Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of theBRA/10/G32 –Third National Communication to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change – UNFCCC (PIMS # 4299).

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

Project Summary Table

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Title: |  | | | | | |
| GEF Project ID: | | 4299 |  | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | | *at completion (Million US$)* |
| UNDP Project ID: | | 71915 | GEF financing: | 5,720,000 | | 5,720,000 |
| Country: | | Brazil | IA/EA own: | 0 | | 0 |
| Region: | | RBLAC | Government: | 6,500,000 | | 6,500,000 |
| Focal Area: | | CC | Other: | 0 | | 0 |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): | | EA | Total co-financing: | 6,500,000 | | 6,500,000 |
| Executing Agency: | | MCTI | Total Project Cost: | 12,220,000 | | 12,220,000 |
| Other Partners involved: | | N/A | ProDoc Signature (date project began): | | | October 29th, 2010 |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | | Proposed:  November 2014 | Actual:  June 2016 |

Objective and Scope

This Enabling Activity Project was planned to assist Brazil in the preparation of the Third National Communication (TNC) to the UNFCCC. Its objective is to extend coverage of the annual Brazilian Inventory of Anthropogenic GHGs to period 2000-2010, focusing on the sectors/gases that have a significant share of GHG emissions and/or present a large degree of data uncertainty. New integrated global model for climate change studies and downscaling of global models will be developed to reduce the uncertainties in V&A assessments for different sectors. Brazil’s description of national circumstances will be updated, as well as the steps to be taken or envisaged to implement the Convention. Finally, the project continued building institutional capacity for the implementation of the Convention in Brazil, including undertaking activities related to climate change education and awareness.

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects.

The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

Evaluation approach and method

An overall approach and method[[1]](#footnote-1) for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact,** as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR (Annex C). The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence‐based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Brazil, including the following project sites (Brasilia at Distrito Federal; and Cachoeira Paulista, Campinas and São José dos Campos in the state of São Paulo). Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: the Brazilian Cooperation Agency (ABC), the Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation (MCTI), the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MRE), and the Brazilian Network for Research on Global Climate Change (Rede CLIMA).

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in [Annex B](#_TOR_Annex_B:) of this Terms of Reference.

Evaluation Criteria & Ratings

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework ([Annex A](#_TOR_Annex_A:)), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact.** Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in  [Annex D](#_TOR_Annex_D:).

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

Project finance / cofinance

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

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

Mainstreaming

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

Impact

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.[[2]](#footnote-2)

Conclusions, recommendations & lessons

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

Implementation arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Brazil. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government, etc.

Evaluation timeframe

The total duration of the evaluation will be *30* days according to the following plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Timing | Completion Date |
| **Preparation** | *03 days* | *July 01st, 2016* |
| **Evaluation Mission** | *07* days | *July 10th, 2016* |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | *10* days | *July 20th, 2016* |
| **Final Report** | *10* days | *July 30th, 2016* |

Evaluation deliverables

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Deliverable | Content | Timing | Responsibilities |
| **Inception Report** | Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method | No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission. | Evaluator submits to UNDP CO |
| **Presentation** | Initial Findings | End of evaluation mission | To project management, UNDP CO |
| **Draft Final Report** | Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes | Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission | Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs |
| **Final Report\*** | Revised report | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft | Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC. |

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

Team Composition

The evaluation team will be composed of 1 international /national evaluator*.* The consultant shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The evaluator 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 must present the following qualifications:

* Minimum 15 years of relevant professional experience;
* Knowledge of UNDP and GEF ;
* Previous experience with results‐based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
* Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s).

Evaluator Ethics

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

Payment modalities and specifications

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| % | Milestone |
| *40%* | Following submission and approval of the 1st draft terminal evaluation report |
| *60%* | Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report |

Application process

Applicants are requested to apply online by June 22nd, 2016. Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions. The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in English or Portuguese, with indication of the e‐mail and phone contact. Shortlisted candidates will be requested to submit a price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs).

UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

Annex A: Project Logical Framework

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcomes as defined in CPAP or CPD:**  MYFF03 - Public policies with increased mainstreaming and crosscutting of the environmental dimension | | | | | |
| **Country Programme Outcome Indicators:**  MYFF03 - Studies to implement public policy conducted on types of environmental impacts caused by economic activities | | | | | |
| **Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area :** 1. Mainstreaming environment and energy | | | | | |
| **Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program: CC Enabling Activity** | | | | | |
| **Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes: National Communications** | | | | | |
| **Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators: National Communication** | | | | | |
|  | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Targets**  **End of Project** | **Source of verification** | **Risks and Assumptions** |
| **Project Objective[[3]](#footnote-3)**  **To assist the Government of Brazil to perform the activities necessary to prepare the Third National Communication to the Conference of Parties in accordance with the UNFCCC.** | **(A) National GHG inventory for the sectors: (i) energy; (ii) industry; (iii) agriculture; (iv) LULUCF; and (v) waste for 2000-2010 produced; and time-series 1990-2000 refined;**  **(B) Publication of formal communication on national circumstances to the UNFCCC;**  **(C) Publication of Third National Communication;**  **(D) Building institutional capacity in Brazil for education, training and public awareness related to climate change.** | **(A) SNC;**  **(B) SNC;**  **(C) SNC;**  **(D) SNC.** | **(A) TNC;**  **(B) TNC;**  **(C) TNC;**  **(D) TNC.** | **Project evaluation, official reports to the UNFCCC** | **Risks:** No major risks have been identified in the implementation of this project since the Government of Brazil is strongly committed to its obligations under the international agreements on Climate Change and in particular to the reporting under the UNFCCC[[4]](#footnote-4).  **Assumptions:** The Government maintains its support to implement the UNFCCC in Brazil. |
| **Outcome 1[[5]](#footnote-5)**  **The national GHG inventory 2000-2010 has been produced and time-series 1990-2000 have been refined for key emission sectors.** | **(A) National GHG inventory for the sectors: (i) energy; (ii) industry; (iii) agriculture; (iv) LULUCF; and (v) waste; for 2000-2010 produced and time-series 1990-2000 refined;**  **(B) QA/QC plan for GHG emission data per sector;**  **(C) Database of emission factors and activity data.** | **(A) GHG inventory available for period 1990-1994 (FNC) and 1990-2000 (SNC);**  **(B) QA/QC pilot has been designed and implemented under SNC;**  **(C) Pilot database available under the SNC.** | **(A) GHG inventory available for the period 1990-2010, including refinement of time-series 1990-2000;**  **(B) Analysis of key GHG emission categories and uncertainty analysis available, and a QA/QC plan established;**  **(C) Data base of emission factors available.** | **Status of the preparation of the inventory report** | **Risks:**  (1) Coordination with stakeholders may cause delay since a large number of actors from different economic sectors of the society are involved. (2) Difficulty in hiring qualified people.  **Assumptions:** (1) TNC will benefit from experience gained with FNC and SNC; (2) Project can draw on a pool of experts; (3) The Government maintains its support to implement the UNFCCC in Brazil. |
| **Outcome 2**  **National circumstances, steps taken or envisaged, constraints and needs have been assessed as input for the implementation of the UNFCCC in Brazil.** | **(A) Assessment of national circumstances in Brazil;**  **B) Assessment of constraints and needs to implement the Convention in Brazil;**  **(C) Identification of activities and CC measures to implement the Convention in Brazil;**  **(D) Publication of formal communication on national circumstances to the UNFCCC.** | **(A) SNC (data until 2005);**  **(B) SNC (data until 2005);**  **(C) SNC (data until 2005);**  **(D) SNC (preliminary SNC results made public by April 2010).** | **(A) TNC (data until 2013);**  **(B) TNC (data until 2013);**  **(C) TNC (data until 2013);**  **(D) TNC (preliminary TNC results made public by April 2013).** | **Status of the report preparation** | **Risks: (1)**  Limited political support to Climate Change issues; (2) Difficulty in hiring qualified people.  **Assumptions:** (1) TNC will benefit from experience gained with FNC and SNC; (2) Project can draw on a pool of experts; (3) The Government maintains its support to implement the UNFCCC in Brazil. |
| **Outcome 3**  **Sector and regional vulnerabilities to climate change have been assessed using improved methodologies and climate models.** | **(A) Status of “Brazilian Global Model of the Climate System (MBSCG)”;**  **(B) Detailed climate change scenarios based on MBSCG and regional Eta model;**  **(C) Climate change impact assessment for key sectors (agriculture, water resources, energy, megacities and urban areas, biodiversity, human health);**  **(D) Mapping of vulnerability of key sectors and regions to climate change impacts.** | **(A) SNC (no Brazilian Global model, only Eta/CPTEC regional model);**  **(B) Limited climate change scenarios generated under SNC;**  **(C) Limited CC impact assessment has been prepared under SNC;**  **(D) Inadequate insight in key V&A sectors due to limitations of data and methodologies under SNC.** | **(A) MBSCG developed and Eta/CPTEC model improved with higher resolution for a larger domain;**  **(B) Higher number (at least 4) climate change scenarios generated under TNC;**  **(C) Improved CC impact assessment has been prepared under TNC;**  **(D) Improved insight in key V&A sectors due to improved data and methodologies under TNC.** | **Status of the development of the MBSCG and improvement of Eta/ CPTEC model** | **Risks:** Several minor risks have been identified: (1) complex coordination with stakeholders may cause project delays; (2) access to supercomputers; (3) delay to generate regional climate change scenarios; (4) technical problems during the completion of the Brazilian Global Model of the Climate System; (5) delays in the preparations of reports.  **Assumptions:** The Government maintains its support to implement the UNFCCC in Brazil. |
| **Outcome 4**  **The Brazilian Third National Communication has been published and presented to the Government and national stakeholders.** | **(A) Sharing of project outputs (reports, GHG inventories, website);**  **(B) Publication of Third National Communication;**  **(C) Final Evaluation Report.** | **(A) Project outputs not produced;**  **(B) Preliminary SNC results made public (April 2010);**  **(C) No FEV.** | **(A) Project reports, GHG inventories and website updated and published;**  **(B) TNC has been finalized and presented to the GoB;**  **(C) FEV completed.** | **Project reports (TNC, evaluation report)** | **Risks:** No specific risks have been identified.  **Assumptions:** (1) The Government maintains its support to implement the UNFCCC in Brazil; (2) project stakeholders correctly understand UNDP/GEF M&E principles. |

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

* PRODOC;
* PIRs – Plan Implementation Reports (2010-2015);
* Annual Operational Plans (AOPs/POAs);
* List of technical reports produced and or commissions and respective Terms of Reference;
* Financial data including co-funding data and audit reports, whenever applicable.

Annex C: Evaluation Questions

*This is a generic list, to be further detailed with more specific questions by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on the particulars of the project.*

| **Evaluative Criteria Questions** | | **Indicators** | **Sources** | **Methodology** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels? | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? | | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
| Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards? | | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
| Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? | | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
| **Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?** | | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |

Annex D: Rating Scales

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution*** | ***Sustainability ratings:*** | ***Relevance ratings*** |
| 6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings  5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings  4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS)  3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings  2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems  1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems | 4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability | 2. Relevant (R) |
| 3. Moderately Likely (ML):moderate risks | 1.. Not relevant (NR) |
| 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks  1. Unlikely (U): severe risks | ***Impact Ratings:***  3. Significant (S)  2. Minimal (M)  1. Negligible (N) |
| *Additional ratings where relevant:*  Not Applicable (N/A)  Unable to Assess (U/A | | |

Annex E: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form

**Evaluators:**

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people’s right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people’s right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders’ dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form[[6]](#footnote-6)**

**Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System**

**Name of Consultant:** \_\_     \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Name of Consultancy Organization** (where relevant)**:** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.**

Signed at *place* on *date*

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

Annex F: Evaluation Report Outline[[7]](#footnote-7)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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[[8]](#footnote-8)) |
| **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[[9]](#footnote-9)) |
| **3.1** | Project Design / Formulation   * Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators) * Assumptions and Risks * Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design * Planned stakeholder participation * Replication approach * UNDP comparative advantage * Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector * Management arrangements |
| **3.2** | Project Implementation   * Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation) * Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region) * Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management * Project Finance: * Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (\*) * UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (\*) coordination, and operational issues |
| **3.3** | Project Results   * Overall results (attainment of objectives) (\*) * Relevance(\*) * Effectiveness & Efficiency (\*) * Country ownership * Mainstreaming * Sustainability (\*) * Impact |
| **4.** | Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons   * Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project * Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project * Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives * Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success |
| **5.** | Annexes   * ToR * Itinerary * List of persons interviewed * Summary of field visits * List of documents reviewed * Evaluation Question Matrix * Questionnaire used and summary of results * Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form |

Annex G: Evaluation Report Clearance Form

*(to be completed by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and included in the final document)*

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

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

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

UNDP GEF RTA

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

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

1. For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](http://www.undp.org/evaluation/handbook), Chapter 7, pg. 163 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office:  [ROTI Handbook 2009](http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/M2_ROtI%20Handbook.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. *Objective (Atlas output) monitored quarterly ERBM and annually in APR/PIR* [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. A potential implementation risk exists due to the reduced value of the US Dollar (USD) compared to the Real (BRL). It is worth mentioning that the SNC was negotiated with the USD value at 3 BRL. During project implementation, its value fell to 1.85 BRL. The USD depreciation and/or fluctuation could force adjustments to the project outputs and compromise project performance. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. *All outcomes monitored annually in the APR/PIR. It is highly recommended not to have more than 4 outcomes.* [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. 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-9)