support the introduction of a Standards and Labeling system; (ii) providing technical assistance and tools to the National Energy Research Center to establish an energy labeling system and a Minimum Energy Performance Standards programme for household appliances in Jordan; and (iii) strengthening the institutional and operational capacities of Government ministries and enforcement agencies so that they can ensure that the new regulations are applied consistently.

***Outcome 2: Structured verification & enforcement of appliance EE labels and standards.*** This outcome will focus on: (i) the selection and adoption of international test procedures, Minimum Energy Performance Standards and label classifications tailored to national conditions, and (ii) the development and implementation of a verification and enforcement system.

***Outcome 3:* Consumers’ and retailers’ awareness raised and improved marketing of appliance EE standards and labels*.*** This outcome will focus on: (i) setting up comprehensive consumer awareness campaigns to inform end-users about the energy efficiency of appliances and equipment as well as the costs and benefits of more efficient products; (ii) providing support to retailers for marketing energy efficient appliances. This will result in an increased market share of energy efficient air conditioners, refrigerators, freezers and washing machines.

***Outcome 4: Increased capacity of manufacturers to produce and market energy efficient appliances.*** This outcome will focus on the capacity building of local manufacturers to allow them to make the necessary assessments related to the potential of technological upgrades and energy efficiency improvements as well as to the marketing of energy efficient appliances.

***Outcome 5: Project management and M&E support.*** Operational support will be provided to the MoPIC and the NERC to assist with key project management functions. This technical assistance will focus on strengthening the NERC’s ability to establish an EE Standards and Labeling system for household appliances. This outcome will also help coordinate sectoral policies among Government ministries and enforcement agencies to facilitate the adoption of the Minimum Energy Performance Standards and energy label schemes in Jordan and will ensure the monitoring and evaluation of the project.

Note that the activities have been modified from the Project Document and the updated list is found at

<https://skydrive.live.com/redir?resid=B75380CFAEC19BBD!890&authkey=!AI84km4K6S9doqQ>

1. **Scope of work**

In the context outlined above, UNDP seeks the recruitment of an international consultant to support the achievement of the following project final-term evaluation objectives:

Conduct a final-term evaluation of the Energy Efficiency Project in line with internal procedures of UNDP and GEF guidelines. The scope of Objective One should cover the following:

The scope of the evaluation will cover all activities undertaken in the framework of the project. The evaluator will compare planned outputs of the project to actual outputs and assess the actual results to determine their contribution to the attainment of the project objectives. He/she will also attempt to evaluate the efficiency of project management, including the delivery of outputs and activities in terms of quality, quantity, timeliness and cost efficiency as well as features related to the process involved in achieving those outputs and the impacts of the project. The evaluation will also address the underlying causes and issues contributing to targets not adequately achieved.

The key product expected from the final-term evaluation is a comprehensive analytical report in English that should, at least, follow the requirements as indicated in Annex E.

The terminal evaluation report will be a stand-alone document that substantiates its recommendations and conclusions. The report will have to provide convincing evidence to support its findings/ratings.

The report together with its annexes shall be presented in electronic form in MS Word format.

The consultant is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring engagement with the project team, project partners and key stakeholders.

The consultant is expected to use project data, third-party data and interviews as a means of collecting data on the performance and success of the project. Questionnaires prepared by the consultant can be distributed to national project partners, facilitated by participating implementing agencies.

1. **METHODOLOGY**

An overall approach and method[[3]](#footnote-3) for conducting project evaluations of UNDP supported and 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 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 A](#_TOR_Annex_C:)). The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and 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 National Energy Research Center and other stakeholder agencies, the GEF OFP, the UNDP Country Office, the project team, the UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders.

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, etc. – and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment.

**Evaluation criteria and 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.** The obligatory rating scales are included in [Annex C](#_TOR_Annex_D:).

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Ratings:** | | | |
| **1. Monitoring and Evaluation** | ***rating*** | **2. IA& EA Execution** | ***rating*** |
| M&E design at entry |  | Quality of UNDP Implementation |  |
| M&E Plan Implementation |  | Quality of Execution - Executing Agency |  |
| Overall quality of M&E |  | Overall quality of Implementation / Execution |  |
| **3. Assessment of Outcomes** | **rating** | **4. Sustainability** | **rating** |
| Relevance |  | Financial resources: |  |
| Effectiveness |  | Socio-political: |  |
| Efficiency |  | Institutional framework and governance: |  |
| Overall Project Outcome Rating |  | Environmental : |  |
|  |  | Overall likelihood of sustainability: |  |

**Project finance / co-finance**

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

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

**Mainstreaming**

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

**Impact**

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts.

**Conclusions, recommendations and 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 Jordan CO. UNDP Jordan will issue and manage the contract. The Project Team and Country Office will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluator to set up stakeholder interviews, coordinate with the Government, etc.

*Although the Consultant should feel free to discuss with the authorities concerned all matters relevant to his/her assignment, he/she is not authorized to make any commitment or statement on behalf of UNDP, the GEF or the project management.*

**Evaluator ethics**

Evaluation consultant will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex D) 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).

**4. DELIVERABLES**

Below are the required activities and expected outputs (deliverables), based on the objectives and scope of work stated above, respective timelines/deadlines and number of working days:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Output** | **Timeline** |
| 1. Agenda of meetings and report submission time-plans | 2 days after signing the contract and discussion with Project’s management team for initial sources of information |
| 1. Debriefing meeting on evaluation results with Project stakeholders, and delivery of an inception report | After conclusion of the mission |
| 1. A first draft of the evaluation report and GEF climate change mitigation tracking tool | Two weeks after signing the contract |
| 1. Final evaluation report responding to all comments from Project stakeholders. | Three weeks after signing the contract |

1. **DURATION OF MISSION**

# The expected duration of this assignment is up to 3 weeks maximum, expected to consist of approximately 12 working days to conduct necessary meetings and finalize the evaluation report.

**Annex A Project Results Framework:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPAP or CPD:** CPAP Outcome 3.2.: Environmental policies aligned to global conventions and national implementation capacities enhanced. | | | | | |
| **Country Programme Outcome Indicators:**   * Percentage of local manufacturers involved in the production and marketing of energy efficient appliances. * Percentage increase in the sale of energy efficient appliances. | | | | | |
| **Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area**: Mainstreaming environment and energy | | | | | |
| **Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program:** (CC-SP1) “Promoting Energy Efficiency in residential and commercial buildings” | | | | | |
| **Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes:** Outcome #1: Energy-Efficient - Buildings | | | | | |
| **Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators:** Quantity of Energy saved (to be saved or MWh saved) | | | | | |
|  | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Targets**  **End of Project** | **Source of verification** | **Risks and Assumptions** |
| **Project Objective**:  **Reduce GHG emissions by supporting a market transformation towards energy efficient new appliances in Jordan.** | -Sales of energy-efficient appliances increase rapidly, for refrigerators / freezers, washing machines and air conditioners; A two classes (EU) improvement in average refrigerator sales is observed.  -Reduction of GHG emissions by 183,000 tons of CO2 for the improved appliances put on the market during the three years project duration. | -Number of energy efficient appliances (refrigerators / freezers, washing machines and air conditioners) sold per year in Jordan  -Current emissions of CO2 in the domestic sector. | -Increase market share of energy efficient appliances in Jordan by30%  -Significant amount of CO2 emissions are avoided per year due to the market transformation of energy efficient appliances in Jordan. | -Project final report.  -Midterm and final evaluation reports.  -Appliance sales impact monitoring report.  -Laboratory testing for refrigerators and freezers. | -Government budgets for compliance checking are present or can be raised.  -Improvement in economic situation continues. |
| **Outcome 1**:  **Enhanced capacities in Government and energy agency units for appliance EE policy development, implementation and market surveillance.** | -National appliance energy efficiency program and impact monitoring system developed and approved by the Government. | -No energy efficient policy for refrigerators / freezers, washing machines and air conditioners. | -All the energy agencies in Government are well equipped to develop, implement and enforce appliances energy efficiency policy. | -Project implementation reports. | -Government staff are willing to commit sufficient time for participation in capacity building activities, then in program preparation. |
| **Outcome 2:**  **Structured verification & enforcement of appliance EE standards and labels.** | -Verification and enforcement procedures are developed, pilot tested are implemented for retailers and product compliance checking, including yearly shop visits for major retailers and spot-checking for other outlets. | -No verification and enforcement procedures in place. | -End term target: Verification and enforcement procedures in place and functional. | -Project implementation reports.  -Retailer compliance pilot checking and product compliance pilot checking reports from the PMU. | -Government budgets for compliance checking are present or can be raised. |
| **Outcome 3:**  **Increased consumers’ and retailers’ awareness and improved marketing of appliance EE standards and labels.** | -Percentage of consumers and retailers understand the trade-off between higher purchase cost and lower running cost of EE appliances and apply this knowledge in their purchase decisions and purchasing advice, respectively. | -Current number of retailers and customers who have understood the trade-off between high purchase cost and lower running cost. | -At least 50% of consumers and 80% of retailers. | -First year and final surveys of consumer and retailer understanding and perceptions of EE appliance.  -Project implementation reports. | -Improvement in economic situation continues. |
| **Outcome 4:**  **Increased capacity of manufacturers to produce and market EE appliances.** | -Percentage of local manufacturers have developed, produced and marketed more efficient appliances. | -Current number of manufacturers producing and marketing EE appliances. | -At least 50% of local manufacturers. | -Project implementation reports. | -Manufacturers are willing to commit staff time for appliance S&L training and financial resources to improve their products. |

Annex B: Evaluation Questions

| **Evaluative Criteria Questions** | | **Indicators** | **Sources** | **Methodology** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels? | | | | |
|  | * How and why have project outcomes and strategies contributed to the achievement of the expected results? Have the project outcomes contributed to national development priorities and plans? | * tbd[[4]](#footnote-4) | * tbd | * tbd |
|  | * Are the project’s objectives and components clear, practicable and feasible within the project’s timeframe? | * Tbd | * tbd | * tbd |
|  | * Were the capacities of executing institutions and counterparts properly considered when the project was designed? | * Tbd | * tbd | * tbd |
|  | * Were counterpart resources (funding, staff, and facilities), enabling legislation, and adequate project management arrangements in place at project entry? | * Tbd | * tbd | * tbd |
|  | * What are the underlying factors beyond the project’s immediate control and to what extent they have influenced outcomes and results? How appropriate and effective were the project’s management strategies for these factors. | * Tbd | * tbd | * tbd |
| Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? | | | | | |
|  | * To what extent have the project objectives and outcomes, as set out in the Project Document, project’s Logical Framework and other related documents, have been achieved? | * Tbd | * tbd | * tbd | |
|  | * Review planned strategies and plans for achieving the overall objective of the project within the timeframe. | * Tbd | * tbd | * tbd | |
|  | * Were the assumptions made by the project right and what new assumptions that should be made could be identified? | * Tbd | * tbd | * tbd | |
|  | * Were the project budget and duration planned in a cost-effective way? | * Tbd | * tbd | * tbd | |
|  | * How and to what extent have implementing agencies contributed and national counterparts (public, private) assisted the project? | * Tbd | * tbd | * tbd | |
| Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards? | | | | | |
|  | * How useful was the logical framework as a management tool during implementation and any changes made to it? | * Tbd | * tbd | * tbd | |
|  | * Were the risks identified in the project document and PIRs the most important and the risk ratings applied appropriately? | * Tbd | * tbd | * tbd | |
|  | * How and to what extent have project implementation process, coordination with participating stakeholders and important aspects affected the timely project start-up, implementation and closure? | * Tbd | * tbd | * tbd | |
|  | * Do the outcomes developed during the project formulation still represent the best project strategy for achieving the project objectives? | * Tbd | * tbd | * tbd | |
|  | * How have local stakeholders participated in project management and decision-making? What are the strengths and weaknesses of the approach adopted by the project? What could be improved? | * Tbd | * tbd | * tbd | |
|  | * Does the project consult and make use of skills, experience and knowledge of the appropriate government entities, NGOs, community groups, private sector, local governments and academic institutions in the implementation and evaluation of project activities? | * Tbd | * tbd | * tbd | |
| Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? | | | | | |
|  | * Was project sustainability strategy developed during the project design? | * Tbd | * tbd | * tbd | |
|  | * How relevant was the project sustainability strategy? | * Tbd | * tbd | * tbd | |
|  | * Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes? What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GEF assistance ends (resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and trends that may indicate that it is likely that in future there will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project’s outcomes)? | * Tbd | * tbd | * tbd | |
|  | * Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there a sufficient public/ stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project? | * tbd | * tbd | * tbd | |
| **Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?** | | | | | |
|  | * How has the project contributed to the reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status? | * Tbd | * tbd | * tbd | |
|  | * Are the project outcomes contributing to national development priorities and plans? | * Tbd | * tbd | * tbd | |

Annex C: 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 D: 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[[5]](#footnote-5)**

**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 E: Evaluation Report Outline[[6]](#footnote-6)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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[[7]](#footnote-7)) |
| **1.** | **Introduction (4-5 pages)**   * Purpose of the evaluation * Scope & Methodology * Structure of the evaluation report |
| **2.** | **Project description and development context (2-3 pages)**   * 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 (20 pages)**  (In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) must be rated[[8]](#footnote-8)) |
| **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 (3-5 pages)**   * 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 * List of persons interviewed * List of documents reviewed * Evaluation Question Matrix * Questionnaire used and summary of results * Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form |

Annex G: Evaluation Report Clearance Form

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

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

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

UNDP GEF RTA

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

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

1. Population Reference Bureau: <http://www.prb.org/> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Jordan Department of Statistics: <http://www.dos.gov.jo/sdb_pop/sdb_pop_e/inde_o.htm> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. 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-3)
4. tbd – to be determined by consultant in consultations with the project team [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. 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-8)