

Terms of Reference (TOR)



*Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.*

GEF funded Project on “Integrating Global Environment Commitments in Investment and Development Decision Making in Solomon Islands”

Job Title: International Consultant – Terminal Evaluation Specialist (Team Leader)
 Reports to: RSD Team Leader and US/T MECDM
 Application Deadline: 4th May 2016
 Type of Contract: Individual Contract
 Duty Station: (10 days in Duty Station and 10 days home Based)
 Language required: English
 Expected Duration: 20 working days over one month starting May 14 2018.

A. INTRODUCTION AND PROJECT BACKGROUND

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 Integrating Global Environment Commitments in Investment and Development Decision Making in Solomon Islands”(PIMS # 4928.)

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

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	Integrating Global Environment Commitments in Investment and Development Decision Making in Solomon Islands”			
GEF Project ID:	5045		<i>at endorsement (Million US\$)</i>	<i>at completion (Million US\$)</i>
UNDP Project ID:	00091738	GEF financing:	850,000	\$651,096.06 (NB as off 20/04/18 and should increase by end of project)
Country:	Solomon Islands	IA/EA own:	150,000	161,809.7
Region:	Asia Pacific	Government:	250,000	64,929.14 (NB estimated figure as of 20/04/18 and is likely to slightly increase by the end of the project)
Focal Area:	Multiple focal areas	Other:		
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	CD2 To generate, access and use	Total co-financing:	250,000	64,929.14 (NB estimated figure as of 20/04/18 and is likely to slightly

	information and knowledge CD3 To strengthen capacities to develop policy and legislative frameworks			increase by the end of the project)
Executing Agency:	UNDP	Total Project Cost:	1,250,000	877,834.9
Other Partners involved:	Solomon islands Government	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		29-Sep-14
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: 29-Sep-2017	Actual: 30 June 2018

BACKGROUND

Solomon Islands completed its National Capacity Self-Assessment (NCSA) in 2008. The NCSA identified some key cross cutting constraints impeding the country from meeting the obligations under the three Rio Conventions or even its own environment laws. These includes; ineffective legislation and policy framework; institutional, technical and capacity weaknesses; lack of public awareness and information sharing for sound environmental management and decision making; lack of mainstreaming environmental considerations, biodiversity conservation and sustainable development across government programmes; and gaps in human capacity and development. A National Environmental Capacity Development Action Plan (NECDAP) was developed as a result of the NCSA.

In 2011, a UNREDD Program was implemented. A key outcome of the UNREDD program is the Solomon Islands REDD+ Roadmap. The REDD+ Roadmap was endorsed by the cabinet in 2015 through this project-the IGECDMM Project collaboration with the Ministry of Forest and Research (MoFR) and the Ministry of Environment Climate Change Disaster Management and Meteorology (MECDM). The IGECDMM Project is a response to the key capacity constraints identified in the country's NCSA.

The Project goal is to deliver global environmental benefits across the three Rio Conventions through reduced deforestation and forest degradation (REDD+) by strengthening policy coordination and existing planning mechanisms. This requires the country to have, among others, the capacity to access and use data and information, as well as best practices for integrating global environmental priorities into planning, decision and reporting processes. To this end, the project's objective is to strengthen and institute a tiered network of key decision-makers, planners, and other stakeholders to catalyze and sustain reductions of deforestation and forest degradation in a way that meets objectives under the three Rio Conventions.

To that end, the project mainly use REDD+ Roadmap as the overarching framework to guide the strengthening of existing institutional arrangements to be more effective in meeting the Rio Conventions. The project is divided into three key components.

Component 1 focuses on strengthening the policy and institutional framework by integrating Rio Convention provisions into The Solomon Islands' sectoral policies that serve to meet national socio-economic development priorities. This mainstreaming exercise will be conducted in coordination with the REDD+ Roadmap to reinforce the legitimacy of these improved sectoral policies, programmes, plans and legislations.

Component 2 focuses on the establishment of an effective knowledge management system that addresses the Development Consent Process within the context of the Rio Conventions. The system will provide a strong tool for promoting multiple benefits within the REDD+ and monitoring the implications of safeguards. This component will especially support the national institutions responsible for the Rio Conventions in establishing clear, strong linkages

with the REDD+ safeguards in order to increase cost effectiveness in the implementation and monitoring of results toward meeting the objectives of the Rio Conventions in a highly harmonized fashion.

Component 3 aims to strengthen institutional sustainability of the project results by advancing awareness, understanding, and capacity of REDD+ as a means of developing nationally appropriate social and environmental safeguards respecting the guidance and safeguards of the UNFCCC Cancun Agreements.

The two key outcomes of the project are:

- i. Strengthened policy coordination and planning mechanism, and
- ii. Improved communication and dissemination of information related to Rio Conventions.

These outcomes will be measured through a set of output, process, and performance indicators. Output indicators include the preparation of an in-depth institutional analysis of information needs to enable an environmental management information system which improves overall monitoring and evaluation of the country's performance in implementing both the REDD+ Roadmap as well as the Rio Conventions. Process indicators include the convening of a national working group on land degradation that will facilitate better inter-agency communication, coordination, and collaboration with regard to the formulation of the National Land-Use Policy. Performance indicators include the set of learn-by-doing review of best practices for mainstreaming global environmental priorities into national planning from a REDD+ framework.

The UNDP Office in Solomon Islands was the implementing agency for this project and partners for implementation is the MECDM. The key beneficiaries include MECDM itself, Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock (MAL) and MoFR.

The Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management, and Meteorology (MECDM) is the executing entity for this project, and the project was developed in accordance with agreed policies and procedures between the Government of The Solomon Islands and UNDP. With the support of UNDP, MECMD will establish the necessary planning and management mechanisms and facilitate government decision-making to catalyze implementation of project activities and timely delivery of project outputs. The project was designed to be complementary to other related projects under implementation in The Solomon Islands, including those supported by the Global Environment Facility (GEF). Given these, careful attention will be given to coordinating project activities in such a way that activities are mutually supportive and opportunities capitalized to realize synergies and cost-effectiveness.

This project conforms to Programme Framework CD-3 of the GEF-5 Cross-Cutting Capacity Development Strategy, which calls for countries to strengthen capacities for developing policy and legislative frameworks. More precisely, this Cross-Cutting Capacity Development (CCCD) framework provides the vision for CCCD projects to integrate and mainstream Rio Convention obligations into The Solomon Islands' national environmental management framework by institutionalizing capacities to manage the global environment through the pursuit of sustainable development.

The project is also consistent with the programmatic objectives of the three GEF thematic focal areas of biodiversity, climate change and land degradation, the achievement and sustainability of which is dependent on the critical development of capacities (individual, organizational and systemic). Through the successful implementation of this project, The Solomon Islands' institutional and human resources will be strengthened to help implement MEAs and national policy instruments in a manner that fully reflects Rio Convention principles and obligations. Furthermore, this project is consistent with other GEF-funded activities such as the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).

The project will take an adaptive collaborative management approach to implementation, which calls for stakeholders to take an early and proactive role in the mainstreaming exercises, as well as to help identify and solve unexpected implementation barriers and challenges. By taking an approach, project activities and outputs can be more legitimately modified and adapted to maintain timely and cost-effective project performance and delivery.

B. SCOPE, RESPONSIBILITIES, ETHICS, EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

Objective and Scope

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.

Evaluator Ethics

The Evaluation consultant 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'](#)

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 (fill in [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 Honiara, Solomon Islands. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: Ministry of Environment Climate Change Disaster Management and Meteorology (MECDM), Ministry of Forest and Research (MoFR), and Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock (MAL).

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.

The consultant is expected to use personal and phone interviews as a means of collecting data on the performance and success of the project. The consultant can also make use of written questionnaires, which could be distributed to the project partners and stakeholders with the assistance of the project team. In addition, the consultant can use other data collection methods and evaluation methods in order to assess the project.

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 (mil. US\$)		Government (mill. US\$)		Partner Agency (mill. US\$)		Total (mill. US\$)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Actual	Actual
Grants	\$ 150,000	\$161,809.7					\$150,000	\$161,809.7
Loans/Concessions								
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In-kind support 			\$ 250,000	64,929.14 (NB estimate d figure as of 20/04/18 and is likely to slightly			\$ 250,000	64,929.14 (NB estimated figure as of 20/04/18 and is likely to slightly

				increase by the end of the project)				increase by the end of the project)
• Other								
Totals	\$150,00 0	\$161,809. 7	\$250,00 0	64,929.1 4			350,000	226,739.8 4

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 chapters providing a set of **conclusions, recommendations and lessons**. The report will have to provide convincing evidence to support its findings/ratings. Special attention will be paid to the Lessons Learned section. This should provide recommendations for replication and transfer of the experience related mainly to:

- Exit strategy;
- post-project sustainability of the efforts both in terms of governance and in terms of environmental benefits;
- capacity building;
- project achievements and challenges;
- mobilization of stakeholders and participation of the civil society;
- key institutional, technical and legal barriers found during the implementation of the project, and recommendations to address them in the future.

Implementation Arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Solomon Islands. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluator and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for him/her. The Evaluator will be responsible for liaising with the UNDP CO in Solomon Islands and the project team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

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](#)

C. EXPECTED OUTPUTS

The key product expected from the terminal evaluation is a comprehensive analytical report written in English that should follow the requirements indicated in Annex F. The terminal evaluation report will be a stand-alone document that substantiates its conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned. The report will have to provide convincing evidence to support its findings/ratings. The report, together with its annexes, will be submitted in electronic format in both, MS Word and pdf format.

Evaluation Deliverables

The evaluator 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.

The report shall be submitted and all further communication with UNDP regarding the implementation of this assignment should be addressed to:

Lynelle Popot

Team leader, Resilience & Sustainable Development (RSD)

UN Joint Presence Office

Ground Floor, ANZ Haus, Ranadi, Honiara, Solomon Islands

e-mail: Lynell.popot@undp.org

D. EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the evaluation will be 20days according to the following plan starting 14 May 2018:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation	3 days (recommended: 2-3)	3 rd week May 2018
Evaluation Mission	10 days (recommended: 7-10)	4 th week May and 1 st week June 2018
Draft Evaluation Report	5 days (recommended: 5-10)	2 nd week June 2018
Final Report	2 days (recommended: 1-2)	4 th week June 2018

E. THE CONSULTANT PROFILE

The evaluation team will be composed of (1 international / and 1 national evaluators). The International and National consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Prior Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

International Consultant (Team Leader)

The International Consultant shall be responsible for completing and delegating tasks as appropriate for the Terminal Evaluation to the National Counterpart. He/she will ensure the timely submission of the first draft and the final version of the Terminal Evaluation Report with incorporated comments from UNDP and others.

National Consultant (Team member)

The National Consultant will, jointly with, and under the supervision of the International Consultant, support the evaluation. He/she will be responsible to review documents, translate necessary documents and interpret interviews, meetings and other relevant events for the International Consultant. He/she will work as a liaison for stakeholders of the project and ensures all stakeholders of the project are aware of the purposes and methods of the evaluation and ensures all meetings and interviews take place in a timely and effective manner.

Provide logistical support for the evaluation mission as per travel schedule.

The consultants must satisfy the following qualifications:

COMPETENCIES

The evaluator must present the following qualifications:

International Consultant

Education (20%):

- A minimum Master degree in fields related to environmental science

Experience (65%)

- Minimum 10 years of relevant professional experience
- Knowledge and experience with UNDP and/or GEF monitoring and evaluation policies and procedures.
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
- Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s): Multi-focal areas cross-cutting capacity development projects
- Recent experience in evaluation of international donor driven development projects.
- Experience in the Asia Pacific region will be an advantage.

Competencies (15%):

- Demonstrable analytical skills;
- Competence in Adaptive Management, as applied to conservation or natural resource management;
- Excellent English communication skills;
- Excellent report writing skills
- Good knowledge of Solomon Pidgin is an asset.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

Education:	A minimum Master degree in fields related to environmental science	20
-------------------	--	-----------

Experience:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimum 10 years of relevant professional experience • Knowledge and experience with UNDP and/or GEF monitoring and evaluation policies and procedures. • Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies; • Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s): Multi-focal areas cross-cutting capacity development projects • Recent experience in evaluation of international donor driven development projects. • Experience in the Asia Pacific region will be an advantage 	65
Functional Competency:	<p>Demonstrable analytical skills;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Competence in Adaptive Management, as applied to conservation or natural resource management; • Excellent English communication skills; • Excellent report writing skills • Good knowledge of Solomon Pidgin is an asset. 	15

F. HOW TO APPLY

The application should contain:

The application should contain:

- **Cover letter** explaining why you are the most suitable candidate for the advertised position, a concise description of the bidders understanding of the consultancy assignment, a summary of the comments on the TOR, and a **brief methodology** on the proposed approach and conduct of the required work.
- **Confirmation of Interest document, template attached along with the ToR.**
- **Updated and signed P-11 along with your CV** to include qualifications/competencies and relevant past experience in similar projects and contact details of 2 professional referees who can certify your competencies, professionalism, quality of writing, presentation and overall suitability to this TOR
- Individual consultants will be evaluated based on a combination of factors including cover letter, the credentials on offer and brief interview (optional) and the offer which gives the **best value for money for the UNDP.**
- **Please duly fill the below financial proposal *and attach to the last page of the CV along with all other required documentation above.***
- To apply please access UNDP Jobs site <http://jobs.undp.org>.

G. FINANCIAL PROPOSAL

All Inclusive Lump Sum Fee: USD (_____) Or

All Inclusive Daily Fee: USD (_____)

Amount in words: (.....)

Note: Payments will be based on invoices on achievement of agreed milestones i.e. upon delivery of the services specified in the TOR and certification of acceptance by the UNDP. The applicant must factor in all possible costs in his/her **"All Inclusive Lump Sum Fee/Daily Fee"** financial proposal including his/her consultancy and professional fee, honorarium, communication cost such as telephone/internet usage, printing cost, return travel from home to office, ad-hoc costs, stationery costs, and any other foreseeable costs in this exercise. No costs other than what has been indicated in the financial proposal will be paid or reimbursed to the consultant. The UNDP will only pay for any unplanned travel outside of this TOR and Duty Station on actual basis and on submission of original bills/invoices and on prior agreement with UNDP officials. Daily per diems and costs for accommodation/meals/incidental expenses for such travel shall not exceed established local UNDP DSA rates.

For an Individual Contractor who is of 62 years of age or older, and on an assignment requiring travel, be it for the purpose of arriving at the duty station or as an integral duty required under the TOR, a full medical examination and statement of fitness to work must be provided. Such medical examination costs must be factored in to the financial proposal above. Medical examination is not a requirement for individuals on RLA contracts. Consultants are also required to comply with the UN security directives set forth under dss.un.org .

H. PAYMENT FOR SERVICES

The Terminal Evaluation Specialist shall receive payment from UNDP as follows:

%	Milestone
10%	Upon submission of inception report
40%	Following the submission and approval of the first draft terminal evaluation report
50%	Following the submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report

Approved by: _____
Name/designation/Signature

ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators			Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Indicator	Baseline value	Target value and date		
Long-term goal: To strengthen institutional capacities that contribute to policy development and improved implementation of the three Rio Conventions from a REDD+ framework					
Project objectives: A. To enhance the capacity of relevant policy	Outcome indicators: ▪ Institutional capacity and interagency	▪ Institutional capacities for managing the Rio Conventions is	By the end of the project: ▪ Government staff have learned,	▪ Meeting	▪ Insufficient commitment at district level to test forest management

and institutional stakeholders to enable compliance with the three Rio Conventions and other MEAs	<p>coordination are strengthened for improved implementation of the Rio Conventions within national planning frameworks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Global environmental priorities are mainstreamed into REDD+ management framework ▪ Awareness of the linkages between the Rio Conventions and REDD+ forest management 	<p>piecemeal and takes place through Rio Convention-specific projects, with development emphasizing poverty alleviation and other socio-economic priorities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Requirements of the Rio Conventions are not adequately incorporated in sectoral development planning or Development Consent Processes ▪ Best practices and lessons learned from mainstreaming Rio Conventions into REDD+ framework are not readily accessed or tested. ▪ Planners and decision-makers do not fully appreciate the value of the Rio Conventions, the result of which is that the global 	<p>applied, and tested best practice tools to integrate Rio Conventions into forest and agriculture sector development plans</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Rio Convention priorities will be mainstreamed within the Development Consent Processes and government staff will be trained on revised environmental management information system ▪ There is a minimum of 20% increase in the understanding of the Rio Convention mainstreaming among government staff ▪ There is a minimum of 15% increase in the appreciation of the Rio Conventions among the general public ▪ There is a minimum of 	<p>Minutes³</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Working Group meeting reports ▪ UNDP quarterly progress reports ▪ Independent final evaluation reports ▪ Rio Convention national reports and communications ▪ GoSI and provincial government decisions (with respect to testing REDD+ approach to management) ▪ GEF Cross-Cutting Capacity Development Scorecard ▪ Statistical analyses of surveys 	<p>plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Planners and decision-makers are resistant to adopt new attitudes towards the global environment ▪ The project will be executed in a transparent, holistic, adaptive, and collaborative manner ▪ Government staff and non-state stakeholder representatives are actively engaged in the project ▪ Policy and institutional reforms and modifications recommended by the project and the REDD+ Roadmap are politically, technically, and financially feasible
---	---	--	---	---	---

³ Meeting minutes includes records of key meetings such as local, regional and national consultations regarding inputs on the design and implementation of the relevant output and associated activities. Meetings may be individual or group meetings, with government officials or non-state stakeholders.

		environment is heavily discounted	25% increase in the acceptance by government representatives and other stakeholder representatives of the legitimacy of REDD+ and its accompanying Roadmap		
Outcome 1: Institutional capacities to implement Rio Conventions are strengthened					
Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators			Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Outcome Indicator	Baseline value	Target value and date		
Output 1.1 Strengthen organizational capacities of the REDD+ Implementation Unit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> REDD+ Implementation unit has mandate to coordinate CCCD activities National REDD+ Committee and Focal Points formally established Memoranda of Agreement between REDD+ Committee and national working groups Working group on land degradation Training workshops for inter-agency cooperation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> REDD+ organizational structures are still inchoate and in need of clearly defined mandates Evidence of public sector staff's technical capacities related to the Rio Conventions is limited 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementation unit receives mandate by month 3 National REDD+ Committee and Focal Points formally recognized by month 3 MOU signed by month 4 Working group on land degradation established by month 8 Training workshops for inter-agency cooperation convened by month 12 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meeting minutes Tracking and progress report MOA Training workshop materials Official letters of endorsement from district and national government authorities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Institutions and working groups are open to proposed coordination agreements and there is no active institutional resistance
Output 1.2: Global environmental priorities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analytical framework for integrating Rio Conventions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no systematic approach or institutional 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analytical framework finalized by month 6 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meeting minutes Tracking and progress 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analytical framework is not seen as mutually

mainstreamed into selected development plans	<p>into forest and agriculture sector planning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Working groups for Rio Convention mainstreaming in forest and agriculture sector and provincial development plan Technical training sessions on mainstreaming global environmental priorities into development plans Pilot forest management project Report on lessons learned from pilot forest management approach 	<p>procedures to integrate environmental conservation priorities and Rio Convention provisions into socio-economic development planning processes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Commitment to Rio Convention provisions are not evident Sector development plans do not adequately address Rio Convention obligations Implementation of sector development plans emphasize socio-economic priorities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analytical framework is revised per COP decisions by month 20 and by month 32 High quality rating of analytical framework by peer review experts Working groups established by month 3 Technical training sessions held by month 7 and updated annually by months 15 and 27 Pilot project begins by month 13 and ends by month 24 Lessons learned report drafted by month 27, finalized by month 33, and presented in stakeholder workshops by month 33 All Rio Convention Focal Points endorse analytical framework by months 13, again by month 21 and finally by month 33 	<p>report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analytical Framework Integrated Rio Convention sector development plans Lessons learned report Endorsement letters 	<p>exclusive from other analytical frameworks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development partners in The Solomon Islands support analytical framework and pilot project High and sustained commitment at the district level as well at the national level support to test integrated development plans Project enjoys champions at the national and district levels Pilot implementation of the integrated REDD+ forest management is overall successful Report will be read and valued by target recipients
Output 1.3: Resource mobilization strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resource mobilization strategy and plan for National REDD+ 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strategy and plan drafted, reviewed, and finalized by month 7 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meeting minutes Tracking and progress reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expert peer reviewers follow through with quality reviews

	<p>Roadmap</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Feasibility study and consultations on REDD+ Roadmap implementation		<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Feasibility study on financial and economic instruments to implement REDD+ Roadmap completed by month 12▪ Expert working group is made of at least 20 rotating members, who will undertake a review of the drafts of the strategy, plan, and feasibility study, and meet at least once to discuss the findings of each within one month of their completion, i.e., by months 8 and 13▪ Feasibility study and plan are rated as high quality⁴	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Peer reviewers' consent forms▪ Feasibility study▪ Resource mobilization strategy and plan▪	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Analyses are deemed legitimate, relevant, and valid among all key stakeholder representatives and project champions▪ Strategy and plan developed by the project are politically, technically, and financially feasible
Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators			Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Indicator	Baseline value	Target value and date		
Outcome 2: Mainstream Rio Conventions into the Development Consent Process					
Output 2.1: Global environmental priorities and REDD+ Safeguards are integrated within the EIS and PER processes	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Safeguards framework▪ Strengthened EIA guidelines▪ Training and workshops for revised guidelines▪ Linked National Forest	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ The current Development Consent Process lacks clarity and oversight and does not adequately reflect Rio Convention obligations	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Safeguards framework drafted by month 9, peer reviewed and finalized by month 12▪ Strengthened EIA guidelines drafted by month 6, peer-	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Meeting minutes▪ Tracking and progress reports▪ Peer reviewer comments▪ Safeguards framework▪ Strengthened	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Expert peer reviewers follow through with quality reviews▪ Revised guidelines are deemed legitimate, relevant, and valid among all

⁴ Ratings will be based on a set of 12 criteria on a scale of 1 to 5.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitoring System database Formal approval of National Safeguard Information System Study on ecosystem services valuation within EIS and PER processes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land-cover databases are not linked to Development Consent Process Impacts to environmental services are not accounted for within EIS and PER processes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> reviewed and finalized by month 8 Letters of endorsement by month 4 Training programmes by month 17 and 25 Study on ecosystem services valuation drafted by month 20, peer-reviewed by month 24, and finalized for distribution by month 32 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EIA guidelines Training materials Linked databases Official letters of endorsement from government authorities Study on ecosystem services valuation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> key stakeholder representatives and project champions Safeguards framework is politically, technically, and financially feasible
Output 2.2: Improved environmental management information system and National Forest Monitoring System	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analysis of information needs Working group meetings to draft proposal of improved EMIS Unified data format for all government institutions Training programme and resource materials for EMIS and NFMS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing socio-economic and environmental data are managed in a highly disorganized and fragmented manner with little awareness of Rio Convention obligations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analysis of information needs completed by month 5 Working group meets by month 3 and 9 Draft proposal of improved EMIS by month 13 and finalized by month 16 Unified format by month 22 Training programme and materials by month 24 Training programme implemented by month 15 and month 27 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meeting minutes Tracking and progress reports Peer reviewer comments Analysis of needs Draft proposal Training programme resources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expert peer reviewers follow through with quality reviews Analyses are deemed legitimate, relevant, and valid among all key stakeholder representatives and project champions Strategy and plan developed by the project are politically, technically, and financially feasible
Project	Objectively verifiable indicators			Sources of	Risks and

Strategy	Indicator	Baseline value	Target value and date	verification	Assumptions
Outcome 3: Awareness of the linkages between Rio Conventions and REDD+ is raised					
Output 3.1: Project launch and results conferences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One-day Kick-Off conference raises high profile of Rio Convention mainstreaming into sectoral policies and plans, and REDD+ One-day project results conference to showcase lessons learned and opportunities for replication 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Awareness of Rio Convention mainstreaming is limited, with stakeholders not fully appreciating the value of conserving the global environment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One-day Kick-Off conference is held by month 3 One-day Project Results conference is held between months 32 and 34 Over 200 participants attend both conferences 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conference registration lists Meeting minutes Tracking and progress reports Conference report 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participation to the conference assumes that most all stakeholders will attend the conference Concurrent panel discussions will not significantly limit conference attendance Conference will further enhance support for Rio Convention mainstreaming
Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators			Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Indicator	Baseline value	Target value and date		
Output 3.2: Public awareness implementation plan and survey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analysis of The Solomon Islands' awareness and understanding of the link between environment and development (survey results) Comprehensive public awareness plan developed to organize and convene 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Solomon Islands has been carrying out a number of activities to promote environmental consciousness, including with support from development partners. However, these have focused on specific thematic issues Articles on the Rio Conventions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Broad-based surveys (N>250) completed by month 3 and month 34 Independent analysis by month 35 Public awareness plan completed by month 5 9 articles by end of project: 1 article by month 6, 4 by month 18, and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public awareness campaign plan Meeting minutes Tracking and progress reports Survey instrument Statistical and sociological analysis of survey results Survey responses Published 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public attitudes towards environment are not too negative that they are willing to participate in awareness raising activities There is sufficient commitment from policy-makers to maintain long-term support to public

	<p>targeted activities to promote the Rio Conventions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Articles on Rio Convention mainstreaming in popular literature ▪ High school and university education modules and accompanying lecture material on the global environment ▪ Public service announcement on practices to safeguard global environmental benefits 	<p>are being published, but in specialized literature that is largely read by environmental supporters or in the popular literature during crisis events, with few exceptions</p>	<p>7 by month 30</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Articles on Rio Convention mainstreaming are also published as brochures, at 100 copies each, and distributed to at least two high value special events, at least 9 by month 20 and at least 18 by month 32 ▪ By month 34, statistical and sociological analysis of broad-based survey shows at least 20% increase in the understanding of Rio Convention mainstreaming values and opportunities ▪ By month 31, reporting in the popular literature on Rio Convention mainstreaming shows a 10% increase over business as usual forecast ▪ High school and SINU education module on Rio Conventions and accompanying lecture material are 	<p>articles</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Published brochures ▪ High school and university education module and accompanying lecture materials ▪ Meeting minutes ▪ Tracking and progress reports 	<p>awareness raising activities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Development partners implementing parallel public awareness campaigns are willing to modify, as appropriate, their activities to supporting the awareness activities of the present project to create synergies and achieve cost-effectiveness ▪ Survey respondents contribute their honest attitudes and values ▪ Changes in awareness and understanding of Rio Convention mainstreaming can be attributed to project activities (survey questionnaire can address this issue) ▪ Articles published in the popular media will be read and not skipped over ▪ Brochures will be read and
--	---	---	---	---	--

			<p>completed by month 8</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 10 high schools and SINU have implemented education module by month 20 At least 20 high schools have implemented education module by month 32 		<p>the content absorbed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> High school education module will be popular with teachers, students, and their parents Government and schools will agree to expand environmental studies to a full course and offer in all high schools The Solomon Islands National University will be willing to incorporate module
Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators			Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Indicator	Baseline value	Target value and date		
Output 3.3: Awareness-raising dialogues and workshops	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expert panel discussions on synergies between Rio Conventions and business Annual public constituent meetings on Rio Convention mainstreaming Awareness-raising workshop at the provincial level on implications of Rio 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The private sector is primarily focused on traditional approaches to maximizing profits, seeing environmental issues as an added transaction cost that reduces profits Provincial-level government representatives are not familiar with approaches to mainstream 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Three (3) panel discussions, with at least 50 private sector representatives, one held each year, the first by month 8 At least four provincial awareness workshops on Rio Convention mainstreaming and REDD+ implementation, one held by month 9 and the last by month 33, with at least 50 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meeting minutes Tracking and progress reports Participant registration lists Awareness and sensitization workshop reports Public dialogue meeting reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Private sector representatives are open to learn about Rio Convention mainstreaming values and opportunities, and will actively work to support project objectives Participation to the public dialogues attracts people that are new to the concept of Rio

	<p>Conventions to local socio-economic priorities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased sensitization and understanding on Rio Convention mainstreaming values 	<p>Rio Convention into provincial development plans</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The general public in The Solomon Islands remains generally unaware or unconcerned about the contribution of the Rio Conventions to meeting and satisfying local and national socio-economic priorities 	<p>district government representatives attending each</p>		<p>Convention mainstreaming, as well as detractors, with the assumption that dialogues will help convert their attitudes in a positive way</p>
Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators			Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Indicator	Baseline value	Target value and date		
<p>Output 3.4:</p> <p>Internet visibility of Rio Convention mainstreaming via REDD+</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Website for REDD+ and Rio Convention mainstreaming activities A new website that serves as a form of clearing house on Rio Convention mainstreaming Facebook page on Rio Convention mainstreaming 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are websites that promote environmental issues in The Solomon Islands, but they are poorly linked, often outdated and tend to focus on topical issues, such as water, energy, sea level rise, and air pollution. Government websites, if they exist, tend to be outdated with sparse details on activities No websites 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New website that provides clear guidance and best practices for Rio Convention mainstreaming by month 9 Website is regularly updated, at least once a month with new information, articles, and relevant links on Rio Convention mainstreaming. Number of visits to website shows sustained and increasing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meeting minutes Tracking and progress reports Survey results Website and unique site visits using site meters Facebook 'likes' 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interest in environmental issues can be distinguished from rising interest on Rio Convention mainstreaming

		could be found that promoted an integrated Rio Convention and socio-economic development approach	<p>interest over the project life cycle</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Facebook page created by month 9 ▪ At least 500 Facebook likes by month 31 		
--	--	---	---	--	--

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

Document	Description
Project document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Document
Project reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inception Report • Implementing/Executing partner arrangements • Project budget and financial data • Project Mid Term Review (MTR) Report
Technical documents produced by the project	<p>Terms of Reference and reports for the following contracts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • International Technical Specialist • REDD+ Specialist • Environmental Economist • Environment and Customary Law Specialist • Environment Safeguard Specialist • Social Safeguard Specialist • Forest Inventory Specialist • Community Consultation and Stakeholder Engagement Specialist • LOA with Solomon Islands National University (SINU) • SINU materials Editor

Other relevant materials:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Board meeting minutes • Annual work programs and reports • Project budget revisions • Financial Audit Reports • National and local strategic and legal documents <p>List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Boards, and other partners to be consulted</p> <p>Project Staff</p> <p>Hayley Kouto, Project Manager: Hayley.kouto@undp.org or phone +677 23107</p> <p>Eric Houma, Project Assistant: eric.houma@undp.org or phone+677 23107</p> <p>Project Board</p> <p>Azusa Kubota, UNDP SOI Country Manager: azusa.kubota@undp.org</p> <p>Dr Melchior Mataka, Permanent Secretary, MECDM: mmataka@mecm.gov.sb</p> <p>Dr Vaeno Vigulu, Permanent Secretary, MoFR: ps@mofr.gov.sb</p> <p>Jimi Saelea, Permanent Secretary, MAL: Jimi.Saelea@sig.gov.sb</p> <p>Lynelle Popot, Team leader, UNDP SOI RSD: Lynelle.popot@undp.org</p> <p>Project Technical Review Committee</p> <p>Joe Horokou, Director MECDM: horokoujoe@gmail.com</p> <p>Hudson Kauhiona: Deputy Director, MECDM: hkhiona@gmail.com</p> <p>David Tufi, MECDM: dmtufi@gmail.com</p> <p>Agnetha Vave Karamui, MECDM: AVave-Karamui@mecdm.gov.sb</p> <p>Terrence Titiulu, Deputy Commissioner of Forest, MoFR: ttitiulurukale@gmail.com</p> <p>Kedson Ago, Director, MoFR: agokedz@gmail.com</p> <p>Samuel Vazu, Pitakia, Under Secretary, Acting, MoFR: svazu@mofr.gov.sb</p> <p>Cathy Unga: MoFR: cathyunga@gmail.com</p> <p>Gideon Solo: MoFR: gsolo@mofr.gov.sb</p> <p>Chris Wagatora, MoFR: chrizegi@gmail.com</p>
---------------------------	--

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?			
• To what extent is the project suited to national development priorities and policies?	•	•	•
• To what extent is the project in line with GEF /UNDP operational programs?	•	•	•
• To what extent are the objectives and design of the project supporting regional environment and development priorities?	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
• Has the project been effective in achieving the expected outcomes and objectives?	•	•	•
• To what extent has the project increased institutional capacity (at national and island level) to help build the capacity of the line ministries responsible for the RIO conventions.	•	•	•
• How was the project able to influence monitoring and implementation of the REDD+ roadmap and process?	•	•	•
• What were the risks involved and to what extent were they managed?	•	•	•
• What lessons have been learned from the project regarding achievement of outcomes?	•	•	•
• What changes could have been made (if any) to the design of the project in order to improve the achievement of the project's expected results?	•	•	•
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?			

• How cost-effective were project interventions? To what extent was project support provided in an efficient way?	•	•	•
• How efficient were partnership arrangements for the project and why?	•	•	•
• Did the project efficiently utilize local capacity in implementation?	•	•	•
• What lessons can be drawn regarding efficiency for other similar projects in the future?	•	•	•
• Was project support provided in an efficient way?	•	•	•
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
• What risk have affected/influenced the project and in what ways?	•	•	•
• How were these risks managed?	•	•	•
• What lessons can be drawn regarding sustainability of project results?	•	•	•
• What changes could have been made (if any) to the design of the project in order to improve the sustainability of the project results?	•	•	•
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
• To what extent has the project contributed to a) integrating global environment commitment into the environment safeguards to support the REDD+ process	•	•	•
• What lessons can be drawn regarding contributions towards the REDD+ process of the country	•	•	•
• Are stakeholders more aware about the RIO convention safeguards established under the project? Which ones?	•	•	•

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 Form⁵

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: _____

⁵www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE⁶

- 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 Manual⁷)
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 rated⁸)
- 3.1 Project Design / Formulation
 - Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)
 - Assumptions and Risks
 - Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design
 - Planned stakeholder participation
 - Replication approach
 - UNDP comparative advantage
 - Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
 - Management arrangements
- 3.2 Project Implementation
 - Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
 - Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)
 - Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management
 - Project Finance:
 - Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (*)

⁶The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

⁷ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

⁸ 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.

- 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: _____