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 *Strengthen national decision making towards ratification of the Minamata Convention and build capacity towards implementation of future provisions project.* (PIMS #5410.)

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

Project Summary Table

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Title: |  | | | | | |
| GEF Project ID: | | 6959 |  | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | | *at completion (Million US$)* |
| UNDP Project ID: | | 5410 | GEF financing: | $1,000,000 | | $1,000,000 |
| Country: | | Bangladesh, Guinea Bissau, Mauritania, Mozambique, and Samoa | IA/EA own: | 0 | | 0 |
| Region: | | multiple | Government: | 0 | | 0 |
| Focal Area: | |  | Other: |  | |  |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): | |  | Total co-financing: |  | |  |
| Executing Agency: | | UNDP | Total Project Cost: |  | |  |
| Other Partners involved: | | UNITAR | ProDoc Signature (date project began): | | | 09.09.2015 |
|  | |  | (Operational) Closing Date: | | Proposed:  30.05.2017 | Actual:  30.06.2019 |

Objective and Scope

The project was designed to:

The project’s objective is to undertake a Mercury Initial Assessment to enable the Governments of the five project countries to determine the national requirements and needs for the ratification of the Minamata Convention and establish a sound foundation to undertake future work towards the implementation of the Convention.

It will do so by implementing 4 components as specified in the GEF guidelines (GEF/C.45/Inf.05 paragraph 19), as well as a fifth component on mainstreaming.

**1. Undertake an assessment of legislation and policies in regard to the implementation of Convention provisions of**

• Article 3;

• Article 5;

• Article 7 (including legislation and policy to cover formalization, worker health and safety);

• Article 8 (specifically in regard to relevant national air pollution/emission standards and regulations);

• Article 9 (specifically in regard to the ability to identify and categorize sources of releases).

The policy and legislative assessment will be undertaken through a review of existing legislation on chemicals management and identification of the gaps prevalent in association to issues of mercury. In addition the legislation review will assess the necessary steps for the establishment of a National Mercury Coordination/Consultation Mechanism.

**2. Undertake an initial assessment of Mercury in the following categories:**

• Stocks of mercury and/or mercury compounds and import and export procedures including an assessment of the storage conditions;

• Supply of mercury, including sources, recycling activities and quantities;

• Sectors that use mercury and the amount per year, including manufacturing processes, ASGM and mercury added products;

• Trade in mercury and mercury containing compounds.

**3. Identify:**

• Emission sources of mercury;

• Release sources of mercury to land and water.

**4. Assess institutional and capacity needs to implement the Convention.**

Institutional capacity of governmental institutions and agencies will be assessed to determine the capacity needs and gaps that exist for the implementation of the Convention and propose intervention to strengthen these institutions and capacity. The assessment will also review the systems needed to report to the Convention under article 21.

The institutional capacity gaps identified and the findings of the legislation and policy review will used to formulate a number of priority actions, which will be included in the Mercury Initial Assessment Report. Proposed actions will be discussed and agreed upon among the key stakeholders mentioned above through several rounds of discussions.

**5. Mainstream national Mercury priorities in national policies and plans to raise the importance of Hg priority interventions:**

• Identify national mercury priorities;

• Assess opportunities for mainstreaming Hg priorities;

• Mainstream Hg priority interventions in relevant policies/plans.

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.

Though as per project document a mid-term evaluation was foreseen, it was agreed amongst UNDP and UNITAR that the evaluation will be a light terminal evaluation, implemented with budgetary restrictions. The terminal evaluation will only cover the project.

Evaluation approach and method

The evaluation is to be undertaken in accordance with the [UNITAR Monitoring and Evaluation Policy Framework](http://www.unitar.org/sites/default/files/uploads/pprs/monitoring-and-evaluation_revised_april_2017.pdf) and the [United Nations norms and standards for evaluation.](http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1914) The evaluation will be undertaken by a supplier or an international consultant (the “evaluator”) under the overall responsibility of the UNITAR Planning, Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Unit (PPME).

An overall approach and method[[1]](#footnote-1) 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*](#_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 *Istanbul to attend Final Global MIA workshop at which the focal points of four out of the five countries (except Samoa) will be present.* Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

* Ministries of Environment - Responsible for providing policies pertaining to environmental protection e.g. such as National Environmental Policies, Environmental Management Acts and its Regulations, programmes and projects.
* Ministries of Finance – Responsible for determining opportunities for mainstreaming existing financial mechanisms (e.g. collateral registries) that can be used to access financing for informal sectors such as ASGM.
* Ministries of Health – The Ministry is responsible for the development and implementation of health policies and assumes responsibilities related to monitoring, control, regulation and standardization. In addition, the Ministry registers medical devices and monitors companies that import, manufacture, distribute and / or store medical equipment and devices.
* Ministries of Energy – Ensuring that electricity systems functions with reliability and productivity, and promoting innovation in the energy sector.
* Ministries of Mining – Formulation and administration of the rules and regulations and laws relating to mines and responsible for survey and exploration of all minerals.
* Ministries of Local Government and Municipalities/City Councils - Regulate and supervise waste management in municipalities/districts/councils and are responsible for hazardous waste storage and disposal.

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](#_TOR_Annex_B:) of this Terms of Reference.

Evaluation Criteria & Ratings

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework ( [Annex A](#_TOR_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](#_TOR_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.[[2]](#footnote-2)

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 UNITAR. UNITAR 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 25 days according to the following plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Timing | Completion Date |
| **Preparation** | 3 days *(recommended: 2-4)* | *25.03.2019 (just before the mission though)* |
| **Evaluation Mission** | 11 days (*r: 7-15)* | *26.03.-27.03.2019 plus data collection* |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | 9 days (*r: 5-10*) | *19.5.2019* |
| **Final Report** | *2* days *(r;: 1-2*) | *16.06.2019* |

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 UNITAR |
| **Presentation** | Initial Findings | End of evaluation mission | To project management, UNITAR |
| **Draft Final Report** | Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes | Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission | Sent to UNITAR, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs |
| **Final Report\*** | Revised report | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft | Sent for uploading to UNITAR |

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

Team Composition

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

The evaluator must present the following qualifications:

* Minimum 7 years of relevant professional experience
* Knowledge of UNDP and GEF
* Previous experience with results‐based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
* Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s) (environment)
* Fluency in English and French. Portuguese is an advantage.

• Field work experience in developing countries.

• Excellent research and analytical skills, including experience in a variety of evaluation methods and approaches.

• Excellent writing skills.

• Strong communication and presentation skills.

• Cross-cultural awareness and flexibility.

• Availability to travel.

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'](http://www.unevaluation.org/ethicalguidelines)

Payment modalities and specifications

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| % | Milestone |
| *50%* | Following submission and approval of the Inception Report |
| *50%* | Following submission and approval (UNITAR and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report |

Application process

Applicants are requested to apply online by sending an email to [evaluation@unitar.org](mailto:evaluation@unitar.org) by 17 March 2019. Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions. The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in English with indication of the e‐mail and phone contact. Shortlisted candidates will be requested to submit a price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs).

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

Annex A: Project Logical Framework

# SECTION II: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

| **Objective/ Outcome** | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **End of Project target** | **Source of Information** | **Risks and assumptions** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Objective of the Project:** Undertake a Mercury Initial Assessment (MIA) to enable the Governments of Bangladesh, Guinea-Bissau, Mauritania, Mozambique, and Samoa to determine the national requirements and needs for the ratification of the Minamata Convention and establish a national foundation to undertake future work towards the implementation of the Convention. | | | | | |
| **Component 1:**  Establishment of enabling environment for decision-making on the ratification of the Minamata Convention. | ***Key Outputs*:**  **1.1: National Coordination/Consultation Mechanism on Mercury operational.**  1.1: National Coordination/Consultation Mechanism on Mercury established.  **1.2 Policy and regulatory framework, and institutional and capacity needs in regard to the implementation of Convention provisions assessed.**  1.2 Assessment report prepared on the existing and required policy and regulatory framework as well as institutional capacity to implement the Convention (*incl. overview of existing barriers*).  **1.3 Awareness raised on the environmental and health impacts of Mercury.**  1.3 Hg awareness raising activities conducted targeting decision makers and population groups at risk.  **1.4: Project countries equipped and prepared for the mainstreaming of national Mercury Priorities**  1.4: Socio-economic studies on Mercury priorities completed; Awareness of decision makers raised; Mainstreaming road maps developed | | | | |
| **Outcome 1.1:** National Coordination/Consultation Mechanism on Mercury operational | * Awareness on Mercury issues created among all project stakeholders. * One regional and five national Inception Workshops organized. * National Coordination/Consultation Mechanism on Mercury established | * Some of the project countries do have chemicals related coordination mechanisms in place – however these require strengthening in terms of the life-cycle management of Hg. Other project countries do not have such mechanisms in place. | * One regional inception workshop/GPB meeting organized. * National Project Inception Workshops organized in each of the project countries. * National Coordination/Consultation Mechanism on Mercury, which is authorized to take decisions on Mercury, meets at least once every 6 months. | * Copy of Government decision/degree which established the Hg Coordination/Consultation Mechanism. * Copy of meeting minutes | **Assumption**: It is assumed that in the situation that a country disposes of an Inter-Agency Coordinating Mechanism on Chemicals – responsibilities related to Mercury can easily be added to their TORs.  **Risk**: Low |
| **Outcome 1.2**: Policy and regulatory framework, and institutional and capacity needs in regard to the implementation of Convention provisions assessed. | * Assessment Report finalized. | * None of the project countries have yet undertaken a comprehensive assessment of their policy and regulatory framework in light of the requirements for Minamata implementation. | * Institutional capacities, and the policy and regulatory framework in place to management of Mercury, assessed, gaps and needs identified. * Barriers that would hinder implementation of the Convention identified. * Assessment reviewed and discussed by Mercury Focus Group. | * Assessment Report * Meeting minutes * List of participants | **Assumption**: It is assumed that all involved institutions are willing to share information about current capacity, gaps and needs.  **Risk**: Low |
| **Outcome 1.3**: Awareness raised on the environmental and health impacts of Mercury. | * Awareness on the health effects of Mercury increased among decision makers, the general public and population groups at risk. | * Some awareness of the impacts of Mercury is present – although the degree of awareness varies greatly by project country and sector. | * National Assessment on health and environmental impacts of Mercury concluded. * Population groups at risk identified. * Awareness raising plan finalized. * Public awareness raising campaign organized on the health and environmental effects of Mercury and how to manage Hg containing wastes properly. * Awareness raised among decisions makers and population groups at risk. * Preventive programmes on occupational exposure implemented. | * Awareness raising plan * News articles (tv, newspaper, internet, etc.) * Awareness raising materials (flyers, brochures, etc.) | **Assumption**: It is assumed that all government institutions are willing to share accurate information about the health effects of Mercury and the potential health exposure for certain risk groups.  **Risk**: Medium |
| **Outcome 1.4:** Project countries equipped and prepared for the mainstreaming of national Mercury Priorities | * Socio-economic study on Mercury priority(ies) completed in each project country. * Awareness of decision makers raised. * Mainstreaming road maps developed for each project country. * Sample text for mainstreaming prepared for each country. | * In none of the project countries priorities related to Mercury have been mainstreamed. Neither do nat. government budgets contain activities/budget lines for mercury lifecycle management. | * Socio-economic study on Mercury priority(ies) completed in each project country. * Awareness of decision makers raised. * Mainstreaming road maps developed for each project country. * Sample text for mainstreaming prepared for each country. | * Hg priorities/activities are reflected in relevant action/development plans and/or policies. | **Assumption**: It is assumed that once the project has agreed on which Hg priorities to mainstream, national development plans are being reviewed and it is timely to mainstream selected priorities.  **Risk**: High |
| **Outcome 2:**  Development of National Mercury Profile and Mercury Initial Assessment Report | ***Key Outputs*:**  **2.1 National capacity built to undertake Mercury inventories.**  2.1 Capacity building and training conducted to commence the Mercury inventory.  **2.2 National Mercury Profile available.**  2.2 Mercury Inventory conducted and sector description by usage of Mercury developed.  **2.3 National MIA Report available.**  2.3 National MIA Report for the ratification and implementation of the Convention prepared (*including proposed policy/regulatory interventions, inst. Cap. Building and required investment plans*). | | | | |
| **Outcome 2.1**: National capacity built to undertake Mercury inventories. | * 5 teams of national experts trained on conducting Mercury Inventories (at regional level) * National technical experts (consultants and Mercury Focus Group members) trained on data collection methodologies, reliability, credibility and data analysis. | * Bangladesh: Some limited capacity was build as part of an assessment of Mercury sources and hotspots in Bangladesh (ESDO, 2012). * Mozambique: Limited capacity following assessment of mining activities (2000) * Guinea-Bissau/Mauritania/Samoa no capacity on conducting inventories. | * National technical experts trained to be able to undertake the Mercury Inventory. * National Mercury Coordination/Consultation Mechanism members trained to be able to review the Hg Inventory. | * Training materials/handouts * List of participants | **Assumption**: It is assumed that the project will have available sufficient funds to hire technical experts that have already a proven track record in the area of Hg.  **Risk**: Medium |
| **Outcome 2.2:** National Mercury Profile available. | * Mercury profile finalized. | * None of the project countries have a Mercury Profile. | * Methodology and work programme on how to conduct the inventory submitted and approved by the project board. * Mercury Inventory (Level 2) completed, incl.: * Overview of emission and releases sources * Inventory of wastes (stockpiles and generation rates) * Assessment of current practices to manage Hg * Identification of main risk groups * Recommendations for improved Hg management prepared. * National Mercury Profile finalized. | * Excel files containing inventory data * Mercury profile. | **Assumption**: The project team is able to collect the necessary data and information that would be necessary to prepare a high quality Mercury Profile.  **Risk**: Low |
| **Outcome 2.3:** National MIA Report available. | * National MIA Report finalized. * Regional/National reporting/validation workshops organized to approve/adopt the project’s outputs (Inventory, Mercury Profile, MIA Report, Mainstreaming Roadmap). | * None of the project countries have a National MIA Report. | * MIA Report prepared, containing: * Institutional structures available to implement the Convention. * Barriers for implementation of the Convention. * Summary of Mercury Profile. * Identification of technical and financial needs for implementation of the Convention. * Inventory of wastes (stockpiles and generation rates) * Proposal for action. * Recommendations for policy and regulatory revisions. * Lessons-Learned Report prepared. * MIA Report reviewed, approved and adopted. * One regional, or five national reporting/validation workshops will be organized to approve/adopt the projects outputs, among else the Inventory report, Mercury Profile, MIA Report and Mainstreaming Roadmap. | * MIA Report * Meeting minutes * List of participants | **Assumption**: The MIA report is of sufficiently high quality and in line with government expectations, that it can be approved and adopted relatively fast.  **Risk**: Low |

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

*• Project document: GEF Application Form*

*• Logical framework*

*• Agreements*

*• Grant-out agreements with partner countries*

*• Narrative reports*

*• Financial reports*

*• Feedback Survey and Training Event Follow-up Questionnaire on UNITAR’s Event Management System*

*• Content from face-to-face events*

*• Any other document deemed to be useful to the evaluation*

Annex C: Evaluation Questions

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

| **Evaluative Criteria Questions** | | **Indicators** | **Sources** | **Methodology** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels? | | | | |
|  | * Is the project reaching its intended users and relevant to the beneficiaries needs and priorities? |  |  |  |
|  | * To what extent is the project contributing to supporting Member States to implement Agenda 2030? |  |  |  |
|  | * To what extent has the project been relevant for advancing gender equality, the empowerment of women and meeting the needs of other groups made vulnerable? |  |  |  |
| Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? | | | | | |
|  | * To what extent has the project contributed to determine the national requirements and needs for the ratification of the Minamata Convention? |  |  |  | |
|  | * To what extent has the project contributed to create a foundation to undertake future work towards the implementation of the Minamata Convention? |  |  |  | |
|  | * To what extent has the project contributed to create an enabling environment to strengthen national decision-making for the ratification of the Minamata Convention? |  |  |  | |
|  | * What factors have influences the achievement or non-achievement of the project’s objectives? |  |  |  | |
|  | * To what extent were a human-rights based approach and a gender mainstreaming strategy incorporated in the design and implementation of the project? |  |  |  | |
|  | * To what extent has the project been successful in supporting the partner countries beneficiaries’ in applying their knowledge and skills to undertake Mercury inventories? |  |  |  | |
| Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards? | | | | | |
|  | * To what extent have the outputs been produced in a cost-efficient manner in comparison with alternative approaches? |  |  |  | |
|  | * Were the objectives achieved on time? |  |  |  | |
|  | * How efficient are the management arrangements? |  |  |  | |
| Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? | | | | | |
|  | * To what extent are the results likely to endure beyond the implementation of the activities? |  |  |  | |
|  | * What is the likelihood that the benefits of the project will continue after funding ceases in the mid- and long-term? |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
| **Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?** | | | | | |
|  | * What real difference has the project made with regards to environmental and health impacts of Mercury? |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |

Annex D: Rating Scales

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution*** | ***Sustainability ratings:*** | ***Relevance ratings*** |
| 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 | 4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability | 2. Relevant (R) |
| 3. Moderately Likely (ML):moderate risks | 1.. Not relevant (NR) |
| 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks  1. Unlikely (U): severe risks | ***Impact Ratings:***  3. Significant (S)  2. Minimal (M)  1. Negligible (N) |
| *Additional ratings where relevant:*  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[[3]](#footnote-3)**

**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: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Annex F: Evaluation Report Outline[[4]](#footnote-4)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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[[5]](#footnote-5)) |
| **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[[6]](#footnote-6)) |
| **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) (\*) * 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 UNITAR and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and included in the final document)*

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNITAR

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

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

UNDP GEF RTA

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

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

1. For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](http://www.undp.org/evaluation/handbook), Chapter 7, pg. 163 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office:  [ROTI Handbook 2009](http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/M2_ROtI%20Handbook.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. The Report length should not exceed *20-30* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. 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. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)