



# PROJECT-LEVEL EVALUATION

**GUIDANCE FOR CONDUCTING TERMINAL  
EVALUATIONS OF UNDP-SUPPORTED,  
GEF-FINANCED PROJECTS**



# **GUIDANCE FOR CONDUCTING TERMINAL EVALUATIONS OF UNDP-SUPPORTED, GEF-FINANCED PROJECTS**

# CONTENTS

Acronyms and Abbreviations	iii
<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 UNDP and GEF Policies	1
<b>2. Evaluation Cycle</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1 Evaluation Timing	4
2.2 Pre-evaluation	5
2.3 Preparatory	5
2.4 Implementation	8
2.5 Post- evaluation	11
<b>3. Evaluation Content</b>	<b>13</b>
3.1 Introduction	13
3.2 Report	14
3.3 Ratings	25
<b>Annexes</b>	
Annex 1: Glossary of Terms	26
Annex 2. Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference	28
Annex 3: Co-financing Table for UNDP supported GEF financed projects	39
Annex 4: Sample Evaluation Criteria Matrix	40
Annex 5: Sample Matrix for Rating the Achievement of Outcomes	47
Annex 6: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct Agreement Form	49
Annex 7: Management Response Template	50
Annex 8: Terminal Evaluation Review Form used by UNDP EO	51
<b>Boxes</b>	
Box 1. GEF-mandated Strengthening of the Evaluation Role for Operational Focal Points	2
Box 2. UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators	8
Box 3. UNDP Evaluation Criteria	15
Box 4. GEF Focal Area Tracking Tools	19
Box 5. Basic definition for each link in RBM Chain	20
Box 6. Project Sustainability Ratings	22
<b>Figures</b>	
Figure 1. Evaluation Implementation Phase	4
Figure 2. Management Response	11
Figure 3. Assessment of Catalytic Role	23
Figure 4. Theory of Change Approach	24
<b>Tables</b>	
Table 1. Ratings Scales	26

# ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

APR	annual project report
CEO	chief executive officer
CPAP	UNDP country programme action plan
CPD	UNDP country programme document
CO	UNDP country office
EA	executing agency
ERC	Evaluation Resource Centre
ET	evaluation team
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GEF EO	GEF Evaluation Office
FSP	full size project
IA	implementing agency
LFA	logframe analysis
M&E	monitoring and evaluation
MOU	memorandum of understanding
MSP	medium size project
MTE	midterm evaluation
NGO	non-governmental organization
OFP	GEF operational focal point
PDF-A	preparatory development assistance block A
PIF	project identification form
PIMS	UNDP GEF project information management system
PIR	project implementation report
POPP	UNDP Programme and Operations Policies and Procedures
ProDoc	project document
PSC	project steering committee
PT	project team
PTA	principal technical advisor
RCU	UNDP/GEF regional coordinating unit
ROAR	results oriented annual report
TE	terminal evaluation
TER	terminal evaluation review
ToR	terms of reference
UNDAF	UN development assistance framework
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNDP EO	UNDP Evaluation Office
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNOPS	United Nations Office for Project Services

## CHAPTER 1

# INTRODUCTION

This document provides guidance for initiating and implementing final (terminal) project evaluations of UNDP supported projects that have received grant financing from the Global Environmental Facility (GEF). The guidance is designed to help clarify steps in the evaluation cycle, their timing and who is responsible. It also details the suggested content of evaluation 'deliverables' including terms of reference, evaluation reports, management responses and the quality assurance of evaluations.

The guidance is intended to assist key participants in the project evaluation cycle, in particular country office personnel managing GEF-financed projects. The guidance is designed to enhance compliance with both UNDP and GEF evaluation policies and procedural requirements. The aim is to improve the overall quality of UNDP project evaluations, which in turn should enhance the results of UNDP projects financed through the GEF.

GEF and UNDP guidance are by and large consistent and mutually reinforcing, and use common standards.<sup>1</sup> Two aspects of GEF guidance extend beyond current UNDP evaluation guidance: a) all GEF-financed projects must receive a final (terminal) evaluation; and b) terminal evaluations of GEF projects include, at a minimum, ratings on a project's relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and monitoring and evaluation implementation, plus the likelihood that results (outputs and outcomes) can be sustained.

The following sections are included in this guide:

1. Introduction: setting out the basic policies

and procedures driving the UNDP/supported GEF financed project evaluation process

2. Procedures: explaining the key activities and responsibilities during the four evaluation phases: pre-evaluation, preparatory, implementation and post-evaluation
3. Content: providing guidance and recommendations on the approaches to take in designing evaluations of GEF-financed projects
4. Annexes: providing specific guidance and templates for terminal evaluation terms of reference

### 1.1 UNDP AND GEF POLICIES

The UNDP Evaluation Policy states that: *"Project evaluations assess the efficiency and effectiveness of a project in achieving its intended results. They also assess the relevance and sustainability of outputs as contributions to medium-term and longer-term outcomes. Projects can be evaluated during the time of implementation, at the end of implementation (terminal evaluation), or after a period of time after the project has ended (ex-post evaluation). Project evaluation can be invaluable for managing for results, and serves to reinforce the accountability of project managers, COs, PTAs, etc. Additionally, project evaluation provides a basis for the evaluation of outcomes and programmes, as well as for strategic and programmatic evaluations and Assessment of Development Results (ADRs), and for distilling lessons from experience for learning and sharing knowledge. In UNDP, project evaluations are mandatory when required by a partnership protocol, such as with the Global Environment Facility."*

---

<sup>1</sup> UNDP and GEF are members of the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) and have developed evaluation requirements in conformance with UNEG norms and standards, see <http://www.uneval.org>.

The UNDP Programme and Operations Policies and Procedures (POPP) set the overall procedural requirements for programme and project management; including for UNDP supported GEF financed projects and programmes. As noted in the POPP: "Project evaluation assesses the performance of a project in achieving its intended results. It yields useful information on project implementation arrangements and the achievement of outputs. It is at this level that direct cause and attribution can be addressed given the close causal linkage between the intervention and its effect or output. Project evaluation provides a basis for the evaluation of outcomes and programmes." The POPP goes on to note that project evaluations are mandatory only when they are required by a partnership protocol. Such a protocol has been established with GEF.

In 2009, UNDP developed a revised Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results. The Handbook provides UNDP programming units with practical guidance and tools to strengthen results-oriented planning, monitoring and evaluation in UNDP.

In November, 2010, the GEF Council approved a revised Policy on Monitoring and Evaluation. The M&E Policy states that through monitoring

and evaluation the GEF aims to "promote accountability for achievement of GEF objectives through the assessment of results, effectiveness, processes, and performance of the partners involved in GEF activities." It further states that "GEF results will be monitored and evaluated for their contribution to global environmental benefits." The policy enunciates that the GEF partners, in addition to conducting various other evaluations, also evaluate projects "at the end of the intervention (terminal evaluation)."<sup>2</sup>

Changes from the 2006 GEF M&E Policy are minor with respect to evaluation guidance for the implementing agencies, however the 2010 guidance placed greater emphasis on the need for baseline information at time of project approval by the GEF Secretariat (CEO endorsement), and it strengthened the role of the country-designated Operational Focal Points (OFPs), as highlighted in box 1.

As noted in the 2010 GEF M&E policy: *"The M&E criteria, minimum requirements, and key principles will continue to be further elaborated in guidelines...The GEF Evaluation Office has issued guidelines on ethical norms and conflict of interest in evaluations, as well as guidelines for terminal evaluations. The GEF Secretariat may issue further*

#### **Box 1. GEF-mandated strengthening of the evaluation role for Operational Focal Points<sup>3</sup> :**

1. The M&E Plan for all projects must now include an indication of how the project or program will keep the OFP informed and, where applicable and feasible, involved in evaluation activities, while respecting the independent nature of evaluations. All costs incurred by OFP participation is to be funded by the OFP or country concerned.
2. COs must ensure that OFPs are fully informed on the planning, conduct and results of midterm and terminal evaluations. Where applicable, the OFPs should be briefed and de-briefed at the start and end of evaluation missions.
3. The OFP has a particular responsibility with respect to the use, follow up to and action on evaluation recommendations related to GEF matters and directed at the regional, national, and local levels. Accordingly, ODPs should receive all draft evaluation reports for comment and be asked to contribute to management responses. The OFP is to receive all terminal evaluation reports for projects within their national portfolio within 12 months of project operational closure.
4. The OFP plays a key role in keeping all national stakeholders (particularly the civil society organizations involved in GEF activities) fully consulted with, informed on, and involved in the plans, implementation, and results of country-related GEF M&E activities.
5. The UNDP EO, in its quality assurance review of GEF project evaluations will keep track of the application of these conditions involving the enhanced role of OFPs.

<sup>2</sup> See paragraph 13, pg 4, of 'The GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy' (February, 2006); M&E Policy

<sup>3</sup> See Revised GEF M&E Policy, 2010, pages 23, 24 & 33

*guidelines on monitoring and indicators, as part of the results based management framework of the GEF.”<sup>4</sup>*

The [Operational Guidance for GEF Agencies in Conducting Terminal Evaluations](#) states that “*the GEF Agencies<sup>5</sup> are required to prepare, in English, a terminal evaluation report at project completion for all GEF full-size projects (FSP) and, until further notice, all medium-size projects (MSP)<sup>6</sup>. Terminal evaluations are also required for enabling activities, excluding those that were approved under expedited procedures. Terminal evaluations are required for canceled projects if the actual GEF expenditure at the point of project cancellation was \$0.5 million or more*.”<sup>7</sup> It goes on to note the following specific responsibilities of the GEF Agencies:

- a. Conduct terminal evaluations within six months before or after project completion.
- b. Develop specific terms of reference for each terminal evaluation.
- c. Include a provision in the terms of reference that requires the terminal evaluation team to provide information relevant for follow-up studies, including terminal evaluation verification on request to the GEF partnership up to five years after completion of the terminal evaluation.
- d. Ensure that the terms of reference (TOR) and its schedule are made known to key stakeholders.
- e. Ensure that the evaluation team is composed of individuals with appropriate expertise and experience to assess the project, including, when required, the expertise to address social issues.
- f. Ensure that project evaluation team members are independent, unbiased, and free of conflicts of interest or ensure a quality control review of the terminal evaluation by its independent evaluation office.
- g. Provide guidance, documentation, and support to evaluation teams.
- h. Facilitate the engagement of the GEF focal points in terminal evaluations and, as requested by the GEF Council, provide them with a copy of the terminal evaluation report in a timely manner.
- i. Ensure that terminal evaluations take into account the views of all relevant stakeholders.
- j. Submit the terminal evaluation report to the Director of the GEF Evaluation Office immediately after it is completed and no more than 12 months after project completion.
- k. Make terminal evaluation reports publicly available and circulate them among the GEF country focal points and relevant government counterparts.

---

<sup>4</sup> The GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy, Working Document for Council Decision, October 2010, pg 24.

<sup>5</sup> There are ten GEF implementing agencies including UNDP. The others are the Asian Development Bank (ADB), African Development Bank (AfDB), European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD), Food and Agriculture Organization of the UN (FAO), Inter-American Development Bank (IADB) International Fund for Agriculture Development (IFAD), the UN Environment Programme (UNEP), UN Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) and the World Bank).

<sup>6</sup> GEF projects with budgets of \$1 million or more are full-size projects.

<sup>7</sup> GEF Evaluation Office, Evaluation Document No. 3, 2008, pg. 3.

## CHAPTER 2

# EVALUATION CYCLE

This chapter covers procedures for carrying out terminal evaluations for GEF-financed projects. Terminal evaluations (TE) provide a comprehensive and systematic accounting of performance at the end of the project cycle, considering the totality of the effort from project design, through implementation to wrap up, also considering the likelihood of sustainability and possible impacts.

Separate guidance is being prepared to support the preparation of project mid-term reviews (MTR). Note that mid-term evaluations are no longer required by the GEF. MTRs are a monitoring tool to assess project status and challenges, identify corrective actions to ensure that projects are on track to achieve planned outcomes. MTRs are required for full-sized UNDP supported projects with GEF financing, and are highly recommended for medium-sized projects with GEF financing. MTRs are submitted to the GEF Secretariat.

The following information on preparing, conducting and responding to terminal project evaluations highlights the roles and responsibilities of key actors in the process: evaluation team (ET), project team (PT), country office (CO), region based technical advisers (RTAs), UNDP Evaluation Office (UNDP EO), GEF Evaluation Office (GEF EO), and GEF operational focal point (OFP). Activities have been divided into four phases: pre-evaluation,

preparatory, implementation and post-evaluation (see figure1).


Before conducting an evaluation the involved parties should come to an understanding of the evaluation objectives, the process for coordinating and conducting the evaluation, as well as **roles and responsibilities** in each evaluation phase. UNDP country office personnel shoulder the main preparation and implementation responsibilities, including ToR development, team selection, report reviews and management responses. Project teams provide evaluators with project information and assist with logistics. The UNDP-GEF Technical Adviser based in the region provides technical support to the TE process and is involved in approving the final TE report. The UNDP Evaluation Office provides guidance and quality assurance.

### 2.1 EVALUATION TIMING

In planning a terminal evaluation for a GEF financed project, please note:

1. Terminal evaluations must be carried out during the period 6 months before and 6 months after project operational closure. This is stipulated in GEF guidance and consistent with UNDP procedures. Ideally, the evaluation should be scheduled so that the

**Figure 1. Evaluation Implementation Phases**



evaluation mission occurs during the last three months prior to project operational closure, allowing the evaluation mission to proceed while the project team is still in place, yet ensuring the project is close enough to completion for the evaluation team to reach conclusions on key aspects such as project sustainability.

2. There are special timing considerations for phased projects. As noted in the GEF terminal evaluation guidance, projects that have been developed as phased projects should submit a terminal evaluation at the time of the 2nd phase endorsement by the GEF Chief Executive Officer (CEO). For projects that have not been approved by the GEF Council as phased projects, the proposal requesting support for a follow-up project must be accompanied by an independent terminal evaluation of the earlier project when the project concept is reviewed for pipeline entry. If the current phase of the project is still under implementation, an interim evaluation should be prepared and presented when the follow-up phase is first submitted to the GEF Secretariat. A full terminal evaluation is then required when the 1st phase is completed.

## 2.2 PRE-EVALUATION

### COUNTRY, REGION AND GLOBAL EVALUATION PLANS

Consistent with the UNDP Evaluation Policy, all decentralized evaluation activities are to be included in an evaluation plan. This means that the **country office evaluation plans produced along with the Country Programme Document must include all planned UNDP supported GEF financed project terminal evaluations during the 5-year cycle.** UNDP supported GEF financed global and regional project terminal evaluations must also be included in evaluation plans. **Regional project terminal evaluations that are financially managed by the Regional**

**Service Centre (RSC) should be included in the RSC evaluation plan. Likewise, global or regional project terminal evaluations that are financially managed by the Bureau for Development Policy (BDP), should be included in the BDP evaluation plan.** The evaluation plans are posted to the [Evaluation Resource Center](#).

## PROJECT M&E PLANS AND BUDGET

The programming guidance for implementing UNDP supported GEF financed projects includes a standard section on M&E requirements. The programming guidance sets out a budget for M&E activities, and notes the mandatory UNDP APR/PIR and other reporting requirements. For full size projects financed by the GEF, the M&E Plan should include expectations for the mid-term review and terminal evaluation. The CO should ensure that enough funds have been allocated for conducting planned M&E activities, as per the M&E budget outlined in the project document.

Evaluation budgets will vary depending on whether the project is an MSP or FSP, whether it is country-specific or regionally focused, the array of outputs planned, and whether the evaluators are locally or internationally hired. Typical costs for the terminal evaluation of a full-size single-country project are between USD \$30,000 and \$60,000.

## 2.3 PREPARATORY

Preparatory activities for terminal project evaluations need to commence during the 6 months prior to operational closure. A fairly long lead time is necessary to develop a Terms of Reference and go through the consultant hiring process. The evaluation team should ideally be selected and contracted four to six weeks before any planned evaluation missions and field visits, to ensure that the evaluation team is available and that stakeholders, are given sufficient notice.

## EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

The Terms of Reference (ToR) is a written document that defines in particular the issues that the evaluation should address, the composition of the team expected to carry out the evaluation, and the 'expected deliverables'. It is important to a) invest adequate time in formulating and refining the ToR and b) involve key stakeholders in the process in order to reflect their views and interests. It is the responsibility of the CO to prepare the ToR. The CO should develop the ToR with significant input from the project team, and technical input from the UNDP GEF Technical Advisor based in the region (RTA). Before the ToR is finalized, it should be reviewed and commented on by the GEF operational focal point.

The ToR should provide the evaluator with clear guidance on process and content requirements. It specifies team member expectations: qualifications, role and functions, and terms and conditions of engagement (e.g. duration of engagement). Also included are the evaluation scope and key evaluation questions, methodology, and implementation approach, and a clarification of roles and responsibilities of the main participants. The TOR should reference this Guidance (attached or hyperlinked). A template for ToR development is included in Annex 2.

## PROJECT BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Before the evaluation mission, and in order to facilitate the evaluator's documentation review, the project team should compile a 'project information package' that brings together the most important project documents for use by the evaluation team. Included with the package should be a brief explanatory note identifying the package contents and highlighting especially important documents.

The project information package should include financial data, and in particular, information on co-financing needs to be provided. Obtaining up-to-date co-financing information will require contacting each of the co-financing parties,

including the government, to get a full and up-to-date accounting prior to carrying out the evaluation. The evaluation team is required to compare the planned and realized co-financing amounts. The co-financing table included in Annex 3 must be filled in and included for the evaluation report. The CO or the evaluation team must send this table to each of the co-financers and have them fill in their information.

A list of suggested key documents to include is as follows:

Key documents
Project documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>■ GEF Project Information Form (PIF), Project Document and Log Frame Analysis (LFA)</li><li>■ Project Implementation Plan</li><li>■ Implementing/executing partner arrangements</li><li>■ List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Boards, and other partners to be consulted</li><li>■ Project sites, highlighting suggested visits</li><li>■ Midterm evaluation (MTE) and other relevant evaluations and assessments</li><li>■ Annual Project Implementation Reports (PIR)</li><li>■ Project budget, broken out by outcomes and outputs</li><li>■ Project Tracking Tool</li><li>■ Financial Data</li><li>■ Sample of project communications materials, i.e. press releases, brochures, documentaries, etc.</li></ul>
UNDP documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>■ Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF)</li><li>■ Country Programme Document (CPD)</li><li>■ Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP)</li></ul>
GEF documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>■ GEF focal area strategic program objectives</li></ul>

## EVALUATION TEAM

An evaluation team will be selected using established UNDP procurement protocols. The ToR should detail the required skills, competencies and characteristics of the evaluation team plus the expected team structure and composition, roles and responsibilities. The evidence (resumes, work samples, references) that will be expected to support claims of knowledge, skills and experience should be specified.

The team composition typically includes one or two international and/or national consultants.

For MSPs and many FSPs one evaluator will be sufficient. On larger FSPs, and especially regional FSPs, it is useful to include two consultants - a team leader and team specialist. The team members should be experienced professionals who understand the subject matter of the project under review, and are knowledgeable about UNDP and GEF. When selecting evaluation teams, it is important to keep in mind the high priority that UNDP places on gender balance.

When there is a question as to the independence and qualifications of a potential team member, the country office should raise such issues with the UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and then UNDP Evaluation Office for review and recommendations on how to proceed.

The UNDP country office should utilize a competitive selection process<sup>8</sup> for team selection, ensuring transparency, impartiality and neutrality. Candidates can be international and/or national. Consultancy announcement should be done locally, through the CO web page, and internationally, through for instance the UNDP Jobs<sup>9</sup> web pages. The latter site is accessible through the country office's Human Resources department. In addition, each RSC should keep an updated list of competent evaluators that have successfully carried out terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects. The UNDP EO has established and maintains a roster of evaluation consultants, for use by UNDP personnel, which can be accessed from the Evaluation Resource Center.

## EVALUATION ETHICS <sup>10</sup>

UNDP and GEF take seriously the importance

of having competent, fair and independent evaluators carry out evaluation assignments.<sup>11</sup> As indicated in the POPP, evaluations of UNDP-supported activities need to be independent, impartial and rigorous. Evaluations should be carried out by evaluators that are independent from organizations that were involved in designing, executing or advising on the intervention that is the subject of the evaluation. Evaluators must have personal and professional integrity and be guided by propriety in the conduct of their business. Terms of Reference for UNDP terminal evaluations should explicitly state that evaluations in UNDP are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'.

Evaluation ethics also concerns the ways in which evaluations are carried out, and the steps evaluators should take to protect the rights and confidentiality of persons interviewed.

Attached to each evaluation team contract should be a signed 'Code of Conduct' form that indicates the team member agrees to the ethical expectations set out in box 2. A Code of Conduct Agreement form is included in Annex 6

## TERMS AND CONDITIONS

The ToR should elaborate the timing and payment terms, consistent with the UNDP procurement contractors (IC).

## EXPRESSIONS OF INTEREST

The CO will need to specify the form and content for receiving proposals/expressions of interest, to carry out the assignment. The information should be spelled out in requests for proposals, including on-line job postings. The Country Office Operations team typically handles such

<sup>8</sup> For additional information on candidate selection, see the [UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](#), ppg 152 & 153, and Annex 5.

<sup>9</sup> <http://jobs.undp.org/>

<sup>10</sup> For details on the ethics in evaluation, see [UNEG Ethical Guidelines](#).

<sup>11</sup> See [GEF Evaluation Office Ethical Guidelines](#), Evaluation Document No. 2, 2007, <http://www.thegef.org/gef/node/1556>

## Box 2. UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators

### 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 limitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

procurement issues and should provide the necessary guidance, based from requirements set out in the UNDP POPP.

### JOINT EVALUATIONS

Some GEF financed projects are carried out 'jointly', meaning that one GEF financed projects is carried out by more than one of the ten GEF implementing agencies. In these situations, GEF policy dictates that the project M&E plan should clearly set out the process by which these jointly-implemented projects get evaluated. The Plan should clarify responsibilities for review and approval procedures, and should be developed through consultations between the implementing agencies prior to, or then immediately after, launch of the project. A single **GEF project should receive only one project terminal evaluation report, with one set of ratings.** Joint evaluations can be expected to entail more extensive and time consuming ToR and report

commenting procedures.

UNDP also supports GEF financed projects where the Implementing Partner is a UN Agency (e.g. UNOPS). The evaluation roles and responsibilities in these cases must be clarified in the Project Document and should be clarified in any memoranda of agreement (MOA), and other contractual obligations. The overall accountability for adhering to the UNDP and GEF evaluation policies remains with UNDP.

## 2.4 IMPLEMENTATION

### EVALUATION INCEPTION REPORT

An inception report should be prepared by the evaluation team prior to the main evaluation mission, detailing the evaluators' understanding of the project being evaluated and why, showing how each evaluation question will be answered by way of: proposed methods, proposed sources of data and data collection procedures. The inception

report should include a proposed schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables, designating a team member with the lead responsibility for each task or product. The Inception Report should be shared with the GEF operational focal point (OFP) and other key stakeholders, to ensure a common understanding of the mission plan, methodology and timing.

## **EVALUATION MISSION & SITE VISITS**

In most situations, and especially when evaluations are carried out by international consultants, an 'evaluation mission' should be scheduled, providing an intensive 2-3 weeks for the evaluation team to hold interviews and visit project sites. Ideally, the mission should occur within four to six weeks of contract approval, enabling the evaluation to move ahead expeditiously yet allowing time for the evaluation team to review documents and develop an implementation plan, and for agreement to be reached on persons to interview and site visit arrangements.<sup>12</sup>

The mission will need to be formally agreed with the CO, but the practical aspects, such as logistics for local travels, will benefit from assistance from the project team.<sup>13</sup> It is important to ensure that the roles are clear with respect to requesting evaluation interviews, especially with high level government officials. In many countries the CO will need to send out formal meeting requests.

The evaluation mission should be planned far enough in advance to enable interviews to be properly set up, especially to request meetings with senior Ministry officials. A detailed plan for the mission should be included in the TE inception report, which should be revised based on CO, project team and OFP inputs.

Best practice suggest that at the start of the evaluation mission the evaluation team should

first meet with the project team, country office personnel, GEF Operational Focal Point (OFP) in the country, and the UNDP GEF Technical Advisor based in the region (RTA).

Interviews should include a wide array of interested persons including civil society, NGOs and the private sector, local ministry officials as relevant, and national ministry officials (in addition to the OFP). Evaluation teams should strive to pace their interview schedules to ensure adequate time for writing up interview notes each day.

Visits to demonstration sites should be planned, or a select sampling if there are multiple sites spread over a large territory. The project team is expected to assist the evaluators with the logistics for site visits. The decision on which sites to visit should be done jointly with the CO and project team. When the evaluation team is conducting interviews and site visits, it is not appropriate for programme officers from the country office, or project team members, to be in attendance.

Data analysis should be conducted in a systematic manner to ensure that all the findings, conclusions and recommendations are substantiated by evidence. Appropriate tools should be used to ensure proper analysis (e.g. including a data analysis matrix that records, for each evaluation question/criteria, information and data collected from different sources and with different methodology). As part of the fact finding effort, evaluators should in particular seek evidence of impact during the field visits, i.e. progress towards the articulated global environmental benefits of the project.

## **MISSION WRAP-UP**

By the end of the evaluation mission, the team should have a draft set of initial findings established. Prior to mission completion a wrap up

---

<sup>12</sup> see section 2.1 above for more information on evaluation timing.

<sup>13</sup> In the case of UNDP supported GEF financed regional projects, the UNDP GEF RTA should be involved in the decision on mission timing and content.

discussion with the country office and project team should be held, to review initial findings and request any additional information. A stakeholder workshop at mission end is useful, especially when the evaluation team is led by an international consultant who will then leave the country. Such 'face to face' interactions offer the opportunity for information to be shared with persons who may not otherwise read the final report, for instance if it is written in a language (usually English), in which they lack fluency.

## DRAFT AND FINAL EVALUATION REPORTS

The evaluation team should complete and submit to the CO a first draft project terminal evaluation report no later than four weeks after the Mission. A template for the evaluation report is provided in Annex 2, (TOR Annex F).

The draft report should include evaluation scope and method, findings, conclusions and recommendations. The report should define the evaluation criteria and performance standards used and the rationale for selecting them. The general criterion applied for evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects is relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability. As noted in the GEF Guidelines for Terminal Evaluations: "The evaluation of relevancy, effectiveness and efficiency will be as objective as possible and will include sufficient and convincing empirical evidence. Ideally the project monitoring system should deliver quantifiable information that can lead to a robust assessment of project's effectiveness and efficiency."<sup>16</sup>

## EVALUATION REPORT REVIEW PROCESS

The evaluation ToR should indicate the review process that will be used for the evaluation. Once the evaluation team provides a draft evaluation to the CO, it is the responsibility of the CO to coordinate a review and comment process. Typically, the review process is done in two steps.

The first is a quick review by the CO, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and project team to check for inaccuracies. The CO then circulates a revised draft for wider circulation to the OFP and or/partner agencies, and to other stakeholders. Reflecting the strengthening of the OFP role, it is vital that they are part of this review process and are given the opportunity to comment.

The review process is designed to highlight errors and omissions of facts, and to ensure that the evaluation report covers all aspects set out in the ToR. Reviewers can produce additional information that they believe is relevant to the evaluation team's assessment of results; however as an independent evaluation it is the prerogative of the evaluation team to develop its own conclusions, ratings and recommendations.

The CO will collate comments on the report and send them to the evaluation team, which is required to take all comments into consideration. The evaluation team should provide an 'audit trail' indicating explicitly how received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the revised terminal evaluation report. The evaluation team should provide this audit trail when it submits the final draft evaluation report to the CO, after the stakeholder workshop.

### Stakeholder Workshops

Where budgets permit, a stakeholder workshop should be held prior to completion of the final draft terminal evaluation report. As noted in the preceding discussion, this can be done at the end of the evaluation mission, or then after a draft final terminal evaluation report has been prepared. The purpose is to provide interested stakeholders the opportunity to hear from the evaluation team on their findings and conclusions and provide comments in writing and verbally. The project team usually takes responsibility for setting up a stakeholder workshop, including inviting participants and securing a venue. The workshop itself may get chaired by the RR/RC, Country Director, RTA or Principle Technical Advisor, as fits the project scope and prominence.

<sup>15</sup> In the case of Regional Projects, the RTA should also be involved in the decision on mission timing and content.

The draft terminal evaluation report is considered complete, in contractual terms, only when it has achieved acceptable standards. In order to keep record of the review process, both the CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region should sign a clearance form, to be included with the final report (see TOR Annex G).

## 2.5 POST- EVALUATION

As noted in section 2.3, all project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects must be included in evaluation plans at their respective level (country office, regional and global). After a terminal evaluation has been completed and approved it must be posted to the UNDP [Evaluation Resource Center](http://erc.undp.org) (<http://erc.undp.org>). It is the CO responsibility to post TEs to the ERC for country-level projects, the RSC responsibility for regional projects that are managed by the RSC, and BDPs responsibility for global/regional projects managed by BDP. All terminal evaluations should be finalised and posted to the ERC within 9 months of project operational closure.


The UNDP Evaluation Office will take responsibility for sending the completed terminal evaluations to the GEF Evaluation Office. In addition to being posted on the publicly-accessible UNDP Evaluation Resource Centre, the final evaluation reports should be sent to the OFP and implementing partners.

## MANAGEMENT RESPONSE

As one measure for ensuring the timely and effective use of evaluations, UNDP has institutionalized a management response system. The management response system has two parts: 1) presentation of management response to key issues and recommendations, and key follow-up actions, and 2) follow-up by tracking actions.

The process of preparing a response provides an opportunity to dialogue with relevant stakeholders to reflect on the evaluation process, findings, recommendations and lessons from the terminal evaluation.

The management response to terminal evaluations should be clear and comprehensive and should address the dimensions set out in Figure 2 below.



A template for management responses is included as Annex 7. The template is intended to facilitate the preparation of the response. A comment box in the template can be used to highlight lessons from the evaluation experience, reactions to findings and issues that are not directly addressed by key recommendations and/or any other points that the commissioning unit and stakeholders think are important to be recorded.

For terminal evaluations, responsibility for drafting the management response falls to the commissioning unit<sup>15</sup> for the evaluation. Prior to their completion, management responses for terminal evaluations should be reviewed and commented on by key project partners including the GEF Operational Focal Point.

<sup>15</sup> For country-specific projects the commissioning unit is the Country Office. UNDP supported GEF regional projects are typically handled by a lead country, so the lead CO is likewise responsible. The RSC can also take on this role when appropriate. Global projects are commissioned through EEG/GEF in BDP.

After the management response is developed, it is uploaded to the [Evaluation Resource Centre \(ERC\)](#) by the CO (or RSC for regional projects, and BDP for global projects). The implementation of proposed actions is tracked in the ERC. The timing and quality of management responses for all decentralized outcome evaluations, including terminal evaluations of UNDP-supported GEF financed projects, will be reviewed on an annual basis by the UNDP Evaluation Office.

**Important!** The evaluation cycle for terminal evaluations is not considered complete until the report has been approved and translated into English, a management response completed, and both the TE report and management response has been uploaded to the ERC.

## INFORMATION SHARING

Knowledge gained through evaluation is at the core of UNDP's organizational learning process. It is important to draw lessons that have the potential for broader application and to improve subsequent project design and implementation. UNDP should ensure that its project terminal evaluations contribute to a better understanding of development effectiveness. Key findings, conclusions and recommendations should be widely shared and made available to stakeholders. This can be done by incorporating them in existing reports and publications, including brochures and news bulletins, and organizing meetings with interested stakeholders.

## QUALITY ASSURANCE

The UNDP Evaluation Office is tasked with providing quality assurance on all terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects and programmes. TE quality assurance reviews (TERs) are desk analyses that evaluate the quality of each terminal evaluation report and also yield an independent 2nd tier assessment of

project achievements.

Annex 8 to this guide provides a report form used for the terminal evaluation quality assurance review. This is a useful document for country offices and other UNDP staff to also review, as it identifies the key issues and aspects of terminal evaluations that are viewed as especially important by the GEF and UNDP EO. The management response should be uploaded to the ERC together with the final terminal evaluation report.

Terminal evaluation reports are assessed on a rolling basis after they have been uploaded to the ERC. The terminal evaluation quality assurance results are then submitted to the GEF Evaluation Office, which compiles performance results across all of the implementing agencies as part of the GEF EO Annual Performance Report submitted to the GEF Council.

**Note:** The role of the UNDP EO is advisory and evaluative, not supervisory. No project terminal evaluation will be 'rejected' by the EO, just as the EO has no role in the approval or rejection of CO Evaluation Plans. The UNDP EO evaluates the quality of UNDP supported GEF financed project terminal evaluations and will utilize these findings in its annual review of evaluation (ARE). UNDP EO is also required to submit these findings to the GEF EO for their annual reporting.

<sup>16</sup> GEF Evaluation Office Guidelines for implementing and executing agencies to conduct terminal evaluations; May 9, 2007, pg. 5

## CHAPTER 3

# EVALUATION CONTENT

In this section of the guide are set out explanations and further details for the content of project terminal evaluations. This information is provided as a tool for evaluators, as well as a guide for the commissioning offices, so they can assess the quality and completeness of evaluation reports. Included in the Terminal Evaluation TOR template (Annex 2) is a report outline (TOR Annex F) that this guidance section helps to explain and embellish.

### 3.1 INTRODUCTION

#### EVALUATION PURPOSE

Evaluations for UNDP Supported GEF financed projects have the following complementary purposes:

- To promote accountability and transparency, and to assess and disclose the extent of project accomplishments.
- To synthesize lessons that can help to improve the selection, design and implementation of future GEF financed UNDP activities.
- To provide feedback on issues that are recurrent across the UNDP portfolio and need attention, and on improvements regarding previously identified issues.
- To contribute to the overall assessment of results in achieving GEF strategic objectives aimed at global environmental benefit.
- To gauge the extent of project convergence with other UN and UNDP priorities, including harmonization with other UN Development Assistance Framework

(UNDAF) and UNDP Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) outcomes and outputs.

#### METHODOLOGY OF THE EVALUATION

An overall approach and method<sup>17</sup> for conducting project terminal evaluations has developed over time, and involves using the following tools:

- documentation reviews
- stakeholder interviews
- field visits
- questionnaires
- focus groups and other participatory techniques for information gathering

The ToR for the evaluation should propose a mix of these tools, including at a minimum a review of background documents, stakeholder interviews and field visits. The aim is to utilize the best mix of tools that will yield the most reliable and valid answers to the evaluation questions within the limits of resources and availability of data.

The methodology should be agreed with the key participants (UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region, CO, evaluation team and GEF Operational Focal Point) and further detailed in the Inception Report developed by the evaluation team.

The evaluation report will then describe the selected approaches, methods and analysis; the rationale for their selection; and how, within the constraints of time and money, the approaches and methods employed yielded data that helped

---

<sup>17</sup> For additional information on methods, see the Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results, Chapter 7, pg. 163

answer the evaluation questions and achieved the evaluation purposes. The description should help the report users judge the merits of the methods used in the evaluation and the credibility of the findings, conclusions and recommendations.

## DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

The evaluation terms of reference, inception report and final report must each include a section that articulates how data will be / has been collected and analysed. This includes the sources of information (documents reviewed and stakeholders), the rationale for their selection and how the information obtained addressed the evaluation questions. Lists of documents reviewed and persons interviewed should be annexed to the evaluation report.

The inception report should indicate methods and procedures in collecting data, including discussion of data collection instruments (e.g., interview protocols and questionnaires), their appropriateness for the data source and evidence of their reliability and validity. The evaluation report should then describe the procedures used and should clarify any deviations from the planned data collection and analysis set out in the TOR and inception report.

## EVALUATION MATRIX

An evaluation criteria matrix should be provided with the reports (inception and final), that clarifies how evaluators expect to collect the data. Annex 4 of this guide provides a sample set of criteria developed for a recent UNDP supported GEF financed biodiversity project terminal evaluation. The point of the exercise is to detail the evaluation questions that need to be answered in order to determine project results, and to identify where the information is expected to come from, (i.e. documents, questionnaires, interviews, and site visits).

The scope of terminal evaluations for MSPs and enabling activities includes some important stipulations established by the GEF EO<sup>18</sup> :

- "All medium-size projects and those enabling activities that are not approved under the expedited procedure will be evaluated to report on achievement of results and lessons learned. The limited absolute amount available for evaluation might entail lower credibility and reduced cost effectiveness of such evaluations. Therefore, medium-size projects and enabling activities not approved under the expedited procedure will be subject to specific guidance to ensure that these evaluations will be lighter but nonetheless credible and cost-effective. This guidance will be developed by the GEF Evaluation Office. Evaluations of medium-size projects and enabling activities not approved under the expedited procedure will be sent to the GEF Evaluation Office when ready or at latest within 12 months of project completion."

In all cases, the evaluation is expected to examine and assess the perspectives of the various stakeholders. In most cases, the evaluation will include field visits to ascertain project accomplishments and interviews of the key stakeholders at national and, where appropriate, local levels. It will also analyze the use of GEF and co-financing resources in the broader context of UNDP country programming. UNDP evaluations cover at a minimum the five major criteria (see box 3).

## 3.2 EVALUATION REPORT

### PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The ToR, inception and terminal evaluation reports will include a section setting out the project description, indicating what the project was intended to accomplish, its start and duration, the problems it seeks to address, the immediate and development objectives and the

---

<sup>18</sup> Revision of the GEF M&E Policy, 2010, pg. 31

### Box 3. UNDP Evaluation Criteria

#### 1. Relevance

- The extent to which the activity is suited to local and national development priorities and organizational policies, including changes over time.
- the extent to which the project is in line with the GEF Operational Programs or the strategic priorities under which the project was funded.
- Note: Retrospectively, the question of relevance often becomes a question as to whether the objectives of an intervention or its design are still appropriate given changed circumstances.

#### 2. Effectiveness

- The extent to which an objective has been achieved or how likely it is to be achieved.

#### 3. Efficiency

- The extent to which results have been delivered with the least costly resources possible; also called cost effectiveness or efficacy.

#### 4. Results

- The positive and negative, foreseen and unforeseen changes to and effects produced by a development intervention.
- In GEF terms, results include direct project outputs, short to medium-term outcomes, and longer term impact including global environmental benefits, replication effects and other local effects.

#### 5. Sustainability

- The likely ability of an intervention to continue to deliver benefits for an extended period of time after completion.
- Projects need to be environmentally, as well as financially and socially sustainable.

main stakeholders. Much of this information can be accessed from the Project Identification Form (PIF), and the project document. In particular, attention should be paid to the PIF PART II: Project Justification arguments, which describes the project's: expected global environmental benefits, consistency with national priorities, justification for GEF financing, coordination with other initiatives, value-added of GEF involvement, risks to successful project completion, expected project cost-effectiveness and justification for the comparative advantage of the GEF agency.<sup>19</sup>

The description should be focused and concise, highlighting only those issues most pertinent to the evaluation. Additional background and context information may include:

- Total resources that have been identified for the project, including expected financing and co-financing from the GEF Trust Fund and other sources.
- Key partners involved in the project, including UNDP, other joint implementing partners,

responsible parties, and, country counterparts - including the GEF operational focal point, and other key stakeholders.

- How the project objectives fit into the partner government's strategies and priorities; and UNDP priorities and programming.
- Pertinent details from the Project document, results framework/logframe, M&E Plan and Project Implementation Plan that identify outcome and output indicators and targets to measure performance and status of implementation, plus the availability of relevant global, regional and national data.
- How this evaluation fits within the context of other ongoing and previous evaluations, for example if a midterm evaluation was also carried out for the project, or if another implementing partner has evaluated this or a closely-linked project.
- Significant socio-economic and environmental changes since the beginning of project implementation and any other major external contributing factors.

<sup>19</sup> GEF Project Identification Form, December 2008.

## FINDINGS

The evaluation report will include a chapter that sets out the evaluation findings. These should be presented as statements of fact based on analysis of the data. They should be structured around the evaluation criteria so that report users can readily make the connection between what was asked and what was found. Variances between planned and actual results should be explained, as well as factors affecting the achievement of intended results.

With respect to the **findings** discussion, it is suggested that the ToR elaborate three general areas: **project formulation, project implementation, and project results.**

### PROJECT FORMULATION

The GEF guidelines include a useful set of questions for the ToR, to assess project formulation. These are:

- Were the project's objectives and components clear, practicable and feasible within its time frame?
- Were the capacities of the executing institution(s) and its counterparts properly considered when the project was designed?
- Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated in the project design?
- Were the partnership arrangements properly identified and roles and responsibilities negotiated prior to project approval?
- Were counterpart resources (funding, staff, and facilities), enabling legislation, and adequate project management arrangements in place at project entry?
- Were the project assumptions and risks well articulated in the PIF and project document?

An additional important point to raise in terms of project formulation is to consider whether the planned outcomes were "**Smart**":

<b>S</b>	Specific: Outcomes must use change language, describing a specific future condition
<b>M</b>	Measurable: Results, whether quantitative or qualitative, must have measurable indicators, making it possible to assess whether they were achieved or not
<b>A</b>	Achievable: Results must be within the capacity of the partners to achieve
<b>R</b>	Relevant: Results must make a contribution to selected priorities of the national development framework
<b>T</b>	Time-bound: Results are never open-ended. There should be an expected date of accomplishment

## ASSUMPTIONS AND RISKS

The evaluation should provide an assessment of the project assumptions and risks as set out in the project document and Log Frame/Results Framework, including:

- An assessment of the stated assumptions and risks, whether they are logical and robust, and have helped to determine activities and planned outputs.
- Externalities (i.e. effects of climate change, global economic crisis, etc.) which are relevant to the findings.

### PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

Some elements to include in the assessment of implementation approach include:

- The logical framework used during implementation as a management and M&E tool
- Effective partnerships arrangements established for implementation of the project with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region, including the formation of a Project Board. Lessons from other relevant projects incorporated into project implementation. Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management.

## FINANCE / CO-FINANCE

The evaluation report should clarify the financial particulars of the project, including extent

of co-financing across the portfolio. Project cost and funding data should be presented, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures should be assessed and explained. Observations from financial audits as available should be considered. If a financial audit has been conducted the major findings should be presented in the TE.

When considering the effectiveness of financial planning, the evaluator should consider whether the project document:

- a) identifies potential sources of co-financing as well as leveraged and associated financing;<sup>20</sup>
- b) includes strong financial controls that allow the project management to make informed decisions regarding the budget at any time, allows for the timely flow of funds and for the payment of satisfactory project deliverables;
- c) demonstrates due diligence in the management of funds, including periodic audits.

The TE should include a table that show planned and actual co-financing commitments, as set out in Annex 4. Evaluators during their fact finding efforts should request assistance from the Project Team to fill in the table, and the Evaluator should then follow up through interviews to substantiate. The evaluator should briefly describe the resources the project has leveraged since inception and indicate how these resources are contributing to the project's ultimate objective.

The evaluator should determine:

- Whether there was sufficient clarity in the reported co-financing to substantiate in-kind and cash co-financing from all listed sources.
- The reasons for differences in the level of expected and actual co-financing.
- The extent to which project components supported by external funders was well integrated into the overall project.

- The effect on project outcomes and/or sustainability from the extent of materialization of co-financing.
- Whether there is evidence of additional, leveraged resources that have been committed as a result of the project. Leveraged resources can be financial or in-kind and may be from other donors, NGOs, foundations, governments, communities or the private sector.

Cost-effective factors include:

- Compliance with the incremental cost criteria and securing co-funding and associated funding.
- The project completed the planned activities and met or exceeded the expected outcomes in terms of achievement of Global Environmental and Development Objectives according to schedule, and as cost-effective as initially planned.
- The project used either a benchmark approach or a comparison approach (did not exceed the costs levels of similar projects in similar contexts)

## **GEF IMPLEMENTING AGENCY EXECUTION - UNDP**

The evaluator should assess and rate the quality of UNDP execution of the project. The assessment should be established through consideration of the following issues:

- Whether there was an appropriate focus on results
- The adequacy of UNDP support to the Implementing Partner and project team
- Quality and timeliness of technical support to the Executing Agency and project team
- Candor and realism in annual reporting
- The quality of risk management
- Responsiveness of the managing parties to significant implementation problems (if any)

<sup>20</sup> Refer to Council documents on co-financing for definitions, such as GEF/C.20/6.

- Any salient issues regarding project duration, for instance to note project delays, and how they may have affected project outcomes and sustainability

## IMPLEMENTING PARTNER EXECUTION

Similarly, the quality of execution by the Implementing Partner should be assessed, considering the following issues:

- Whether there was an appropriate focus on results and timeliness
- Adequacy of management inputs and processes, including budgeting and procurement
- Quality of risk management,
- Candor and realism in reporting
- Government ownership (when national execution)

## PROJECT M&E

An assessment and rating of the project monitoring and evaluation (M&E) plan design and implementation is required. As noted in the GEF TE Guidance, projects should have a sound M&E plan to monitor results and track progress towards achieving project objectives. An M&E plan should include a baseline (including data, methodology, etc.), SMART<sup>21</sup> indicators and data analysis systems, mid-term review, terminal evaluation and adequate funding for M&E activities.<sup>22</sup>

Some projects may include project outputs involving assistance to countries on long-term monitoring, including setting baselines, developing indicators and building capacity for data gathering and analysis. The ToR should indicate that achievements against these outputs should be addressed in a separate section of the evaluation report.

The evaluation team should be expected to

deliver an **M&E assessment** that provides:

1. An analysis of the M&E plan at project start up, considering whether baseline conditions, methodology and roles and responsibilities are well articulated. Is the M&E plan well conceived? Is it articulated sufficient to monitor results and track progress toward achieving objectives?
2. The quality of M&E plan implementation: Was the M&E plan sufficiently budgeted and funded during project preparation and implementation?
3. The effectiveness of monitoring indicators from the project document for measuring progress and performance;
4. Compliance with the progress and financial reporting requirements/ schedule, including quality and timeliness of reports;
5. The value and effectiveness of the monitoring reports and evidence that these were discussed with stakeholders and project staff;
6. The extent to which follow-up actions, and/or adaptive management, were taken in response to monitoring reports (APR/PIRs);
7. Check to see whether APR/PIR self-evaluation ratings were consistent with the MTR and TE findings. If not, were these discrepancies identified by the project steering committee and addressed?
8. Terminal Evaluations for full size projects should also consider whether changes were made to project implementation as a result of the MTR recommendations.

## STAKEHOLDER INTERACTION

The Terminal Evaluation should include a section covering the extent of stakeholder interaction. This includes planned interactions, as set out in the Project Document, and then actual involvement during the course of the project.

<sup>21</sup> SMART: Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Timely.

<sup>22</sup> GEF TE Guidance, pg. 8

Stakeholders are the individuals, groups, institutions, or other bodies that have an interest or stake in the outcome of the UNDP support GEF-financed project. The term also applies to those potentially adversely affected by a project. Stakeholder interactions include information dissemination, consultation, and active participation in the project.

## ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT

The evaluation team should take note whether there were changes in the environmental and development objectives of the project during implementation, why these changes were made and what was the approval process. The GEF guidance indicates the following possible reasons for adaptive management:

- a) original objectives were not sufficiently articulated;
- b) exogenous conditions changed, due to which a change in objectives was needed;
- c) project was restructured because original objectives were overambitious;
- d) project was restructured because of a lack of progress;
- e) Other (specify).

In addition to determining the reasons for change, the evaluator should consider how the changes were instigated and how these changes affected project results. Questions may include:

- Did the project undergo significant changes as a result of recommendations from the mid-term review? Or as a result of other review procedures? Explain the process and implications.
- If the changes were extensive, did they materially change the expected project outcomes?
- Were the project changes articulated in writing and then considered and approved by the project steering committee?

## PROJECT RESULTS

A 'result' is defined as a describable or measurable development change resulting from a cause-and-effect relationship. In GEF terms, results include direct project outputs, short- to medium-term outcomes, and longer term impact including global environmental benefits, replication effects, and other local effects.

Assessing project results involves attention to the full scope of a results based management (RBM) chain, from inputs to activities, to outputs, outcomes and impacts. Basic definitions for each link in the RBM chain, are described in box 4.

For UNDP supported GEF financed projects, the main focus of attention is at the outcome level, recognizing that global environmental benefit impacts are often difficult to discern and gauging outputs is straightforward but not sufficient to capture project effectiveness. Most UNDP supported GEF financed projects are expected to achieve anticipated outcomes by project closing. For GEF 4 (and subsequent cycle) projects it is required, and for GEF 3 projects it is encouraged, that the evaluators assess the project results using indicators and relevant tracking tools."<sup>23</sup> A sample matrix for assessing outcomes against indicators is included in Annex 5.

### Box 4. GEF Focal Area Tracking Tools

To measure and monitor project progress in achieving outcomes and impacts as outlined in the GEF results framework, tracking tools have been developed for each GEF focal area (i.e. Biodiversity, Land Degradation, Climate Change Mitigation etc...). GEF Tracking tools must be completed and submitted to the GEF at CEO endorsement (i.e. with project document), mid-term of the project cycle (i.e. with midterm review), and during the closing phase of the project (i.e. with terminal evaluation). The tracking tools are important evidence for the evaluation teams to take into account when gauging achievement of project outcomes and impacts. As part of the final APR/PIR process, all projects should have their final GEF focal area tracking tools completed and available for review during the terminal evaluation. Additional information on each focal area tracking tool is available at [www.thegef.org](http://www.thegef.org)

<sup>23</sup> GEF TE Guidance, pg. 5

**Box 5. Basic definition for each link in RBM Chain****Inputs**

Financial, human and material resources used for the project

**Activities**

Actions taken through which the project inputs are mobilized to produce specific outputs

**Outputs**

Products and services that result from the project

**Outcomes**

The likely or achieved short- and medium-term effects of an intervention's outputs. Examples of outcomes could include, but are not restricted to, stronger institutional capacities, higher public awareness (when leading to changes of behavior), and transformed policy frameworks or markets.

**Impacts**

Actual or anticipated, positive or negative changes in global environmental benefit, as verified by environmental stress and/or status change, and also taking into account sustainable development impacts, including changed livelihoods.

In addition to assessing project outcomes, the evaluation should include consideration of results as measured by broader aspects such as: **country ownership, mainstreaming, sustainability, catalytic role and impact**. These aspects are discussed below.

**COUNTRY OWNERSHIP**

An important result for UNDP supported GEF financed projects is that they address country priorities. It will be important for the evaluators to find evidence that the project fits within stated sector development priorities, and also that outputs, such as new environmental laws, or new strategies for sustainable livelihoods around protected areas, have been developed with involvement from government officials and have been adopted into national strategies, policies and legal codes. If the level of country ownership is low, consequent weaknesses in capacity building, project sustainability and positive environmental impact can be expected. This is to be a narrative discussion, with no terminal evaluation ratings expected.

Some elements of effective country ownership may include:

- Project concept has its origin within the national sectoral and development plans

- Outcomes (or potential outcomes) from the project have been incorporated into the national sectoral and development plans
- Relevant country representatives (e.g., governmental official, civil society, etc.) are actively involved in project identification, planning and/or implementation
- The recipient government has maintained financial commitment to the project
- The government has approved policies and/or modified regulatory frame works in line with the project's objectives.

Some questions to consider in evaluating country ownership:

- Was the project concept in line with development priorities and plans of the country (or countries)?
- Were the relevant country representatives from government and civil society involved in project implementation, including as part of the project steering committee?
- Was an intergovernmental committee given responsibility to liaise with the project team, recognizing that more than one ministry should be involved?
- Have the government(s), enacted legislation,

and/or developed policies and regulations in line with the project's objectives?

## MAINSTREAMING

UNDP supported GEF financed projects are key elements in UNDP country programming. As such, the objectives and outcomes of the project should align with UNDP country programme strategies as well as to GEF-required global environmental benefits as outlined in global environmental conventions. Project terminal evaluations must therefore assess how these projects are successfully mainstreaming other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and women's empowerment. This means an additional effort will be needed to review the UNDAF in the country, to review also the UNDP Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) and the evaluation plan that is part of the CPAP.

### **The section on mainstreaming should assess:**

1. Whether it is possible to identify and define positive or negative effects of the project on local populations (e.g. income generation/job creation, improved natural resource management arrangements with local groups, improvement in policy frameworks for resource allocation and distribution, regeneration of natural resources for long term sustainability).
2. If the project objectives conform to agreed priorities in the UNDP country programme document (CPD) and country programme action plan (CPAP).
3. Whether there is evidence that the project outcomes have contributed to better preparations to cope with natural disasters.
4. Whether gender issues had been taken into account in project design and implementation and in what way has the project

contributed to greater consideration of gender aspects, (i.e. project team composition, gender-related aspects of pollution impacts, stakeholder outreach to women's groups, etc). If so, indicate how.<sup>24</sup>

The mainstreaming assessment should take note of the points of convergence between UNDP environment-related and other development programming. The assessment will be in narrative form only, with no ratings expected.

## SUSTAINABILITY

When assessing the sustainability of UNDP supported GEF financed projects, UNDP conforms to the general guidance set out in the GEF M&E policy and GEF Guidelines, which stipulates that all terminal evaluations should at a minimum assess "the likelihood of sustainability of outcomes at project termination, and provide a rating for this".<sup>25</sup>

Sustainability is generally considered to be the likelihood of continued benefits after the project ends. Consequently the assessment of sustainability considers the risks that are likely to affect the continuation of project outcomes. The GEF Guidelines establish four areas for considering risks to sustainability. Each should be separately evaluated and then rated as to the likelihood and extent that risks will impede sustainability.

1. **Financial risks:** Are there financial risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outcomes? What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once GEF grant assistance ends? (This might include funding through government - in the form of direct subsidies, or tax incentives, it may involve support from other donors, and also the private sector. The analysis could also point to macroeconomic factors.)

<sup>24</sup> Both UNDP and GEF are focusing greater attention to ensure that gender issues are taken into account in project formulation and implementation, (see UNDP Gender Equality Strategy 2008-2011).

<sup>25</sup> Guidelines for GEF Agencies in Conducting Terminal Evaluations, 3.3 para. 19, pg.9-10

2. **Socio-economic risks:** Are there social or political risks that may threaten the sustainability of project outcomes? What is the risk for instance that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public/stakeholder awareness in support of the project's long-term objectives?
3. **Institutional framework and governance risks:** Do the legal frameworks, policies, and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project benefits? Are requisite systems for accountability and transparency, and required technical know-how, in place?
4. **Environmental risks:** Are there ongoing activities that may pose an environmental threat to the sustainability of project outcomes? For example, biodiversity-related gains or water quality-related gains at risk due to frequent severe storms?

All the risk dimensions of sustainability are critical. Therefore, the overall rating for sustainability should not be higher than the lowest rated dimension. For example, if a project has an unlikely rating in any dimension, its overall rating cannot be higher than unlikely.

Project outputs that typically improve the sustainability of project outcomes include:

- Development and implementation of a sustainability strategy.
- Establishment of financial and economic instruments and mechanisms to ensure the ongoing flow of benefits once the GEF assistance ends (from the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and market transformations to promote the project's objectives).
- Development of suitable organizational arrangements by public and/or private sector.
- Development of policy and regulatory frameworks that further the project objectives.
- Incorporation of environmental and ecological factors affecting future flow of benefits.
- Development of appropriate institutional capacity (systems, structures, staff, expertise, etc.).
- Identification and involvement of champions (i.e. individuals in government and civil society who can promote sustainability of project outcomes).
- Achieving social sustainability, for example, by mainstreaming project activities into the economy or community production activities.
- Achieving stakeholders' consensus regarding courses of action on project activities.

#### Box 6. Project Sustainability Ratings

4	<b>Likely (L)</b>	negligible risks to sustainability, with key outcomes expected to continue into the foreseeable future.
3	<b>Moderately Likely (ML)</b>	moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained
2	<b>Moderately Unlikely (MU)</b>	substantial risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on.
1	<b>Unlikely (UL)</b>	severe risk that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained.
Not Applicable (N/A) Unable to Assess (U/A)		

## CATALYTIC ROLE

In addition to sustainability, terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects should include an assessment of catalytic or replication effect. No ratings are expected, however the evaluator should consider the extent to which the project has demonstrated: a) production of a public good, b) demonstration, c) replication, and d) scaling up. Definitions of these terms are included in Figure 4.

Replication can be considered when lessons and experiences are replicated in different geographic areas, and also when lessons and experiences are replicated within the same area but funded by other sources. Examples of replication approaches include:

- Knowledge transfer (i.e., dissemination of lessons through project result documents, training workshops, information exchange, a national and regional forum, etc).
- Expansion of demonstration projects.
- Capacity building and training of individuals, and institutions to expand the project's achievements in the country or other regions.
- Use of project-trained individuals, institutions or companies to replicate the project's outcomes in other regions.

## IMPACT

It is increasingly relevant to discuss the extent to which UNDP supported GEF financed projects are achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. The key findings that should be brought out in evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated:

- verifiable improvements in ecological status
- verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems
- through specified process indicators, that progress is being made towards achievement of stress reduction and/or ecological improvement.<sup>26</sup>

In the discussion on impacts it will be important at a minimum to:


- identify the mechanisms at work (i.e. the causal links to project outputs and outcomes);
- assess the extent to which changes are taking place at scales commensurate to natural system boundaries; and
- assess the likely permanence (long lasting nature) of the impacts.

Impact analysis requires the availability of verifiable data on pollution reduction and ecological

**Figure 3. Assessment of Catalytic Role**

Scaling up	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Approaches developed through the project are taken up on a regional / national scale, becoming widely accepted, and perhaps legally required</li> </ul>
Replication	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Activities, demonstrations, and/or techniques are repeated within or outside the project, nationally or internationally</li> </ul>
Demonstration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Steps have been taken to catalyze the public good, for instance through the development of demonstration sites, successful information dissemination and training</li> </ul>
Production of public good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ The lowest level of catalytic result, including for instance development of new technologies and approaches.</li> <li>■ No significant actions were taken to build on this achievement, so the catalytic effect is left to 'market forces'</li> </ul>

**Figure 4. Theory of change approach**



status improvement, and/or the existence of process indicators that suggest such impacts should occur in the future as a result of project achievements. When baseline information exists, this information should be used in the assessment. For GEF-4 and GEF-5 projects, the existence of GEF focal-area tracking tools should greatly aid in the assessment of impact.

For many projects, and especially foundation setting efforts, (i.e. enabling activities, and international waters projects developing Transboundary Diagnostic Analyses), it may often be the cases that stress reduction and/or status change impacts cannot be discerned at project closure. Consequently, the GEF Evaluation Office has been developing a methodology that enables the evaluator to build on findings related to outcomes and sustainability and use them to consider whether the project has put in place the conditions (building blocks or process) that could eventually lead to impact (lasting improvements on socioeconomic and environmental status). On the basis of the outcome and sustainability analyses, evaluators can also identify key missing elements as well as contextual factors observed at the time, that are likely to obstruct further progress.

As part of the GEF 4th Overall Performance Review (2009) the GEFEO developed and published a Handbook on the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (RoTI).<sup>27</sup> The Handbook sets out a useful methodology for gauging the likelihood of impacts at project closure. The methodology uses a Theory of Change approach to evaluate the overall performance of GEF projects. The

methodology features three main stages, (see figure 4).

**Attention:** The RoTI methodology is not required for terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects; however the GEF Evaluation Office is developing new guidance in 2012 that will likely require the introduction of a new section in the results analysis on 'progress to impacts' for all full size projects. A 'theory of change' as described above will need to be developed and included in the 'progress to impacts' section, and a rating of the project's progress to impact is expected. Included in this guidance manual is an interim rating scheme for impact, which provides an opportunity to rate whether progress towards impact has been significant, minimal or negligible. UNDP guidance will be modified to fully address the assessment of impacts after the GEF Evaluation Office completes its new evaluation guidance.

The evaluators will include a section of the report setting out their conclusions, in light of the findings. The **conclusions** should be comprehensive and balanced, and highlight the strengths, weaknesses and outcomes of the project. They should be well substantiated by the evidence and logically connected to the terminal evaluation findings. They should respond to key evaluation questions and provide insights into the identification of and/or solutions to important problems or issues pertinent to project beneficiaries, UNDP and GEF.

The terminal evaluation report should provide practical, feasible **recommendations** directed to the intended users of the evaluation about what actions to take and decisions to make. The recommendations should be specifically supported by the

<sup>26</sup> For example, if as a result of the project, there have been regulatory and policy changes at regional, national and/or local levels

<sup>27</sup> [OPS4-M2-ROtI Handbook | Global Environment Facility](#)

evidence and linked to the findings and conclusions around key questions addressed by the evaluation.

The terminal evaluation report should also include, if available, **lessons** that can be taken from the evaluation, including best (and worst) practices that can provide knowledge gained from the particular circumstance(programmatic and evaluation methods used, partnerships, financial leveraging, etc.) that are applicable to other GEF and UNDP interventions.

### 3.3 RATINGS

While the UNDP evaluation policy does not require ratings as part of its performance standards, the GEF stipulates that ratings should be used to assess **project relevance, effectiveness and efficiency, as well as the quality of M&E systems**. UNDP has agreed to rate all terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects for these criteria. It is important to note that the ratings scales differ for different criteria.

Table 1. Rating Scales		
<b>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&amp;E, I&amp;E Execution</b>  <b>6: Highly Satisfactory (HS):</b> The project had no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency  <b>5: Satisfactory (S):</b> There were only minor shortcomings  <b>4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS):</b> there were moderate shortcomings  <b>3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU):</b> the project had significant shortcomings  <b>2. Unsatisfactory (U):</b> there were major shortcomings in the achievement of project objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency  <b>1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU):</b> The project had severe shortcomings	<b>Sustainability ratings:</b>  <b>4. Likely (L):</b> negligible risks to sustainability  <b>3. Moderately Likely (ML):</b> moderate risks  <b>2. Moderately Unlikely (MU):</b> significant risks  <b>1. Unlikely (U):</b> severe risks	<b>Relevance ratings:</b>  <b>2. Relevant (R)</b>  <b>1. Not relevant (NR)</b>  <b>Impact Ratings:</b>  <b>3. Significant (S)</b>  <b>2. Minimal (M)</b>  <b>1. Negligible (N)</b>
<i>Additional ratings where relevant:</i> Not Applicable (N/A) Unable to Assess (U/A)		

## ANNEX 1

# GLOSSARY

This glossary of terms is drawn from UNDP, GEF and UNEG source materials, as well as from the OECD-DAC<sup>28</sup>

Term	Definition
Conclusions	Point out the factors of success and failure of the evaluated intervention, with special attention paid to the intended and unintended results and impacts, and more generally to any other strength or weakness. A conclusion draws on data collection and analyses undertaken, through a transparent chain of arguments.
Co-Financing	Includes Grants, Loans/Concessional (compared to market rate), Credits, Equity investments, In-kind support, other contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector and beneficiaries. Refer to Council documents on co-financing for definitions, such as GEF/C.20/6.
Cost Effectiveness	Assesses the achievement of the environmental and developmental objectives as well as the project's outputs in relation to the inputs, costs, and implementing time. It also examines the project's compliance with the application of the incremental cost concept.
Country Ownership	Relevance of the project to national development and environmental agendas, recipient country commitment, and regional and international agreements where applicable.
Effectiveness	The extent to which the development intervention's objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance. Note: Also used as an aggregate measure of (or judgment about) the merit or worth of an activity, i.e. the extent to which an intervention has attained, or is expected to attain, its major relevant objectives efficiently in a sustainable fashion and with a positive institutional development impact. Related term: efficacy.
Efficiency	A measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to results.
Evaluation	Project evaluations assess the efficiency and effectiveness of a project in achieving its intended results. They also assess the relevance and sustainability of outputs as contributions to medium-term and longer-term outcomes. Projects can be evaluated during the time of implementation, at the end of implementation (terminal evaluation), or after a period of time after the project has ended (ex-post evaluation). Project evaluation can be invaluable for managing for results, and serves to reinforce the accountability of project managers, COs, PTAs, etc. Additionally, project evaluation provides a basis for the evaluation of outcomes and programmes, as well as for strategic and programmatic evaluations and ADRs, and for distilling lessons from experience for learning and sharing knowledge. In UNDP, project evaluations are mandatory when required by a partnership protocol, such as with the Global Environment Facility
Financial Planning	Includes actual project cost by activity, financial management (including disbursement issues), and co-financing.

<sup>28</sup> Development Cooperation Directorate, Development Assistance Committee, at the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. See the DAC Network on Development Evaluation, [Glossary of key terms in evaluation and results based management](#);

Implementation Approach	Includes an analysis of the project's logical framework, adaptation to changing conditions (adaptive management), partnerships in implementation arrangements, changes in project design, and overall project management.
Joint Evaluation	An evaluation to which different donor agencies and/or partners participate.
Lessons Learned	Generalizations based on evaluation experiences with projects, programs, or policies that abstract from the specific circumstances to broader situations. Frequently, lessons highlight strengths or weaknesses in preparation, design, and implementation that affect performance, outcome, and impact.
Leveraged Resources	Additional resources, beyond those committed to the project itself at the time of approval, which are mobilized later as a direct result of the project. Leveraged resources can be financial or in-kind and they may be from other donors, NGO's, foundations, governments, communities or the private sector.
Monitoring	The periodic oversight of a process, or the implementation of an activity, which seeks to establish the extent to which inputs, work schedules, other required actions and outputs are proceeding according to plan, so that timely action can be taken to correct the deficiencies detected.
Quality Assurance	Quality assurance encompasses any activity that is concerned with assessing and improving the merit or the worth of a development intervention or its compliance with given standards. Note: examples of quality assurance activities include appraisal, results based management, reviews during implementation, evaluations, etc. Quality assurance may also refer to the assessment of the quality of a portfolio and its development effectiveness. For the purposes of this Guide, it especially refers to the assessment of the quality of terminal evaluations carried out for UNDP/GEF projects.
Relevance	The extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country needs, global priorities and partners' and donors' policies.
Replication Approach	In the context of GEF projects, is defined as lessons and experiences coming out of the project that are replicated or scaled up in the design and implementation of other projects.
Risk Analysis	An analysis or an assessment of factors (called assumptions in the logframe) affect or are likely to affect the successful achievement of an intervention's objectives. A detailed examination of the potential unwanted and negative consequences to human life, health, property, or the environment posed by development interventions; a systematic process to provide information regarding such undesirable consequences; the process of quantification of the probabilities and expected impacts for identified risks.
Results	The positive and negative, foreseen and unforeseen changes to and effects produced by a development intervention. In GEF terms, results include direct project outputs, short-to medium-term outcomes, and longer term impact including global environmental benefits, replication effects, and other local effects.
Stakeholder Participation	Stakeholders are agencies, organizations, groups or individuals who have a direct or indirect interest in the development intervention or its evaluation.
Sustainability	Measures the extent to which benefits are likely to continue, within or outside the project domain, from a particular project or program after GEF assistance/external assistance has come to an end. Projects need to be environmentally as well as financially and socially sustainable
Terms of Reference	Written document presenting the purpose and scope of the evaluation, the methods to be used, the standard against which performance is to be assessed or analyses are to be conducted, the resources and time allocated, and reporting requirements. Two other expressions sometimes used with the same meaning are "scope of work" and "evaluation mandate".
Triangulation	The use of three or more theories, sources or types of information, or types of analysis to verify and substantiate an assessment. Note: by combining multiple data sources, methods, analyses or theories, evaluators seek to overcome the bias that comes from single informants, single methods, single observer or single theory studies.

## ANNEX 2

# TERMINAL EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

### INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the *Project title* (PIMS #.)

The essentials of the project to be evaluated are as follows: *(fully complete the table below)*.

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE				
Project Title: <input type="text"/>				
GEF Project ID:	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	at endorsement (Million US\$)	at completion (Million US\$)
UNDP Project ID:	<input type="text"/>	GEF financing:	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Country:	<input type="text"/>	IA/EA own:	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Region:	<input type="text"/>	Government:	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Focal Area:	<input type="text"/>	Other:	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Operational Program:	<input type="text"/>	Total co-financing:	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Executing Agency:	<input type="text"/>	Total Project Cost:	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Other Partners involved:	<input type="text"/>	Prodoc Signature (date project began):		<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed:	Actual:

### OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The project was designed to: *(provide a project summary including project goal and outcomes. Also, in cases where the GEF funded project forms part of a larger programme, specify if the TE is to cover the entire programme or only the GEF component).*

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

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

## EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

An overall approach and method<sup>29</sup> 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 TOR Annex C*). The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

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

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – incl. Annual APR/PIR and other Reports, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other material 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 TOR Annex B of this Terms of Reference.

## EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (*see Annex A*), 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 TOR Annex D.

*A useful table to include in the evaluation report is set out below.*

Rating Project Performance		
Criteria	Comments	
<b>Monitoring and Evaluation:</b> Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S) Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)		
Overall quality of M&E	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
M&E design at project start up	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
M&E Plan Implementation	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
<b>IA &amp; EA Execution:</b> Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S) Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)		
Overall Quality of Project Implementation/Execution	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Implementing Agency Execution	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Executing Agency Execution	(rate 6 pt. scale)	

<sup>29</sup> For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](#), Chapter 7, pg. 163

<b>Outcomes</b> Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S) Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)		
Overall Quality of Project Outcomes	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Relevance: relevant (R) or not relevant (NR)	(rate 2pt. scale)	
Effectiveness	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Efficiency	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
<b>Sustainability:</b> Likely (L); Moderately Likely (ML); Moderately Unlikely (MU); Unlikely (U).		
Overall likelihood of risks to Sustainability:	(rate 4pt. scale)	
Financial resources	(rate 4pt. scale)	
Socio-economic	(rate 4pt. scale)	
Institutional framework and governance	(rate 4pt. scale)	
Environmental	(rate 4pt. scale)	
<b>Impact:</b> Significant (S), Minimal (M), Negligible (N)		
Environmental Status Improvement	(rate 3 pt. scale)	
Environmental Stress Reduction	(rate 3 pt. scale)	
Progress towards stress/status change	(rate 3 pt. scale)	
<b>Overall Project Results</b>	(rate 6 pt. scale)	

## PROJECT FINANCE / COFINANCE

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

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

## MAINSTREAMING

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

## 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, or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.

## CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

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

## IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

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

## EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the evaluation will be *XX* days according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation	<i>XX</i> days <i>(recommended: 2-4)</i>	<i>date</i>
Evaluation Mission	<i>XX</i> days <i>(r: 7-15)</i>	<i>date</i>
Draft Evaluation Report	<i>XX</i> days <i>(r: 5-10)</i>	<i>date</i>
Final Report	<i>XX</i> days <i>(r: 1-2)</i>	<i>date</i>

## EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

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

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

## TEAM COMPOSITION

The evaluation team will be composed of *(1-2 international /national evaluators)*. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. *(If the team has more than 1 evaluator, one will be designated as the team leader and will be responsible for finalizing the report)*. The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project

preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The Team members must present the following qualifications:

- Minimum **XX** years of relevant professional experience
- Knowledge of UNDP and GEF
- Previous experience with results based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
- Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s)
- *(additional skills based on project particulars)*

## EVALUATOR ETHICS

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct ([Annex E](#)) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG '[Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations](#)'.

## PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

*(this payment schedule is indicative, to be filled in by the CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on their standard procurement procedures)*

%	Milestone
10%	At contract signing
40%	Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report
50%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report

## APPLICATION PROCESS

Applicants are requested to apply online *(indicate the site, such as <http://jobs.undp.org>, etc.)* by (date). Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions. The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in English *(Spanish in LAC, French in Francophone Africa, etc.)* with indication of the e mail and phone contact. Shortlisted candidates will be requested to submit a price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs).

UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/ skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

## TOR ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

(to be added)

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

(to be added)

## TOR ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

Evaluative Criteria	Questions	Indicators	Sources
<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>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>			

## TOR ANNEX D: RATINGS

Ratings Scales		
Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution	Sustainability ratings:	Relevance ratings
<p>6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): The project had no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency</p> <p>5: Satisfactory (S): There were only minor shortcomings</p> <p>4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS):there were moderate shortcomings</p> <p>3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): the project had significant shortcomings</p> <p>2. Unsatisfactory (U): there were major shortcomings in the achievement of project objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency</p> <p>1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): The project had severe shortcomings</p>	<p>4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability</p> <p>3. Moderately Likely (ML):moderate risks</p> <p>2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks</p> <p>1. Unlikely (U): severe risks</p>	<p>2. Relevant (R)</p> <p>1.. Not relevant (NR)</p> <p>Impact Ratings:</p> <p>3. Significant (S)</p> <p>2. Minimal (M)</p> <p>1. Negligible (N)</p>
<p>Additional ratings where relevant:</p> <p>Not Applicable (N/A)</p> <p>Unable to Assess (U/A)</p>		

## ANNEX E: EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT AGREEMENT FORM

### Evaluators:

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

### Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form<sup>30</sup>

#### 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: \_\_\_\_\_

<sup>30</sup> www.undp.org/unegcodeofconduct

## TOR ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE<sup>31</sup>

### i. Opening page:

- Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
- UNDP and GEF project ID#s.
- Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report
- Region and countries included in the project
- GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program
- Implementing Partner and other project partners
- Evaluation team members
- Acknowledgements

### ii. Executive Summary

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

### iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations

(See: UNDP Editorial Manual<sup>32</sup> )

#### 1. Introduction

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

#### 2. Project description and development context

- Project start and duration
- Problems that the project sought to address
- Immediate and development objectives of the project
- Baseline Indicators established
- Main stakeholders
- Expected Results

#### 3. Findings

(In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) must be rated<sup>33</sup> )

##### 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

---

<sup>31</sup> The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

<sup>32</sup> UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

<sup>33</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.

### **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 (\*)
- 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 County Office

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

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

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

#### UNDP GEF RTA

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

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

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

## ANNEX 3

# CO-FINANCING TABLE FOR UNDP SUPPORTED GEF FINANCED PROJECTS

Co financing (Type/ Sources)	IA own Financing (mill US\$)		Government (mill US\$)		Other Sources* (mill US\$)		Total Financing (mill US\$)		Total Disbursement (mill US\$)	
	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual
Grant										
Credits										
Equity										
In-kind										
Non-grant Instruments*										
Other Types										
Total										

\*Other Sources refer to contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector, etc. Specify each and explain "Other sources" of co-financing when possible.

\* Describe "Non-grant instruments" (such as guarantees, contingent grants, etc.)

## Annex 4

# SAMPLE EVALUATION CRITERIA MATRIX

Evaluative Criteria	Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
<b>Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the UNCBD and GEF focal areas, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels for biodiversity conservation in Carpathian mountain grassland ecosystems?</b>				
Is the project relevant to UNCBD and other international convention objectives?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How does the project support the objectives of the UNCBD?</li> <li>Does the project support other international conventions, such as the Carpathian Convention, and the UNFCCC?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>UNCBD priorities and areas of work incorporated in project design</li> <li>Level of implementation of UNCBD in Czech Republic, and contribution of the project</li> <li>Priorities and areas of work of other conventions incorporated in project design</li> <li>Extent to which the project is actually implemented in line with incremental cost argument</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project documents</li> <li>National policies and strategies to implement the UNCBD, other international conventions, or related to environment more generally</li> <li>UNCBD and other international convention web sites</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documents analyses</li> <li>Interviews with project team, UNDP and other partners</li> </ul>
Is the project relevant the GEF biodiversity focal area?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How does the project support the GEF biodiversity focal area and strategic priorities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existence of a clear relationship between the project objectives and GEF biodiversity focal area</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project documents</li> <li>GEF focal areas strategies and documents</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documents analyses</li> <li>GEF website</li> <li>Interviews with UNDP and project team</li> </ul>
Is the project relevant to the Czech Republic's environment and sustainable development objectives?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How does the project support the environment and sustainable development objectives of the Czech Republic?</li> <li>Is the project country-driven?</li> <li>What was the level of stakeholder participation in project design?</li> <li>What was the level of stakeholder ownership in implementation?</li> <li>Does the project adequately take into account the national realities, both in terms of institutional and policy framework in its design and its implementation?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Degree to which the project supports national environmental objectives</li> <li>Degree of coherence between the project and national priorities, policies and strategies</li> <li>Appreciation from national stakeholders with respect to adequacy of project design and implementation to national realities and existing capacities</li> <li>Level of involvement of government officials and other partners in the project design process</li> <li>Coherence between needs expressed by national stakeholders and UNDP-GEF criteria</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project documents</li> <li>National policies and strategies</li> <li>Key project partners</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documents analyses</li> <li>Interviews with UNDP and project partners</li> </ul>

Is the project addressing the needs of target beneficiaries at the local and regional levels?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ How does the project support the needs of relevant stakeholders?</li> <li>■ Has the implementation of the project been inclusive of all relevant stakeholders?</li> <li>■ Were local beneficiaries and stakeholders adequately involved in project design and implementation?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Strength of the link between expected results from the project and the needs of relevant stakeholders</li> <li>■ Degree of involvement and inclusiveness of stakeholders in project design and implementation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Project partners and stakeholders</li> <li>■ Needs assessment studies</li> <li>■ Project documents</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Document analysis</li> <li>■ Interviews with relevant stakeholders</li> </ul>
Is the project internally coherent in its design?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Are there logical linkages between expected results of the project (log frame) and the project design (in terms of project components, choice of partners, structure, delivery mechanism, scope, budget, use of resources etc)?</li> <li>■ Is the length of the project sufficient to achieve project outcomes?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Level of coherence between project expected results and project design internal logic</li> <li>■ Level of coherence between project design and project implementation approach</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Program and project documents</li> <li>■ Key project stakeholders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Document analysis</li> <li>■ Key interviews</li> </ul>
How is the project relevant with respect to other donor-supported activities?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Does the GEF funding support activities and objectives not addressed by other donors?</li> <li>■ How do GEF-funds help to fill gaps (or give additional stimulus) that are necessary but are not covered by other donors?</li> <li>■ Is there coordination and complementarity between donors?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Degree to which program was coherent and complementary to other donor programming nationally and regionally</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Documents from other donor supported activities</li> <li>■ Other donor representatives</li> <li>■ Project documents</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Documents analyses</li> <li>■ Interviews with project partners and relevant stakeholders</li> </ul>
Does the project provide relevant lessons and experiences for other similar projects in the future?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Has the experience of the project provided relevant lessons for other future projects targeted at similar objectives?</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Data collected throughout evaluation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Data analysis</li> </ul>

Effectiveness: To what extent have/will the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been/be achieved?				
Has the project been effective in achieving the expected outcomes and objectives?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has the project been effective in achieving its expected outcomes?               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Institutional capacity in place to assess, plan and implement priority conservation management of mountain grasslands taking advantage of newly available EU funding mechanisms</li> <li>Farmers' capacity and incentives for and participation in conservation-oriented management of mountain grasslands is improved</li> <li>Monitoring and evaluation programme for mountain grassland biodiversity conservation management in place</li> <li>National policy for agro-environmental schemes incorporates project experience</li> </ol> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See indicators in project document results framework and logframe</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project documents</li> <li>Project team and relevant stakeholders</li> <li>Data reported in project annual and quarterly reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documents analysis</li> <li>Interviews with project team</li> <li>Interviews with relevant stakeholders</li> </ul>
How is risk and risk mitigation being managed?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How well are risks, assumptions and impact drivers being managed?</li> <li>What was the quality of risk mitigation strategies developed? Were these sufficient?</li> <li>Are there clear strategies for risk mitigation related with long-term sustainability of the project?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Completeness of risk identification and assumptions during project planning and design</li> <li>Quality of existing information systems in place to identify emerging risks and other issues</li> <li>Quality of risk mitigation strategies developed and followed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project documents</li> <li>UNDP, project team, and relevant stakeholders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document analysis</li> <li>Interviews</li> </ul>
What lessons can be drawn regarding effectiveness for other similar projects in the future?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What lessons have been learned from the project regarding achievement of outcomes?</li> <li>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?</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Data collected throughout evaluation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Data analysis</li> </ul>

Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?				
Was project support provided in an efficient way?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Was adaptive management used or needed to ensure efficient resource use?</li> <li>■ Did the project logical framework and work plans and any changes made to them use as management tools during implementation?</li> <li>■ Were the accounting and financial systems in place adequate for project management and producing accurate and timely financial information?</li> <li>■ Were progress reports produced accurately, timely and responded to reporting requirements including adaptive management changes?</li> <li>■ Was project implementation as cost effective as originally proposed (planned vs. actual)?</li> <li>■ Did the leveraging of funds (co-financing) happen as planned?</li> <li>■ Were financial resources utilized efficiently? Could financial resources have been used more efficiently?</li> <li>■ Was procurement carried out in a manner making efficient use of project resources?</li> <li>■ How was results-based management used during project implementation?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Availability and quality of financial and progress reports</li> <li>■ Timeliness and adequacy of reporting provided</li> <li>■ Level of discrepancy between planned and utilized financial expenditures</li> <li>■ Planned vs. actual funds leveraged</li> <li>■ Cost in view of results achieved compared to costs of similar projects from other organizations</li> <li>■ Adequacy of project choices in view of existing context, infrastructure and cost</li> <li>■ Quality of results-based management reporting (progress reporting, monitoring and evaluation)</li> <li>■ Occurrence of change in project design/ implementation approach (i.e. restructuring) when needed to improve project efficiency</li> <li>■ Cost associated with delivery mechanism and management structure compare to alternatives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Project documents and evaluations</li> <li>■ UNDP</li> <li>■ Project team</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Document analysis</li> <li>■ Key interviews</li> </ul>
How efficient are partnership arrangements for the project?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ To what extent partnerships/linkages between institutions/ organizations were encouraged and supported?</li> <li>■ Which partnerships/linkages were facilitated? Which ones can be considered sustainable?</li> <li>■ What was the level of efficiency of cooperation and collaboration arrangements?</li> <li>■ Which methods were successful or not and why?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Specific activities conducted to support the development of cooperative arrangements between partners,</li> <li>■ Examples of supported partnerships</li> <li>■ Evidence that particular partnerships/linkages will be sustained</li> <li>■ Types/quality of partnership cooperation methods utilized</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Project documents and evaluations</li> <li>■ Project partners and relevant stakeholders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Document analysis</li> <li>■ Interviews</li> </ul>
Did the project efficiently utilize local capacity in implementation?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Was an appropriate balance struck between utilization of international expertise as well as local capacity?</li> <li>■ Did the project take into account local capacity in design and implementation of the project?</li> <li>■ Was there an effective collaboration between institutions responsible for implementing the project?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Proportion of expertise utilized from international experts compared to national experts</li> <li>■ Number/quality of analyses done to assess local capacity potential and absorptive capacity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Project documents and evaluations</li> <li>■ UNDP</li> <li>■ Beneficiaries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Document analysis</li> <li>■ Interviews</li> </ul>

What lessons can be drawn regarding efficiency for other similar projects in the future?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ What lessons can be learnt from the project regarding efficiency?</li> <li>■ How could the project have more efficiently carried out implementation (in terms of management structures and procedures, partnerships arrangements etc...)?</li> <li>■ What changes could have been made (if any) to the project in order to improve its efficiency?</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Data collected throughout evaluation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Data analysis</li> </ul>
Effectiveness: To what extent have/ will the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been/be achieved?				
Has the project been effective in achieving the expected outcomes and objectives?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Has the project been effective in achieving its expected outcomes?</li> <li>■ 1. Institutional capacity in place to assess, plan and implement priority conservation management of mountain grasslands taking advantage of newly available EU funding mechanisms</li> <li>■ 2. Farmers' capacity and incentives for and participation in conservation-oriented management of mountain grasslands is improved</li> <li>■ 3. Monitoring and evaluation programme for mountain grassland biodiversity conservation management in place</li> <li>■ 4. National policy for agro-environmental schemes incorporates project experience</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ See indicators in project document results framework and logframe</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Project documents</li> <li>■ Project team and relevant stakeholders</li> <li>■ Data reported in project annual and quarterly reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Documents analysis</li> <li>■ Interviews with project team</li> <li>■ Interviews with relevant stakeholders</li> </ul>
How is risk and risk mitigation being managed?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ How well are risks, assumptions and impact drivers being managed?</li> <li>■ What was the quality of risk mitigation strategies developed? Were these sufficient?</li> <li>■ Are there clear strategies for risk mitigation related with long-term sustainability of the project?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Completeness of risk identification and assumptions during project planning and design</li> <li>■ Quality of existing information systems in place to identify emerging risks and other issues</li> <li>■ Quality of risk mitigations strategies developed and followed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Project documents</li> <li>■ UNDP, project team, and relevant stakeholders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Document analysis</li> <li>■ Interviews</li> </ul>

What lessons can be drawn regarding effectiveness for other similar projects in the future?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ What lessons have been learned from the project regarding achievement of outcomes?</li> <li>■ 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?</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Data collected throughout evaluation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Data analysis</li> </ul>
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?				
Was project support provided in an efficient way?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Was adaptive management used or needed to ensure efficient resource use?</li> <li>■ Did the project logical framework and work plans and any changes made to them use as management tools during implementation?</li> <li>■ Were the accounting and financial systems in place adequate for project management and producing accurate and timely financial information?</li> <li>■ Were progress reports produced accurately, timely and responded to reporting requirements including adaptive management changes?</li> <li>■ Was project implementation as cost effective as originally proposed (planned vs. actual)?</li> <li>■ Did the leveraging of funds (co-financing) happen as planned?</li> <li>■ Were financial resources utilized efficiently? Could financial resources have been used more efficiently?</li> <li>■ Was procurement carried out in a manner making efficient use of project resources?</li> <li>■ How was results-based management used during project implementation?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Availability and quality of financial and progress reports</li> <li>■ Timeliness and adequacy of reporting provided</li> <li>■ Level of discrepancy between planned and utilized financial expenditures</li> <li>■ Planned vs. actual funds leveraged</li> <li>■ Cost in view of results achieved compared to costs of similar projects from other organizations</li> <li>■ Adequacy of project choices in view of existing context, infrastructure and cost</li> <li>■ Quality of results-based management reporting (progress reporting, monitoring and evaluation)</li> <li>■ Occurrence of change in project design/ implementation approach (i.e. restructuring) when needed to improve project efficiency</li> <li>■ Cost associated with delivery mechanism and management structure compare to alternatives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Project documents and evaluations</li> <li>■ UNDP</li> <li>■ Project team</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Document analysis</li> <li>■ Key interviews</li> </ul>

How efficient are partnership arrangements for the project?	<p>To what extent partnerships/linkages between institutions/ organizations were encouraged and supported?</p> <p>Which partnerships/linkages were facilitated?</p> <p>Which ones can be considered sustainable?</p> <p>What was the level of efficiency of cooperation and collaboration arrangements?</p> <p>Which methods were successful or not and why?</p>	<p>Specific activities conducted to support the development of cooperative arrangements between partners,</p> <p>Examples of supported partnerships</p> <p>Evidence that particular partnerships/linkages will be sustained</p> <p>Types/quality of partnership cooperation methods utilized</p>	<p>Project documents and evaluations</p> <p>Project partners and relevant stakeholders</p>	<p>Document analysis</p> <p>Interviews</p>
Did the project efficiently utilize local capacity in implementation?	<p>Was an appropriate balance struck between utilization of international expertise as well as local capacity?</p> <p>Did the project take into account local capacity in design and implementation of the project?</p> <p>Was there an effective collaboration between institutions responsible for implementing the project?</p>	<p>Proportion of expertise utilized from international experts compared to national experts</p> <p>Number/quality of analyses done to assess local capacity potential and absorptive capacity</p>	<p>Project documents and evaluations</p> <p>UNDP</p> <p>Beneficiaries</p>	<p>Document analysis</p> <p>Interviews</p>
What lessons can be drawn regarding efficiency for other similar projects in the future?	<p>What lessons can be learnt from the project regarding efficiency?</p> <p>How could the project have more efficiently carried out implementation (in terms of management structures and procedures, partnerships arrangements etc...)?</p> <p>What changes could have been made (if any) to the project in order to improve its efficiency?</p>		<p>Data collected throughout evaluation</p>	<p>Data analysis</p>

## Annex 5

# SAMPLE MATRIX FOR RATING THE ACHIEVEMENT OF OUTCOMES

<b>PROJECT GOAL: To catalyze the improved conservation of globally significant biodiversity through the demonstration of new mechanisms and approaches for effective management of protected areas and natural resources adjacent to them.</b>						
<b>GOAL/OBJECTIVE/Outcome</b>	<b>Performance Indicator</b>	<b>2006 Baseline</b>	<b>2011 End of Project Target</b>	<b>2011 End of Project Status*</b>	<b>Terminal Evaluation Comments</b>	<b>Rating</b>
PROJECT OBJECTIVE: To strengthen the management effectiveness and sustainability of the three selected protected areas of different types, thereby providing models and best practices replicable throughout the national PA system.	Improved Management effectiveness of protected areas	METT scores Current average METT score – 22 for the PA system	Average METT score for 20 PAs is 38 out of potential score of 96 (ref Table XX).  NB This indicator cannot be rated for state of delivery as it was not designed to be met by end of project.	Average METT score for 20 PAs is 38 out of potential score of 96 (ref Table XX).  NB This indicator cannot be rated for state of delivery as it was not designed to be met by end of project.	METT scores have increased on average by 42%, which is considered satisfactory progress towards the 10 year target	S
	No further reduction in the total land under conservation management compared with the baseline.	25,100 ha (under PA)  104,170 ha – surrounding landscape  3,100,000 ha under system level	25,100 ha (under PA)  104,170 ha – surrounding landscape  3,100,000 ha under system level (the whole PA system in the country)	25,100 ha (under PAs)  102,400 ha – surrounding landscape  3,100,000 ha under entire PAs system	No change but Presidential Order issued to expand one of the protected areas by an additional 28,000 ha.  Reduction due to transfer of 1,770 ha in one PA to private forest under cooperative management in 2008.  No change but PAs system is expected to cover 3,502,800 ha after planned expansions	S

### Color Coding

Green: completed, indicator shows successful achievement

Yellow: indicator shows expected completion by the end of the project

Red: indicator shows poor achievement – unlikely to be completed by project closure

<b>Outcome 1:</b> Strengthened environmental governance provides a more sustainable land-use context for the PA system	Local policies on sustainable land-use designed and supported by the selected local governments	Policies on sustainable land-use at local level do not exist	Policies on sustainable land-use at local level designed and supported by the selected local governments	Preparation of specific district land use policies and plans largely in order to focus more on Forest Code and management planning.  Land use within non-core areas (under remit of Forestry Agency) addressed for next 5 years in management plans.	Project design focused on strengthening Protected Areas Law (see ProDoc logframe) but during implementation it became apparent that a new Forestry Code (see MTE logframe) was a necessary precursor. Both these instruments needed to be in place ahead of being able to strengthen land use policies at local level. Thus, switch to initial focus on Forestry Code, alongside Protected Areas Law, justified.	MS
	Sustainable land use practices adopted by selected communities and community members	No widely accepted sustainable land-use practices exist	Sustainable land-use practices implemented by selected communities and community members	More sustainable practices tested / demonstrated under Component 3, plus introduction of normative acts related to access and resource use (e.g. visitor access, tree cutting and fuel wood collection, forest management grazing and collection of hay, collection and preparation of medicinal herbs,).	Management plans for 2 PAs (provide basis for adopting sustainable land-use practices but demonstration of good practice jeopardized by lack of time to implement plans.	MU
	Amendments to the existing or new versions of the Protected Areas Law and the Forest Code prepared and submitted to the Parliament	New draft prepared, consultations held by mid-2007 The draft law submitted to the Parliament by end of 2007	New draft prepared, consultations held by mid-2007 The draft law submitted to the Parliament by end of 2007	Draft PAs Law submitted to Lower Chamber of Parliament in April 2011; adopted by Higher Chamber on 30 Nov. 2011; and new Law on Specially Protected Natural Areas adopted by Presidential Order #788 on 26 Dec. 2011.	Project instrumental in establishing Working Group of relevant stakeholders (government agencies, biodiversity experts and parliamentarians) to fast-track revision of legislation. Major achievement to have new Forest Code and PAs Law adopted in 2011.	S
		Current Forest Code of 1993 is considered outdated and needs to be revised	New draft or amendments prepared and consultations held by mid-2007, and submitted to the Parliament by end of 2007	New Forest Code adopted by Parliament in May 2011 and signed by President 2 August 2011.		

## Annex 6

# EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT 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 limitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

### Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form<sup>34</sup>

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 \_\_\_\_\_

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

<sup>34</sup> [www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct](http://www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct)

## Annex 7

# MANAGEMENT RESPONSE TEMPLATE

### UNDP/GEF Terminal Evaluation Management Response and Tracking Template

Project Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Project PIMS #: \_\_\_\_\_

Terminal Evaluation Completion Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Key issues and Recommendations	Management Response*	Tracking**				
	Response	Key Actions	Timeframe	Responsible unit(s)	Status***	Comments

\* Unit(s) assigned to be responsible for the preparation of a management response will fill the columns under the management response section.

\*\* Unit(s) assigned to be responsible for the preparation of a management response will be updating the implementation status. Assigned with an oversight function monitors and verifies the implementation status.

\*\*\* Status of Implementation: Completed, Partially Completed, Pending

## Annex 8

# TERMINAL EVALUATION REVIEW FORM USED BY UNDP EO

1. Project Information				
Review date:				
GEF Project ID:			at endorsement (Million US\$)	at completion (Million US\$)
UNDP Project ID:		GEF financing:		
Project Name:		IA/EA own:		
Country:		Government:		
		Other:		
		Total Cofinancing		
Operational Program:		Total Project Cost:		
Executing Agency	DATES			
		Prodoc Signature (date project began):		
		Closing Date	Proposed:	Actual:
TER Prepared by:				
	TER peer reviewed by:	Duration between Project Document signature date and planned closing (in months):	Duration between Project Document signature date and actual closing (in months):	Difference between planned and actual project duration (in months):
Author of TE:		TE completion date:	TE submission date to UNDP:	Difference between TE completion and submis- sion date (in months):

2. Project Objectives and Adaptive Management				
a.	List the overall environmental objectives of the project, and indicate whether there were any changes during implementation:			
b.	List the development objectives of the project, and indicate whether there were changes during implementation.			
c.	If there were changes to either of the above, note the level where the change was approved (e.g. GEFSEC, UNDP or Executing Agency)			
d.	Indicated the applicable reasons for changes made (to objectives):			
	Original Objectives not sufficiently articulated	Exogenous conditions changed, due to which changes in the objectives was needed	Project was restructured because original objectives were over ambitious	Any other (specify)

3. Monitoring and Evaluation		UNDP EO rating	TE rating
a.	M&E design at entry		
b.	M&E Plan Implementation		
c.	Overall quality of M&E		
Comments and justifications:			

4. IA <sup>35</sup> & EA <sup>36</sup> Execution		UNDP EO rating	TE rating
a.	Quality of UNDP Implementation		
b.	Quality of Execution - Executing Agency		
c.	Overall quality of Implementation and Execution		
Comments and justifications:			

5. Assessment of Outcomes <sup>37</sup>		UNDP EO rating	TE rating
a.	Relevance		
b.	Effectiveness		
c.	Efficiency		
d.	Overall Project Outcome Rating		
Comments and justifications:			

6. Sustainability <sup>38</sup>		UNDP EO rating	TE rating
a.	Financial resources:		
b.	Socio-political:		
c.	Institutional framework and governance:		
d.	Environmental :		
e.	Overall rating on the likelihood of sustainability		
Comments and justifications:			

7. Impacts <sup>39</sup> & Catalytic Effects <sup>40</sup>	
a.	Summarize achieved intended or unintended impacts of the project:
b.	Summarize catalytic effects:

<sup>35</sup> UNDP performance on issues such as quality of project design, focus on results, adequacy of supervision inputs and processes, quality of risk management, candor and realism in supervision reporting, and suitability of the chosen executing agencies for project execution.

<sup>36</sup> IP performance on issues such as focus on results, adequacy of management inputs and processes, quality of risk management, and candor and realism in reporting

<sup>37</sup> Based on the 6 point 'satisfactory' scale: HS = 6, HU = 1

<sup>38</sup> 4 point scale for the likelihood of sustainability: 4 = likely (no or negligible risk); 3= moderately likely (low risk); 2 = moderately unlikely (substantial risks; 1 = Unlikely (high risk). Ratings should take into account both the probability of a risk materializing and the anticipated magnitude of its effect on the continuance of project benefits. Risk definitions: a) whether financial resources will be available to continue activities resulting in continued benefits; b) whether sufficient public stakeholder awareness and support is present for the continuation of activities providing benefit; c) whether required systems for accountability and transparency plus technical know-how are in place; and d) whether environmental risks are present that can undermine the future flow of the project benefits).

<sup>39</sup> If possible, clarify based on extent: a) verifiable improvement in ecological status; and/or b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems; c) through specified process indicators that progress is being made towards achievement of stress reduction and/or ecological improvement; d) regulatory and policy changes at regional, national and/or local levels.

<sup>40</sup> Provide a brief comment on whether the project has exhibited a) scaling up (to regional and national levels), b) replication (outside of the project), c) demonstration, and/or d) production of a public good (lowest level of catalytic effect, such as new technologies and approaches).

8. Mainstreaming <sup>41</sup>		ProDoc	TE
Reference to:		(Y/N)	(Y/N)
a.	UNDAF, CPD, and/or CPAP		
b.	Poverty/environment nexus, sustainable livelihoods		
c.	Crisis prevention and recovery		
d.	Gender		
Comments and justifications:			

9. Lessons and Recommendations	
a.	Summarize the main recommendations set out in the TE:
b.	Highlight key lessons, good practices and approaches mentioned in the TE that may have application in other UNDP supported GEF financed projects:

10. Quality of Terminal Evaluation Report		Rating <sup>42</sup>
a.	To what extent does the TE contain an assessment of relevant outcomes of the project and achievement of objectives?	
b.	Is the TE internally consistent, the evidence complete and convincing, and the ratings well substantiated? Are there any major evidence gaps?	
c.	Does the TE properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	
d.	Are the lessons and recommendations listed in the TE supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	
e.	Does the Report provide a full accounting of the actual project costs (totals, per activity, and per source) and actual co-financing used?	
f.	To what extent does the TE fully consider and evaluate project M&E systems? <sup>43</sup>	
g.	To what extent did the Terminal Evaluation follow accepted (UNEG) norms and standards for evaluation? <sup>44</sup>	
h.	Overall Rating for the Terminal Evaluation	

11. Management Response		
a.	Was a management response to the terminal evaluation submitted?	Yes [ ] No [ ] Date:
b.	Summarize key proposed follow-up actions	

<sup>41</sup> Consider how the project document and then terminal evaluation acknowledge UNDP priorities as set out in the UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF), Country Program Document (CPD) and Country Program Action Plan (CPAP) that frame the UNDP assistance in each country. Projects should acknowledge the UNDP focus on sustainable livelihood. Projects should consider as relevant the connection between environmental protection and disaster management (especially with respect to climate change adaptation). All projects should pay attention to gender aspects - in terms of stakeholders, gender sensitive programming, and also in project team selection; (see UNDP Gender Equality Strategy 2008-2011).

<sup>42</sup> Based on the 6 point 'satisfactory' scale: HS = 6, HU =1

<sup>43</sup> The TE should provide information on the quality of the M&E plan, the M&E budget, timeliness and utilization of the midterm evaluation (MTE) if carried out, and consistency in reporting between monitoring (APR/PIR) and evaluations (MTE).

<sup>44</sup> This includes such aspects as the development of evaluation criteria, 'triangulation' methods for validating findings, interviews with a wide range of stakeholders, holding to high ethical standards in consultant hiring and evaluator conduct. (See UNEG Norms and Standards, and UNDP/GEF project evaluation guidance)

<sup>45</sup> UNDP country office should provide a response to the TE including actions that will be taken as a result of the findings. This gets posted to PIMS and the Evaluation Resource Center.

**United Nations Development Programme  
Evaluation Office  
220 East 42nd Street, New York, NY 10017 USA  
Tel. (646) 781 4200 Fax. (646) 781 4213  
Internet: <http://www.undp.org/evaluation>**