

**Terms of Reference**  
**Ref: PN/FJI/002/20**

**Consultancy Title:** Terminal Evaluation (TE) for the Integrating Global Environmental Priorities into Kiribati's National Policies and Programmes – Kiribati Cross-Cutting Capacity Development Project, (PIMS #: 4936)

**Project Name:** Integrating Global Environmental Priorities into Kiribati's National Policies and Programmes – Kiribati Cross-Cutting Capacity Development Project, (PIMS #: 4936)

**Duty Station:** Home based with mission travel to the Environment and Conservation Division in Tarawa, Kiribati.

**Duration of the Contract:** Up to 22 working days starting on Wednesday, 17<sup>th</sup> February and ending on 25<sup>th</sup> March 2020

Consultancy Proposal (CV & Financial proposal Template) should be uploaded on UNDP Jobshop website([https://jobs.undp.org/cj\\_view\\_jobs.cfm?cur\\_rgn\\_id\\_c=RAS](https://jobs.undp.org/cj_view_jobs.cfm?cur_rgn_id_c=RAS)) no later than, 30<sup>th</sup> January 2020 (Fiji Time) clearly stating the title of consultancy applied for. Any proposals received after this date/time will not be accepted. Any request for clarification must be sent in writing, or by standard electronic communication to [procurement.fj@undp.org](mailto:procurement.fj@undp.org). UNDP will respond in writing or by standard electronic mail and will send written copies of the response, including an explanation of the query without identifying the source of inquiry, to all consultants. Incomplete, late and joint proposals will not be considered and only offers for which there is further interest will be contacted. Failure to submit your application as stated as per the application submission guide (Procurement Notice) on the above link will be considered incomplete and therefore application will not be considered.

**NOTE:**

Proposals must be sent through UNDP job shop web page. Candidates need to upload their CV and financial proposal -using UNDP template -. This should be scanned as 1 document

*If the selected/successful Candidate is over 65 years of age and required to travel outside his home country; He/She will be required provide a full medical report at their expense prior to issuance to contract. Contract will only be issued when Proposed candidate is deemed medically fit to undertake the assignment.*

**Objectives:**

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.

**Background**

The project was designed to: improve information management and compliance monitoring in order to achieve global environmental benefits. This objective will be achieved through two components/outcomes:

1. The development of an operational environmental management information system (EMIS) providing accurate and timely information: Under this outcome, project resources will be used to develop a comprehensive Environmental Management Information System (EMIS) at the Environment and Conservation Division that serves to create new and improved environmental data and information. This EMIS will be developed through active collaboration and coordination with work programmes of key stakeholder agencies, research institutions, and other non-government organizations as appropriate to ensure the generation, collection, exchange and distribution of the required data and information. The EMIS will also be accompanied by improved capacities to generate and use new and improved data and information for policy and planning purposes and training will be provided to strengthen institutional and staff capacities to use best practice methodologies in data collection and analysis for environmental mainstreaming and environmental protection and management in the face of global climate change.
2. The development of a compliance monitoring system (CMS) tracking key environmental indicators: The project will support the development of a compliance monitoring system (CMS). It will include the identification of a set of environmental indicators that will provide information on the state of the

environment in Kiribati, including the drafting of national reports to international conventions. The CMS would be used as part of the learning and re-tooling (i.e., adaptive collaborative management) of programmes and plans to ensure that their implementation proceed as planned to deliver the agreed-upon objectives and expected outcomes. Under this outcome, the project will support the development of capacities to monitor and report on progress made towards achieving Rio Conventions commitments, and to feed that information to planners and decision-makers.

#### Project Summary Table

|                          |   |  |   |  |
|--------------------------|---|--|---|--|
| <b>Project Title:</b>    | Integrating Global Environmental Priorities into Kiribati's National Policies and Programmes – Kiribati CCCD Project  |  |   |  |
| GEF Project ID:          | 5130  |  | <i>at endorsement</i><br>(Million US\$) | <i>at completion</i><br>(Million US\$) |
| UNDP Project ID:         | Atlas Award: 00083621<br>Atlas Output: 00092010<br>PIMS # 4936  | GEF financing:                         | 0.5                                     | 0.377                                  |
| Country:                 | Republic of Kiribati  | IA/EA own:                             | 0.03 (in kind)                          | TBD @ TE                               |
| Region:                  | Asia & Pacific  | Government:                            | 0.5 (in kind)                           | TBD @ TE                               |
| Focal Area:              | Multi-Focal Areas   | Other:                                 | Not applicable                          | Not applicable                         |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP):  | CD2 To generate, access and use information and knowledge<br>CD5 To enhance capacities to monitor and evaluate environmental impacts and trends   | Total co-financing:                    | 0.53                                    | TBD @ TE                               |
| Executing Agency:        | Environment and Conservation Division (ECD), Ministry of Environment, Lands and Agriculture Development (MELAD)   | Total Project Cost:                    | 1.03                                    | TBD @ TE                               |
| Other Partners involved: | 1. Ministry of Internal Affairs<br>2. Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources Development;<br>3. Ministry of Finance and Economic Development;<br>4. Ministry of Information, Communications, Transport and Tourism Development;<br>5. Kiribati Institute College;<br>6. Kiribati Oil Limited; and<br>7. Kiribati Coconut Developmt. Limited | ProDoc Signature (date project began): |   | 5 <sup>th</sup> March 2015             |
|                          |   | (Operational) Closing Date:            | Proposed: 5 <sup>th</sup> March 2018    | Actual: 2 November 2019                |

Kindly note that TBD @ TE simply means 'To be determined during the terminal evaluation'

#### Scope of work/Expected Output

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

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to the Republic of Kiribati, to the following stakeholders:

- i) the Environment and Conservation Division of MELAD (the main implementing partner), in Bikenibiu, South Tarawa;
- ii) Ministry of Internal Affairs, Bairiki, Tarawa;
- iii) Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources Development, Bairiki, Tarawa;
- iv) Ministry of Finance and Economic Development, Bairiki, Tarawa;
- v) Ministry of Information, Communications, Transport and Tourism Development, Bairiki, Tarawa;
- vi) Kiribati Institute College, Betio, Tarawa;
- vii) Kiribati Oil Limited, Betio, Tarawa

Interviews will be held with the following organizations listed above with their focal points/liaison individuals at a minimum. The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR, project budget revisions, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in [Annex B](#) of this Terms of Reference.

### Evaluation Criteria & Ratings

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (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 covering the criteria of: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact**. Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in [Annex D](#).

| Evaluation Ratings:            |        |   |        |
|--------------------------------|--------|---|--------|
| 1. Monitoring and Evaluation   | rating | 2. IA& EA Execution                           | rating |
| M&E design at entry            |        | Quality of UNDP Implementation                |        |
| M&E Plan Implementation        |        | Quality of Execution - Executing Agency       |        |
| Overall quality of M&E         |        | Overall quality of Implementation / Execution |        |
| 3. Assessment of Outcomes      | rating | 4. Sustainability                             | rating |
| Relevance                      |        | Financial resources:                          |        |
| Effectiveness                  |        | Socio-political:                              |        |
| Efficiency                     |        | Institutional framework and governance:       |        |
| Overall Project Outcome Rating |        | Environmental :                               |        |
|                                |        | Overall likelihood of sustainability:         |        |

### Project finance / co-finance

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

| Co-financing (type/source) | UNDP own financing (mill. US\$) |          | Government (mill. US\$) |          | Partner Agency (mill. US\$) |        | Total (mill. US\$) |          |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------|----------|-------------------------|----------|-----------------------------|--------|--------------------|----------|
|                            | Planned                         | Actual   | Planned                 | Actual   | Planned                     | Actual | Planned            | Actual   |
| Grants                     | NA                              | NA       | NA                      | NA       | NA                          | NA     | NA                 | NA       |
| Loans/ Concessions         | NA                              | NA       | NA                      | NA       | NA                          | NA     | NA                 | NA       |
| • In-kind support          | 0.03                            | TBD @ TE | 0.5                     | TBD @ TE | NA                          | NA     | 0.53               | TBD @ TE |
| • Other                    | NA                              | NA       | NA                      | NA       | NA                          | NA     | NA                 | NA       |
| Totals                     | 0.03                            | TBD @ TE | 0.5                     | TBD @ TE | NA                          | NA     | 1.03               | TBD @ TE |

Kindly note that:

- NA simply means 'Not Applicable'

- **TBD @ TE** simply means 'To be determined during the terminal evaluation'

### Mainstreaming

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

### Impact

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.<sup>1</sup>

### 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 Fiji. The UNDP Fiji CO will contract the evaluator and ensure the timely payments as per the satisfactory deliverables submitted by her/him. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the evaluator to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

### Evaluation timeframe

The total duration of the evaluation will be 22 days according to the following plan:

| Activity                | Timing  | Completion Date                  |
|-------------------------|---------|----------------------------------|
| Preparation             | 2 days  | 19 February 2020                 |
| Evaluation Mission      | 10 days | From 20 February to 5 March 2020 |
| Draft Evaluation Report | 7 days  | 19 March 2020                    |
| Final Report            | 3 days  | 25 March 2020                    |

### 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       | Two (2) weeks after 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 consultant shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The evaluator selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

### Evaluator Ethics

<sup>1</sup> A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office: [ROTI Handbook 2009](#)

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

#### **Resources Provided.**

- Ground transportation to facilitate in-country meetings and consultation will be facilitated only if included in the financial proposal.
- Travel cost to the countries will be facilitated only if included in the financial proposal.
- Visit to stakeholders will be supported by the Project Management Unit (PMU).
- Candidate to provide their own laptop

#### **Supervision/Reporting**

The consultant will be under the direct supervision and will report to the UNDP Fiji Multi-Country Office (MCO).

#### **Requirement for Qualifications & Experience**

##### Education:

- Minimum Master's degree in M&E, environment, development studies, or other closely related field.

##### Work Experiences:

- Minimum 7 years of relevant professional experience in the area of Development, Environment and Sustainable Development with required technical knowledge in the targeted GEF focal areas: Multi-Focal Areas and Cross Cutting Capacity Development for MEAs
- Minimum of 5 years of project evaluation and/or implementation experience in the result-based management framework and adaptive management, with proven accomplishments in undertaking evaluation for international organizations, preferably with UNDP-GEF
- Knowledge of UNDP and GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policies
- Excellent English Writing and reporting skills (present at least 3 references of documents prepared).
- Good communication skills and positive interrelation.

#### **Proposal Requirements**

##### Technical Proposal

- CV
- Statement of how applicant meets requirement
- Names/Contacts of 3 referees

##### Financial Proposal

- Applicants must send a financial proposal based on a Lump Sum Amount. The total amount quoted shall be all-inclusive and include all costs components required to perform the deliverables identified in the TOR, including professional fee for 22 working days, travel costs, living allowance (specifically for the days of mission to Kiribati; the 20<sup>th</sup> February – 5<sup>th</sup> March, 2020) and any other applicable cost to be incurred by the Individual Consultant in completing the assignment. The contract price will be fixed output-based price regardless of extension of the herein specified duration. Payments will be done upon completion of the deliverables/outputs.
- In general, UNDP shall not accept travel costs exceeding those of an economy class ticket. Should the Individual Consultant wish to travel on a higher class he/she should do so using their own resources.

##### Travel:

- Mission travel will be required, which is a maximum of 14 travel days (inclusive of travel). Ten (10) of these are working days spent with the Environment and Conservation Division.
- The [Advanced and Basic Security in the Field II courses](#) must be successfully completed prior to commencement of travel;
- Individual Consultants are responsible for ensuring they have vaccinations/inoculations when travelling to certain countries.
- Consultants are responsible for obtaining any visas and security clearances needed in connection with travel with the necessary support from UNDP;
- The Consultant is required to comply with the UN security directives set forth under <https://dss.un.org/dssweb/>;

- The consultant will be responsible for making his/her own mission travel arrangements in line with [UNDP travel policies](#);
- All related travel expenses will be supported by UNDP funds and will be reimbursed as per UNDP rules and regulations for consultants. Costs for mission airfares, terminal expenses, insurance, and living allowances should not be included in financial proposal;
- Financial proposal to be submitted separate from Technical proposal.

**Payment Schedule (if required):**

Payments will be done upon completion of the deliverables in the table below:

| %   | Milestone  |
|-----|--|
| 10% | At contract signing  |
| 40% | Following submission and approval of the 1 <sup>st</sup> draft terminal evaluation report        |
| 50% | Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report |

**Evaluation**

- Cumulative analysis
- The proposals will be evaluated using the cumulative analysis method with a split 70% technical and 30% financial scoring. The proposal with the highest cumulative scoring will be awarded the contract. Applications will be evaluated technically and points are attributed based on how well the proposal meets the requirements of the Terms of Reference using the guidelines detailed in the table below:
- When using this weighted scoring method, the award of the contract may be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:
  - a) responsive/compliant/acceptable, and
  - b) having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation.
- \* Technical Criteria weighting; 70%
- \* Financial Criteria weighting; 30%
- Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 49 points in the Technical Evaluation would be considered for the Financial Evaluation. Interviews may be conducted as part of technical assessment for shortlisted proposals.

| Criteria   | Percentage  |
|--|-------------|
| <b>Qualification</b>   |             |
| Minimum Master’s degree in M&E, environment, development studies, or other closely related field   | 15%         |
| <b>Experience</b>  |             |
| Minimum 7 years of relevant professional experience in the area of Development, Environment and Sustainable Development with required technical knowledge in the targeted GEF focal areas: Multi-Focal Areas and Cross Cutting Capacity Development for MEAs | 20%         |
| Minimum of 5 years of project evaluation and/or implementation experience in the result-based management framework and adaptive management, with proven accomplishments in undertaking evaluation for international organizations, preferably with UNDP-GEF  | 15%         |
| Knowledge of UNDP and GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policies.  | 10%         |
| Excellent English Writing and reporting skills (present at least 3 references of documents prepared).  | 5%          |
| Good communication skills and positive interrelation.  | 5%          |
| <b>Technical Criteria</b>  | <b>70%</b>  |
| **If necessary interviews shall also be conducted as part of the technical evaluation to ascertain best value for money.   |             |
| <b>Financial Criteria – Lowest Price</b>   | <b>30%</b>  |
| <b>Total</b>   | <b>100%</b> |

**Proposal Submission:** Offerors must send the following documents.

1 Shortlisted candidates may be contacted for an interview.

Offerors must send the following documents.

- i) **CV including names/contacts of at least 3 referees.**
- ii) **A cover letter indicating why the candidate considers himself/herself suitable for the required consultancy**

**Completed template for confirmation of Interest and Submission of Financial Proposal.**

Individuals applying for this consultancy will be reviewed based on their own individual capacity. The successful individual may sign an Individual Contract with UNDP or request his/her employer to sign a Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA) on their behalf by indicating this in the Offerors letter to Confirming Interest and Availability

For any clarification regarding this assignment please write to [procurement.fj@undp.org](mailto:procurement.fj@undp.org)

Women candidates are encouraged to apply.

*\*The Fiji Office covers Fiji, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Nauru, Palau, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu and Vanuatu*

**TOR prepared by:**

**Name:**

**Designation:**

**Approved by:**

**Name:**

**Designation:**

Annex A: Project Logical Framework

| Objectives and Outcomes   | Indicator   | Baseline  | Targets End of Project   | Source of verification   | Risks and Assumptions  | Status to Date (Ratings will be based on the scales of ANNEX D)  | Justifications of Ratings  |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| <p><b>Objective:</b> To improve information management and compliance monitoring in order to achieve global environmental benefits.</p> | <p>1. ECD stated as the primary source for environmental information in Kiribati by a significant number of national, regional and international development partners</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Capacity of the main stakeholders for translating environmental information from EMIS into decision-making is low and dispersed over many organizations</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>50% of stakeholders have benefitted from capacity development activities for better use of this information in decision-making and policy-making</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reference to ECD-EMIS in project documents; national strategies, programmes and plans; national assessments</li> <li>State of the environmental reports and communications /national reports sent to Conventions</li> </ul> | <p><b>Risk:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Political will to provide ECD with the necessary resources to sustain the EMIS and the CMS</li> </ul> <p><b>Assumption:</b></p> <p>MELAD will support ECD and provide it with necessary resources</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To be determined on site when IC is on TE mission in-country</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To be determined on site when IC is on TE mission in-country</li> </ul> |
|   | <p>2. Reported availability of better environmental monitoring information</p>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Collection and use of up-to-date environmental management information is ad-hoc and feebly coordinated</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Up-to-date environmental information is being used by policy-makers and also by the public</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information products such as newsletters, flyers, articles, etc.</li> <li>Policies referring to this new environmental information</li> </ul>   | <p><b>Risk:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New information is not used and stays stored in computers at ECD</li> </ul> <p><b>Assumption:</b></p> <p>Better environmental information is readily available and actively utilized and used</p>     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To be determined on site when IC is on TE mission in-country</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To be determined on site when IC is on TE mission in-country</li> </ul> |
|   | <p>3. Quality of monitoring reports and communications to measure implementation</p>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Current reports are produced with limited data, weak analysis and weak trend analysis</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reports present adequate disaggregated data at local level, are informative and present</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ECD reports</li> <li>Environmental reports such as the State of Environment and Communications</li> </ul>   | <p><b>Risk:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Communications and national reports are not submitted on time</li> </ul> <p><b>Assumption:</b></p>  | <p>To be determined on site when IC is on TE mission in-country</p>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To be determined on site when IC is on TE mission in-country</li> </ul> |



| Objectives and Outcomes  | Indicator   | Baseline  | Targets End of Project  | Source of verification  | Risks and Assumptions   | Status to Date (Ratings will be based on the scales of ANNEX D) | Justifications of Ratings  |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|
|  | progress of the Rio Conventions                           | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are not fully responding to the national and international requirements.</li> </ul>  | environmental trends over time  | to the Conventions  | Communications and national reports are submitted on time and include information stored in the EMIS  |   |  |
|  | 4. Capacity development scorecard rating                  | Capacity for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Engagement: 3 of 9</li> <li>Generate, access and use information and knowledge: 6 of 15</li> <li>Policy and legislation development: 3 of 9</li> <li>Management and implementation: 3 of 6</li> <li>Monitor and evaluate: 1 of 6 (total score: 16/45)</li> </ul> | Capacity for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Engagement: 6 of 9</li> <li>Generate, access and use information and knowledge: 10 of 15</li> <li>Policy and legislation development: 7 of 9</li> <li>Management and implementation: 5 of 6</li> <li>Monitor and evaluate: 4 of 6 (total targeted score: 32/45)</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mid-term review and final evaluation reports, including an updated CD scorecard</li> <li>Annual PIRs</li> <li>Capacity assessment reports</li> </ul> | <b>Risk:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project activities and resources do not translate in increasing the capacity of ECD to provide better environmental information</li> </ul> <b>Assumption:</b> The project is effective in developing the capacity in the area of information management | To be determined on site when IC is on TE mission in-country    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To be determined on site when IC is on TE mission in-country</li> </ul> |
| <b>Outcome 1:</b> An operational environmental management information system (EMIS) providing accurate and | 5. An environmental data repository architecture in place | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No data architecture is in place to structure environmental information at ECD</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Environmental data is stored in a structured way and easily accessible</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Technical report</li> <li>PIRs</li> <li>Web pages</li> </ul>   | <b>Risk:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of relevant expertise in local market may result in delay of required outputs and distortion of targeted deadlines</li> </ul> <b>Assumption:</b>   | To be determined on site when IC is on TE mission in-country    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To be determined on site when IC is on TE mission in-country</li> </ul> |

| Objectives and Outcomes  | Indicator   | Baseline  | Targets End of Project   | Source of verification   | Risks and Assumptions  | Status to Date (Ratings will be based on the scales of ANNEX D) | Justifications of Ratings  |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|---|--|
| timely information.  |   |   |  |  | Implementation of project activities and recruitment of relevant national expertise is monitored and actions will be identified if the lack of expertise is affecting the timely implementation of the project   |   |  |
| <b>Output 1.1:</b> An environmental data repository with standards, norms and protocols to collect, analyze, store and make available accurate, and reliable environmental information related to all three Rio Conventions, and of direct use by decision-makers. | 6. Information technologies in place to store the data repository | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited technology is in place to support data management for an EMIS</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hardware, communication and networking equipment is in place to store environmental data and provide easy access to this information</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Equipment procured</li> <li>PIRs</li> <li>Observations</li> </ul> | <p><b>Risk:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acquire inadequate hardware within the ECD context and the EMIS hardware requirements</li> </ul> <p><b>Assumption:</b><br/>Specification requirements will be done carefully to identify the adequate hardware, communication and network equipment</p> | To be determined on site when IC is on TE mission in-country    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To be determined on site when IC is on TE mission in-country</li> </ul> |
| <b>Output 1.2:</b> An information technology architecture in place to store, manage and  | 7. Agreements for data sharing in place                           | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information is shared on an ad-hoc basis among institutions following formal requests made at Secretary level</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3-4 agreements are in place between ECD and 3-4 agencies/institutions to share data on a regular basis</li> </ul>                               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreements in place</li> <li>Procedures to share data</li> </ul>  | <p><b>Risk:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Political will to accept sharing data among government institutions</li> </ul> <p><b>Assumption:</b><br/>Government will see the benefit of sharing data through cabinet support</p>  | To be determined on site when IC is on TE mission in-country    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To be determined on site when IC is on TE mission in-country</li> </ul> |

| Objectives and Outcomes  | Indicator   | Baseline  | Targets End of Project  | Source of verification   | Risks and Assumptions   | Status to Date (Ratings will be based on the scales of ANNEX D) | Justifications of Ratings  |
|--|---|---|---|--|---|---|--|
| <p>provide public access to environmental information.</p> <p><b>Output 1.3:</b> Environmental information available and disseminated to stakeholders.</p> | 8. Use of this environmental information in decision-making and policy-making | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited environmental information is used to develop policies and programmes</li> </ul>        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3-4 policies, programmes or plans are developed using environmental information from the EMIS</li> </ul>         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy, programme and plan documents</li> </ul> | <p><b>Risk:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No interest from decision-makers to use better environmental information</li> </ul> <p><b>Assumption:</b></p> <p>The benefit of using better environmental information will encourage decision-makers to use it</p> <p>Cabinet support is in place</p> | To be determined on site when IC is on TE mission in-country    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To be determined on site when IC is on TE mission in-country</li> </ul> |
|  | 9. Environmental information is shared regionally and internationally         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited interaction exists at the regional level to share environmental information</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2 regional sharing procedures in place by the end of the project</li> </ul>                                      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regional procedures in place</li> </ul>         | <p><b>Risk:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is no regional commitment to share environmental information</li> </ul> <p><b>Assumption:</b></p> <p>Regional organizations will lead the sharing of environmental information</p>   | To be determined on site when IC is on TE mission in-country    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To be determined on site when IC is on TE mission in-country</li> </ul> |
|  | 10. Quality, quantity and timeliness of reports submitted to conventions      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reports are not submitted on time and do not contain much primary collected data</li> </ul>    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>National communications/ reports are submitted on time and contain primary data collected by the EMIS</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>National communication s and reports</li> </ul> | <p><b>Risk:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The government does not fulfill its international obligations; including those from the 3 Rio Conventions</li> </ul> <p><b>Assumption:</b></p>   | To be determined on site when IC is on TE mission in-country    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To be determined on site when IC is on TE mission in-country</li> </ul> |

| Objectives and Outcomes  | Indicator  | Baseline   | Targets End of Project   | Source of verification   | Risks and Assumptions  | Status to Date (Ratings will be based on the scales of ANNEX D) | Justifications of Ratings   |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|---|
|  | 11. Public states higher awareness of environmental information products | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Public and decision-makers are not aware about existing environmental information</li> </ul>                                      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>50% of Members of Parliament are aware about existence of easily accessible environmental information at ECD</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Surveys of decision-makers</li> <li>Citations in newspapers and other media</li> <li>References in brochures, pamphlets, flyers, etc.</li> </ul>  | <p>The government continues to fulfill its international commitments</p> <p><b>Risk:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Socio-economic pressures do not devalue environmental attitudes and concern</li> </ul> <p><b>Assumption:</b></p> <p>Survey results will show an increased awareness and understanding of the Rio Conventions' implementation for decision-makers</p> | To be determined on site when IC is on TE mission in-country    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To be determined on site when IC is on TE mission in-country.</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>Outcome 2:</b> A Compliance Monitoring System (CMS) developed and tracking key environmental indicators.</p> <p><b>Output 2.1:</b> An institutionalized set of environmental indicators.</p> | 12. Adequate environmental indicators monitored                          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The existing set of environmental indicators is not comprehensive and does not respond to the information requirements</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Set of environmental indicators in place and responds to national and international information requirements</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>List of official environmental indicators monitored by relevant institutions</li> <li>Final Evaluation report</li> <li>State of environment report and National communications / reports</li> </ul> | <p><b>Risk:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New indicators are adopted but they require additional resources to be monitored; which might not be available</li> </ul> <p><b>Assumption:</b></p> <p>The government pursues its budget support to integrate the 3 Rio Conventions obligations into the Kiribati information management approach and monitoring system</p>   | To be determined on site when IC is on TE mission in-country    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To be determined on site when IC is on TE mission in-country</li> </ul>  |

| Objectives and Outcomes   | Indicator  | Baseline   | Targets End of Project   | Source of verification  | Risks and Assumptions   | Status to Date (Ratings will be based on the scales of ANNEX D)     | Justifications of Ratings  |
|---|--|--|--|---|---|---|--|
| <b>Output 2.2:</b> An operational compliance monitoring system. | 13. Adequate national standards, norms, procedures for monitoring these environmental indicators are officially in place                       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is no unified set of standards, norms and procedures to collect data, conduct observations and make sampling</li> </ul>     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adequate official standards, norms and procedures are in place and use by the relevant institutions</li> </ul>                            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>List of official standards, norms and procedures</li> <li>Assessment reports</li> <li>Final Evaluation report</li> </ul> | <p><b>Risk:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New standards, norms and procedures are identified but might not be adopted by the Government</li> </ul> <p><b>Assumption:</b></p> <p>The government pursues its policies to integrate the 3 Rio Conventions obligations into the Kiribati information management approach and monitoring system</p>   | <p>To be determined on site when IC is on TE mission in-country</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To be determined on site when IC is on TE mission in-country</li> </ul> |
|   | 14. An in-service training programme for public servants include course(s) covering environmental information management and monitoring system | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is no training programme for public administrators on environmental information management and monitoring system</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The catalogue of in-service training programme include course(s) on environmental information management and monitoring system</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Catalogue of in-service training programme</li> <li>Other training programmes</li> <li>PIRs</li> </ul>                   | <p><b>Risk:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The in-service training system for public servants might not be interested in integrating into its catalogue the training curricula developed with the support of the project</li> </ul> <p><b>Assumption:</b></p> <p>The related in-service training institution(s) will be contacted early on to establish a partnership with the project and involved them in designing and delivering the course</p> | <p>To be determined on site when IC is on TE mission in-country</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To be determined on site when IC is on TE mission in-country</li> </ul> |

| Objectives and Outcomes | Indicator   | Baseline | Targets End of Project   | Source of verification  | Risks and Assumptions  | Status to Date (Ratings will be based on the scales of ANNEX D) | Justifications of Ratings  |
|-------------------------|---|----------|--|---|--|---|--|
|                         | 15. Number of public servants trained by taking the course(s) on EMIS and CMS | • 0      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 100 Public Servants are trained using the new training programme</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proceeding of courses delivered</li> <li>• PIRs</li> <li>• Project management reports</li> </ul> | <p><b>Risk:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No interest in better integrating environmental information in government decision-making</li> </ul> <p><b>Assumption:</b></p> <p>There is sufficient commitment from decision-makers to maintain long-term support to public servant training in the environmental area, including MEAs implementation in Kiribati</p> | To be determined on site when IC is on TE mission in-country    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To be determined on site when IC is on TE mission in-country</li> </ul> |

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

**Checklist of Documents Required for the Terminal Evaluation of the Kiribati CCCD Project**

| Particulars                         | Year        | Document  | Source            | Check |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|-------------------|-------|
| Project Approval                    | 2015        | Letter of Approval from the GEF CEO               | UNDP              |       |
|                                     |             | Signed Project Document                           | UNDP              |       |
|                                     |             | Delegation of Authority                           | UNDP              |       |
| Project Start-Up                    | 2015 - 2016 | Staff contract for the Project Coordinator        | ECD, MELAD        |       |
|                                     |             | Staff contract for the Project Finance Personnel  | ECD, MELAD        |       |
| Project Planning and Implementation | 2015        | Inception Workshop Report                         | Kiribati CCCD PMU |       |
|                                     |             | Annual Workplan and Budget                        | Kiribati CCCD PMU |       |
|                                     |             | 1 <sup>st</sup> Quarter Workplan                  | Kiribati CCCD PMU |       |
|                                     |             | 2 <sup>nd</sup> Quarter Workplan                  | Kiribati CCCD PMU |       |
|                                     |             | 3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter Workplan                  | Kiribati CCCD PMU |       |
|                                     |             | 4 <sup>th</sup> Quarter Workplan                  | Kiribati CCCD PMU |       |
|                                     | 2016        | Annual Workplan and Budget                        | Kiribati CCCD PMU |       |
|                                     |             | 1 <sup>st</sup> Quarter Workplan                  | Kiribati CCCD PMU |       |
|                                     |             | 2 <sup>nd</sup> Quarter Workplan                  | Kiribati CCCD PMU |       |
|                                     |             | 3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter Workplan                  | Kiribati CCCD PMU |       |
|                                     |             | 4 <sup>th</sup> Quarter Workplan                  | Kiribati CCCD PMU |       |
|                                     |             | 2015 – 2016 Annual Project Report                 | UNDP              |       |
|                                     | 2017        | Annual Workplan and Budget                        | Kiribati CCCD PMU |       |
|                                     |             | 1 <sup>st</sup> Quarter Workplan                  | Kiribati CCCD PMU |       |
|                                     |             | 2 <sup>nd</sup> Quarter Workplan                  | Kiribati CCCD PMU |       |
|                                     |             | 3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter Workplan                  | Kiribati CCCD PMU |       |
|                                     |             | 4 <sup>th</sup> Quarter Workplan                  | Kiribati CCCD PMU |       |
|                                     |             | 2016 – 2017 Annual Project Report                 | UNDP              |       |
|                                     | 2018        | Annual Workplan and Budget                        | Kiribati CCCD PMU |       |
|                                     |             | 1 <sup>st</sup> Quarter Workplan                  | Kiribati CCCD PMU |       |
|                                     |             | 2 <sup>nd</sup> Quarter Workplan                  | Kiribati CCCD PMU |       |
|                                     |             | 3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter Workplan                  | Kiribati CCCD PMU |       |
|                                     |             | 4 <sup>th</sup> Quarter Workplan                  | Kiribati CCCD PMU |       |
|                                     |             | 2017 – 2018 Annual Project Report                 | UNDP              |       |
|                                     | 2019        | Annual Workplan and Budget                        | Kiribati CCCD PMU |       |
|                                     |             | 1 <sup>st</sup> Quarter Workplan                  | Kiribati CCCD PMU |       |
|                                     |             | 2 <sup>nd</sup> Quarter Workplan                  | Kiribati CCCD PMU |       |
|                                     |             | 3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter Workplan                  | Kiribati CCCD PMU |       |
| 4 <sup>th</sup> Quarter Workplan    |             | Kiribati CCCD PMU                                 |                   |       |
| 2018 – 2019 Annual Project Report   |             | UNDP  |                   |       |
| Project Monitoring                  | 2015        | 2 <sup>nd</sup> Quarter Progress Report/FACE form | Kiribati CCCD PMU |       |
|                                     |             | 3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter Progress Report/FACE form | Kiribati CCCD PMU |       |
|                                     |             | 4 <sup>th</sup> Quarter Progress Report/FACE form | Kiribati CCCD PMU |       |
|                                     |             | Signed 2015 CDR                                   | UNDP              |       |

| Particulars                   | Year    | Document  | Source            | Check |
|-------------------------------|---------|---|-------------------|-------|
|                               | 2016    | 1 <sup>st</sup> Quarter Progress Report/FACE form                 | Kiribati CCCD PMU |       |
|                               |         | 2 <sup>nd</sup> Quarter Progress Report/FACE form                 | Kiribati CCCD PMU |       |
|                               |         | 3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter Progress Report/FACE form                 | Kiribati CCCD PMU |       |
|                               |         | 4 <sup>th</sup> Quarter Progress Report/FACE form                 | Kiribati CCCD PMU |       |
|                               |         | Signed 2016 CDR   | UNDP              |       |
|                               | 2017    | 1 <sup>st</sup> Quarter Progress Report/FACE form                 | Kiribati CCCD PMU |       |
|                               |         | 2 <sup>nd</sup> Quarter Progress Report/FACE form                 | Kiribati CCCD PMU |       |
|                               |         | 3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter Progress Report/FACE form                 | Kiribati CCCD PMU |       |
|                               |         | 4 <sup>th</sup> Quarter Progress Report/FACE form                 | Kiribati CCCD PMU |       |
|                               |         | Signed 2017 CDR   | UNDP              |       |
|                               | 2018    | 1 <sup>st</sup> Quarter Progress Report/FACE form                 | Kiribati CCCD PMU |       |
|                               |         | 2 <sup>nd</sup> Quarter Progress Report/FACE form                 | Kiribati CCCD PMU |       |
|                               |         | 3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter Progress Report/FACE form                 | Kiribati CCCD PMU |       |
|                               |         | 4 <sup>th</sup> Quarter Progress Report/FACE form                 | Kiribati CCCD PMU |       |
|                               |         | Signed 2018 CDR   | UNDP              |       |
|                               | 2019    | 1 <sup>st</sup> Quarter Progress Report/FACE form                 | Kiribati CCCD PMU |       |
|                               |         | 2 <sup>nd</sup> Quarter Progress Report/FACE form                 | Kiribati CCCD PMU |       |
|                               |         | 3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter Progress Report/FACE form                 | Kiribati CCCD PMU |       |
|                               |         | 4 <sup>th</sup> Quarter Progress Report/FACE form                 | Kiribati CCCD PMU |       |
|                               |         | Signed 2019 CDR   | UNDP              |       |
| Project Oversight             | 2015    | Project Board Meeting Agenda                                      | Kiribati CCCD PMU |       |
|                               |         | Project Board Meeting Minutes                                     | Kiribati CCCD PMU |       |
|                               | 2016    | Project Board Meeting Agenda                                      | Kiribati CCCD PMU |       |
|                               |         | Project Board Meeting Minutes                                     | Kiribati CCCD PMU |       |
|                               | 2017    | Project Board Meeting Agenda                                      | Kiribati CCCD PMU |       |
|                               |         | Project Board Meeting Minutes                                     | Kiribati CCCD PMU |       |
|                               |         | Request and Approval Documentations for No-Cost Project Extension | UNDP              |       |
|                               | 2018    | Project Board Meeting Agenda                                      | Kiribati CCCD PMU |       |
|                               |         | Project Board Meeting Minutes                                     | Kiribati CCCD PMU |       |
|                               | 2019    | Project Board Meeting Agenda                                      | Kiribati CCCD PMU |       |
| Project Board Meeting Minutes |         | Kiribati CCCD PMU   |                   |       |
| Asset Management              | Y1 – Y4 | Project Assets List/Register                                      | Kiribati CCCD PMU |       |



## Annex C: Evaluation Questions

| Evaluative Criteria Questions   | Indicators | Sources | Methodology |
|---|------------|---------|-------------|
| <b>Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?</b> |            |         |             |
| • Is the project relevant to Kiribati’s environmental policies?   | •          | •       | •           |
| • Is the project relevant to UNDP’s objectives for the country?   | •          | •       | •           |
| • Is the project addressing the needs of the targeted beneficiaries?  | •          | •       | •           |
| • How is the project complementary to the actions of other stakeholders active in the country/region?   | •          | •       | •           |
| • Is the project internally consistent in its design?   | •          | •       | •           |
| <b>Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?</b>  |            |         |             |
| • Are the activities and outputs of the project consistent with the project's goals and objectives?   | •          | •       | •           |
| • To what extent has the delivered project outputs contributed to the achievement of its expected outcomes?   | •          | •       | •           |
| • How was risk managed during the project?  | ▪          | •       | •           |
| • What are the lessons learnt from the project in terms of effectiveness?   | ▪          | •       | •           |
| • Which changes could have been made in project’s design to improve its effectiveness?  | ▪          | •       | •           |
| • How could the project have been more effective in achieving results?  | ▪          | •       | •           |
| <b>Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?</b>  |            |         |             |
| • Was adaptive management needed and used to ensure efficient use of resources?   | •          | •       | •           |
| • Were the accounting and financial systems in place adequate?  | •          | •       | •           |
| • Were progress reports produced in a timely manner and in compliance to project reporting requirements?  | •          | •       | •           |
| • Was project implementation as cost-effective as originally envisaged?   | •          | •       | •           |

|  |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|
| • Was the expected co-finance leveraged as initially expected?   | • | • | • |
| • Were the reported lessons learnt shared among project stakeholders for subsequent improvement of project implementation?   | • | • | • |
| • Which partnerships and networking were facilitated among stakeholders?   | • | • | • |
| • Was local capacity and know-how adequately mobilized?  | • | • | • |
| <b>Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?</b>   |   |   |   |
| • Were sustainability issues adequately addressed at project design?   | • | • | • |
| • Is there evidence that some partners and stakeholders will continue their activities beyond project termination? And if such partners/stakeholders were identified, which ones were they?                          | • | • | • |
| • Which are the main risks to the continuation of policies and actions initiated by the projects? (financial, institutional, socioeconomic, environmental)   | • | • | • |
| • Are project actions and results being scaled up or replicated elsewhere in the region?   | • | • | • |
| • Did the project adequately address institutional and financial sustainability issues?  | • | • | • |
| • How is the beneficiary planning to mainstream the lessons learnt to ensure quality reporting to the global platforms?  | • | • | • |
| <b>Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?</b>  |   |   |   |
| • How likely is the project to achieve its long-term goal?   | • | • | • |
| • Are stakeholders more aware about the project's contribution towards setting up an EMIS and ensuring that it is operational? Which ones?   | • | • | • |
| • What is the impact of the project for the citizens of Kiribati in terms of awareness about the government's commitment to reporting its updated environmental data to the global platforms of the Rio conventions? | • | • | • |



Empowered Lives.  
Resilient Nations.



Empowered Lives.  
Resilient Nations.

**Annex D: Rating Scales**

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| <p><b><i>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&amp;E, I&amp;E Execution</i></b></p> <p>6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings<br/> 5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings<br/> 4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS)<br/> 3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings<br/> 2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems<br/> 1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems</p> | <p><b><i>Sustainability ratings:</i></b></p> <p>4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability<br/> 3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks<br/> 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks<br/> 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks</p> | <p><b><i>Relevance ratings</i></b></p> <p>2. Relevant (R)<br/> 1.. Not relevant (NR)</p> <p><b><i>Impact Ratings:</i></b></p> <p>3. Significant (S)<br/> 2. Minimal (M)<br/> 1. Negligible (N)</p> |
| <p><b><i>Additional ratings where relevant:</i></b><br/> Not Applicable (N/A)<br/> Unable to Assess (U/A)</p>  |   |  |

**Annex E: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form**

**Evaluators:**

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

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form<sup>2</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>2</sup>[www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct](http://www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct)

## Annex F: Evaluation Report Outline<sup>3</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>4</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>5</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
- 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) (\*)

<sup>3</sup>The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

<sup>4</sup> UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

<sup>5</sup> Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations.

- Relevance(\*)
  - Effectiveness & Efficiency (\*)
  - Country ownership
  - Mainstreaming
  - Sustainability (\*)
  - Impact
4. **Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons**
- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
  - Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
  - Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
  - Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success
5. **Annexes**
- ToR
  - Itinerary
  - List of persons interviewed
  - Summary of field visits
  - List of documents reviewed
  - Evaluation Question Matrix
  - Questionnaire used and summary of results
  - Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

**Annex G: Evaluation Report Clearance Form**

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

|   |             |
|---|-------------|
| Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by |             |
| UNDP Country Office                       |             |
| Name: _____                               | _____       |
| Signature: _____                          | Date: _____ |
| UNDP GEF RTA                              |             |
| Name: _____                               | _____       |
| Signature: _____                          | Date: _____ |