



## INDIVIDUAL PROCUREMENT NOTICE

Date: **January 27, 2020**

---

**Country:** Cairo, Egypt

**Description of the assignment:** UNDP-GEF Terminal Evaluation International Consultant for Egypt for Strengthening Protected Area Financing and Management Systems Project.

**Project name:** Strengthening Protected Area Financing and Management Systems Project

**Assignment:** Terminal Evaluation (TE)

**Period of assignment/services (if applicable):** 22 working days

Proposal should be submitted at the following email address to: [Procurementnotice.egypt@undp.org](mailto:Procurementnotice.egypt@undp.org) no later than **February 2, 2020**.

Any request for clarification must be sent in writing, or by standard electronic communication to the address or e-mail indicated above. The procurement unit 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.

---

### 1. BACKGROUND

The project was designed to have a comprehensive, ecologically representative and effectively managed national protected area system operating in Egypt, in-line with its commitments agreed at the CBD Conferences of Parties.

The project objective is to establish of a sustainable protected area financing system, with associated management structures, systems and capacities needed to ensure the effective use of generated revenues for priority biodiversity conservation needs. It will achieve this objective by strengthening: Legal, policy, regulatory and institutional frameworks that facilitate revenue generation, revenue retention and other aspects of sustainable PA financing and management are established and functional. Levels of financial resource mobilization are adequate to ensure effective conservation-oriented management of Egypt's PA system. And Business planning and cost-effective management systems are ensuring the effective allocation and management of mobilized resources.

## 2. MAIN OBJECTIVES, RESPONSABILITIES AND DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ANALYTICAL WORK.

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.

## 2. SCOPE OF WORK, RESPONSIBILITIES AND DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ANALYTICAL WORK

*As Per attached TOR – Annex 1*

## 3. REQUIREMENTS FOR EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS

The evaluation team will be composed of one international evaluator. The consultant shall have prior experience in evaluating similar biodiversity 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.

### **Education:**

- Advanced university degree in Biological Science, Economics, Sustainable Development, or related discipline (20%)

### **Experience:**

- Minimum 7 years of relevant professional experience in the area of biodiversity and ecosystem (20%)
- Knowledge of UNDP and GEF (5%)
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies; (20%)
- Good communication and analytical skills (5%)
- Good command of English language, both written and spoken (20%)
- Previous work experience in the region is an asset (5%)
- Previous experience with gender-sensitive analysis (5%)

### **Competencies:**

#### **Job Knowledge & Expertise:**

- Excellent organizational skills and ability to handle effectively multiple tasks without compromising quality, team spirit and positive working relationships with all colleagues;
- Dependability, reliability and initiative;
- Is motivated & demonstrates a capacity to pursue personal development & learning.

**Results-Orientation:**

- Plans and produces quality results to meet established goals.

**People Skills:**

- Sets clear performance goals and standards; executes responsibilities accordingly.
- Partnering & Networking:
- Seeks and applies knowledge, information, and best practices from within and outside UN.

**Innovation & Judgment:**

- Contributes creative, practical ideas and approaches to deal with challenging situations;
- Pursues own personal and professional development;
- Strives for quality client-centered services (internal/external).

**Language Requirements:**

Proficiency in English or Arabic Languages are essential.

**4. DOCUMENTS TO BE INCLUDED WHEN SUBMITTING THE PROPOSALS.**

- Applicants are requested to apply no later than **February 2, 2020**. Individual consultants are invited to submit their applications together with an updated P11 form for this position either online (on UNDP website) or by email to the Procurement Unit, [Procurementnotice.egypt@undp.org](mailto:Procurementnotice.egypt@undp.org).
- The application should contain a current and complete **Personal History Form** ([P11 form<sup>1</sup>](#)) in English including the e-mail and phone contact, together with a **financial offer** including a lumpsum for the fees excluding the travel costs that will be covered as per UNDP rules and regulations.
- 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.

**5. FINANCIAL PROPOSAL****\* Contracts based on daily fee**

The financial proposal will specify the daily fee, travel expenses and per diems quoted in separate line items, and payments are made to the Individual Consultant based on the number of days worked.

**\* Travel**

All envisaged travel costs must be included in the financial proposal. This includes all travel to join duty station/repatriation travel. In general, UNDP should not accept travel costs exceeding those of an economy class ticket. Should the IC wish to travel on a higher class he/she should do so using their own resources.

In the case of unforeseeable travel, payment of travel costs including tickets, lodging and terminal expenses should be agreed upon, between the respective business unit and Individual Consultant, prior to travel and will be reimbursed

## 6. EVALUATION

Individual consultants will be evaluated based on the following methodology:

### Cumulative analysis

*When using this weighted scoring method, the award of the contract should 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 weight; [70%]*

*\* Financial Criteria weight; [30%]*

# ANNEX

## ANNEX 1- TERMS OF REFERENCES (TOR)

### ANNEX 1- TERMS OF REFERENCES (TOR)

#### 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 **Strengthening Protected Area Financing and Management Systems Project (PIMS #3668)**

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

##### PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	Strengthening Protected Area Financing and Management Systems Project			
GEF Project ID:	3209		<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)	<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$)
UNDP Project Atlas Award ID: Atlas Output ID:	3668 00057529 00071131	GEF financing:	3,616,000	3,616,000
Country:	Egypt	IA/EA own:	250,000	250,000
Region:	Arab States	Government:	13,800,000	13,800,000
Focal Area:	BD	Other:	1,266,200	1,266,200
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):		Total co-financing:	15,316,200	15,316,200
Executing Agency:	Egyptian Environmental Affairs Agency	Total Project Cost:	18,932,200	18,932,200
Other Partners involved:		ProDoc Signature (date project began):		24 June 2010
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: June 2020	Actual: 30 June 2020

##### OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The project was designed to have a comprehensive, ecologically representative and effectively managed national protected area system operating in Egypt, in-line with its commitments agreed at the CBD Conferences of Parties.

The project objective is to establish of a sustainable protected area financing system, with associated management structures, systems and capacities needed to ensure the effective use of generated revenues for priority biodiversity

conservation needs. It will achieve this objective by strengthening: Legal, policy, regulatory and institutional frameworks that facilitate revenue generation, revenue retention and other aspects of sustainable PA financing and management are established and functional. Levels of financial resource mobilization are adequate to ensure effective conservation-oriented management of Egypt's PA system. And Business planning and cost-effective management systems are ensuring the effective allocation and management of mobilized resources.

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>1</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 ([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 **Egypt**, including the following project sites in **Sinai, Cairo, Western Desert, Red Sea and Upper Egypt**. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

### **key stakeholders:**

- The Egyptian Environmental Affairs Agency (Ministry of Environment)
- Nature Conservation Sector, EEAA
- United Nations Development Programme, Egypt Country Office
- The Ministry of Tourism,
- Rangers of different Protected areas
- Civil society,
- Private sector, and
- Universities/research institutes.

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in [Annex B](#) of this Terms of Reference.

---

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

## EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see [Annex A](#)), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact**. Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in [Annex D](#).

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

## PROJECT FINANCE / COFINANCE

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

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

## MAINSTREAMING

---

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

## IMPACT

---

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.<sup>2</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 **Egypt**. 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 **22** days according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
<b>Preparation</b>	4 days	<i>1<sup>st</sup> of March 2020</i>
<b>Evaluation Mission</b>	6 days	<i>End of March 2020</i>
<b>Draft Evaluation Report</b>	10 days	<i>1<sup>st</sup> of April 2020</i>
<b>Final Report</b>	2 days	<i>1<sup>st</sup> of May 2020</i>

---

<sup>2</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 DELIVERABLES

---

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
<b>Inception Report</b>	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission. <b>1st of March 2020</b>	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
<b>Presentation</b>	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission	To project management, UNDP CO
<b>Draft Final Report</b>	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission <b>1st of April 2020</b>	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs
<b>Final Report*</b>	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft <b>1st of May 2020</b>	Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC.

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

## TEAM COMPOSITION

---

The evaluation team will be composed of one international evaluator. The consultant shall have prior experience in evaluating similar biodiversity 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.

The Team members must present the following qualifications:

- Advanced university degree in Biological Science, Economics, Sustainable Development, or related discipline (20%)
- Minimum 7 years of relevant professional experience in the area of biodiversity and ecosystem (20%)
- Knowledge of UNDP and GEF (5%)
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies; (20%)
- Good communication and analytical skills (5%)
- Good command of English language, both written and spoken (20%)
- Previous work experience in the region is an asset (5%)
- Previous experience with gender-sensitive analysis (5%)

## 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%	Acceptance of Inception Report prior to the field visit
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

1. Applicants are requested to apply no later than **February 2, 2020**. Individual consultants are invited to submit their applications together with an updated P11 form for this position either online (on UNDP website) or by email to the Procurement Unit, [Procurementnotice.egypt@undp.org](mailto:Procurementnotice.egypt@undp.org).
2. The application should contain a current and complete **Personal History Form** ([P11 form](#)<sup>3</sup>) in English including the e-mail and phone contact, together with a **Financial offer** including a lumpsum for the fees excluding the travel costs that will be covered as per UNDP rules and regulations.
3. 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.

---

<sup>3</sup> [http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11\\_Personal\\_history\\_form.doc](http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc)

#### 4. ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Project strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Assumptions
<b>Objective:</b> Establishment of a sustainable protected area financing system, with associated management structures, systems and capacities needed to ensure the effective use of generated revenues for priority biodiversity conservation needs	Level and diversity of financing for the PA system	Financing of protected areas is below 20% of basic scenario  Only two predominant sources (government and tourism) in use	At project end, achieved levels of revenue are within 10% of projection and the trend in growth rates sets the NCS on track to meet the optimal scenario by year 10 <sup>4</sup>  At least two new, reliable sources of funds are established	NCS financial	External shocks do not affect flagship species and corals  External financial fluctuations do not affect financial projections and revenues
	Levels of live coral coverage in dive sites and non-dive sites	Most Red Sea dive sites are being degraded by heavy and careless diving	No significant degradation measured in new dive sites to be opened to special seasonal tourists Degradation in old dive sites does not increase	Field surveys	
	Flagship species at priority PAs	Flagship species at several priority PAs have been declining, including:  (Species to be defined)	Flagship species in PAs of terrestrial biomes recover or maintained, including:  (Species to be defined)	Field surveys	

<sup>4</sup> Achievement at year 6 to be measured by applying following formula :  $R_n = \text{Net PA System revenue for year } n$ ; (actual  $R_6 - \text{scenario } R_6$ )/scenario  $R_6$  should be between -0,1 and 0,1.;  $GR_6 = \text{growth rate of } R \text{ from year 5 to year 6}$ ; actual  $R_6 * (1 + GR_6)^4 - \text{scenario } R_{10}$ /(scenario  $R_{10}$ ) should be between -0,1 and 0,1

<b>Outcome 1:</b> Policy, regulatory and institutional frameworks that facilitate revenue generation, revenue retention and other aspects of sustainable PA financing and management are established and operational	National PA financing strategy	No strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comprehensive 5-year financing strategy, including a financial needs assessment defining targets, standards, procedures and criteria for resource allocation, is approved at ministerial level by end of year 2</li> </ul>	Project reports	Changes in political leadership and priorities remain conducive to action on protected areas conservation and financing.
	Institutional arrangements	Ad-hoc arrangements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explicit policies and procedures to negotiate, monitor and implement institutional arrangements with business and social actors</li> </ul>	Project reports	
	Financial arrangements for revenue re-injection	Generated revenues are co-mingled with revenues from other sources and allocations to NCS are ad-hoc and minimal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Internal registry system (accounting system) for NCS established within EPF, accounting for revenues generated and disbursements, by end of project inception period.</li> </ul>	Project reports	
	Policy regarding re-injection	No policies to guide level of re-injection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Revenue re-injection: A Ministerial Decree establishing a 10-year policy of achieving an optimal financing scenario largely through re-injected revenues.</li> </ul>	Published Ministerial Decree	
	Institutional structure and human capacities	Minimal human capacities or institutional structure to address issues of financial sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Financial sustainability unit established at Headquarters level</li> </ul>	Project reports	
	Legal and regulatory framework	41% - 39 out of 95	76% - 72 out of 95	Financial sustainability scorecard	
<b>Outcome 2:</b> Levels of financial resource mobilization are	Improved financial sustainability for PAs, as measured by the <a href="#">Financial</a>			Financial Sustainability scorecard	EEAA and other relevant agencies agree to allow NCS to adopt more aggressive revenue

adequate to ensure effective conservation-oriented management of Egypt's PA system	<a href="#">Sustainability Scorecard</a>				generating options, once these have been developed and their potential impacts, e.g., on demand, are better understood
	Business planning	41% - 25 out of 61	82% - 50 out of 61		
	Tools for revenue generation	43% - 31 out of 57	88% - 50 out of 57		
		Total 42% - 95 out of 227	Total 76% - 172 out of 227		
	Revenues generated	2005-2008 annual average of \$3.7 million USD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Revenues generated by PA system over 6-year project duration total approximately \$74 million with final exact figures depending on final financial needs assessments and basic and optimal scenarios</li> </ul>	NCS audited accounts/EPF accounts	
	Revenues re-injected	2005-2008 annual average of \$595,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Revenues re-injected into PA system over 6-year project duration total approximately \$53 million, with final exact figures depending on final financial needs assessments and basic and optimal scenarios</li> </ul>	NCS audited accounts/EPF accounts	
	Diversified revenues	95% of revenues generated by fees; Entrance fees at Ras Mohamed generating 53% of total system revenues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At least 25 % of revenues are being generated by sources other than user fees</li> <li>No single site generating more than 40% of PA system revenues</li> </ul>	NCS audited accounts	
<b>Outcome 3:</b> Business planning and cost-effective management systems are ensuring the effective allocation and management of	METT Scores	Baseline scores Ras Mohamed – 69 Wadi El-Gemal/Hamata – 64 St. Katherine – 63 White Desert – 60 Nabq – 59 Wadi Degla – 51 Red Sea Northern Islands – 47	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improved management effectiveness in eight PAs altogether covering 1.85 million ha., as follows:</li> </ul> Ras Mohamed – 85 Wadi El-Gemal/Hamata – 85 Wadi-el Rayan – 80	METTs	NCS and local partners are open to change in management styles and modalities and engage in meaningful management and partnerships.

mobilized			St. Katherine – 80 White Desert – 75 Nabq – 80 Wadi Degla – 75 Red Sea Northern Islands – 75		
	Business planning	Business plans in 2-3 sites, but not operational  Management plans in several sites, but lacking funds for implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By end of project, eight priority PAs are operated according to a full and consistent set of business and management planning tools</li> <li>• Standardized, high quality</li> </ul>	Project reports	
	Alternative management	Ad-hoc arrangements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community partnership system tested in at least one PA</li> </ul>	Partnership agreement	
	Accounting, audit & reporting	Systems in place do not reach international standards	International standards systems in place by end of project	Published audits	

---

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

---

1. Project document
2. Annual Project Review (APR)/Project Implementation Report (PIR)
3. Mid Term Evaluation Report
4. Project Technical Reports
5. Project brochures and awareness materials

## ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

*This is a generic list, to be further detailed with more specific questions by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on the particulars of the project.*

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
<b>Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?</b>			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
<b>Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?</b>			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•		•	•
<b>Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?</b>			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
<b>Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?</b>			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
<b>Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?</b>			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•



## ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

---

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

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

---

### **Evaluators:**

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

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form<sup>5</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>5</sup>[www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct](http://www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct)

## ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE<sup>6</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>7</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>8</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:

---

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

<sup>7</sup> UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

<sup>8</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.

- 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)*