Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference

INTRODUCTION

UNDP/GEF seek to hire International Project Evaluation Expert to carry out Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the following projects:

1. "**Ensuring Sufficiency and Predictability of Revenues for the Georgia’s Protected Areas System" –UNDP Georgia (PIMS #4285)**
2. **"Catalyzing Financial Sustainability of Armenia’s Protected Areas System" – UNDP Armenia (PIMS # 4258)**

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).

As a result of the evaluation UNDP COs (Armenia and Georgia) will obtain separate reports for the two projects.

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

ProjectS Summary Table

Project: Ensuring Sufficiency and Predictability of Revenues for the Georgia’s Protected Areas System

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Title: |  | | | | |
| GEF Project ID: | | 4285 |  | | *at endorsement (Million US$)* |
| UNDP Project ID: | | 00059440 | GEF financing: | | 1,000,000 |
| Country: | | Georgia | IA/EA own: | |  |
| Region: | | RBEC | Government: | | 2,435,000 |
| Focal Area: | | Biodiversity | Other: | | 1,930,000 (CNF/CPAF[[1]](#footnote-1))  TJS, KfW 144,000  Bank of Georgia  225,000 |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): | | BD-1 | Total co-financing: | | 4,440,00 |
| Executing Agency: | | CNF | Total Project Cost: | | 5,440,000 |
| Other Partners involved: | |  | ProDoc Signature (date project began): | | | July 2010 |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | Proposed:  2016 | | Actual:  2016 |

Project Catalyzing Financial Sustainability of Armenia’s Protected Areas System Summary Table

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Project Title: |  | |
| GEF Project ID: | | 4258 |  | *at endorsement (Million US$)* |
| UNDP Project ID: | | 00057497 | GEF financing: | 990,000 |
| Country: | | Armenia | IA/EA own: |  |
| Region: | | RBEC | Government: | 2,425,000 |
| Focal Area: | | Biodiversity | Other: | 2,161,000 (CPAF)  174,000 (TJS/KfW) |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): | | BD-1 | Total co-financing: | 4,760,000 |
| Executing Agency: | | NGO | Total Project Cost: | 5,750,000 |
| Other Partners involved: | | CNF | ProDoc Signature (date project began):  October 2010 | |

Objective and Scope

**The projects have two components and objectives**: to ensure sufficiency and predictability of revenue sources for the PA system and to raise cost-effectiveness and capacities of PAs through the operation of the regional conservation trust fund (CNF)[[2]](#footnote-2), including the newly constituted, country - dedicated, 7-year sinking fund.

The duration of the project is seven years. Total budget of the project for Georgia is US$ 5,440,000 (including 1,000,000 from the GEF) and for Armenia 5,750,000 (including 990,000 from the GEF). The remaining amount is financial and in-kind parallel co-funding, including: respective governments, CNF, KfW/TJS, and other partners.

UNDP is a GEF implementing agency for the project. Sinking Fund operations and management as well as capacity development and provision of high-quality technical advice on sustainable financing of PAs, is delegated to CNF the project management and fund operations responsibilities and reflected in Sinking Fund and Project Management Agreement. CNF was selected for fund operations and the project management is that it is the only organization in the Caucasus with the mandate granted by the governments of three South Caucasus countries to operate Trust Funds, including both endowment and sinking funds in support of Protected Areas in these countries. CNF’s organizational structure and operations allow for effective and efficient management of the Trust Fund, whose general rules and policies is defined in the framework agreement between the respective governments the CNF.

A Project Executive Board (PEB) directs the project and is the ultimate decision-maker for it, ensuring that the project remains on course to deliver the desired outcomes of the required quality.

The implementation of the project started as planned and all components of the project are on the way to reaching the project objectives. Projects undergone Mid Term Evaluation (MTEs) in 2014, where the progress was reviewed, the project approach analyzed, lessons learned captured, replication strategy developed and implemented.

Now at the final stage of the projects the Terminal Evaluation (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[[3]](#footnote-3) for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact,** as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR ([*Annex C*](#_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 reports. As a result of the assignment there will be two separate report sets prepared for each of the projects.

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 field missions to Georgia and Armenia, including the most appropriate projects sites to be selected by the evaluator in consultation with the UNDP COs and project teams and in accordance with logistical availability, available timeframe and what seems best suited for the purposes of the evaluation*.* Interviews will be held with representatives from the following organizations in both countries at a minimum:

**- UNDP COs (Energy and Environment Portfolio managers and Management);**

**- Ministries of Nature Protection (Armenia) and Environment (Georgia). GEF Operational Focal Points, CBD focal points, Agency of Protected Areas in Georgia;**

**- CNF;**

**- from WWF and other key NGOs;**

**- from World Bank offices, USAID, KFW and other key international partners.**

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

Evaluation Criteria & Ratings

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

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

Project finance / cofinance

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

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

Mainstreaming

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

Impact

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.[[4]](#footnote-4)

Conclusions, recommendations & lessons

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

In this chapter it is desirable to include recommendations for a strategy for future replication of the project approach for other types of the biodiversity conservation projects for other regions of the country.

Implementation arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Georgia. 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 E&E Team in Georgia CO and Armenia CO and/or CNF 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 *27* days according to the following plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Timing | Completion Date |
| **Preparation** | 4 days | *Date to be defined* |
| **Evaluation Mission** | 10 days | *date* |
| **Draft Evaluation Reports** | 9 days | *date* |
| **Final Reports** | 4 days | *date* |

Evaluation deliverables

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Deliverable | Content | Timing | Responsibilities |
| **Inception Reports** | Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method | No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission. | Evaluator submits to UNDP CO |
| **Presentation** | Initial Findings | End of evaluation mission in Georgia  End of evaluation mission in Armenia  The evaluator may elect to organize one common briefing of initial findings at the end of both missions for the discussion of issues common to both countries | To project management, UNDP CO |
| **Draft Final Reports** | Full reports, (per annexed template) with annexes | Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission | Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs |
| **Final Reports\*** | Revised reports | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft | Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC. |

\*When submitting the final evaluation reports, 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 reports.

**TERMINAL EVALUATION (TE) TEAM DUTIES AND RESPONSIBIITIES**

* Desk review of documents, development of draft methodology, detailed work plan and TE outline;
* Debriefing with UNDP CO, agreement on the methodology, scope and outline of the TE reports;
* Interviews with Project Executive, relevant Government, Project Manager, NGO and donor representatives and UNDP/GEF Regional Technical Advisor;
* Field visit to two project sites and interviews with PA administration key staff;
* Debriefing with UNDP, Project Executive and Project Manager;
* Development and submission of the first TE reports drafts. The draft will be shared with the UNDP CO, UNDP/GEF (UNDP/GEF IRH Istanbul) and key project stakeholders for review and commenting;
* Finalization and submission of the final TE reports through incorporating suggestions received on the draft reports.

Team Composition

The evaluation team will be composed of 1 (one) international and 1 (one) national evaluators in each country*.* The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. International evaluator will be designated as the team leader and be responsible for finalizing the reports).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 International Team Leader and the Local Consultants must present the following qualifications:

* At least Master’s degree in Biodiversity Conservation, Natural Resource Management, Environmental Economics or other related areas;
* At least 7 years of working experience in providing management or consultancy services to the biodiversity conservation and/or protected areas projects, preferably in protected areas finance;
* Experience in monitoring and evaluating protected areas and/or biodiversity conservation projects for UN or other international development agencies (at least in one project);
* Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage.
* Knowledge of the CIS region, particularly Georgia’s context;
* Knowledge of GEF M&E guidelines and procedures;
* Sound knowledge in results-based management (especially results-oriented monitoring and evaluation);
* Fluency in English both written and spoken and good technical writing skills
* E-literacy;

Competencies:

* Ability to critically analyze issues, find root-causes and suggest optimum solutions;
* Ability to interact with a wide range of partners: government officials, development agencies and etc.;
* Excellent team working and management skills;

CV and/or P11 should provide evidence on the abovementioned qualifications and competencies.

***Important note****: The evaluator selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.*

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)

CONTRACT TYPE AND DURATION

The consultant will be hired for maximum 25 man/days under Individual Contract (IC) with maximum 15 man/days of homework and maximum 5 days of mission to Armenia and 5 days to Georgia. The Consultant will be paid Daily Subsistence Allowance in accordance with itinerary and UN DSA rate, cost of most direct and economy fare round-trip tickets and terminal expenses. DSA payments will be made based on actual days worked in Georgia and in Armenia.

Payment modalities and specifications

(*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%* | After provision of assignment-related time schedule and method clarifications |
| *40%* | Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation reports |
| *50%* | Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation reports |

Application process

Applicants are requested to apply online (indicate the site, such as http://jobs.undp.org, etc.) by (date). Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their P11/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

# Project Results Frameworks:

**GEORGIA**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome::** National & local capacity for sustainable environmental and natural resources management enhanced | | | | | |
| **Country Programme Outcome Indicators:** Enhanced planning and implementation capacities of the government and civil society (yes/no); No. of sustainable environmental and natural resource management practices adopted, their geographic scope and size of population affected | | | | | |
| **Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area:** Catalyzing environmental finance | | | | | |
| **Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program:** SO: Catalyze Sustainability of Protected Area Systems; SP: Sustainable finance of protected area systems at the national level | | | | | |
| **Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes:** Biodiversity conserved and sustainably used in protected area systems; Strategic Programme: PA systems secure increased revenue and diversification of revenue streams to meet total expenditures required to meet management objectives; Reduction in financing gap to meet PA management objectives | | | | | |
| **Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators:** Total revenue and diversification in revenue streams | | | | | |
|  | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Targets**  **End of Project** | **Source of verification** | **Risks and Assumptions** |
| **Project Objective**  To secure long-term financial sustainability of the Georgian PA system | Area of sustainably financed PAs | 0 | >100,000 ha cat. I-II by 2013  >400,000 ha cat. I-IV by 2016 | CPAF project grants and technical audits | Renewed regional political stability  MOEPNR/APA leadership remains committed to the project objectives |
| Improved funding ratio of optimal needs of PAs measured by financial sustainability score card | 47% | 70% | Financial Scorecard |
| Critical ecosystems of protected areas providing habitats for endemic and endangered species are conserved | Ecosystems are deteriorating | Habitats in 4-5 Cat1-II PAs are conserved by 2013[[5]](#footnote-5) | Monitoring and reporting of park rangers |
| **Outcome 1**  Ensuring sufficiency and predictability of revenue sources for the PA system | Reduce annual funding gap by $440,000 by 2013 | 70% of basic funding  47% of optimal funding | 96% of basic funding  64% of optimal funding | Financial Scorecard;  End-of year PA financial reports | MOEPNR sets an effective coordination mechanism for development of PAs’ management and financial plans and take a lead on preparation of grant applications |
| US$ value of capitalization of sinking fund. | 0 | $2,435,000[[6]](#footnote-6) | CPAF reporting |
| Number of PAs financed from CPAF | CPAF is currently not financing any PAs | Four to five PAs financed by 2013[[7]](#footnote-7) | CPAF reporting and mid-term and final evaluation reports |
| Increase in tools for PA system revenue generation | 30% | 55% | Financial Scorecard rating |
| Long-term annual funding capacity of CPAF available for Georgia based on its endowment, sinking fund and other regular annual commitments. | $100,000 | $950,000 | CPAF audit and financial statements; agreements with CPAF donors. |
| **Outcome 2**  Raising cost-effectiveness and capacities of PAs | Increase in cost-effectiveness of at least 10 PAs measured by financial score card (part II, component II); | 8% | 33% | Financial Scorecard rating |  |
| Adoption of site-specific business plans at 10 PAs providing transparency on the optimum level of management costs | 0 | 10 business plans adopted | CPAF funding applications; annual PA reporting and technical audits include assessment of cost-effectiveness; benchmarking of appropriate staff & salary levels, equipment and infrastructure |
| Number of site managers trained in cost-effective management | 0 | At least three in a minimum of 10 targeted PAs | PA Management Support Group; Technical audits; project reviews |
| Existence of electronic system to track changes in management effectiveness based on the METT score and – where appropriate – on the Financial Sustainability Scorecard. | No such system exists | Development and implementation of such a system | Review of CPAF reporting; project reviews |

**ARMENIA**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome:** Environmental governance strengthened at central and local levels and greater compliance with EU environmental standards and international conventions. | | | | | |
| **Country Programme Outcome Indicators:** No. of policy documents incorporating SD principles | | | | | |
| **Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area:** Catalyzing environmental finance | | | | | |
| **Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program:** SO: Catalyze Sustainability of Protected Area Systems; SP: Sustainable finance of protected area systems at the national level | | | | | |
| **Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes:** Biodiversity conserved and sustainably used in protected area systems; Strategic Programme: PA systems secure increased revenue and diversification of revenue streams to meet total expenditures required to meet management objectives; Reduction in financing gap to meet PA management objectives | | | | | |
| **Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators:** Total revenue and diversification in revenue streams | | | | | |
|  | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Targets**  **End of Project** | **Source of verification** | **Risks and Assumptions** |
| **Project Objective**  To secure long-term financial sustainability of the Armenian PA system | Area of sustainably financed PAs | 0 | >100,000 ha cat. I-II by 2013  >300,000 ha cat. I-IV by 2016 | CPAF project grants and technical audits | Renewed regional political stability  MNP leadership remains committed to the project objectives |
| Improved funding ratio of optimal needs of PAs measured by financial sustainability score card | 29% (excluding non-recurring donor funding) | 54% | Financial Scorecard |
| Critical ecosystems of protected areas providing habitats for endemic and endangered species are conserved | Ecosystems are deteriorating | Habitats in 4-5 Cat1-II PAs are conserved by 2013[[8]](#footnote-8)1 | Monitoring and reporting of park rangers |
| **Outcome 1**  Ensuring sufficiency and predictability of revenue sources for the PA system | Reduce annual funding gap by $440,000 by 2013 | 49% of basic funding  29% of optimal funding | 78% of basic funding  47% of optimal funding | Financial Scorecard;  End-of year PA financial reports | MNP sets an effective coordination mechanism for development of PAs’ management and financial plans and take a lead on preparation of grant applications |
| US$ value of capitalization of sinking fund. | 0 | $2,425,000[[9]](#footnote-9) | CPAF reporting |
| Number of PAs financed from CPAF | CPAF is currently not financing any PAs | Four to five PAs financed by 2013[[10]](#footnote-10) | CPAF reporting and mid-term and final evaluation reports |
| Existence of NRM guidance and on-line training  Number of successfully implemented NRM projects with lessons learned documented and shared with other PAs for replication;  Level of additional PA income-generation through natural resources management (NRM). | No NRM guidance exists today.  0  0 | Context adapted Guidance on NRM developed, on-line training made available  2    Modest[[11]](#footnote-11) | CPAF reporting; technical and financial audits; project reviews |
| Long-term annual funding capacity of CPAF available for Armenia based on its endowment, sinking fund and other regular annual commitments. | $100,000 | $950,000 | CPAF audit and financial statements; agreements with CPAF donors. |
| **Outcome 2**  Raising cost-effectiveness and capacities of PAs | Increase in cost-effectiveness of at least 10 PAs measured by financial score card (part II, component II); | 8% | 33% | Financial Scorecard rating |  |
| Adoption of site-specific business plans at 10 PAs providing transparency on the optimum level of management costs | 0 | 10 business plans adopted | CPAF funding applications; annual PA reporting and technical audits include assessment of cost-effectiveness; benchmarking of appropriate staff & salary levels, equipment and infrastructure |
| Number of site managers trained in cost-effective management | 0 | At least three in a minimum of 10 targeted PAs | PA Management Support Group; Technical audits; project reviews |
| Existence of electronic system to track changes in management effectiveness based on the METT score and – where appropriate – on the Financial Sustainability Scorecard. | No such system exists | Development and implementation of such a system | Review of CPAF reporting; project reviews |

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

* Project Documents, project document revisions
* Project Inception Reports
* APR/PIRs (2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015)
* Standard Annual Progress Reports
* Projects MTE reports
* Annual/Multi-year Work Plans (project budget and its revisions)
* Project Annual Work Programmes
* Technical Audits Reports (CNF/KPMG)
* Minutes of the Project Board meetings
* Minutes of project stakeholder meetings
* Letters of Intent and Letters of Agreement signed with regard to the projects
* Data on co-financing, including additionally leveraged
* Financial Scorecard
* GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policies;
* Handbook on planning, monitoring and evaluating for development results
* List of project publications
* Other documents upon request

Annex C: Evaluation Questions

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

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

Annex D: Rating Scales

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

Annex E: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form

**Evaluators:**

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

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form[[12]](#footnote-12)**

**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[[13]](#footnote-13)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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[[14]](#footnote-14)) |
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Annex G: Evaluation Report Clearance Form

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

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

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

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

UNDP GEF RTA

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

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

1. CNF is used after the establishment of the Caucasus fund and has replaced the CPAF (Caucasus protected areas fund) which is the reference used for this establishment during project development and within the project documents. For purposes of clarity, references to this organization in the evaluation should use the current title -- CNF (Caucasus Nature Fund). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. CNF is used after the establishment of the Caucasus fund and has replaced the CPAF (Caucasus protected areas fund) which is the reference used for this establishment during project development and within the project documents. For purposes of clarity, references to this organization in the evaluation should use the current title -- CNF (Caucasus Nature Fund). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](http://www.undp.org/evaluation/handbook), Chapter 7, pg. 163 [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office:  [ROTI Handbook 2009](http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/M2_ROtI%20Handbook.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Deterioration is halted; habitats are conserved [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Of which $825,500 from GEF and $1,609,500 from co-financing (a portion of the $1,609,500 is in the form of project funding or annual grants). [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. CAPF funding is being channeled to recipients to cover the regular PA annual running costs, biodiversity research and monitoring, establishment and support of tourism, catering, interpretation and other income-generating facilities, as well as for preparation of management plans. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. 1 Deterioration is halted; habitats are conserved [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Of which $815,500 from GEF and $1,609,500 from co-financing (a portion of the $1,609,500 is in the form of project funding or annual grants). [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. CAPF funding is being channeled to recipients to cover the regular PA annual running costs, biodiversity research and monitoring, establishment and support of tourism, catering, interpretation and other income-generating facilities, as well as for preparation of management plans. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. NRM income flowing to the 2 pilot PAs [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. The Report length should not exceed 60 pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)