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 the*Project “Developing National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan and Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation into Provincial Planning*”(PIMS #.4811)

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

Project Summary Table

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Title: | *Developing National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan and Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation into Provincial Planning* | | | | | |
| GEF Project ID: | | 00063449 |  | | *at endorsement (US$)* | *at completion (US$)* |
| UNDP Project ID: | | 00080525 | GEF financing: | | 909,091 | 909,091 |
| Country: | | Vietnam | IA/EA own: | | 300,000 | 300,000 |
| Region: | | Asia and the Pacific | Government: | | 200,000 | (TBC) |
| Focal Area: | | Biodiversity | Other: | | - | - |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): | |  | Total co-financing: | | 4,300,000 | (TBC) |
| Executing Agency: | | Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MONRE) | Total Project Cost: | | 5,459,091 | (TBC) |
| Other Partners involved: | | Son La and Lang Son DONREs | Pro Doc Signature (date project began): | | | August, 2012 |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | Proposed:       August, 2015 | | Actual:        August,2015 |

Objective and Scope

The project was designed to: support Viet Nam’s international obligations as a signatory to the CBD, and its national priorities for enhancing improved environmental management and biodiversity conservation for sustainable development. It has two components, under which specific outcomes and outputs are expected:

* **Component 1**: New NBSAP and 5th National Report prepared in compliance with Biodiversity Law and CBD Strategic Plan 2011-2020.
* **Component 2**: Provincial commitment and capacity strengthened to implement NBSAP.

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-2) for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects have 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 Hanoi, Lang Son and Son La. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

- NBSAP Project Management Board

- Biodiversity Conservation Agency

- Vietnam Environment Administration

- Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MONRE)

- Son La DONRE

- Lang Son DONRE

- General Directorate of Land Administration (GDLA) : Land Planning Agency and Land Registration and Inventory Agency

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

Evaluation Criteria & Ratings

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

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Ratings:** | | | |
| **1. Monitoring and Evaluation** | ***rating*** | **2. IA& EA Execution** | ***rating*** |
| M&E design at entry |  | Quality of UNDP Implementation – Implementing Agency (IA) |  |
| M&E Plan Implementation |  | Quality of Execution - Executing Agency (EA) |  |
| 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 | Planned | Actual |
| Grants | 300,000 | 300,000 | 200,000 | (TBC) | 4,050,000 | (TBC) | 4,550,00 | (TBC) |
| Loans/Concessions | - |  | - |  | - |  | - | - |
| * In-kind support |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |
| * Other | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |
| Totals | 300,000 | 300,000 | 200,000 |  | 4.050.000 | (TBC) |  | (TBC) |

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-3)

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 *Viet Nam.* 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 over a time period of *10* weeks (30 day for IC and 27 for NC) according to the following plan:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Timing | | Completion Date |
| **Preparation** | *3* days | *3 days* | *20 October, 2015* |
| **Evaluation Mission** | *10* days | *10 days* | *9 November, 2015* |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | *10* days | *8 days* | *30 November, 2015* |
| **Final Report** | *7* days | *6 days* | *14 December, 2015* |

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:  *07 September, 2015* | Evaluator submits to UNDP CO |
| **Presentation** | Initial Findings | End of evaluation mission:  *20 September, 2015* | To project management, UNDP CO |
| **Draft Final Report** | Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes | Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission:  *15 October, 2015* | Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs |
| **Final Report\*** | Revised report | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft:  *30 October, 2015* | 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 01 international consultant (team leader) for 30 days and 01 national consultant for 27 days.The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The Team members must present the following qualifications:

* Minimum *10* 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) of biodiversity conservation, NBSAP, land-use planning
* Experience in environmental/biodiversity strategic/land use planning
* Experience with the IUCN Red List and plant and animal taxonomy in Viet Nam desired

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 |
| *10%* | At submission and approval of inception report |
| *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 |

Application process

Applicants are requested to apply online ([www.jobs.undp.org](http://www.jobs.undp.org); [www.vn.undp.org](http://www.vn.undp.org)) 2 October 2015. 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 (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

| **Hierarchy of Objectives/Outcomes** | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **End of project target** | **Source of Verification** | **Risks and Assumptions** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Objective:**Strengthen biodiversity conservation in Viet Nam by increasing the supply of policy relevant, actionable information through preparation of a revised NBSAP that complies with CBD guidelines and Biodiversity Law; and by increasing the demand for this information by building provincial level capacity to integrate NBSAP results into land use plans. | | | | | |

| **Hierarchy of Objectives/Outcomes** | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **End of project target** | **Source of Verification** | **Risks and Assumptions** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Objective:** Strengthen biodiversity conservation in Viet Nam by increasing the supply of policy relevant, actionable information through preparation of a revised NBSAP that complies with CBD guidelines and Biodiversity Law; and by increasing the demand for this information by building provincial level capacity to integrate NBSAP results into land use plans. | | | | | |
| **Outcomes 1.1-1.2**: NBSAP and 5th National Report to CBD prepared in compliance with Biodiversity Law and CBD Strategic Plan 2011-2020. | NBSAP with clear implementation plan | NBSAP prepared in 1995 , with an addendum in 2007 is out of date and do not reflect changes in national and international context, such as new CBD guidelines and 2008 Biodiversity Law. | New 10-year NBSAP with clear institutional design and financing plan approved by government by 12/2012 and thereafter submitted to the CBD. To include:  Prioritizing biodiversity through economic valuation of goods and services.  Restoring and safeguarding ecosystems that provide essential services.  Assessment of protected area design and management effectiveness.  Conservation status of selected species (re)assessed based on international criteria, e.g., Red List.  Assessment of rules and procedures for species reintroductions.  plan for capacity development for NBSAP implementation.  Technology needs assessment  communication and outreach strategy for the NBSAP.  plan for resource mobilization for NBSAP implementation  assessment of opportunities of mainstreaming into selected sectoral plans such as development, poverty reduction and climate change plans through sectoral consultations  Clearing House mechanism | New NBSAP. | Key national stakeholders and NGOs share essential data and information, and actively participate in NBSAP development process. |
| National reports on biodiversity status, trends, causes and consequences; and actions. | 1st to 4th National Reports submitted to CBD. | 5th National Report submitted to CBD by 2014. | 5th National Report. | Government agencies aware of and committed to biodiversity conservation.  International organizations and NGOs actively support government in building capacity for biodiversity conservation. |
| Annual SOE reports to national assembly do not contain up-to-date data on biodiversity status and trends. | By 2014, at least two SOE reports submitted to National Assembly to reflect latest biodiversity data. | Annual SOE reports. |
| Report on Critical Biodiversity Issues | Report on critical biodiversity issues to reflect critical and emerging issues related to biodiversity | Report Critical Biodiversity Issues |
| National GIS based map of key biodiversity information | Comprehensive national database that is geo referenced on maps are not available | GIS map that has key biodiversity information (hotspots, PAs, ongoing projects etc.) available for wider use and dissemination | Project report |
| **Outcomes 2.1-2.2:** Provincial commitment and capacity strengthened to implement NBSAP. | Provincial capacity for NBSAP implementation. | Provincial staffs have very limited capacity and skills to implement NBSAP and connect land use with ecosystem functions, and biodiversity. | Provincial capacity for NBSAP implementation, including biodiversity financing, enhanced for up to 20 provinces through:  Guidelines developed to support to NBSAP realization at provincial level.  Up to 150 provincial staffs trained. | Training materials and training reports.  Guidelines for NBSAP implementation. | Provinces effectively participate in training. |
| Biodiversity reporting mechanism. | No guidelines or legal requirements or procedures exist to support provinces to report to central government. | Mechanism in place to report on biodiversity status and good practice from provincial to national levels. | Guidelines and legal procedures. | Provinces commit to NBSAP implementation. |
| Provincial implementation of NBSAP priorities. | Land use plans do not explicitly incorporate biodiversity conservation priorities. | NBSAP priorities implemented in 2 provinces through:  Land use plans updated to incorporate NBSAP priorities.  Biodiversity criteria tested and proposed for inclusion in provincial performance assessment systems. | Updated land-use plans.  Set of biodiversity criteria. | Selected provinces commit and actively mainstream their biodiversity priorities into land use plans. |
| Spatial Biodiversity Assessment | Currently maps that highlight key biodiversity information at provincial levels do not exist | Biodiversity spatial assessment for two provinces prepared | Maps | Provinces have adequate data available |
| Experience and lessons learned from 2 pilot provinces documented and shared nationally. | Little cross-provincial learning on biodiversity planning takes place. | Results from piloted provinces considered for replication to other provinces | List of project documents, lessons learned disseminated.  Workshop reports. | Good results achieved from pilot mainstreaming. |

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

*GEF Project Information Form (PIF), Project Document*

*Annual Workplans of 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015*

*Implementing/Executing partner arrangements*

*Project reports:*

1. Current issues on policies, institutions and management in biodiversity conservation and development in Vietnam
2. Ecosystems and Protected areas
3. Assessment on status and conservation management of species and genetic resources in Vietnam for the development of national biodiversity strategy
4. Viet Nam National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan to 2020 (NBSAP full text)
5. Fifth National Report
6. Guidelines for the NBSAP implementation
7. NBSAP training documents
8. An overview of land regulations relating to biodiversity conservation and proposed solutions
9. Methodology and Guidelines to integrate biodiversity into land use planning
10. Report on assessment of spatial biodiversity in Lang Son
11. Report on assessment of spatial biodiversity Son La
12. Report on “Proposals for integrating biodiversity conservation into land use planning of Lang Son province”
13. Report on “Proposals for integrating biodiversity conservation into land use planning of Son La province”
14. Report on Biodiversity criteria set for performance assessment and testing results in two pilot provinces
15. Report on overview of international experience and approach/methodology for mainstreaming biodiversity into sectors
16. Report on Assessment of Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation into Land use Planning and Lesson learnt
17. Report on Critical Biodiversity Issues
18. Review of current financing for biodiversity, Accessing financial needs and proposing mobilization plan for the implementation of prioritized programs of NBS

*List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Boards, and other partners to be consulted*

*- NBSAP Project Board:*

* *Mr. Pham Anh Cuong, National Project Director, Phone: 0912.179.360 , Email:* [pacuong@yahoo.com](mailto:pacuong@yahoo.com)
* *Ms. Hoang Thi Thanh Nhan, Deputy Project Director, Phone: 0902.282.326, Email:* [hoangnhan.bca@gmail.com](mailto:hoangnhan.bca@gmail.com)
* *Ms. Nguyen Dang Thu Cuc, Project Coordinator, Phone: 0942.636.868, Email:* [cucnguyen.bca@gmail.com](mailto:cucnguyen.bca@gmail.com)
* *Ms. Tran Thi Hoa, Project Manager, Phone: 0943.621.757, Email:tranthihoa@agi.vaas.vn*
* *Ms. Ha Huong Giang, Project Accountant, Phone: 0983.343.818, Email:* [gianghahuong2003@gmail.com](mailto:gianghahuong2003@gmail.com)

*- Stakeholders:*

* *Biodiversity Conservation Agency (BCA)*
* *Vietnam Environment Administration (VEA)*
* *Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MONRE)*
* *Son La DONRE*
* *Lang Son DONRE*
* *Land Administration*

*Annual Project Implementation (APR/PIR) Reports*

*Project budget and financial data*

*Project Tracking Tool, at the baseline and at the mid-term*

*One UN Plan II 2011-2016*

*UNDP Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP)*

*GEF focal area strategic program objectives*

Annex C: Evaluation Questions

This Evaluation Criteria Matrix must be fully completed by the consultant and included as an Annex to the TE report.

| **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? | | | | | | |  | |
|  | * To what extent is the principle of the project in line with the national priorities | * Level of participation of the concerned agencies in project activities * Consistency with national strategies and policies | * Project documents * National policies and strategies | | * Desk review * Interviews with project team, UNDP and other partners | |  | |
|  | * To what extent is the Project aligned to the main objectives of the GEF focal area? | * Consistency with GEF strategic objectives | * Project documents * GEF focal areas strategiesand documents | | * Desk review * GEF website * Interviews with project team and UNDP | |  | |
| Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? | | | | | | | |
|  | * Has the project been effective in achieving its expected outcomes? | * See indicators in project document results framework | * Project document * Project team and stakeholder * Data reported in project annual and quarterly reports | | * Desk review * Interviews with project team and relevant stakeholders | | |
|  | * What lessons have been learned from the project regarding achievement of outcomes? |  | Data collected throughout evaluation | | * Desk review | | |
| Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards? | | | | | | | |
|  | * Were the accounting and financial system in place adequate for project management and producing accurate and timely financial information? * Was the Project efficient with respect to incremental cost criteria? * Were progress reports produced accurately, timely and responded to reporting requirements including adaptive management changes? * Was project implementation as cost effective as originally proposed (planned vs. actual)? * Was procurement carried out in a manner making efficient use of project resources? | * Availability and quality of financial and progress reports * Timeliness and adequacy of reporting provided * Level of discrepancy between planned and utilized financial expenditures * Planned vs. actual funds leveraged * Quality of results-based management reporting (progress reporting, monitoring and evaluation) | * Project documents and evaluations * UNDP * Project team | | * Document analysis * Key interview | | |
|  | * To what extent partnerships/linkages between institutions/organizations were encouraged and supported? * What was the level of efficiency of cooperation and collaboration arrangements? | * Specific activities conducted to support the development of cooperative arrangements between partners * Examples of supported partnerships * Evidence that particular partnership/linkages will be sustained * Types/quality of partnership cooperation methods utilized | * Project documents and evaluations * Project partners and relevant stakeholders | | * Document analysis * Interviews | | |
| Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? | | | | | | | |
|  | * How does the project support financial mobilization for the NBSAP implementation? | * Amount of national budget allocation | * Legal regulation | | | * Document analysis | |
|  | * How does the project support personnel allocation for the NBSAP implementation? | * Personnel allocation | Legal regulation | | | * Document analysis | |
|  | * To what extent is biodiversity conservation consideration mainstreamed into land use planning? | * Government agencies aware of and committed to biodiversity conservation * Legislation, planning documents show evidence of mainstreaming | * Legal regulation * Project documents/reports | | | * Document analysis * Interview with stakeholders | |
|  | * Are there any political risks that may threaten the sustainability of the project outcomes? | * Government agencies aware of and committed to biodiversity conservation | * Government policies | | | * Analysis | |
| **Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?** | | | | | | | |
|  | * Has the project strengthened local capacity in the NBSAP implementation ? | * Awareness and understanding of the NBSAP at the provincial level | * Interviews * Provincial level plans/strategies | * Interviews * Document analysis | | | |
|  | * Has the project made improvement for provincial biodiversity planning of two pilot provinces? | * Awareness and understanding of biodiversity planning at the provincial level * Evidence of incorporation of biodiversity conservation objectives in provincial level planning documents | * Interviews * Provincial level plans/strategies | * Interview * Document analysis | | | |
|  | * Has the project supported the revised land use planning of two pilot provinces to meet for biodiversity conservation? | * Evidence that biodiversity has been mainstreamed into land use planning | * Interviews * Provincial level plans/strategies | * Interview * Document analysis | | | |

Annex D: Rating Scales

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, IA&EA 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 |  |
| *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[[3]](#footnote-4)**

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

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

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

**I confirm that I have 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[[4]](#footnote-5)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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) |
| **1.** | Introduction   * Purpose of the evaluation * Scope & Methodology * Structure of the evaluation report |
| **2.** | Project description and development context   * Project start and duration * Problems that the project sought to address * Immediate and development objectives of the project * Baseline Indicators established * Main stakeholders * Expected Results |
| **3.** | Findings  (In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) must be rated) |
| **3.1** | Project Design / Formulation   * Analysis of LFA/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

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-2)
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%252520Handbook.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-5)