

TERMINAL EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

Project N°: 00073902

Project Title: Financial Sustainability for the National System of Protected Areas (SNAP)

Functional Title: Consultant for Independent Terminal Evaluation – Senior Expert

Contract Type: Individual Contract

Location: Quito - Ecuador

Duration: 20 days (over a period 4 weeks / working days)

1. 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) set out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the Project "Financial Sustainability for the National System of Protected Areas (SNAP)" (PIMS 4142).

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

Project Title:	Financial Sustainability for the National System of Protected Areas (SNAP)			
GEF Project ID:	3829		at endorsement (Million US\$)	At completion (Million US\$)
UNDP Project PIMS ID:	4142	GEF financing:	6,400,000	6,400,000
Country:	Ecuador	IA/EA own:	128,000	139,585
Region:	Latin America	Government:	5,670,000	7,301,715
Focal Area:	Biodiversity	Other:	4,266,718	5,638,317
Operational Program:	UNDP	Total co-financing:	10,064,718	13,079,617
Executing Agency:	Ministry of Environment of Ecuador	Total Project Cost:	16,464,718	19,479,617
Other Partners involved:	National Corporation of Private Forest and Reserves of Ecuador, The Nature Conservancy, Conservation International, National Environmental Fund The Tembladera Wetland	Prodoc Signature (date project began):		5 May 2010
		Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: 30 May 2015	Actual: 30 Nov 2016

FR

2. OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The long term goal of the project is contribute to improve the sustainability of the National System of Protected Areas (SNAP), so that it provides development results through a healthy and sustainable environment and guarantees the Rights of Nature (as established in the Ecuador's Constitution). The project immediate objective is to implement a field-tested, financial and institutionalized operational framework for an expanded Ecuadorian National System of Protected Areas. Hence, it will contribute to enhancing the financial sustainability of Ecuador's SNAP by addressing the four principal barriers to financial sustainability: (i) Laws, regulations, policies, and institutional responsibilities are not conducive to long-term financial sustainability of the SNAP; (ii) Institutions and individuals responsible for management of protected areas do not have strong capacities for financial and business planning, and cost-effective results-based management of PAs; (iii) System-wide, there is limited recognition of the contribution of SNAP to economic growth and the reduction of inequalities so, there is still weak support from decision-makers and the general public; and (iv) There are insufficient experiences with practical mechanisms for diversifying reserve incomes and containing costs through partnerships among the state, local communities, and private reserve owners.

The project's policy development and institutional strengthening actions at the systemic level will be complemented with demonstration of financial sustainability within 9 protected areas representing public (7), private (1), and communal (1) areas. The demonstration sites have been selected based on consultations and comprehensive technical and financial criteria to ensure that in the long term this experience can be strategically up scaled and/or replicated to the whole system.

The terminal evaluation will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by the 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.

The terminal evaluation will assess the implementation and performance of the project by looking at the potential impact and sustainability of results. This includes contribution to capacity development to achieve effective management of protected areas and the attainment of global and country specific environmental goals. It is expected to review the project's results with the main stakeholders: Ministry of Environment of Ecuador (MAE), National Corporation of Forest and Private Reserves of Ecuador (CNRPE) and Communities of La Tembladera RAMSAR Wetland. Additionally, it is considered as a significant opportunity to provide donors, government and project partners with an independent assessment of relevance and achievement of objectives and impact indicators, to determine progress being made towards the achievement of outcomes.

The assessment of the overall view of the project information will be led by a Financial Expert who will be in charge of drafting the general report that includes all the components of the project; however, the Financial Expert will need the international Senior Expert inputs for the initial draft and final report. She/he will lead and coordinate the activities with the financial expert who will be leading this evaluation. Both experts will be responsible for the quality assurance of all deliverables.

TS
ZUK

3. EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

An overall approach and method¹ for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed project has developed over time. The Senior Expert 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 (see Annex A). The Senior Expert is expected to complete and submit the questions of Annex A which will be developed in coordination with the Financial Expert 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 Senior Expert in coordination with the leader of the project assessment 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 Senior Expert is expected to conduct a field mission with the Financial Expert to chosen pilot areas of the three subsystems of the National System of Protected Areas (SNAP): State Natural Area Patrimony (PANE), Private Conservation Area (APPRI) and Community Conservation Area (APC). Interviews with organizations and individuals, listed in ANNEX H are suggested.

The Senior Expert will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – incl. Annual APR/PIR and other Reports, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, and GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other material that the Senior Expert considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the Senior Expert for review is included in TOR Annex B of this Terms of Reference.

4. EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see Annex C), 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 TOR Annex D.

¹ For additional information on methods, see the Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results, Chapter 7, pg. 163

TP

Zu

A useful table to include in the evaluation report is set out below:

Evaluation rating Project Performance		
Criteria	Rating	Comments
Monitoring and Evaluation: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S) Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)		
Overall quality of M&E	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
M&E design at project start up	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
M&E Plan Implementation	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
IA & EA Execution: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S) Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)		
Overall Quality of Project Implementation/Execution	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Implementing Agency Execution	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Executing Agency Execution	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Outcomes: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S) Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)		
Overall Quality of Project Outcomes	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Relevance: relevant (R) or not relevant (NR)	(rate 2pt. scale)	
Effectiveness	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Efficiency	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Sustainability: Likely (L); Moderately Likely (ML); Moderately Unlikely (MU); Unlikely (U).		
Overall likelihood of risks to Sustainability:	(rate 4pt. scale)	
Financial resources	(rate 4pt. scale)	
Socio-economic	(rate 4pt. scale)	
Institutional framework and governance	(rate 4pt. scale)	
Environmental	(rate 4pt. scale)	
Impact: Significant (S), Minimal (M), Negligible (N)		
Environmental Status Improvement	(rate 3 pt. scale)	
Environmental Stress Reduction	(rate 3 pt. scale)	
Progress towards stress/status change	(rate 3 pt. scale)	
Overall Project results	(rate 6 pt. scale)	

5. 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

AB
201

explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The Senior Expert (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.

Cofinancing (type/source)	UNDP own financing		Government (mill. US\$)		Partner Agency (mill. US\$)		Total (mill. US\$)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual
Grants	128,000	139,585			6,400,000	6,400,000	6,528,000	6,539,585
Loans/Concessions								
* In-kind			5,670,000	6,559,477			5,670,000	6,559,477
* Other					4,266,718	5,638,317	4,266,718	5,638,317
Totals	128,000	139,585	5,670,000	6,559,477	6,400,000	6,400,000	16,464,718	18,737,378

6. 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. In addition, the evaluation will be included in the country office evaluation plan.

7. IMPACT

The Senior Expert will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progress towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) Benefits and costs of including a private conservation area subsystem and a community conservation area subsystem to the National System of Protected Areas, b) the cost of preserving a private conservation areas, and c) how can this cost be effectively managed².

The project expects the evaluation to answer some of the following questions:

- Has the project achieved the results and products expected at the terminal implementation?
- What is the progress towards each Outcome, output and impact indicator?
- Which factors have contributed or hinder the achievement of the expected results?
- What level of appropriation, support and technical support has provided the executing agency (MAE) for the project's achievement of results?

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](#)

Handwritten initials/signature in blue ink.

- How do the main stakeholders (MAE, CNBRPE, La Tembladera) plan to provide sustainability to the project's results in the future?
- How has the UNDP contribution helped the project's achievement of Outcomes?

8. CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of conclusions, recommendations and lessons learnt of the project. This document will be elaborate together with the Financial Expert.

9. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Ecuador. The UNDP CO will contract the Senior Expert 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 Senior Expert team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

10. EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the evaluation support of the overall view of the project will be done within 20 working days. Please note that the activities for this evaluation will start with the previous agreement with the Financial Expert.

Duties and Responsibilities:

- Desk review of documents, (maximum 4-days);
- Interviews with project implementing partner (executing agency), relevant Government, NGO and donor representatives and local partners (maximum 4 days); in coordination with the Financial Expert;
- Field visit to the pilot project site and interviews (4 days); in coordination with the Financial Expert;
- Development and submission of the first draft report and Presentation of initial findings regarding to the overall view of the project (maximum of 2 days after departure of the country);
- Completed and submission the overall view of the project through incorporating suggestions received on the draft report that includes conclusions and recommendations regarding elements sustainable financing; identification of lessons learnt (maximum 4 days after receiving feedback);
- Review of final report Final submission. 2 days

PS: the dates will be fix previous coordination with the Financial Expert. Please note, that the field work will be carried in at least 8 days.

↑
2/11

11. EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	responsibilities
Inception Report	Senior Expert provides clarifications on timing and method.	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission.	Senior Expert 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 OEPs.
Final Report*	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft.	Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP IRC.

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

12. TEAM COMPOSITION

The evaluation team will be composed by two evaluators with international experience, one Financial Expert (team leader) who will be in charge of preparing the main report and a Senior expert that will provide inputs of the overall view of the project. The Financial Expert shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The Financial Expert selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The consultant must present the following qualifications:

- Professional with master degree in environment sciences, economics, administration or other related fields. Experience and knowledge of protected areas management and protected area system is an advantage
- Minimum 10 years of relevant professional experience evaluating development projects
- Knowledge of UNDP and GEF Principles and Projects.
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
- Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s)
- Conceptual thinking and analytical skills;
- Project evaluation experiences within United Nations system and GEF projects will be considered an asset;
- Fluency in reading, speaking and writing Spanish will be necessary;
- Excellent English and Spanish communication skills;
- Computer literacy.

TS

2014

13. SENIOR EXPERT 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'.

14. PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

Lump sum payable upon satisfactory completion and approval by UNDP of all deliverables, including the Evaluation report. The costs of in-country mission of the consultant are to be included in the lump sum. (This payment schedule is indicative; to be filled in by the CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on their standard procurement procedures)

%	Milestone
10%	At contract signing
40%	Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report
50%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report

15. APPLICATION PROCESS

Applicants are requested to apply online:

<http://www.ec.undp.org/content/ecuador/es/home/operations/procurement/> by (dateXXX). 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 Spanish; with indication of the e-mail and phone contact. The 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.

TOR ANNEX A: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

Evaluative Criteria	Questions	Indicators	Sources
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?			

TOR ANNEX B: LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE SENIOR EXPERT S

1. Project document (PRODOC) and annex
2. Midterm Evaluation
3. Management Response
4. Project Annual Reports APR/PIR
5. Annual Operational Plan
6. Project budget revisions
7. National Steering Committee Proceedings
8. Ministerial Agreement No. 012, that allows the institutionalization of the Management Effectiveness Evaluation (EEM) of Natural Heritage Areas of the State (PANE), which was published in Official Registration No. 322 on 26 May 2015.
9. Ministerial Agreement No. 076 that establishes the mandating use of the Annual Operational Management Plan (PGOA), which was published in Official Registration No. 534 on July 1, 2015.
10. GEF focal area tracking tools: Management Evaluation Tracking Tool (MEET)
11. UNDP focal area tracking tool: UDNF Financial Scorecard
12. Study of financial gap of the SNAP, 2013
13. Financial sustainability strategy for the National System of Protected Areas of Ecuador, 2015
14. The Economic Valuation for the SNAP (tourism and energy matrix)
15. DVDs Sustainable Financing of Ecuador's National System of Protected Areas, Products 2013 – 2015
16. Guidance for conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects
17. Guidelines for GEF Agencies in Conducting Terminal Evaluations

TOR ANNEX C: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

OBJECTIVE	<p>Implement a field-tested, financial and institutionalized operational framework for an expanded Ecuadorian National System of Protected Areas</p>			
RESULTS	<p>1. Laws, regulations, policies, and institutional responsibilities are not conducive to long-term financial sustainability of the SNAP</p>	<p>2. Institutions and individuals responsible for management of protected areas do not have strong capacities for financial and business planning, and cost-effective results-based management of PAs</p>	<p>3. System-wide, there is limited recognition of the contribution of SNAP to economic growth and the reduction of inequalities so there is still weak support from decision-makers and the general public</p>	<p>4. There are insufficient experiences with practical mechanisms for diversifying reserve incomes and containing costs through partnerships among the state, local communities, and private reserve owners</p>
INDICATORS	<p>1. Governance frameworks that enable sustainable PA financing</p> <p>2. Law for the SNAP and supporting regulations</p> <p>3. Staffing competency profiles and institutional procedures in SNAP/MAE</p> <p>4. Pilot institutional foundations for financing private reserve networks & sub-systems</p>	<p>1. Strengthened capacities for business planning and cost-effective management:</p> <p>2. % of Updated Management Plans and Business Plans</p> <p>3. % of technical-administrative SNAP staff with skills required for financial management and results based M&E</p> <p>4. Improvement in accounting for, and assessing expenditure linked to management effectiveness of the SNAP</p>	<p>1. Increase in the assigned budget for the SNAP by the National Government.</p> <p>2. Increase on the % of resources assigned budget from new funding mechanisms based on international resources</p> <p>3. Increase of visits per year to Pilot PA, as a result of marketing strategies implemented (within carry capacity)</p> <p>4. Increase on budget from new sources based on intersector partnerships</p>	<p>1. % of improvement on tools for revenue generation as measure UNDP financial scorecard</p> <p>2. Reduced funding gap through improving net income on Pilot PA by the end of the project</p> <p>3. Pilot specific indicators will be developed as CBSI initiatives are selected</p>

PRODUCTS

1. Governance frameworks that enable sustainable PA financing
2. Political recommendations and directions to improve the SNAP financial sustainability.
3. Strengthen institutional foundations of the SNAP for management effectiveness and financial viability

1. Strategic Plan for SNAP includes subsystems
2. Management and business plans for pilot areas
3. Implement administrative and M & E results based system
4. Training program for financial, administrative and M&E result based system

1. Economic valorization
2. Biomass stock for carbon sequestration evaluation
3. Communication campaign
4. Strengthen negotiating capacities

Establish productive initiatives for the financial sustainability of pilot areas

TOR ANNEX D: RATINGS

Ratings Scales		
Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution	Sustainability ratings:	Relevance ratings
<p>6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): The project had no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency</p> <p>5: Satisfactory (S): There were only minor shortcomings</p> <p>4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS):there were moderate shortcomings</p> <p>3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): the project had significant shortcomings</p> <p>2. Unsatisfactory (U): there were major shortcomings in the achievement of project objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency</p> <p>1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): The project had severe shortcomings</p>	<p>4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability</p> <p>3. Moderately Likely (ML):moderate risks</p> <p>2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks</p> <p>1. Unlikely (U): severe risks</p>	<p>2. Relevant (R)</p> <p>1.. Not relevant (NR)</p> <p>Impact Ratings:</p> <p>3. Significant (S)</p> <p>2. Minimal (M)</p> <p>1. Negligible (N)</p>
<p>Additional ratings where relevant: Not Applicable (N/A)</p> <p>Unable to Assess (U/A)</p>		

TOR ANNEX E: EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT AND AGREEMENT FORM

Senior Expert s:

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. Senior Expert s must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Senior Expert s 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. Senior Expert s 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, Senior Expert s 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, Senior Expert s 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 Form³

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: _____

³www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

TOR ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE

- 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 Manual⁴)
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 rated⁵)
- 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

⁴ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

⁵ 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.

- 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 County Office

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

UNDP GEF RTA

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

ANNEX H: INTERVIEWS WITH ORGANIZATIONS AND INDIVIDUALS (SUGGESTED)

Area	Site Distance is evaluated from the project's office in the MAE	Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum
State Natural Area Patrimony (PANE)	Ilinizas Ecological Reserve - Quilotoa Lagoon (170 km) – (initiative of community based tourism)	Area Chief Community of Quilotoa
	Chimborazo Reserve for Fauna Production - Interpretation Center (210 km) – (initiatives of community based tourism and livestock management)	Area Chief Communities: Calshi Natahua, Yurack Ugsha, Cunugyacu, Pulinguí San Pablo, Chorrera.
	National Parks Yasuní – (initiative of recycling and prevention of hunting animals)	Area Chief Recycling Association (ARO) of Orellana Association of Women Kichwas Challuwa Mikuna
La Tembladera Wetland APC	La Tembladera RAMSAR Wetland (520 km)	Agriculture Artisan Producers Association La Tembladera (ASOGROTEM) Decentralized Autonomous Government (GAD) of Santa Rosa Decentralized Autonomous Government (GAD) of El Oro Governing Board of La Tembladera San Jose Community
Northwestern Node (Nodo de Noroccidente) APPRI	Interpretation Centre, Tour Operator and Marketing (CICOP) (80 km)	National Corporation of Forests and Private Reserves of Ecuador (CNBRPE)

ANNEX I: CO-FINANCING TABLE FOR UNDP SUPPORTED GEF FINANCED PROJECTS

Co financing (Type/ Sources)	IA own Financing (mill US\$)		Government (mill US\$)		Other Sources* (mill US\$)		Total Financing (mill US\$)		Total Disbursement (mill US\$)	
	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual
Grant										
Credits										
Equity										
In-kind										
Non-grant Instruments*										
Other Types										
Total										

*Other Sources refer to contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector, etc. Specify each and explain "Other sources" of co-financing when possible.

* Describe "Non-grant instruments" (such as guarantees, contingent grants, etc.)

ANNEX J: SAMPLE MATRIX FOR RATING THE ACHIEVEMENT OF OUTCOMES

Evaluative Criteria	Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the UNCBD and GEF focal areas, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels for biodiversity conservation in Carpathian mountain grassland ecosystems?				
Is the project relevant to UNCBD and other international convention objectives?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> f How does the project support the objectives of the UNCBD? f Does the project support other international conventions, such as the Carpathian Convention, and the UNFCCC? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> f UNCBD priorities and areas of work incorporated in project design f Level of implementation of UNCBD in Czech Republic, and contribution of the project f Priorities and areas of work of other conventions incorporated in project design f Extent to which the project is actually implemented in line with incremental cost argument 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> f Project documents f National policies and strategies to implement the UNCBD, other international conventions, or related to environment more generally f UNCBD and other international convention web sites 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> f Documents analyses f Interviews with project team, UNDP and other partners
Is the project relevant the GEF biodiversity focal area?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> f How does the project support the GEF biodiversity focal area and strategic priorities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> f Existence of a clear relationship between the project objectives and GEF biodiversity focal area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> f Project documents f GEF focal areas strategies and documents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> f Documents analyses f GEF website f Interviews with UNDP and project team
Is the project relevant to the Czech Republic's environment and sustainable development objectives?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> f How does the project support the environment and sustainable development objectives of the Czech Republic? f Is the project country-driven? f What was the level of stakeholder participation in project design? f What was the level of stakeholder ownership in implementation? f Does the project adequately take into account the national realities, both in terms of institutional and policy framework in its design and its implementation? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> f Degree to which the project supports national environmental objectives f Degree of coherence between the project and nationals priorities, policies and strategies f Appreciation from national stakeholders with respect to adequacy of project design and implementation to national realities and existing capacities f Level of involvement of government officials and other partners in the project design process f Coherence between needs expressed by national stakeholders and UNDP-GEF criteria 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> f Project documents f National policies and strategies f Key project partners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> f Documents analyses f Interviews with UNDP and project partners

<p>Is the project addressing the needs of target beneficiaries at the local and regional levels?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> f How does the project support the needs of relevant stakeholders? f Has the implementation of the project been inclusive of all relevant stakeholders? f Were local beneficiaries and stakeholders adequately involved in project design and implementation? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> f Strength of the link between expected results from the project and the needs of relevant stakeholders f Degree of involvement and inclusiveness of stakeholders in project design and implementation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> f Project partners and stakeholders f Needs assessment studies f Project documents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> f Document analysis f Interviews with relevant stakeholders
<p>Is the project internally coherent in its design?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> f Are there logical linkages between expected results of the project (log frame) and the project design (in terms of project components, choice of partners, structure, delivery mechanism, scope, budget, use of resources etc)? f Is the length of the pro- 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> f Level of coherence between project expected results and project design internal logic f Level of coherence between project design and project implementation approach 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> f Program and project documents f Key project stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> f Document analysis f Key interviews
<p>How is the project relevant with respect to other donor-supported activities?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> f Does the GEF funding support activities and objectives not addressed by other donors? f How do GEF-funds help to fill gaps (or give additional stimulus) that are necessary but are not covered by other donors? f Is there coordination and complementarity between donors? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> f Degree to which program was coherent and complementary to other donor programming nationally and regionally 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> f Documents from other donor supported activities f Other donor representatives f Project documents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> f Documents analyses f Interviews with project partners and relevant stakeholders
<p>Does the project provide relevant lessons and experiences for other similar projects in the future?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> f Has the experience of the project provided relevant lessons for other future projects targeted at similar objectives? 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> f Data collected throughout evaluation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> f Data analysis

Effectiveness: To what extent have/will the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been/be achieved?				
Has the project been effective in achieving the expected outcomes and objectives?	<p>f Has the project been effective in achieving its expected outcomes?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Institutional capacity in place to assess, plan and implement priority conservation management of mountain grasslands taking advantage of newly available EU funding mechanisms 2. Farmers' capacity and incentives for and participation in conservation-oriented management of mountain grasslands is improved 3. Monitoring and evaluation programme for mountain grassland biodiversity conservation management in place 4. National policy for agro-environmental 	f See indicators in project document results framework and logframe	<p>f Project documents</p> <p>f Project team and relevant stakeholders</p> <p>f Data reported in project annual and quarterly reports</p>	<p>f Documents analysis</p> <p>f Interviews with project team</p> <p>f Interviews with relevant stakeholders</p>
How is risk and risk mitigation being managed?	<p>f How well are risks, assumptions and impact drivers being managed?</p> <p>f What was the quality of risk mitigation strategies developed? Were these sufficient?</p> <p>f Are there clear strategies for risk mitigation related with long-term sustainability of the project?</p>	<p>f Completeness of risk identification and assumptions during project planning and design</p> <p>f Quality of existing information systems in place to identify emerging risks and other issues</p> <p>f Quality of risk mitigations strategies developed and followed</p>	<p>f Project documents</p> <p>f UNDP, project team, and relevant stakeholders</p>	<p>f Document analysis</p> <p>f Interviews</p>
What lessons can be drawn regarding effectiveness for other similar projects in the future?	<p>f What lessons have been learned from the project regarding achievement of outcomes?</p> <p>f What changes could have been made (if any) to the design of the project in order to improve the achievement of the project's expected results?</p>		f Data collected throughout evaluation	f Data analysis

Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?				
Was project support provided in an efficient way?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> f Was adaptive management used or needed to ensure efficient resource use? f Did the project logical framework and work plans and any changes made to them use as management tools during implementation? f Were the accounting and financial systems in place adequate for project management and producing accurate and timely financial information? f Were progress reports produced accurately, timely and responded to reporting requirements including adaptive management changes? f Was project implementation as cost effective as originally proposed (planned vs. actual) f Did the leveraging of funds (co-financing) happen as planned? f Were financial resources utilized efficiently? Could financial resources have been used more efficiently? f Was procurement carried out in a manner making efficient use of project resources? f How was results-based management used during project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> f Availability and quality of financial and progress reports f Timeliness and adequacy of reporting provided f Level of discrepancy between planned and utilized financial expenditures f Planned vs. actual funds leveraged f Cost in view of results achieved compared to costs of similar projects from other organizations f Adequacy of project choices in view of existing context, infrastructure and cost f Quality of results-based management reporting (progress reporting, monitoring and evaluation) f Occurrence of change in project design/ implementation approach (i.e. restructuring) when needed to improve project efficiency f Cost associated with delivery mechanism and management structure compare to alternatives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> f Project documents and evaluations f UNDP f Project team 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> f Document analysis f Key interviews
How efficient are partnership arrangements for the project?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> f To what extent partnerships/linkages between institutions/ organizations were encouraged and supported? f Which partnerships/linkages were facilitated? Which ones can be considered sustainable? f What was the level of efficiency of cooperation and collaboration arrangements? f Which methods were successful or not and why? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> f Specific activities conducted to support the development of cooperative arrangements between partners, f Examples of supported partnerships f Evidence that particular partnerships/linkages will be sustained f Types/quality of partnership cooperation methods utilized 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> f Project documents and evaluations f Project partners and relevant stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> f Document analysis f Interviews
Did the project efficiently utilize local capacity in implementation?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> f Was an appropriate balance struck between utilization of international expertise as well as local capacity? f Did the project take into account local capacity in design and implementation of the project? f Was there an effective collaboration between institutions responsible for implementing the project? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> f Proportion of expertise utilized from international experts compared to national experts f Number/quality of analyses done to assess local capacity potential and absorptive capacity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> f Project documents and evaluations f UNDP f Beneficiaries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> f Document analysis f Interviews

<p>What lessons can be drawn regarding efficiency for other similar projects in the future?</p>	<p>fWhat lessons can be learnt from the project regarding efficiency? How could the project have more efficiently carried out implementation (in terms of management structures and procedures, partner- ships arrangements etc...)?</p> <p>fWhat changes could have been made (if any) to the project in order to improve its efficiency?</p>		<p>fData collected throughout evaluation</p>	<p>fData analysis</p>
<p>Effectiveness: To what extent have/ will the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been/be achieved?</p>				
<p>Has the project been effective in achieving the expected outcomes and objectives?</p>	<p>fHas the project been effective in achieving its expected outcomes?</p> <p>f1. Institutional capacity in place to assess, plan and implement priority conservation management of mountain grasslands taking advantage of newly available EU funding mechanisms</p> <p>f2. Farmers' capacity and incentives for and participation in conservation-oriented management of mountain grasslands is improved</p> <p>f3. Monitoring and evaluation programme for mountain grassland biodiversity conservation management in place</p> <p>f4. National policy for agro-environmental schemes incorporates project experience</p>	<p>fSee indicators in project document results framework and logframe</p>	<p>fProject documents</p> <p>fProject team and relevant stakeholders</p> <p>fData reported in project annual and quarterly reports</p>	<p>fDocuments analysis</p> <p>fInterviews with project team</p> <p>fInterviews with relevant stakeholders</p>
<p>How is risk and risk mitigation being managed?</p>	<p>fHow well are risks, assumptions and impact drivers being managed?</p> <p>fWhat was the quality of risk mitigation strategies developed? Were these sufficient?</p> <p>fAre there clear strategies for risk mitigation related with long-term sustainability of the project?</p>	<p>fCompleteness of risk identification and assumptions during project planning and design</p> <p>fQuality of existing information systems in place to identify emerging risks and other issues</p> <p>fQuality of risk mitigations strategies developed and followed</p>	<p>fProject documents</p> <p>fUNDP, project team, and relevant stakeholders</p>	<p>f Document analysis</p> <p>f Interviews</p>

<p>What lessons can be drawn regarding effectiveness for other similar projects in the future?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> f What lessons have been learned from the project regarding achievement of outcomes? f What changes could have been made (if any) to the design of the project in order to improve the achievement of the pro- 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> f Data collected throughout evaluation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> f Data analysis
<p>Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?</p>				
<p>Was project support provided in an efficient way?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> f Was adaptive management used or needed to ensure efficient resource use? f Did the project logical framework and work plans and any changes made to them use as management tools during implementation? f Were the accounting and financial systems in place adequate for project management and producing accurate and timely financial information? f Were progress reports produced accurately, timely and responded to reporting requirements including adaptive management changes? f Was project implementation as cost effective as originally proposed (planned vs. actual)? f Did the leveraging of funds (co-financing) happen as planned? f Were financial resources utilized efficiently? Could financial resources have been used more efficiently? f Was procurement carried out in a manner making efficient use of project resources? f How was results-based 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> f Availability and quality of financial and progress reports f Timeliness and adequacy of reporting provided f Level of discrepancy between planned and utilized financial expenditures f Planned vs. actual funds leveraged f Cost in view of results achieved compared to costs of similar projects from other organizations f Adequacy of project choices in view of existing context, infrastructure and cost f Quality of results-based management reporting (progress reporting, monitoring and evaluation) f Occurrence of change in project design/ implementation approach (i.e. restructuring) when needed to improve project efficiency f Cost associated with delivery mechanism and management structure compare to alternatives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> f Project documents and evaluations f UNDP f Project team 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> f Document analysis f Key interviews

<p>How efficient are partnership arrangements for the project?</p>	<p>To what extent partnerships/linkages between institutions/ organizations were encouraged and supported? Which partnerships/ linkages were facilitated? Which ones can be considered sustainable? What was the level of efficiency of cooperation and collaboration arrangements? Which methods were successful or not and why?</p>	<p>Specific activities conducted to support the development of cooperative arrangements between partners, Examples of supported partnerships Evidence that particular partnerships/linkages will be sustained Types/quality of partnership cooperation methods utilized</p>	<p>Project documents and evaluations Project partners and relevant stakeholders</p>	<p>Document analysis Interviews</p>
<p>Did the project efficiently utilize local capacity in implementation ?</p>	<p>Was an appropriate balance struck between utilization of international expertise as well as local capacity? Did the project take into account local capacity in design and implementation of the project? Was there an effective collaboration between institutions responsible for implementing the project?</p>	<p>Proportion of expertise utilized from international experts compared to national experts Number/quality of analyses done to assess local capacity potential and absorptive capacity</p>	<p>Project documents and evaluations UNDP Beneficiaries</p>	<p>Document analysis Interviews</p>
<p>What lessons can be drawn regarding efficiency for other similar projects in the future?</p>	<p>What lessons can be learnt from the project regarding efficiency? How could the project have more efficiently carried out implementation (in terms of management structures and procedures, partnerships arrangements etc...)? What changes could have been made (if any) to the project in order to improve its efficiency?</p>		<p>Data collected throughout evaluation</p>	<p>Data analysis</p>

ANNEX K: SAMPLE MATRIX FOR RATING THE ACHIEVEMENT OF OUTCOMES

PROJECT GOAL: To catalyze the improved conservation of globally significant biodiversity through the demonstration of new mechanisms and approaches for effective management of protected areas and natural resources adjacent to them.						
GOAL/OBJECTIVE/ Outcome	Performance Indicator	2006 Baseline	2011 End of Project Target	2011 End of Project Status*	Terminal Evaluation Comments	rating
PROJECT OBJECTIVE: To strengthen the management effectiveness and sustainability of the three selected protected areas of different types, thereby providing models and best practices replicable throughout the national PA system.	Improved Management effectiveness of protected areas	METT scores Current average METT score – 22 for the PA system	Average METT score for 20 PAs is 38 out of potential score of 96 (ref Table xx). NB This indicator cannot be rated for state of delivery as it was not designed to be met by end of project.	Average METT score for 20 PAs is 38 out of potential score of 96 (ref Table xx). NB This indicator cannot be rated for state of delivery as it was not designed to be met by end of	METT scores have increased on average by 42%, which is considered satisfactory progress towards the 10 year target	S
	No further reduction in the total land under conservation management compared with the baseline.	25,100 ha (under PA) 104,170 ha – surrounding landscape 3,100,000 ha under system level	25,100 ha (under PA) 104,170 ha – surrounding landscape 3,100,000 ha under system level (the whole PA system in the country)	25,100 ha (under PAs) 102,400 ha – surrounding landscape 3,100,000 ha under entire PAs system	No change but Presidential Order issued to expand one of the protected areas by an additional 28,000 ha. Reduction due to transfer of 1,770 ha in one PA to private forest under cooperative management in 2008. No change but PAs system is expected to cover 3,502,800 ha after planned	S

Color Coding
Green: completed, indicator shows successful achievement
Yellow: indicator shows expected completion by the end of the project
Red: indicator shows poor achievement – unlikely to be completed by project closure

<p>Outcome 1: Strengthened environmental governance provides a more sustainable land-use context for the PA system</p>	<p>Local policies on sustainable land-use designed and supported by the selected local governments</p>	<p>Policies on sustainable land-use at local level do not exist</p>	<p>Policies on sustainable land-use at local level designed and supported by the selected local governments</p>	<p>Preparation of specific district land use policies and plans largely in order to focus more on Forest Code and management planning.</p> <p>Land use within non-core areas (under remit of Forestry Agency) addressed for next 5 years in management plans.</p>	<p>Project design focused on strengthening Protected Areas Law (see ProDoc logframe) but during implementation it became apparent that a new Forestry Code (see MTE logframe) was a necessary precursor. Both these instruments needed to be in place ahead of being able to strengthen land use policies at local level. Thus, switch to initial focus on Forestry Code, alongside</p>	MS
	<p>Sustainable land use practices adopted by selected communities and community members</p>	<p>No widely accepted sustainable land-use practices exist</p>	<p>Sustainable land-use practices implemented by selected communities and community members</p>	<p>More sustainable practices tested / demonstrated under Component 3, plus introduction of normative acts related to access and resource use (e.g. visitor access, tree cutting and fuel wood collection, forest management grazing and collection of hay, collection and preparation of medicinal herbs,).</p>	<p>Management plans for 2 PAs (provide basis for adopting sustainable land-use practices but demonstration of good practice jeopardized by lack of time to implement plans.</p>	MU
	<p>Amendments to the existing or new versions of the Protected Areas Law and the Forest Code prepared and submitted to the Parliament</p>	<p>New draft prepared, consultations held by mid-2007 The draft law submitted to the Parliament by end of 2007</p>	<p>New draft prepared, consultations held by mid-2007 The draft law submitted to the Parliament by end of 2007</p>	<p>Draft PAs Law submitted to Lower Chamber of Parliament in April 2011; adopted by Higher Chamber on 30 Nov. 2011; and new Law on Specially Protected Natural Areas adopted by Presidential Order #788 on 26 Dec. 2011.</p>	<p>Project instrumental in establishing Working Group of relevant stakeholders (government agencies, biodiversity experts and parliamentarians) to fast-track revision of legislation. Major achievement to</p>	S

		Current Forest Code of 1993 is considered outdated and needs to be revised	New draft or amendments prepared and consultations held by mid-2007, and submitted to the Parliament by end of 2007	New Forest Code adopted by Parliament in May 2011 and signed by President 2 August 2011.	have new Forest Code and PAs Law adopted in 2011.	
--	--	--	---	--	---	--

ANNEX L: MANAGEMENT RESPONSE TEMPLATE

**UNDP/GEF Terminal
Evaluation
Management Response and Tracking
Template**

Project Title: _____

Project PIMS #: _____ Terminal Evaluation Completion Date: _____

Key issues and recommendations	manageet response*	Tracking**				
	response	Key Actions	Timeframe	responsible unit(s)	Status***	Comments

* Unit(s) assigned to be responsible for the preparation of a management response will fill the columns under the management response section.

** Unit(s) assigned to be responsible for the preparation of a management response will be updating the implementation status. Assigned with an oversight function monitors and verifies the implementation status.

*** Status of Implementation: Completed, Partially Completed, Pending

ANNEX M: TERMINAL EVALUATION REVIEW FORM USED BY UNDP EO

1. Project Information				
Review date:				
GEF Project ID:			at endorsement (Million US\$)	at completion (Million US\$)
UNDP Project ID:		GEF financing:		
Project Name:		IA/EA own:		
Country:		Government:		
		Other:		
		Total Cofinancing		
Operational Program:		Total Project Cost:		
Executing Agency	DATES			
		Prodoc Signature (date project began):		
		Closing Date	Proposed:	Actual:
TER Prepared by:				
	TER peer reviewed by:	Duration between Project Document signature date and planned closing (in months):	Duration between Project Document signature date and actual closing (in months):	Difference between planned and actual project duration (in months):
Author of TE:		TE completion date:	TE submission date to UNDP:	Difference between TE completion and submission date (in months):

2. Project Objectives and Adaptive management				
a.	List the overall environmental objectives of the project, and indicate whether there were any changes during implementation:			
b.	List the development objectives of the project, and indicate whether there were changes during implementation.			
c.	If there were changes to either of the above, note the level where the change was approved (e.g. GEFSEC, UNDP or Executing Agency)			
d.	Indicated the applicable reasons for changes made (to objectives):			
	Original Objectives not sufficiently articulated	Exogenous conditions changed, due to which changes in the objectives was needed	Project was restructured because original objectives were over ambitious	Any other (specify)

3. Monitoring and Evaluation		UNDP EO rating	TE rating
a.	M&E design at entry		
b.	M&E Plan Implementation		
c.	Overall quality of M&E		
Comments and justifications:			

4. IA & EA Execution		UNDP EO rating	TE rating
a.	Quality of UNDP Implementation		
b.	Quality of Execution - Executing Agency		
c.	Overall quality of Implementation and Execution		
Comments and justifications:			

5. Assessment of Outcomes		UNDP EO rating	TE rating
---------------------------	--	----------------	-----------

a.	Relevance		
b.	Effectiveness		
c.	Efficiency		
d.	Overall Project Outcome Rating		
Comments and justifications:			

6. Sustainability		UNDP EO rating	TE rating
a.	Financial resources:		
b.	Socio-political:		
c.	Institutional framework and governance:		
d.	Environmental :		
e.	Overall rating on the likelihood of sustainability		
Comments and justifications:			

7. Impacts ³⁹ & Catalytic Effects	
a.	Summarize achieved intended or unintended impacts of the project:
b.	Summarize catalytic effects:

8. Mainstreaming ⁴¹		ProDoc	TE
Reference to:		(Y/N)	(Y/N)
a.	UNDAF, CPD, and/or CPAP		
b.	Poverty/environment nexus, sustainable livelihoods		
c.	Crisis prevention and recovery		
d.	Gender		
Comments and justifications:			

9. Lessons and recommendations	
a.	Summarize the main recommendations set out in the TE:
b.	Highlight key lessons, good practices and approaches mentioned in the TE that may have application in other UNDP supported GEF financed projects:

10. Quality of Terminal Evaluation report		rating ⁴²
a.	To what extent does the TE contain an assessment of relevant outcomes of the project and achievement of objectives?	
b.	Is the TE internally consistent, the evidence complete and convincing, and the ratings well substantiated? Are there any major evidence gaps?	
c.	Does the TE properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	
d.	Are the lessons and recommendations listed in the TE supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	
e.	Does the Report provide a full accounting of the actual project costs (totals, per activity, and per source) and actual co-financing used?	
f.	To what extent does the TE fully consider and evaluate project M&E systems? ⁴³	
g.	To what extent did the Terminal Evaluation follow accepted (UNEG) norms and standards for evaluation? ⁴⁴	
h.	Overall Rating for the Terminal Evaluation	

11. Management response		
a.	Was a management response to the terminal evaluation submitted?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Date:
b.	Summarize key proposed follow-up actions	