



Au service  
des peuples  
et des nations

## TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE FINAL EVALUATION

### I. INTRODUCTION

#### UNDP-GEF M&E Policy

UNDP-GEF's M&E policy is available on-line at: <http://www.undp.org/gef/05/monitoring/policies.html>. In accordance with the policy, all projects are encouraged to conduct final evaluations. In addition to providing an independent in-depth review of implementation progress, this type of evaluation is responsive to GEF Council decisions on transparency and better access of information during implementation.

The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) policy at the project level in UNDP/GEF has four objectives:

- i) **to monitor and evaluate results and impacts;**
- ii) **to provide a basis for decision making on necessary amendments and improvements;**
- iii) **to promote accountability for resource use;**
- iv) **to document, provide feedback on, and disseminate lessons learned. A mix of tools is used to ensure effective project M&E. These might be applied continuously throughout the lifetime of the project – e.g. periodic monitoring of indicators -, or as specific time-bound exercises such as final reviews, audit reports and independent evaluations.**

Final evaluations are intended to identify project results, assess progress regarding final objectives, document lessons learned (including lessons that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP/GEF projects), and to make recommendations regarding specific actions that might be taken to improve final results and products of the project. It is expected to serve as a means of validating or filling the gaps in the initial assessment of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency obtained from monitoring.

#### THE PRIVATE SECTOR LED DEVELOPMENT OF ON-GRID WIND POWER IN TUNISIA PROJECT

**The Private Sector Led Development of On-grid Wind Power in Tunisia** project aims at promoting on-grid wind power in Tunisia through the introduction of the necessary regulatory and institutional framework to create favourable conditions for private sector investors in the renewable energy sector. A secondary objective is to assist the government of Tunisia in launching a program of private wind concessions totalling 100 MW. In order to achieve those objectives, the project strategic framework in the original project document outlined that four outcomes would be achieved: **(1) establishing a regulatory and institutional framework that is conducive to on-grid renewables, including a power sector arbitration mechanism; (2), strengthening the technical and organizational capabilities of key stakeholders, including ANME (the RE/EE agency), STEG (the Transmission System Operator) and local Tunisian companies; (3) providing technical assistance to the IPP Bureau in evaluating concession models and developing a tariff settlement mechanism; and (4) providing project monitoring and evaluation support.**

It is a \$2 million project funded by the global environment Facility (GEF), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the Government of Tunisia: cash and in-kind contributions

The National Agency for Energy Conservation (ANME) is the executing Agency. A Steering Committee (SC) was created upon signature of the project document. The terms of reference (TOR) for the SC were drafted and the

first meeting was held in July 2009. Furthermore, a round table conference was organised in December 2009, where all the stakeholders were actively involved. They expressed their needs for capacity building and also gave recommendations related to the project outcomes in order to ensure its success. In addition, based on the steering committee recommendation, the situation analysis of the project was updated and disseminated to the steering committee members, in order to take into account all the measures adopted by Tunisian Government regarding renewable energy since the approval of the project by the GEF in 2007.

The project document was signed in July 2009 for an initial duration of three years. And The Project Management Unit (PMU) started working officially in February 2010. The project was extended until December 2013 further to the mid-term evaluation. The operational extension extended until September 2014 in order to finalize on-going activities in order to disseminate the project results, and conduct the final evaluation.

### **Expected Project Results**

The progress towards the achievement of the project's objectives is to be measured against the project logical framework, which was itself revised and updated following the project's Mid-Term Evaluation.

## **2. EVALUATION AUDIENCE**

This Final Evaluation is initiated by UNDP as the GEF Implementing Agency. It aims to provide stakeholders, including the National Agency for Energy Conservation and UNDP, with an objective, independent assessment of the project's performance and to provide the basis for learning and accountability.

## **3. OBJECTIVES OF THE FINAL EVALUATION**

The Final Evaluation serves as an agent of change and plays a critical role in supporting accountability. Its main objectives are:

1. To assess the lessons-learned from the project and its effects regarding the development of the wind sector.
2. To measure accountability for the achievement of the GEF objective.
3. To enhance organizational and development learning.
4. To enable informed decision-making.

## **4. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION**

The scope of the evaluation will cover:

- All components of the GEF-funded project.
- The co-financed components, such as the UNDP TRAC, Government cost-sharing fund, and the in-kind contributions from the Government, which have been included in the project document.
- The final lessons-learned and achievements with regards to project design, implementation and management.

The Final Evaluation will cover the following aspects:

### **I. Progress towards Results**

- ***Changes in development conditions:***  
Assess the progress towards the following:

- Has there been any change during the project period? Has there been any enhanced engagement by the Government to promote a program of private wind energy concession together with the new renewable law?
  - How has the broader context evolved to affect the project in achieving its stated objective, both positively (i.e. changes supportive of the project's objectives), or negatively (i.e. changes in the broader context that generate constraints to achieve the project's objectives)?
- **Measurement of change:** Progress towards results should be based on a comparison of indicators before and after the project's achievement. Progress can also be assessed by measuring, inter alia, the changes in the regulatory and institutional frameworks for self-production and private power generation concession, and the benefits of the technical assistance and training provided by the project.
  - **Project strategy:** how and why outcomes (listed as outputs) in the project document, result log-frame, and strategies contribute to the achievement of all expected results:
    - Examine their relevance and whether they provided the most effective route towards future results (development of wind and renewable concessions).
    - Assess adequacy of the revised log-frame and indicators in responding to the GEF strategic priorities and achieving the project objective.
    - Assess if the logical framework, indicators and baseline developed during the inception phase and outlined in the 2010-2013 PIRs represented the best project strategy for monitoring and measuring the progress.
  - **Sustainability:** assess the extent to which the benefits of the project will be sustained, within or outside the project domain, after it has come to an end. Relevant factors include, for example: development of a sustainability strategy, establishment of financial and economic instruments and mechanisms, mainstreaming project objectives into the economy or community production activities.
  - **Gender perspective:** Extent to which the project accounts for gender differences when developing and applying project interventions. How were gender considerations mainstreamed into project interventions and how could this approach have been strengthened.

## II. Project's Adaptive Management Framework

### (a) Monitoring Systems

- Assess the monitoring tools used:
  - Did they provide the necessary information?
  - Did they involve key partners?
  - Were they efficient?
  - Were additional tools required?
- Reconstruct baseline data if necessary. Reconstruction should follow participatory processes and can be achieved in conjunction with a learning exercise.
- Ensure the monitoring system, including performance indicators, at least met GEF minimum requirements<sup>1</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> See section 3.2 of the GEF's "Monitoring and Evaluation Policies and Procedures", available at <http://www.undp.org/gef/05/monitoring/policies.html>

- Complete the GEF Tracking Tool and provide an assessment of the GHG mitigation performance of the project, relative to expectations (as described in the Project Document and the Mid-Term Review) and relative to similar projects elsewhere.

#### **(b) Risk Management**

- Validate whether the risks identified in the project document and PIRs were indeed the most important and whether the risk ratings applied were appropriate. If not, explain why. Describe any additional risks identified and suggest risk ratings and possible risk management strategies that the project could/should have adopted.
- Assess the project's risk identification and management systems:
  - Was the UNDP-GEF Risk Management System<sup>2</sup> appropriately applied (with particular emphasis on the financial risks related to micro-grants)?
  - Were risks adequately internalized into the project strategy? If not, how could the UNDP-GEF Risk Management System have been used to strengthen project management?

#### **(c) Work Planning**

- Assess the use of the logical framework as a management tool during implementation and any changes made to it
  - Ensure the logical framework met UNDP-GEF requirements in terms of format and content
  - What impact did the retro-fitting of impact indicators have on project management?
- Assess the use of routinely updated work plans. Were they used to respond to the revised logical framework?
- Assess the use of electronic information technologies to support implementation, participation and monitoring, as well as other project activities
- Were work-planning processes result-based? If not, suggest ways that work planning could/should have been re-orientated.
- Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions. Any irregularities must be noted.

#### **(d) Reporting**

- Assess how adaptive management changes were reported by the project management.
- Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

### **Underlying Factors**

- Assess the underlying factors beyond the project's immediate control that influenced outcomes and results. Consider the appropriateness and effectiveness of the project's management strategies for these factors.
- Test the assumptions made by the project management.
- Evaluate the final results of the project and examine its impacts on the sector, partnerships, etc.
- Assess the effect of any incorrect assumptions made by the project.

### **UNDP Contribution**

---

<sup>2</sup> UNDP-GEF's system is based on the Atlas Risk Module. See the UNDP-GEF Risk Management Strategy resource kit, available as Annex XI at <http://www.undp.org/gef/05/monitoring/policies.html>

- Assess the role of UNDP against the requirements set out in the UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Results. Consider:
  - Field visits
  - Steering committee/TOR follow-up and analysis
  - PIR preparation and follow-up
  - Combined Delivery Report
  - Quarterly Progress and Financial Report
  - GEF guidance
- Consider the new UNDP requirements outlined in the UNDP User Guide, especially the Project Assurance role, and ensure they are incorporated into the project's adaptive management framework.
- Assess the contribution to the project from UNDP "soft" assistance (i.e. policy advice & dialogue, advocacy, coordination, use of knowledge products and worldwide experience to the benefit of the project) looking specifically at linkages and synergies with other UNDP practice areas (e.g. governance, gender, poverty, etc.). Suggest measures to strengthen UNDP's soft assistance to the project management.

### Partnership Strategy

- Assess how partners were involved in the project's adaptive management framework:
  - Involving partners and stakeholders in the selection of indicators and other measures of performance
  - Using already existing data and statistics
  - Analysing progress towards results and determining project strategies.
- Assess how local stakeholders participated in project management and decision-making. Include an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the approach adopted by the project and suggestions for improvement if necessary.
- Consider the dissemination of project information to partners and stakeholders.

### Project finance / co-finance

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								
• In-kind support								
• Other								
Totals								

## 5. METHODOLOGY OR EVALUATION APPROACH

An outline of an evaluation approach is provided below. However, it should be made clear that the consultant is responsible for revising the approach as necessary. Any changes should be in line with international criteria

and professional norms and standards (as adopted by the UN Evaluation Group<sup>3</sup>). They must be also cleared by UNDP before being applied by the evaluation team.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. It must be easily understood by project partners.

The Evaluation will be carried out by the team through:

- (i) Documentation review (desk study); the list of documentation to be reviewed is included as an Annex to the TORs. All documents will be provided in advance by the Project Management Unit and/or UNDP.
- (ii) Interviews will be held with the following organizations and persons as a minimum
  - **UNDP:** DRR, Energy and Environment Team, GEF Regional Technical Adviser.
  - **National Agency for Energy Conservation:** National Project Director (NPD),
  - **Project team:** Project Manager, Project Management Unit.

#### **Stakeholders**

- Director General of ANME
  - Head of planning and studies department at ANME
  - Head of Independent Power Producer Group unit (GIPP),
  - Head of the Tunisian Company for Electricity and Gas (STEG),
  - Ministry of Industry and Technology: Head of the General Directorate for Energy (DGE)
  - STEG Renewable Energies (STEG EnR)
  - GEF Focal Point
  - Climate Change national Focal Point
  - Private sector
  - CSOs
- (iii) **Presentation of findings** – the consultant will present his/her preliminary findings to the national counterparts (Ministries, Agencies, PMU, and UNDP) prior to the preparation of the final report.

To the extent possible, and in order to ensure the independent nature of the evaluation, the consultant will meet with the different stakeholders in the absence of the PMU/UNDP. The PMU and UNDP will facilitate access and organize mission schedules in support of the evaluation; the consultant may request additional meetings as deemed necessary. In keeping with the same independent spirit, the findings and recommendations of the consultant cannot be altered, but factual corrections may be suggested by the counterparts and a management response is to be prepared by the PMU and national counterparts upon submission of the final report.

## **6. CONSULTANT'S PROFILE**

The consultant is required to combine international project evaluation expertise (ideally in the specific context of GEF and UNDP projects), the latest thinking in knowledge and management of renewable energies projects, and ideally knowledge of the Tunisian energy/regulatory context.

#### **Consultant Qualities:**

- Recent experience with result-based management evaluation;

---

<sup>3</sup> See <http://www.uneval.org/>

- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- Experience undertaking GEF or other donor evaluations or Final Reviews, particularly in the Arab region.
- Recent knowledge of the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy;
- Recent knowledge of UNDP's results-based evaluation policies and procedures;
- Competence in renewable energies especially wind energy;
- Demonstrable analytical skills;
- Expertise in Climate Change, Energy Management and Renewable Energy;
- Fluent French – in writing, reading and speaking;
- Possess excellent English reading and writing skills so as to be able to write the evaluation report in English.

The evaluation will be undertaken in-line with GEF principles<sup>4</sup>:

- Independence
- Impartiality
- Transparency
- Disclosure
- Ethical
- Partnership
- Competencies and Capacities
- Credibility
- Utility

The evaluator must be independent from both the policy-making process and the delivery and management of assistance. Therefore, applications will not be considered from evaluators who have had any direct involvement with the design or implementation of the project. Any previous association with the project, UNDP-Tunisia or other partners/stakeholders must be disclosed in the application. This applies equally to firms submitting proposals as it does to individual evaluators.

If selected, failure to make the above disclosures will be considered just grounds for immediate contract termination, without recompense. In such circumstances, all notes, reports and other documentation produced by the evaluator will be retained by UNDP.

## **7. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS**

### **Management arrangements**

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation lies with UNDP-Tunisia. The UNDP Tunisia Country Office is the responsible for liaising with the project team to set up the stakeholder interviews, arrange the field visits and co-ordinate with National Agency for Energy Conservation and the other counterparts.

Although the final report must be cleared and accepted by UNDP before being made public, the UNDP Evaluation Policy is clear that the evaluation function should be structurally independent from operational management and decision-making functions in the organization. The evaluation team will be free from undue influence and has full authority to submit reports directly to appropriate levels of decision-making. UNDP management will not impose restrictions on the scope, content, comments and recommendations of

---

<sup>4</sup> See p.16 of the GEF's Monitoring and Evaluation Policy

evaluation reports. In the case of unresolved difference of opinions between any of the parties, UNDP may request the consultant to set out the differences in an annex to the final report.

### **Time frame**

The effort required for the evaluation is **30man-Days**, extending over the 9-weeks period, with the draft report being available for comment 5 weeks after the signature of the contract with UNDP. A schedule of activities is set out below.

### **Resources, logistical support and deadlines**

- 7 working days to complete in two weeks: preparation before field work– Home-based: to review documents, obtain necessary project background or supporting documents, finalize evaluation methodology, prepare learning sessions, surveys etc, develop hypotheses about the project strategies and management and consider methods for testing hypotheses.
- 8 days field work –: evaluators are expected to work 6-day a week when on mission. With the evaluation’s emphasis on the project’s adaptive management framework, the consultant is expected to work closely with the project team. The in-country period will include learning sessions with the project team and other adaptive management strengthening measures.
- 8 working days – desk-based: after the mission to prepare the first draft of the evaluation report.
- TWO weeks for comments on the draft report – not paid time: The draft Final Evaluation report should be submitted to the Resident Representative of UNDP Tunisia. UNDP Tunisia should analyze, provide comments and share it with different stakeholders. The UNDP Regional Centre Unit may also provide comments on the draft report.
- 7 working days to integrate the comments and finalize the evaluation report – desk-based: The consultant will incorporate the comments into the final version within one week of receiving the comments. The consultant is responsible for ensuring matters of fact are revised in the report, but matters of opinion may be reflected at their discretion. The final report must be cleared and accepted by UNDP. In the case of any unresolved difference of opinions between any of the parties, UNDP may instruct the consultant to set out the differences in an annex to the final report.


NB: The distribution of man / days mentioned above is given as an indication. The planning could be discussed during the inception meeting.

During the evaluation period (field visit), the consultant could be provided space for working at the UNDP Tunisia office or at the project management unit based in ANME.



Suggested time schedule for the Final evaluation, to be adapted by the team as appropriate

Details	Responsible / support	May				June				July
		Week 1	Week 2	Week 3	Week 4	Week 1	Week 2	Week 3	Week 4	Week 1
<b>Mission Preparation (10 working days)</b>										
Document Review	Consultant									
Design approach and methods	Consultant									
Finalize evaluation methodology	Consultant									
Develop hypotheses about the project strategies and management	Consultant									
Prepare surveys	Consultant									
Prepare learning sessions	Consultant									
<b>Mission (8Working days)</b>										
Briefing for evaluator	UNDP									
Meet PMU, partners and stakeholders	Consultant/ UNDP & Project									
Interviews	Consultant/ UNDP GEF RCU / UNDP & Project									
Adaptive management learning	Consultant/ Project									
Debriefings / Presentation	Consultant									
<b>After-mission (12working days)</b>										
Report writing- drafting	Consultant									
Draft Report Submission – UNDP and Circulation of Report for comment	Consultant, UNDP, PMU, others...									

Details		May				June				July
	Responsible / support	Week 1	Week 2	Week 3	Week 4	Week 1	Week 2	Week 3	Week 4	Week 1
Finalize report	Consultant						Two weeks for report review			
Review and final submission of the report	Consultant									

## 8. PRODUCTS EXPECTED FROM THE EVALUATION

There will be three main products:

1. *Final evaluation report*, including an executive summary, fulfilling the evaluation requirements set out in these TORs. The final report is to be cleared and accepted by UNDP, the PMU and the steering committee of the project before final payment.

**N.B: The final report should be in the English language and should not exceed 40pages with annexes. The consultant must also submit an executive summary, both in English and French.**

2. *A power-point presentation of the findings of the evaluation.* Depending upon the complexity of the evaluation findings, UNDP Tunisia may consider organizing a half-day stakeholders meeting at which to make a presentation to the partners and stakeholders.

3. *A completed GEF Tracking Tool for the project.*

Evaluation deliverables during the mission and terms of payment are as following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities	Terms pf payment
<b>Inception Report</b>	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method	No later than 2 weeks after mission start.	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO and project management	20% of the contract
<b>Draft evaluation Report</b>	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	5 weeks after mission start.	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PMU,	30% of the contract
<b>Final Report in English version</b>	Revised report	9 weeks after mission start and within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC	30% of the contract
<b>PowerPoint Presentation Summary of the evaluation report in French and English and a GEF tracking tool</b>	Evaluation findings	9 weeks after mission start	To project management and UNDP CO	20% of the contract

- d.

## ANNEX I: INDICATIVE OUTLINE OF THE EVALUATION REPORT

### 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

### Executive Summary

- Project Summary Table
- Project Description (brief)
- Evaluation Rating Table
- Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons

### Acronyms and Abbreviations

### Introduction

- Purpose of the evaluation
- Scope & Methodology
- Structure of the evaluation report

### 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

### Findings

(In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) must be rated<sup>5</sup>)

#### 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

#### Project Implementation

- Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
- Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)
- Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management
- Project Finance:
- Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (\*)
- UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (\*) coordination, and operational issues

---

<sup>5</sup> 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 Results

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

#### 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

#### Annexes

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

## **ANNEX II: LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE EVALUATORS**

The following documents are essential reading for the evaluators:

- Project Document and any revisions
- [www.undp.org/gef/05/monitoring/policies.html](http://www.undp.org/gef/05/monitoring/policies.html)
- Mid-term Evaluation Report of the project
- M & E Operational Guidelines, all monitoring reports prepared by the project
- Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
- Periodical Progress Report and detailed activity progress reports
- Minutes of Steering Committee, PMU, Tripartite Programme Review and other project management and technical meetings.
- Presentations and other inputs to Executive Committee and project management meetings
- Atlas Reports (such as the AWP, Combined Delivery Report and Project Budget Balance report)
- Project Implementation Reviews (PIRs)
- Inception Report

### **OTHER PRODUCTS AND REPORTS PRODUCED BY THE PROJECT INCLUDING:**

- Technical Reports and studies;
- Baseline reports
- Strategy documents, internal system, management plans.
- Publications

### ANNEX III 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
<b>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?</b>			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
<b>Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?</b>			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
<b>Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?</b>			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
<b>Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?</b>			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
<b>Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?</b>			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•

#### ANNEX IV: RATING SCALES

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



## **ANNEX V: 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. The evaluators should consult with other relevant overseeing entities when there is any doubt about the findings and how such 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.

Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

## ANNEX VI: 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: \_\_\_\_\_