

MID-TERM EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP M&E policies and procedures, and the EU-UNDP Agreement of the '*Clima East: Supporting Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation in Neighbourhood East and Russia (Clima East Pilots)*', the project is required to undergo a mid-term evaluation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for the Mid-term Evaluation (MTE) of the Clima East Pilots. The essentials of the project to be evaluated are as follows:

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	Supporting Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation in Neighbourhood East and Russia (Clima East Pilots)			
Countries:	Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Moldova, Russia, Ukraine		<i>at endorsement (Million Euro)</i>	<i>at completion (Million US\$)</i>
Region:	Europe & CIS	EU financing:	11	11
Other Partners involved:	Relevant ministries of Environment, agencies of Protected areas, municipalities in each country	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		22 July 2008
		Official EU Clima East Project start date:		Dec 2012
		EU Clima East project start-up (implementation):		July 2013 ¹
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: 2016	Actual: 2016

OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The Clima East Pilots Project is part of a broader EU financing package 'Clima East: Supporting Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation in Neighbourhood East and Russia' which will be implemented in the years 2013-2016 in cooperation with the partner countries Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Moldova, Russian Federation and Ukraine. The Clima East package consists of: - The Clima East Policy project, the main aim of which is to improve the information access of partner countries to EU climate change Acquis Communautaire (legislation), policies, knowledge and experience, both on an EU and member-state level and - The Clima East Pilots project, a project (ENPI/2012/303-093) with a maximum budget of 11 MEUR, implemented by UNDP in cooperation with national and international partner organisations. The main aim of the Clima East Pilots project, which is the subject of this evaluation, is to show through pilot projects the feasibility of ecosystem-based approaches to climate change, meaning that intact ecosystems such as peatlands, permafrost landscapes, boreal forests and pasture land can have a strong and cost-efficient positive effect both on climate change mitigation and adaptation.

The Clima East Pilots Project is financed from the Regional Action Programme 2011-2013 of the EU Eastern Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument, ENPI, with contributions made from UNDP in some pilot countries. The Clima East Policy and the Clima East Pilots projects are intrinsically linked. Results achieved in the ecosystems-based Clima East Pilots project will be integrated into adaptation and mitigation strategies supported by the Clima East Policy project.

¹ Specific start dates of implementation vary from country to country and the Belarus component implementation began in February 2014.

The Clima East Pilots project is broken down into 4 components and further into 9 constituting elements, each managed by a separate country office of UNDP:

Peatlands component

1. Belarus peatlands conservation and restoration (implemented by UNDP Belarus, Minsk)
2. Ukraine peatlands conservation and restoration (implemented by UNDP Ukraine, Kiev)
3. Russia steppe peatlands restoration (Implemented by UNDP Russia, Moscow)

Permafrost and boreal forests component

4. Russia permafrost peatlands and boreal forests in Komi and NAO (Implemented by UNDP Russia, Moscow)

Southern pastures and forest management

5. Moldova ecosystem based approaches to climate change in Orhei National Park (implemented by UNDP Moldova, Chisinau)
6. Azerbaijan pastures restoration and protection (Implemented by UNDP Azerbaijan, Baku)
7. Georgia pastures restoration and protection (Implemented by UNDP Georgia, Tbilisi)
8. Armenia pastures restoration and protection (Implemented by UNDP Armenia, Yerevan)

Global

9. Global component on technical knowledge generation and sharing, evaluation and awareness raising (implemented by UNDP EEG Headquarters represented by Istanbul Regional Support Center, which also has the overall supervision responsibility for the package and reporting in front of EC).

The MTE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Office's Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Results (<http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/handbook/me-handbook.pdf>), and as agreed in the EU-UNDP Financial and Administrative Framework Agreement (FAFA).

The objectives of the evaluation are to assess progress towards the achievement of the Clima East Pilot Project objective, identify and document lessons learned (including lessons that might improve design and implementation), and to make recommendations regarding specific actions that might be taken to improve the project. The evaluation will play a critical role in the future implementation of the project by providing advice on: (i) how to strengthen the adaptive management and monitoring function of the project; (ii) how to ensure accountability for the achievement of the EU Clima East Pilot project objective; and (iii) how to enhance organizational and development learning, including among the other pilots projects under the Clima East. The evaluation shall also look at the linkages within the overall Clima East package – between Clima East Pilots and Clima East Policy. The added value of the Global component shall also be considered and its role in facilitating the regional purpose of the Pilots Project.

The MTE for the Permafrost and boreal forests component (nr. 7 above) was conducted in late 2014. The findings of the 2014 Komi evaluation will be integrated into the report of this evaluation to provide a comprehensive analysis of the Clima East Pilots Project as a whole.

EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

An overall approach and method² for conducting project mid-term evaluations of UNDP-implemented 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, the overall approach of which is also relevant for this EU-funded project. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this 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.

² For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](#), Chapter 7, pg. 163

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 Project Directors, UNDP Country Office, project team, EU Clima East Pilot Project Regional Coordinator and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field missions to the pilots. Interviews with the main institutions and organization involved in the Pilots project are to be conducted during the missions.

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, 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](#) of this Terms of Reference.

EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Clima East Pilots Project Indicative Indicators Framework (see [Annex A.1](#)) and the Results Resource Frameworks (RRF) prepared by the country pilots, which provide 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](#).

Evaluation Ratings³:			
1. Monitoring and Evaluation	<i>rating</i>	2. IA& EA Execution	<i>rating</i>
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	<i>rating</i>	4. Sustainability	<i>rating</i>
Relevance		Financial resources:	
Effectiveness		Socio-political:	
Efficiency		Institutional framework and governance:	
Overall Project Outcome Rating		Environmental :	

The evaluation will provide a rating for each pilot, as well as on the global component. The Indicative Indicators for the global component were developed only at the end of 2014. Thus, the evaluation of the global component shall include the evaluators’ analysis of the indicators developed, their relevance and added value to the Pilots project. UNDP would also welcome any recommendations on indicator improvement that may arise as a result of the evaluation.

PROJECT FINANCE

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project. 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 offices (CO) and project teams to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the Evaluation report.

³ The MTE for the Permafrost and boreal forests component (Komi) was conducted in late 2014. The findings of the 2014 evaluation will be integrated into the report of this evaluation to provide a comprehensive analysis of the Clima East Pilots Project as a whole

Co-financing (type/source)	EU Financing (mill. US\$)		Government (mill. US\$)		UNDP financing (mill. US\$)		Other		Total (mill. US\$)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual
Grants	0									
Loans/Concessions										
• In-kind support										
• Other										
Totals										

MAINSTREAMING

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. Any collaboration and cooperation conducted with other EU-funded projects (regional and national) shall be noted.

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.⁴

CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions, recommendations and lessons**. This section should include observations not only on the specific pilot, but also consider regional-level recommendations in lieu of strengthening cooperation and lessons learned among the pilots, as well as between the Pilots and Policy components within the Clima East package.

IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the Clima East Regional Coordinator and the UNDP Regional Support Centre. The UNDP RSC will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements to the countries for the evaluation team. The national Pilots Project teams will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government, etc.

EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the evaluation will be up to four months; expected to be distributed according to the following plan:

Independent International Evaluator (peatlands management) will cover the pilots in Belarus, Russia and Ukraine

Activity	Time allocation	Tentative timeframe
Preparation	7 days	<i>Tentatively March 2-6</i>
Evaluation Mission	18 days (incl.travel)	<i>Tentatively March 9- April 30</i>
Draft Evaluation Report	12 days	<i>Tentatively May 15</i>
Final Report	6 days	<i>Tentatively June 8</i>

⁴ 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](#)

Independent International Evaluator (pasturelands/forests) will cover pilots in Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia and Moldova

Activity	Time allocation	Tentative timeframe
Preparation	7 days	<i>Tentatively March 2-6</i>
Evaluation Mission	25 days (incl.travel)	<i>Tentatively March 9- April 30</i>
Draft Evaluation Report	12 days	<i>Tentatively May 15</i>
Final Report	6 days	<i>Tentatively June 8</i>

The evaluators will be responsible for the assessment of the particular pilots within their scope for the missions and for the Pilots-specific parts of the report. In addition the evaluators will be requested to evaluate the global component and to work as a team in drafting the evaluation report and integrating comments. During preparation of the mission, the evaluation team will be requested to submit a plan for the elaboration of the report with the contributions of the individual evaluators identified for clarity of roles and responsibilities. One evaluator will be selected as Team Leader.

EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
Inception Report	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method, including proposed evaluation questions (Annex C)	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission.	Evaluator submits to Clima East Regional Coordinator, who, in turns coordinates with EU Task Manager
Presentation	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission	To project management, relevant UNDP CO and Regional Coordinator
Draft Final Report	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the completion of the evaluation mission	Sent to Clima East Regional Coordinator, COs, PCUs
Final Report*	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC.

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

TEAM COMPOSITION

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

The evaluator (peatlands) must present the following qualifications:

- Minimum 4 years of relevant professional experience
- Knowledge of UNDP, experience in EU –funded projects is considered to be an asset;
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
- Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s). Knowledge of role of biodiversity (eco-system management) in climate change issues (including GHG mitigation benefits and peatlands function as carbon pools;) is considered an asset;
- Familiarity with protected area policies and management structures in Eastern Europe/CIS/Russia
- Excellent English communication and report writing skills

The evaluator (pasturelands/forests) must present the following qualifications:

- Minimum 4 years of relevant professional experience
- Knowledge of UNDP, experience in EU –funded projects is considered to be an asset;
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
- Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s). Knowledge of role of biodiversity (eco-system management) in climate change issues (including GHG mitigation benefits and the role of pastures and forests in carbon sequestration) is considered an asset;
- Familiarity with protected area policies and management structures in Eastern Europe/CIS/Russia
- Excellent English communication and report writing skills

EVALUATOR ETHICS

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

PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

%	Milestone
10%	At contract signing and after submission of the inception report listed under 'Evaluation deliverables'
40%	Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft MTE report
50%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and Regional Coordination) of the mid-term evaluation report

Annex A.1: Indicative indicators Table

	Activity	Indicator	Other measures/effects
Component 1: Conservation and sustainable management of peatlands in Russia, Ukraine, and Belarus to minimize carbon emissions and help ecosystems to adapt to climate change, while contributing to the overall mitigation and adaptation effort			
1.1. Belarus peatlands	Shrub, tree and reed harvesting at natural fen peatlands in the border area with Ukraine	3,500 ha of peatlands reduced of overgrowth with shrub/reed/trees, 2,500 tons of dry biomass harvested from peatland used per year.	Positive ecological effects (e.g. safe breeding habitat of threatened species, maintained ecosystem functions of the peatland such as spring flood control and nutrient recycling) at Zvanets and Sporovo fen peatlands and around them, Heat value of biomass equivalent to 15,000 GJ/a, Set-up of producer-user structure for harvesting, processing and use of biomass, Increased stability of the population of the globally threatened species (Aquatic Warbler).
1.2. Russia peatlands	Steppe peatland restoration, protection and sustainable management in European South Russia	200 ha steppe peatlands rehabilitated; 4,000 ha of steppe peatlands improved in their protection status	GIS database and up-dated inventory on the state of steppe peatlands in Southern Russia, Integration of sustainable peatland management principles, following IPCC, Wetlands International methodologies, into land-use plans of two subjects of the Russian Federation Voronezh Region and Republic of Bashkortostan), Strengthening of existing (tentatively ca. 3,500 ha) and/or creation of new protected areas (tentatively ca. 500 ha)
1.3. Ukraine peatlands	Hydrological restoration and sustainable management of agricultural peatlands in border area with Belarus	3,000 ha of degraded former agricultural peatlands restored; 16,000 ha of peatlands improved in their protection status	Biomass harvested at 300 ha, producing 300 tons of dry biomass/a per year (equivalent to 5,250 GJ per year) At one cooperative of land users demonstration of a mechanism for restoration and sustainable management of degraded peatlands;
Component 2: Protection and restoration of forest and peatland permafrost carbon pools in Komi Republic and Nenetsky Autonomous Okrug			
2.1. Strengthening protection of forests and permafrost ecosystems	Strengthening of existing and creation of new protected areas	20,000 ha of new regional protected area created in the Chernorechenskaya area Strengthened protected area management capacities of the largest existing forest-and-permafrost protected area Yugyd Va National park (1.9 million ha).	Establishment of a protected area ensures that at 20,000 ha permafrost melt is 5-times slower as it would have been without protection. The new protected area will be equipped with skilled staff, equipment and infrastructure necessary to maintain the optimal ecological regime at this area. At the existing protected area (Yugyd Va), strengthened capacities will translate into more effective prevention and control over illegal fire and logging activities, more efficient patrolling units, integration of climate aspects in management plan, community engagement in forest fire prevention, and better environmental monitoring capacities.
2.2. Piloting restoration of peat permafrost ecosystems	Hydrological restoration, assisted re-vegetation,	180 ha of abandoned permafrost peatland ecosystem restored 60 ha of permafrost peatland under ongoing industrial exploitation – agreements	Re-installed peatland permafrost ecosystem functions (permafrost protection, water-flow and micro-climate regulation) at 180 ha targeted by restoration activities. The agreements with companies at 60 ha will help to prevent the otherwise highly probable risk of

		reached with companies on biodiversity and climate-friendly restoration after completion of their activity, in order to avoid permafrost melt,	permafrost degradation and loss of its ecosystem functions, which would ultimately lead to speeding up of permafrost melt. Internationally important innovation/experimenting with permafrost ecosystem piloted resulting in advanced knowledge of possibilities and technologies to slow down permafrost melt, e.g. through restoration and conservation of the upper soil and vegetation layer of permafrost peatlands, High national and international visibility.
2.3. Monitoring and research	Exchanges between leading permafrost scientists, publication of results	1 method for restoring permafrost ecosystem demonstrated resulting in slowing down of permafrost thaw 3 articles in leading international journals on the subject of permafrost ecosystems relationship with climate change	Data delivered to IPCC for incorporation into the Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories Linkage with other leading research and applied research initiatives.
Component 3: Sustainable management of pastures in the Caucasus (Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia) to demonstrate climate change mitigation and adaptation benefits and dividends for local communities			
3.1. Armenia pastures	Restoration of pastures and forests, and putting them under sustainable management in Gegharkunik region	2,000 ha of degraded pastures restored and 60 ha of degraded forests restored	New set of policies and standards on sustainable pasture management approved at the local level (by local authorities in the target districts) Increased quality of fodder production at target sites resulting in higher productivity and higher income from cattle products for local population Reduced grazing pressure on degraded areas
3.2. Azerbaijan pastures	Restoration and sustainable management of pastures in Ismayilli and Shamakhi regions	3,000 ha of degraded pastures restored	Increased quality of fodder production at target sites resulting in higher productivity and higher income from cattle products for local population Reduced grazing pressure on degraded areas Advanced knowledge on the carbon storage and carbon flow capacities of the Azerbaijani grasslands (before and after restoration)
3.3. Georgia pastures	Restoration and sustainable management of pastures in a close vicinity of the Vashlovani protected areas	4,064 ha of degraded pastures restored Methods for migratory route rehabilitation applied in 300 ha area	Improved status of protected areas (35,053 ha) A model of involvement of local communities in protected area management Sustainable livelihood opportunities explored for local people (wool production, milk products).
Component 4: Sustainable management of pastures and community forests in Moldova's first National Park Orhei to demonstrate climate change mitigation and adaptation benefits and dividends for local communities			
4.1. Moldova pastures	Restoration of pastures and community forests within the territory of the Orhei National Park	500 ha of pasture land restored 150 ha of degraded lands afforested	Development of pasture management plans and community forest plans for 18 communities (5,890.92 ha) and 1,392 ha, respectively in a participatory manner Improved management of pastures and community forests to reduce pressures from grazing and unsustainable use A robust system for monitoring of the carbon dividends and ecological integrity of pastures and forest ecosystem in place to ensure ability of park

			administration to respond to trends of pressures on natural resources in the area
Global component on technical knowledge generation and sharing, evaluation and awareness raising			
G.1. Technical knowledge	Promotion of technical exchanges among pilots	Technical knowledge generated on pilots-level shared regularly. Technical experience from carbon measurements and monitoring in pilots gathered and scientific review prepared	By end of project, technical knowledge in region on carbon potential in protected areas of peatlands and pastures/forests increased. Cooperation among researchers in region facilitated.
G.2. Eco-system based approach to climate issues	Knowledge and awareness of eco-system based approach to climate issues raised	Experiences in eco-system based approach to climate change shared at regional level through: - at least 4 sub-regional and regional workshops; - study tours among countries in the region (at least 3) - common scientific reviews - through the Clima East Project website	Knowledge and awareness of linkages between biodiversity and climate change increase in the region

Summarizing all carbon benefits as stated in the project description, the total GHG benefit (emissions avoided + carbon sequestered) resulting from the implementation of the project in all countries is assessed to be approximately 170,000 tCO₂-eq per year, or over 3.4 mln tCO₂-eq in 20 years following the implementation of project activities (20 year scale is use as a standard for LULUCF projects in Voluntary Carbon Market and by Global Environment Facility).

ANNEX B: LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE EVALUATOR

- Project Description of Action
- Pilots' project documents (Armenia pasturelands/forests, Azerbaijan pastures, Belarus peatlands, Georgia pastures, Moldova pastures and forests, southern peatlands Russia, Ukrainian peatlands)
- Pilots Inception Reports
- Quarterly operational reports
- Annual Project Implementation Reports
- Results-oriented Monitoring Mission (ROM) reports
- Management response to ROM reports
- Project Steering Committee meeting minutes
- Notes from project monitoring missions
- Financial management documents, such as project budget revisions and audit reports
- Various reports and documents available on the project website/with the PIU

ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

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

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the EU regional programme, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did the project's objectives fit EU strategic priorities? 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did the project's objectives fit within national priorities, priorities of the local government and local communities? 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do the project's objectives support implementation of the relevant multi-lateral environmental agreement? 			
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent have the project Objective and Outcomes have been achieved? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indicators at the level of project Objective and Outcomes achieved as planned/otherwise 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project indicators, RRFs, Annual report 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How did stakeholder involvement and public awareness contribute to the achievement of project objective and outcomes? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholder pools from the project show raise of interest to project objective and activities; corresponding indicator values show progress as planned; interview with the project management and key stakeholders confirmed/otherwise PM reports on stakeholder involvement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual reports, Project indicators, interviews 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Which were the key factors that contributed to project success/underachievement; can positive key factors be replicated in other cases, or could negative factors have been anticipated and minimized? 			
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was the project cost-effective? In case its implementation was delayed, did that affect cost-effectiveness? Were expenditures in line with international standards and norms? Was co-financing received at the level anticipated in the project document? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project expenditures for each of the outcomes correspond with rates agreed in the project document; project management costs did not exceed acceptable levels; project audits revealed no 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project financial statements, co-financing reports, 	

	questionable costs and/or violation of procurement, financial and HR administration rules	PIRs, NIM audit reports	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Was the project management effective? Were there any particular challenges with the management process? Did the project Steering Committee provide the anticipated input and support to project management? Were risks assessed in time and adequately dealt with? Was the level of communication and support from the implementing agency adequate and appropriate? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project management arrangements contributed/otherwise to attainment of project objective and outcomes, and were implemented according to the established principles and procedures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interviews with key project stakeholders, incl. National Implementing Agency and UNDP; project risk log, project Steering Committee minutes 	
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the likelihood that any required financial resources will be available to sustain the project results once the EU funding is over? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Major project endeavors (such as financial instruments, institutional arrangements, infrastructure support) will get financial support and be maintained without EU funding 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interviews with stakeholders, project reports, financial data if available 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the likelihood that institutional and technical achievements, legal framework, policies and governance structures and processes will allow for the project results to be sustained? Are there key institutional and governance risks to sustainability? 	Major institutional changes, technical solutions, legal framework amendments get strong support at policy and decision-making levels	Interviews with stakeholders, project reports,	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are there any environmental risks that can undermine the post-project impact and global environment benefits? 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the likelihood that the technical achievements, investments in capacity development, etc introduced through the project will be sustainable in the target communities? 			
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Did the project achieve its planned impacts? Why or why not? 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are there (and what are) secondary impacts achieved by the project, especially as related to local livelihoods? 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Which were the key lessons learned in course of project implementation? 			

ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

<p>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution</p> <p>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</p>	<p>Sustainability ratings:</p> <p>4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks</p>	<p>Relevance ratings</p> <p>2. Relevant (R) 1.. Not relevant (NR)</p> <p>Impact Ratings:</p> <p>3. Significant (S) 2. Minimal (M) 1. Negligible (N)</p>
<p><i>Additional ratings where relevant:</i> Not Applicable (N/A) Unable to Assess (U/A)</p>		

ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE⁵

- i. Opening page:
 - Title of UNDP implemented EU financed project
 - UNDP project ID#s.
 - Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report
 - Region and countries included in the project
 - 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 Manual⁶)
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 rated⁷)
- 3.1 Project Design / Formulation
 - Analysis of Indicative indicators/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators), including regional-level 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 the Pilots and Policy project, linkages among the different Pilots and other interventions within the sector, including other EU projects in the region
 - Management arrangements
- 3.2 Project Implementation

⁵The Report length should not exceed 60 pages in total (not including annexes).

⁶ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

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.

- 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
- Identified recommendations for strengthening regional component

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