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 *Increasing Climate Change Resilience of Maldives through Adaptation in the Tourism Sector Project* (PIMS # 4396)

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

Project Summary Table

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Project Title:  |  |
| GEF Project ID: | 4431 (GEF PMIS #) |   | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | *at completion (Million US$)* |
| UNDP Project ID: | 4396 (UNDP PIMS#) | GEF financing:  | 1.65 |       |
| Country: | Maldives | IA/EA own: |       |       |
| Region: | Asia and Pacific | Government: | 1.63 |       |
| Focal Area: | Climate Change-LDCF | Other: | 0.02 |       |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): | Climate Change Adaptation | Total co-financing: | 1.65 |       |
| Executing Agency: | Ministry of Tourism, Arts and Culture | Total Project Cost: | 3.30 |       |
| Other Partners involved: |       | ProDoc Signature (date project began):  | 17 August 2011 |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | Proposed:30 June 2016 | Actual:      |

Objective and Scope

The project was designed to:

**The Increasing Climate Change Resilience of Maldives through Adaptation in the Tourism Sector Project** addresses key infrastructure issues, and will formulate necessary policies, standards, codes and regulatory guidance that would facilitate necessary investments to increase the resilience of the tourist infrastructure to climate change in the Maldives. The project is the first of its kind in the Maldives where climate change adaptation measures are to be integrated into policy and planning instruments of a key sector such as tourism.

The project strengthens the capacity of the Ministry of Tourism and tourism businesses to recognize evident climate risk issues in tourism operations and adopt appropriate adaptation measures to address them. To cover residual catastrophic risk, the project will develop the capacity of the government and the tourism industry to assess the feasibility of market-based risk financing mechanisms (such as weather index insurance) and ensure that tangible private-sector investments can be leveraged. The Project is funded by GEF/LDCF and implemented through an agreement between UNDP and the Ministry of Tourism.

This goal is to be achieved by increasing the adaptive capacity of the tourism sector in Maldives to respond to the impacts of climate change and promoting investment in appropriate, no-regrets adaptation measures.

The goals and objectives of the project would be achieved through the delivery of the following three Outcomes.

1. Strengthened adaptive capacity of the tourism sector to reduce risks to climate-induced economic losses.
2. Reduced vulnerability of at least 10 tourism operations and 10 tourism-associated communities to the adverse effects of climate change.
3. Transfer of climate risk financing solutions to public and private sector tourism institutions.

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

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

Evaluation approach and method

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

The evaluation must provide evidence‐based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Maldives, including the 2 to 3 agreed project sites of the Small Grants programme*.* Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

1. Ministry of Tourism
2. UNDP Country Office
3. TAP Project Team
4. TAP Grants Evaluation Committee
5. Ministry of Environment and Energy
6. Maldives Meteorological Services (MMS)
7. Ministry of Finance and Treasury
8. Ministry of Housing
9. Ministry of Education
10. National Disaster Management Center
11. Maldives Association of Tourism Industries (MATI)
12. Maldives Association of Travel Agents and Tour Operators (MATATO)
13. Liveaboard Association of Maldives (LAM)
14. Maldives Association of Yacht Agents (MAYA)
15. Civil Society ( Eco Care, Save the Beach)
16. Grantees of Small Grants Component
17. Local council(s)

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 of this Terms of Reference.

Evaluation Criteria & Ratings

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (Annex A) 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 |       |
| M&E Plan Implementation |       | Quality of Execution - Executing Agency  |       |
| Overall quality of M&E |       | Overall quality of Implementation / Execution |       |
| **3. Assessment of Outcomes**  | **rating** | **4. Sustainability** | **rating** |
| Relevance  |       | Financial resources |       |
| Effectiveness |       | Socio-political |       |
| Efficiency  |       | Institutional framework and governance |       |
| Overall Project Outcome Rating |       | Environmental  |       |
|  |  | Overall likelihood of sustainability |       |

Project finance / cofinance

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

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Co-financing(type/source) | UNDP own financing (mill. US$) | Government(mill. US$) | Partner Agency(mill. US$) | Total(mill. US$) |
| Planned | Actual  | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Planned | 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. The evaluation will examine this project’s contribution to the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF).

Impact

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

Conclusions, recommendations & lessons

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions**, **recommendations** and **lessons**. Conclusions should build on findings and be based in evidence. Recommendations should be prioritized, specific, relevant, and targeted, with suggested implementers of the recommendations. Lessons should have wider applicability to other initiatives across the region, the area of intervention, and for the future.

Implementation arrangements

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

Evaluation timeframe

The total duration of the evaluation will be 30 working days over a period of three months, according to the following plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Timing | Completion Date |
| **Preparation** | *5* days | 10 April 2016 |
| **Evaluation Mission** | *15* days | 12 May 2016 |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | *5* days | 29 May 2016 |
| **Final Report** | *5* days  | 15 June 2016 |

Evaluation deliverables

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Deliverable | Content  | Timing | Responsibilities |
| **Inception Report (max. 10 pages)** | Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method  | At least 2 weeks before the start of the mission  | Evaluator submits to UNDP CO  |
| **Presentation** | Initial Findings  | End of evaluation mission | To project management, Tourism Ministry, UNDP CO |
| **Draft Final Report**  | Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes | Within 2 weeks of the evaluation mission | Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs |
| **Final Report\*** | Revised report  | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft  | Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC.  |

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

Team Composition

The evaluation team will be composed of 1 international evaluator*.* The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. The evaluator selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The consultant must present the following qualifications:

Education:

* Minimum of an advanced degree (Masters level or higher) in climate change adaptation, environment management, tourism development or related field

Experience:

* Minimum *5* years of relevant professional experience with climate change adaptation, tourism development and adaptation, and/ or resilience and vulnerability analysis
* Minimum of 5 years experience with evaluations of similar interventions
* Previous experience with results‐based monitoring and evaluation methodologies is desired
* Experience with UNDP and GEF-financed projects is an advantage

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%* | Submission of TE Inception Report |
| *30%* | Presentation of findings of evaluation mission |
| *20%* | Following submission of the 1st draft terminal evaluation report |
| *40%* | Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report  |

Application process

Potential consultants will be shortlisted from the UNDP Roster and invited to submit letter of interest along with CV, financial proposal (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs) and confirmation of availability form, The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in English with indication of the e‐mail and phone contact.

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. The selection of the consultant will be done by a panel consisting of representatives from UNDP Maldives, Ministry of Tourism and the Tourism Adaptation Project.

Annex A: Project Logical Framework

|  |
| --- |
| **This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPAP or CPD:** OUTCOME 8: Communities have access to safe drinking water & adequate sanitation and sustainably manage the natural environment to enhance their livelihoods OUTCOME 9: Enhanced capacities at national and local levels to support low carbon life-styles, climate change adaptation, and disaster risk reduction  |
| **Country Programme Outcome Indicators:** No. of sectors in which adaptive mechanisms are adopted to minimize losses from climate related impacts; No. of community level partnerships with private sector for sustainable environment management |
| **Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area:** Promote climate change adaptation  |
| **Applicable SOF (e.g. GEF) Strategic Objective and Program:** Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) |
| **Applicable SOF Expected Outcomes (relating to the LDCF Results-Based Management Framework):** **Outcome 1.1:** Mainstreamed adaptation in broader development frameworks at country level and in targeted vulnerable areas**Outcome 2.2:** Strengthened adaptive capacity to reduce risks to climate-induced economic losses  |
| **Applicable SOF (e.g .GEF) Outcome Indicators (relating to the LDCF Results-Based Management Framework):** **Indicator 1.1.3** % of development frameworks and sectoral strategies that reach adaptation targets **Indicator 1.2.2** Economic losses through effective climate resilient infrastructure ($US) **Indicator 2.2.1** No. of targeted institutions with increased adaptive capacity to reduce risks of and response to climate variability (Number) |
|  | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Targets** **End of Project** | **Source of verification** | **Risks and Assumptions** |
| **Project Objective**[[3]](#footnote-3)**Increase adaptive capacity of the tourism sector in Maldives to respond to the impacts of climate change and invest in appropriate, no-regrets adaptation measures**.  | Number of tourism-related policies, strategies and action plans which stimulate investment by tourism operators in climate resilient water, waste, energy and infrastructure management Number of tourism operators who invest in concrete initiatives that enhance their climate risk resilience, based on guidance provided by the project.Number of tourism-associated communities which reduce their vulnerability to climate hazards, based on investment activities facilitated by the project  | Existing tourism policies, laws and regulations do not integrate climate risk information and require/enforce private sector investments in climate change adaptation measures Most tourism operators do not draw on, or comply with, consistent guidance for no-regrets adaptation measures to increase resilience to climate-related risks and extreme eventsLimited examples of cooperation between tourism resorts and communities on joint risk management efforts.  | An Addendum to the Maldives National Building Code and its associated compliance documents is developed, disseminated and adopted by all tourism resorts. At least 10 tourism resorts invest in new climate risk management initiatives which increase their resilience to climate-related risks and reduce economic losses from extreme events At least 10 tourism-associated communities reduce the vulnerability of their water, waste, energy and infrastructure management systems, based on partnerships, guidance and private sector investment facilitated by the project.  | Policy documentsField survey with tourism operatorsField surveys; Interviews with tourism resorts and associated communities | No contradictory incentives provided/compliance required by different sector policies Government decision-makers continue to recognize the importance of climate change adaptation in the tourism sector and are committed to facilitate the necessary policy changes Tourism operators recognize the economic benefits of adaptation measures and are willing to invest in changes to their current resource management practicesTourism operators react to improved enforcement of environmental legislation in the tourism sectorTourism resorts and associated communities are willing to undertake joint planning efforts to increase climate resilience and environmental sustainability of their shared value chain Stable government/ governance structure throughout project lifetime  |
| **Outcome 1**Strengthened adaptive capacity of the tourism sector to reduce risks to climate-induced economic losses | Number of island resorts and tourism operators with increased capacity to reduce risks of climate variability Number of new investment projects in the tourism industry that are designed and implemented in accordance with revised tourism policies and planning frameworks  | Most tourism operators are concerned about their increased vulnerability to climate change, but do not draw on, or comply with, consistent guidance for effective no-regrets adaptation measures to increase resilienceNational policies and laws regulating tourism operations do not contain functional references to climate-proofing and fail to incentivize private sector investment in climate risk management  | By the end of the project, 100% of relevant MTAC staff and at least 60% of all trained tourism operators recognize the economic impacts of climate change on tourism operations and know the cost/benefit aspects of different adaptation investmentsBy the end of the project, an Addendum to the Maldives National Building Code and its associated compliance documents is developed, disseminated and adopted by all new tourism development projects.  | Training reports attendance listsTraining feedbackBuilding code addendum and associated compliance documentsField observations | Key Government representatives and stakeholders from the Tourism industry recognize the value of project-related training initiativesand are willing to engage in intensified and regular debate about climate risks in the tourism sectorSenior planners and decision-makers continue to recognize the importance of climate change adaptation and are committed to support necessary policy changes MATI has appropriate leverage to represent the diversity of situations and interests in the tourism industryUncertainties pertaining to climate change modelling are within the acceptance range of decision-makersTourism operators are willing to engage in the review, revision and adoption of new building standards Policy recommendations are actively endorsed and signed into law by national decision-making bodies |
| **Output 1.1.** Inventory of adaptive and maladaptive practices on island resorts and safari boat operations in Maldives  |
| **Output 1.2.**Policy recommendations developed to enable and incentivize private sector investment for climate change adaptation in the tourism industry |
| **Output 1.3.** Addendum to national building codes on the physical planning and construction of infrastructure in tourist resorts is developed and disseminated to all tourism operators  |
| **Output 1.4.** Technical guidance provided to all tourism operators on how to climate-proof sensitive resource management systems and infrastructure (freshwater management; solid waste and wastewater management; physical and energy infrastructure) |
| **Outcome 2**Reduced vulnerability of at least 10 tourism operations and 10 tourism-associated communities to the adverse effects of climate change  | Number of island resorts, tourism operators and tourism-associated communities who report reduced vulnerability to climate risks as a result of guidance provided by the projectPrivate sector investment in climate change adaptation measures which reduce economic losses in tourism operations and tourism-associated communities from extreme climate events (US$) | Most tourism operators are concerned about their increased vulnerability to climate change, but do not draw on, or comply with, consistent guidance for effective no-regrets adaptation measures by the government to increase resilienceEconomic losses in tourism-related value chains from climate-induced hazards and extreme events are quantified only after catastrophic events | By the end of the project, at least 10 tourism-associated communities have planned and implemented concrete adaptation projects which reduce the vulnerability of their infrastructure, water, waste, land-use planning or energy management systems to climate-related hazards By the end of the project, at least 10 tourism operators are adopting project guidance to invest in climate- resilient water, wastewater, solid waste and infrastructure management systems  | Interviews with community representativesQualitative field surveys | Tourism operators find reduced costs associated with the proposed adaptation measures sufficiently attractive to invest in changes to existing setups and practices Tourism operators react to improved enforcement of environmental legislation in the tourism sector.New tourism projects have access to project informationGuidelines developed by the project are considered practical, locally appropriate, innovative, sustainable and cost effective Key Government representatives and stakeholders from the Tourism industry recognize the value of project-related training initiatives Communal plans can be systematically connected with new investment projects by tourism resorts  |
|  **Output 2.1** National tourism adaptation platform created to establish and support effective public-private partnerships for climate change adaptation in the tourism sector |
| **Output 2.2** Development and implementation of at least 10 new investment projects on climate-proofing water supply/storage/distribution, solid waste management, wastewater management, energy management, and/or new physical infrastructure in island resort and/or safari boat operations |
| **Output 2.3** Development of at least 10 new investment partnerships between island resorts and tourism-associated communities which result in joint climate risk management activities  |
| **Output 2.4**South-South transfer of tourism adaptation case studies between Maldives and other SIDS  |
| **Outcome 3**Transfer of climate risk financing solutions to public and private sector tourism institutions  | Number of staff from government agencies and tourism operators who have increased knowledge of climate risk financing instruments Type and number of climate risk financing products and services (such as index-based insurance) available to public and private sector entities  | Government entities and tourism sector operators in Maldives have limited knowledge of climate risk financing products and their potential application in the Maldivian context No climate risk financing products and services are available on the Maldives market | At project completion, all representatives in relevant MTAC and MHE departments and all representatives of different tourist facility groups (including resorts, safari boats and hotel operators)re aware of climate risk financing and –transfer instruments and their potential in the Maldivian context By the end of the project, the Government of Maldives has access to at least one climate risk financing solution  | Qualitative surveysAttendance listsAwareness and training materials Interview with risk financing service providerQualitative surveys | Tourism operators are interested in innovative insurance products to address the residual climate risk that cannot be addressed through other investments in risk reductionInsurance service providers are willing to develop and offer innovative and affordable climate risk financing/transfer products for the Maldives marketSufficient cooperation between relevant government agencies, the tourism industry and representatives of insurance providers in the sharing of relevant information.Insurance and reinsurance service providers interested in engaging with the Maldivian market |
| **Output 3.1**Training of tourism operators and government representatives on climate risk financing options and their potential application in the Maldivian context |
| **Output 3.2**Feasibility study on micro-insurance for tourism-associated communities to buffer climate-related shocks from extreme events.  |
| **Output 3.3.**Feasibility study on index-based insurance and risk pooling options to address risk transfer priorities of the Maldivian government |

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

1. *GEF Project Information Form (PIF)*
2. *Project Document (ProDoc)*
3. *Implementing/Executing partner arrangements*
4. *List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Boards, and other partners to be consulted*
5. *List of all Project sites, highlighting suggested visits*
6. *UNDP – Ministry of Tourism Letter of Agreement*
7. *TAP Progress Reports*
8. *TAP Activity Reports*
9. *Annual Work Plan revisions*
10. *Maldives 4th Tourism Master Plan*
11. *Midterm Review (MTR) report*
12. *Annual project implementation reports (PIR)*
13. *TAP Studies conducted*
14. *List of Grants Evaluation Committee members*
15. *Grants Evaluation Committee minutes*
16. *TAP Board Meeting minutes*
17. *Project budget and Financial reports*
18. *Project outputs (videos, IEC materials)*
19. *UNDP Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF)*
20. *UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD)*
21. *GEF focal area strategic program objectives*
22. *Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects*

Annex C: Evaluation Questions

This Evaluation Criteria Matrix must be fully completed/amended by the consultant and included in the TE inception report and 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?  |
|  | * Did the project activities address the gaps in the policy, regulatory and capacity framework at the national level for climate adaptation in the tourism sector?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * Were project activities relevant in account of the policy, regulatory and resource framework at the beginning of the project?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * Is the project relevant to GEF LDCF Climate Change focal area adaptation?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * Does the project provide relevant lessons and experiences for other similar projects in the future?
 |  |  |  |
| Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? |
|  | * How well have gaps in the policy and regulatory framework for climate adaptation in the tourism sector been identified by the project?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * Was the project effective in acquiring a policy guidance for future development of the tourism sector to ensure that climate adaptation is taken into account ?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * How well has the project involved and empowered communities to implement climate adaptation initiatives?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * How effective has the project been in establishing networks and partnerships for climate adaptation and in the implementation of the project?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * How well did the project management unit leverage its position within the government and UNDP to facilitate implementation of the activities ?
 |  |  |  |
| Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards? |
|  | * Did the project achieve value for investment in implementing activities?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * How successful was the project in maximizing the impact of the activities through no cost methodologies and partnerships?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * How well did the project disseminate the outputs of the project to stakeholders and investors?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * What was the extent of co-financing of the project and what were the explanation for major variances of planned and actual expenditures?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * Assess the effectiveness of the project management unit and the lessons learned or good practices in terms of good project management ?
 |  |  |  |
|  Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? |
|  | * How was sustainability of the project activities ensured?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * What are the tangible or verifiable signs of sustainability of the project activities?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * What are the way forward for the results achieved by the project?
 |  |  |  |
| **Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?**  |
|  | * What are the tangible or verifiable outcomes of the activities of the project?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * What are the confirmed or expected direct outcomes from the project activities that are planned or confirmed?
 |  |  |  |

Annex D: Rating Scales

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Ratings for Effectiveness, Efficiency, Overall Project Outcome Rating, M&E, IA & EA Execution*** | ***Sustainability ratings:***  | ***Relevance ratings*** |
| 6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings 5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS): moderate shortcomings3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems1. 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 risks1. 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[[4]](#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[[5]](#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[[6]](#footnote-6)) |
| **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[[7]](#footnote-7))  |
| **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 (\*), implementation (\*), and overall assessment (\*)
* Implementing Agency (UNDP) execution (\*) and Executing Agency execution (\*), overall project implementation/ execution (\*), coordination, and operational issues
 |
| **3.3** | Project Results* Overall results (attainment of objectives) (\*)
* Relevance(\*)
* Effectiveness (\*)
* Efficiency (\*)
* Country ownership
* Mainstreaming
* Sustainability: financial resources (\*), socio-economic (\*), institutional framework and governance (\*), environmental (\*), and overall likelihood (\*)
* 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
* Annexed in a separate document: Audit trail
 |

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: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Annex H: TE Report audit trail

The following is a template for the evaluator to show how the received comments on the draft TE report have (or have not) been incorporated into the final TE report. This audit trail should be included as an annex in the final TE report.

**To the comments received on (*date*) from the Terminal Evaluation of (*project name*) (UNDP *PIMS #)***

*The following comments were provided to the draft Terminal Evaluation report during (time period); they are referenced by institution (“Author” column) and comment number (“#” column):*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author** | **#** | **Para No./ comment location**  | **Comment/Feedback on the draft TE report** | **TE team response and actions taken** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

1. For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](http://www.undp.org/evaluation/handbook), Chapter 7, pg. 163 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office:  [ROTI Handbook 2009](http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/M2_ROtI%20Handbook.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. *Objective (Atlas output) monitored quarterly ERBM and annually in APR/PIR* [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. See ToR Annex D for rating scales. See TE Guidance section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)