

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 *Strengthening capacities to undertake environmental fiscal reform to meet national and global environmental priorities*

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

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	Strengthening capacities to undertake environmental fiscal reform to meet national and global environmental pri			
GEF Project ID: UNDP-GEF PIMS:	4183 4379		<u>at endorsement (US\$)</u>	<u>at completion (US\$)</u>
UNDP proj. num.: Atlas Project ID: Atlas Output ID:	78482 61741	GEF financing:	510,450	510,450
Country:	Republic of Moldova	IA/EA own:	110,000	110,000
Region:	Europe and CIS	Government (in kind):	250,000	
Focal Area:	Multi Focal Area	Other: OECD (in kind) UNDP (in kind)	200,000 50,000	
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	SP1	Total co-financing:	610,000 (incl. 500,000 in kind)	610,000 (incl. 500,000 in kind)
Executing Agency:	Ministry of Environment	Total Project Cost:	1,120,450 (incl. 500,000 in kind)	1,120,450 (incl. 500,000 in kind)
Other Partners involved:	OECD, Local public Authorities	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		28.10.2011
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: 31 December 2014	Actual: 31 September 2015

OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The project was designed to: build capacities for implementing environmental fiscal reforms (EFR) that will produce increased national and global environmental benefits through the adoption of selected subsidies, fees, fines, taxes and other appropriate fiscal instruments. The reforms will focus on creating conditions, financial incentives and disincentives, and decreased opportunity costs to undertake actions that deliver global environmental outcomes. The expected outcome is that EFR will be adopted as an important element of Moldova's development policy, whereby improved fiscal and financial instruments and their use would strengthen regulatory and other approaches to environmentally sound and sustainable development, with a particular emphasis of meeting obligations under the three Rio Conventions. The project will also contribute to and complement a broader national decentralization

reform process, including policy planning at the national level, redesigning of competencies and responsibilities of local and sub-national governments and reforming local government revenue systems. In order to reach Government of Moldova's objective, the project will adopt a focused and comprehensive strategy composed of three main components: (1) Reform of environmentally harmful subsidies, green subsidies, as well as environmental charges within the agricultural and energy sectors, (2) Capacity development for EFR to build consensus among concerned stakeholders, and (3) Component 3: Integration of EFR in local and central planning processes.

The Terminal Evaluation 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 method¹ 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 *Chisinau, Republic of Moldova*, including the following project pilot towns - *Ungheni and Telenesti*. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

- *UNDP Moldova CO*
- *Ministry of Environment*
- *Ministry of Economy*
- *Ministry of Agriculture and Food Industry*
- *Ministry of Finance*
- *Local Public Authorities from Telenesti and Ungheni towns*
- *NGO "Ecological Movement of Moldova" and/or other NGO's.*

Upon request by the International evaluator, the national evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, progress reports, 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.

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

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	
M&E Plan Implementation		Quality of Execution - Executing Agency	
Overall quality of M&E		Overall quality of Implementation / Execution	
3. Assessment of Outcomes	rating	4. Sustainability	rating
Relevance		Financial resources:	
Effectiveness		Socio-political:	
Efficiency		Institutional framework and governance:	
Overall Project Outcome Rating		Environmental :	
		Overall likelihood of sustainability:	

PROJECT FINANCE / COFINANCE

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

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

MAINSTREAMING

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

IMPACT

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

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 the Republic of Moldova. 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 DELIVERABLES

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

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

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

TEAM COMPOSITION

The evaluation team will be composed of one international and one national evaluator. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The international evaluator will be designated as the team leader and will be responsible for finalizing the evaluation report. 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.

EVALUATOR ETHICS

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](#)

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'](#).

DUTIES AND RESPONSABILITIES OF EVALUATION TEAM

International Expert

- 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 report;
- Interviews with project implementing partner (executing agency), relevant Government, NGO and donor representatives and UNDP/GEF Regional Technical Advisor;
- Field visit to the pilot project site (Ungheni and Telenesti) and interviews with local stakeholders;
- Elaboration of a summary matrix of the project implementation key findings based on interviews and site visits performed;
- Debriefing with UNDP and project implementing partner;
- Development and submission of the first TE report draft. The draft will be shared with the UNDP CO, UNDP/GEF (UNDP/GEF RCU Istanbul) and key project stakeholders for review and commenting;
- Finalization and submission of the Response Grid;
- Finalization and submission of the final TE report through incorporating suggestions received on the draft report;
- Supervision of the work of the national expert (during entire evaluation period).

National Expert

- Collection of background materials upon request by International Expert/ TE Team Leader;
- Provision of important inputs in developing methodologies, work plans and MTE report outlines upon request by International Expert/ TE Team Leader;
- Assistance to the International Expert/ TE Team Leader in desk review of materials;
- Assistance to the International Expert/ TE Team Leader in developing the mission agenda and establishing meeting with relevant stakeholders;
- Participation in debriefings with UNDP CO representatives, project team and project implementing partners;
- Assistance to the International Expert/ TE Team Leader in conducting interviews with relevant stakeholders;
- Field visit and assistance to the International Expert/ TE Team Leader in interviewing local stakeholders at project sites;
- Assist the International Expert/ TE Team Leader in elaboration of a summary matrix of the project implementation key findings based on interviews and site visits performed;
- Assistance to the International Expert/ TE Team Leader in developing the first draft of the TE report. The draft will be shared with the UNDP CO, UNDP/GEF (UNDP/GEF RCU Istanbul) and key project stakeholders for review and commenting;
- Elaboration of the Draft Response Grid based on comments made by UNDP CO, UNDP/GEF (UNDP/GEF RCU Istanbul) and key project stakeholders;

- Assistance to the International Expert/ TE Team Leader in finalization of the Final Terminal Evaluation Report.

DELIVERABLES

The National Expert must present to the International Expert/ TE Team Leader the following deliverables:

Deliverables	Due dates
Inputs to the Inception Report providing clarifications on timing and method to be used	July 15, 2015
Inputs to the Presentation of the Initial Findings	August 10, 2015
Inputs to the Draft Final Report	August 25, 2015
Inputs to the Final Report , revised and coordinated with the UNDP CO, UNDP/GEF (UNDP/GEF RCU Bratislava) and key project stakeholders	September 6, 2015

TIMEFRAME

The National Consultant shall complete the deliverables stated above in 25 days according to the following schedule:

Activity	Timing
Preparation	<i>9 days</i>
Evaluation Mission	<i>6 days</i>
Draft Evaluation Report	<i>8 days</i>
Final Report	<i>2 days</i>

PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

The National consultant will be hired under Individual Contract (IC) modality. Fee payments will be made based on following milestones:

%	Milestone
20%	At contract signing
50%	Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report
30%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report

REQUIRED QUALIFICATIONS AND COMPETENCIES

The National Evaluator must present the following qualifications:

- Master's degree in Public Finance, Economics, Environmental management or other related areas;
- 5 years of working experience in providing management or consultancy services to the multi focal area projects, preferably in environmental planning and management;
- Experience in monitoring and evaluating environmental projects for UN or other international development agencies (at least one project);
- Sound knowledge in results-based management (especially results-oriented monitoring and evaluation);
- Experience in GEF project design, technical consultancy or evaluation will be an asset.

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.

Language requirements:

- Fluent in English and Romanian both written and spoken. Knowledge of Russian will be an asset.

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

APPLICATION PROCESS

Applicants are requested to apply online at http://www.undp.md/jobs/current_jobs) by June 30. 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

Objectives	Indicators	Means of verification	Key assumptions/comments
<p>Project Objective</p> <p>To build capacities for implementing environmental fiscal reforms (EFR) that will produce increased national and global environmental benefits through the adoption of selected subsidies, fees, fines, taxes and other appropriate fiscal instruments.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Demonstrated global environmental benefits through the adoption of EFR instruments related to biodiversity conservation, reducing GHG emissions and combating land degradation ▪ Capacity development scorecard ratings increase in a consistent manner (initial rating to be established at project inception workshop) ▪ Regulatory and operational guidelines adopted by the EFR commission for 5 EFR instruments addressed by the project: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) agricultural subsidies scheme/programme, 2) energy subsidies scheme/programme, 3) environmental charges; 4) green/environmental subsidies through NEF/LEF; 5) new eco-technology subsidies ▪ Medium-Term Expenditure budget reflects increased national allocations to meet CBD, CCD, and FCCC targets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Three case studies are published based the lessons learned related to improved national financing for CBD, CCD, and FCCC implementation through the EFR in Moldova ▪ Capacity Scorecard applied at project inception and as part of the mid-term and final evaluations ▪ Recommendations for legislative texts and technical guidelines elaborated and submitted for political debate and adoption ▪ Comparative analysis of past MTEF with new and improved MTEF prepared by end of the project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Political and economic stability ▪ Concerned stakeholders adopt and enforce EFR recommendations as part of the Environment Law and Tax Code ▪ Eco-technology investments are viable in Moldova ▪ MoE engage in NEF/LEFs restructuring ▪ MoE engage in eco- charges reform
Component 1: Reform of environmentally harmful subsidies, green subsidies as well as environmental charges			
<p>Sub-component 1.1: Introduce policy reform in the area of environmentally harmful subsidies</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Feasibility of reform proposals to energy pricing and subsidies and adoption of appropriate legal amendments and implementation measures is confirmed ▪ Feasibility of reform proposals to agricultural subsidies and adoption of appropriate legal amendments and implementation measures is confirmed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Level of VAT rates, excise tax rates and import duties on energy products (and other possible pricing factors) after reform implementation ▪ Identification of options for greening and reforming current agricultural subsidies, focusing on the development of new markets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Readiness and willingness of concerned ministries (especially ministers responsible for environment, agriculture and energy) and subordinated institutions to implement good international practice ▪ Proposed EFR instruments and reform can effectively be based

<u>Sub-Component 1.2:</u> Reform of environmental charges and facilitation of eco-technology investments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Feasibility of reform proposals for several environmental charges currently in force is confirmed▪ Number of identified eco-technologies that have true potential to be mainstreamed in Moldova▪ Readiness of eco-technology investment scheme for implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Identification of policy and legal options for environmental charges including considering environmental, economic and fiscal effects▪ Market analysis of current (financing) markets for several groups and types of eco-technology solutions that could be mainstreamed in Moldova	on national policies and linked to relevant EU environmental policy (for example, there is no comprehensive environmental policy at the moment that could, among others, outline steps towards EU approximation)
<u>Sub-Component 1.3:</u> Improved regulations and operational management of the National and Local Ecological Funds (NEF/LEFs)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Implementation of good international practice in managing public environment expenditure programmes applied to NEF/LEF management, especially the areas governance, spending strategies, project cycle management, procurement and reporting/promotion	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Procedures for project cycle management (PCM) for 2-3 main spending areas;▪ Procurement procedures in line with relevant domestic and EU procurement legislation/practice▪ Short and long-term spending strategy of NEF/LEFs▪ Revised statutes of the NEF/LEFs▪ Website of NEF/LEFs	
<u>Component 3: Integration of EFR in local and central planning processes</u>			
<u>Sub-Component 3.1:</u> EFR instruments integrated in the decentralization process	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ A common coordination work plan with the Joint Integrated Local Development Programme (JILDP) developed▪ Regular meetings of the Sub-group under the working group Financial Decentralization were held▪ Identification of environmental management priorities within the Local Development Strategies took place▪ Greening JILDP's Performance Based Budgeting system to address local environmental priorities	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Yearly joint work plan between the UNDP/GEF EFR project and JILDP▪ Minutes of meeting of Sub-group under the working group Financial Decentralization▪ Assessment of environmental management priorities within the Local Development Strategies▪ Identification of fiscal reform for local environmental taxes that can be integrated in the PBB system▪ MoE reports confirming stabilized or increased budget allocations and spending on national and global environmental priorities▪ Costing study and financing strategy to implement Rio Conventions▪ Comparative analysis of pre-existing MTEF with MTEF that is strengthened under the project to meet Rio Convention targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Cooperation with the Joint Integrated Local Development Programme (JILDP) is supported by the State Chancellery and MoE▪ Pilot LPAs within the JILDP accept to engage in the identification of policy and legal options for collection and distribution of taxes at decentralized level for environmental management▪ Effective and efficient cooperation between Ministry of Finance and Ministry of Environment as well as other relevant line ministries can be established▪ There is a sufficiency of human resources within the various government agencies that can absorb the green budgeting and planning training provided, and translate these into high calibre financial strategies and plans.
<u>Sub-Component 3.2:</u> EFR instruments integrated into governmental budgeting and MTEF processes	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Budget and MTEF planning is effectively greened in line with good international practice▪ Increased and improved budget allocations and investment finance for biodiversity conservation, addressing climate change, and activities to combat land degradation (all per Rio Convention targets)		

ANNEX B: LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE EVALUATORS

1. Project document and its annexes;
2. Project Annual/Quarter operational and progress reports;
3. Annual/Quarter work plans;
4. Project financial work plans and expenditure reports;
5. 2013, 2014 and 2015 UNDP/GEF Project Implementation Reviews (PIR);
6. Minutes of the PSC meetings;
7. Mission Reports of International Experts;
8. Reports of International and National Experts
9. Research studies;
10. Media information;
11. GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policies;
12. Handbook on planning, monitoring and evaluating for development results;
13. Other upon request.

ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

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?			
• Is the Project relevant to UNCBD and GEF objectives?	•	•	•
• Is the Project relevant to UNDP objectives?	•	•	•
• Is the Project relevant to Moldova's environmental objectives, policies and strategic documents?	•	•	•
• Does the Project address the needs of target beneficiaries?	•	•	•
• Is the Project internally coherent in its design?	•	•	•
• How is the Project complementary to activities of other stakeholders and donors activity in the region?	•	•	•
• How could the Project better target and address the priorities and development challenges of targeted beneficiaries?	•	•	•
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
• To what extent are the outputs and activities of the project consistent with the intended project objective and goal?	•	•	•
• To what extent have implemented outputs produced or contributed to attaining the expected outcomes?	•	•	•
• How was risk and risk mitigation being managed?	•	•	•
• What lessons have been learnt for the Project to achieve its outcomes?	•	•	•
• What changes could have been made (if any) to the design of the Project in order to improve the achievement of the Project' expected results?		•	•
• How could the Project be more effective in achieving its results?		•	•

Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?

• Was adaptive management used or needed to ensure efficient resource use?	•	•	•
• Were the accounting and financial systems in place adequate for Project management and producing accurate and timely financial information?	•	•	•
• Were progress reports produced accurately, timely and respond to reporting requirements including adaptive management changes?	•	•	•
• Was Project implementation as cost effective as originally proposed (planned vs. actual)?	•	•	•
• Was the leveraging of funds (co-financing) happening as planned?	•	•	•
• Were the findings, lessons learned and recommendations shared among Project stakeholders, UNDP and GEF Staff and other relevant organizations for ongoing Project adjustment and improvement?	•	•	•
• Did the Project mainstream gender considerations into its implementation?	•	•	•
• Which partnerships/linkages were facilitated? Can be considered sustainable?	•	•	•
• Did the Project take into account local capacity in design and implementation of the Project?	•	•	•

Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?

• Are sustainability issues adequately integrated in Project design?	•	•	•
• Did the Project adequately address financial and economic sustainability issues?	•	•	•
• Is there evidence that Project partners will continue their activities beyond Project support?	•	•	•
• Are laws, policies and frameworks being addressed through the Project, in order to address sustainability of key initiatives and reforms?	•	•	•

• Is the capacity in place at the national and local levels adequate to ensure sustainability of the results achieved to date?	•	•	•
• Are Project activities and results being replicated elsewhere and/or scaled up?	•	•	•
• What are the main challenges that may hinder sustainability of results?	•	•	•
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
• Will the project achieve its long-term goal to improve the coverage and management effectiveness of protected area system in Moldova?	•	•	•
• What is the level of sensitization and awareness about the protected area management approach?	•	•	•
• What is the impact of the demonstrated approach in private, public and/or at individual levels?	•	•	•
• Were cross-cutting issues identified and reflected during the project implementation?	•	•	•
• How could the Project build on its apparent successes and learn from its weaknesses in order to enhance the potential for impact of ongoing and future initiatives?	•	•	•
•	•	•	•

ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

<i>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution</i> 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	<i>Sustainability ratings:</i> 4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks	<i>Relevance ratings</i> 2. Relevant (R) 1.. Not relevant (NR) <i>Impact Ratings:</i> 3. Significant (S) 2. Minimal (M) 1. Negligible (N)
<i>Additional ratings where relevant:</i> 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 Form³

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

Name of Consultant: _____

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____

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

Signed at *place* on *date*

Signature: _____

³www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE⁴

- 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 Manual⁵)
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 rated⁶)
- 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

⁴The Report length should not exceed 50 pages in total (not including annexes).

⁵ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

⁶ 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.

- Project Finance:
- Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (*)
- UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (*) coordination, and operational issues

3.3 Project Results

- Overall results (attainment of objectives) (*)
- Relevance(*)
- Effectiveness & Efficiency (*)
- Country ownership
- Mainstreaming
- Sustainability (*)
- Impact

4. Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons

- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
- Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
- Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
- Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success

5. Annexes

- ToR
- Itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- Summary of field visits
- List of documents reviewed
- Evaluation Question Matrix
- Questionnaire used and summary of results
- Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

ANNEX G: EVALUATION REPORT CLEARANCE FORM

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

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

UNDP GEF RTA

Name: _ _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____